<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>CONTENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>ANDERSON, J. K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>BOOTH, N. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>BOWRA, C. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>CARNEY, T. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>CHALK, H. H. O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>CORBETT, P. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>DOVER, K. J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>EDWARDS, M. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>GOW, A. S. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>GRAHAM, A. J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>HOOKER, G. T. W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>MacDOWELL, D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>NORMAN, A. F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>PLOMMER, W. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>URE, A. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168.</td>
<td>VAN DER WAERDEN, B. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181.</td>
<td>WATERS, K. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191.</td>
<td>FRENCH, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191.</td>
<td>MITFORD, T. B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194.</td>
<td>SEALEY, R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.</td>
<td>NOTICES OF BOOKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.</td>
<td>BOOKS RECEIVED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251.</td>
<td>INDEXES.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES ON SOME POINTS IN XENOPHON'S ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΗΣ.**
**EMPEDOCLES' ACCOUNT OF BREATHING.**
**HOMERIC EPIPTHESES FOR TROY.**
**PLUTARCH'S STYLE IN THE MARIUS.**
**EROS AND THE LESBIAN PASTORALS OF LONGUS.**
**THE BURGON AND BLACAS TOMBS.**
**ΔΕΚΑΤΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΣ.**
**REPRESENTATION OF MAENADS ON ARCHAIC RED-Figure VASES.**
**THE GALLUS AND THE LION.**
**THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE OPKION TΩΝ ΟΙΚΕΤΡΩΝ OF CYRENE.**
**THE TOPOGRAPHY OF THE FROGS.**
**AIGINA AND THE DELIAN LEAGUE.**
**THE BOOK TRADE IN FOURTH-CENTURY ANTIOCH.**
**THE ARCHAIC ACROPOLIS: SOME PROBLEMS.**
**EUBOEAN LEKANAI.**
**GREEK ASTRONOMICAL CALENDARS AND THEIR RELATION TO THE ATHENIAN CIVIL CALENDAR.**
**SOLON'S 'PRICE-EQUALISATION'.**
**A NOTE ON THUCYDIDES iii 68.5.**
**THE SYLLABIC INSCRIPTION, HOFFMANN No. 106.**
**THEOPOMPOS AND ATHENIAN LIES.**

---

**THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES**

31–34 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1.

**PUBLISHED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE SOCIETY**

Price £3 net
THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENTIC STUDIES

President
PROF. R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, F.B.A.

Vice-Presidents
The following ex-Presidents:
SIR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE, D.Litt., LL.D., 1938–41
PROF. DOROTHY TARRANT, 1954–56

SIR FRANK ADCOCK, D.Litt., F.B.A.
PROF. BERNARD ASHMOLE, C.B.E., F.B.A.
PROF. N. H. BAYNES, D.D., F.B.A.
SIR JOHN BEAZLEY, Litt.D., F.B.A.

and

SIR HAROLD IDRIS BELL, C.B., O.B.E., F.B.A.
SIR JOHN FORSDYKE, K.C.B.
PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, F.B.A.
E. S. G. ROBINSON, C.B.E., F.B.A.
SIR JOHN SHEPPARD, M.B.E., Litt.D.

Council
Elected 1958
PROF. A. J. BEATTIE
J. BOARDMAN
PROF. J. M. R. CORMACK
A. H. COXON
DR. V. EHRENBERG
PROF. W. K. C. GUTHRIE, F.B.A.
PROF. R. J. HOPPER
PROF. L. R. PALMER
DR. D. K. REES
PROF. R. E. WYCHERLEY

Elected 1959
PROF. A. ANDREWES, F.B.A.
R. S. BLUCK
J. CHADWICK
PROF. J. M. COOK
R. M. COOK
PROF. R. A. CROSSLAND
MISS A. DUKE
A. J. GRAHAM
G. S. KIRK, F.B.A.
PROF. C. MARTIN ROBERTSON

Elected 1960
PROF. H. C. BALDRY
V. DESBOROUGH
MISS N. G. DUNBAR
M. J. FINLEY
W. G. FORREST
G. T. GRIFFITH
R. A. HIGGINS
H. LLOYD-JONES
T. T. B. RYDER
DR. F. H. STUBBINGS

Editorial Committee
JOHN BOARDMAN (Editor)
PROF. P. T. STEVENS (Review Editor)

PROF. A. ANDREWES
G. S. KIRK

Trustees
PROF. C. MARTIN ROBERTSON
| PROF. BERNARD ASHMOLE
| PROF. R. J. H. JENKINS

Hon. Treasurer
BERNARD RICKATSON-HATT

Hon. Secretary
SIR JOHN FORSDYKE, K.C.B.

Hon. Secretary for U.S.A.
PROF. STERLING DOW

Secretary
MRS. F. M. BUTT, M.A.

Hon. Auditors
MESSRS. DAVEY, BRIDGATER & CO.,
91-9 BISHOPS GATE, LONDON, E.C.3.

Bankers
MESSRS. COUTTS & CO.,
15 LOMBARD STREET, E.C.3.

Officers of the Joint Library
Hon. Librarian
PROF. E. G. TURNER, F.B.A.

Librarian
MISS J. E. SOUTHAN

Keeper of Lantern Slides
MRS. M. J. THORNTON

Contributions to the Journal should be sent to John Boardman, The Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. Books intended for review should be addressed to The Librarian, 51-53 Gordon Square, W.C.I.
CROMER GREEK PRIZE

With the view of maintaining and encouraging the study of Greek, particularly among the young, the late Lord Cromer founded a Prize, to be administered by the British Academy, for the best Essay on any subject connected with the language, history, art, literature, or philosophy of Ancient Greece.

The Prize, which is ordinarily a sum of £150, is awarded biennially in May,* under the following Rules:

1. Competition is open to all British subjects and subjects of Eire of either sex who will be under thirty-five years of age on 31 December preceding the award.

2. Any such person desirous of competing must send in to the Secretary of the British Academy on or before 1 June of the year preceding the award the title of the subject proposed by him or her. The Academy may approve (with or without modification) or disapprove the subject; their decision will be intimated to the competitor as soon as possible.

3. Preference will be given, in approval of subjects proposed, to those which deal with aspects of the Greek genius and civilization of large and permanent significance over those which are of a minute or highly technical character.

4. Any Essay which has already received or is in competition for another prize of the same nature will be inadmissible. A candidate to whom the Prize has been awarded will not be eligible to compete for it again. But an Essay which has not received the Prize may be submitted again (with or without alteration) in a future year so long as the writer remains eligible under Rule 1.

5. Essays of which the subject has been approved must be sent in to the Secretary of the Academy on or before 31 December of the year preceding the award. They must be typed or printed and should have a note attached stating the main sources of information used.

6. It is recommended that the Essays should not exceed 20,000 words, exclusive of notes. Notes should not run to an excessive length.

7. The Adjudicators shall be free to consider published work not submitted.

Communications should be addressed to 'The Secretary of the British Academy, Burlington Gardens, London, W.1'.

* The next award will be in 1951.
The Woodwork of Greek Roofs
A. TREVOR HODGE
Dr Hodge demonstrates the construction of the wooden roofing of classical Greek temples of the era 600-400 B.C. in Greece, Southern Italy, and Sicily, from a study of existing stonework and of ancient documents. 26 plans; 50 photographs. Ready September.
About 55s. net

Towards a Text of Cicero: Ad Atticum
D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY
Dr Shackleton Bailey is preparing a text of Ad Atticum Ix-xvi for the series Oxford Classical Texts. In this preparatory volume he gives a number of difficult or corrupt passages with a discussion of their difficulties, and makes suggestions for emendations.
CAMBRIDGE CLASSICAL STUDIES.
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Plato: Gorgias
A Revised Text with Introduction and Commentary by E. R. Dodds
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Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica
Edited by Sir David Ross
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A SHORT INTRODUCTION
TO THE GREEK LANGUAGE

by George THOMSON
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Based on courses given at Birmingham University, designed for beginners, this book starts with historical and comparative linguistics, then presents the history of Greek from the ancient language to Modern Greek. It is hoped that the book will serve both as a textbook for classes and as an introduction for individual students.

EARLY GREEK ELEGISTS

by Sir Maurice BOWRA
(The Martin Classical Lectures 1935)
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Pagan Mysteries in the Renaissance

"His book ... touches more than Italian painting. It touches Spenser, Donne, Yeats, indeed by implication all art of a natural glow that is beyond Nature." Geoffrey Grigson The Observer

"... the philosophy of the Renaissance and its relation to the art of its own day must be studied with new and special methods. In this direction Edgar Wind's book undoubtedly represents a contribution of the greatest importance."
Eugenio Garin The Burlington Magazine

"... difficult, absorbing, and disturbing, a fascinating combination of high scholarship and massive commonsense." Eric John The Tablet

"The urbanity with which Professor Wind moves between the fields of art, literature, philosophy and theology ... provides the fullest means of restating the concept, both in painting and poetry." W. M. Marchant Art News and Review

"Of the scores of interpretations of Botticelli's Primavera, his seems to me the most convincing and the most poetic. . . ."
Sir Kenneth Clark The Listener

"... a tour de force in iconographical method."
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Faber and Faber Limited

T. BURTON-BROWN

Early Mediterranean Migrations

The author, an assistant keeper at the Manchester Museum, describes pottery found in Kahun in lower Egypt by Sir Flinders Petrie, and now housed in the Manchester Museum. Its particular interest is that parallels to some of the vessels have been found in other regions of the Near East. The existence of such similarities has not been fully appreciated or studied in the past because of the incompleteness of the documentation.

In addition to examining the pottery, the author describes the Near Eastern archaeology of the earliest part of the second millennium which he considers is illuminated by the Kahun objects. He suggests that periodic migrations from east to west greatly influenced the development of the local civilisations of the Near East and seeks to support this view by examining the evidence of objects which point towards the presence in the Near East at this time of branches of Indo-European speaking peoples.

Demy 8vo. 18s. net

A. ROWE

Cyrenaican Expeditions 1955–7

In 1952, under the sponsorship of the University of Manchester, Mr A. Rowe directed archaeological excavations in the ancient city of Cyrene. Work was resumed during the years 1955, 1956 and 1957 under the same auspices. The first technical account of the free-standing and rock-cut tombs at Cyrene, as well as a brief historical sketch of Cyrenaica as a whole, was published in 1956 under the title Cyrenaican Expedition, 1952. This new volume continues the description of the tombs and includes details of the objects found in all four expeditions, together with a section on the coins, contributed by John F. Healy.

14 figures, 42 half-tone plates containing over 130 illustrations, and 4 colour plates. Demy 4to. 42s net
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SUPPLEMENTUM EPIGRAPHICUM GRAECUM

S.E.G. is published regularly as a review of Greek Epigraphy. As far as possible, it gives references to work done during each year on or relating to Greek inscriptions, and reprints new or emended texts. This offers a service which, it is hoped, is of value not only to epigraphic specialists but also to classical scholars in general.

To assist him in making the Supplementum as complete as possible, the editor would be grateful if scholars who publish studies on Greek Epigraphy, or substantially using epigraphic material, would send him a notice (or if possible a reprint) of their work. Their co-operation in this way would be greatly appreciated.

All communications should be addressed to the Editor

A. G. WOODHEAD, CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND

CAMBRIDGE EPIGRAPHICAL COLLECTION

The attention of members is drawn to the collection of squeezes of Greek inscriptions in the Museum of Classical Archaeology at Cambridge.

This collection already contains about 2,000 squeezes. These are drawn mainly from Attica and Asia Minor; but additions are constantly being made from all parts of the Greek world.

Members of the Society who may wish to consult this collection are cordially invited to do so; and in special cases arrangements can be made for sending out a small number of squeezes on loan by post. The Museum authorities would also receive most gratefully any squeezes in private possession which their owners might wish to make available for general use.

Enquiries should be addressed to

THE LIBRARIAN, MUSEUM OF CLASSICAL ARCHAEOLOGY
LITTLE ST. MARY'S LANE, CAMBRIDGE
The Geographical Fragments of Hipparchus

edited by D. R. DICKS

Last edited in 1869, the extant Greek fragments of Hipparchus' important treatise Against the 'Geography' of Eratosthenes are here collected with translations, a detailed commentary, and an introduction which discusses Hipparchus' contribution to the development of ancient mathematical geography in the light of modern research. UNIVERSITY OF LONDON CLASSICAL STUDIES, NO. 1. 45s net

Menander's Dyskolos

translated into English prose by W. G. ARNOTT

This is the first English translation of the Dyskolos to be published and is specially intended for stage production. Mr. Arnott's version was used for the performance of the play given during the General Meeting of the Classical Association at Southampton in April, 1960. 5s net

Tradition and Personal Achievement in Classical Antiquity

W. K. C. GUTHRIE and B. A. VAN GRONINGEN

The introductory and closing addresses delivered at the Third International Congress of Classical Studies in London, 1959. 3s 6d net

Alfred Edward Housman, 1859-1936

OTTO SKUTSCH

An address delivered at the centenary celebrations in University College London during the Third International Congress of Classical Studies. 3s 6d net
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INSTITUTE OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
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The objects of the Institute are to promote the advancement of the study of Classics; to provide opportunities for contacts between scholars in the Classical field, both within the University and from other centres of learning at home and abroad; and to arrange facilities for advanced study and research and for the training of postgraduate students in Classics and cognate subjects.

PUBLICATIONS

Bulletin (Annual) No. 7 - 1960. Price 10s. (Previous numbers available.)
Bulletin - Supplement No. 9, Monuments Illustrating Old and Middle Comedy by T. B. L. Webster. In the Press.
Studies in Mycenaean Inscriptions and Dialect V - 1959 by John Chadwick, L. R. Palmer and L. J. D. Richardson. Price 5s. (Volumes III and IV available.)

Publications distributed by
INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY BOOKSELLERS LTD.
39 Store Street, London, W.C.1

FONDATION HARDT

The "Fondation Hardt", La Chandoleine, Vandoeuvres near Geneva, Switzerland, is in a position to invite as its guests, for a shorter or longer period, scholars and post-graduates in the field of classics who wish to complete their research in peaceful surroundings. Six guest-rooms are available at the "Fondation", as well as a library consisting of over 8,000 volumes mainly on classical literature.

Applications, accompanied if the case may be by references, should be sent to the above address not later than December 15th of each year for the following year. Applications sent in after that date will only be taken into consideration in special cases. Decisions are taken by the "Conseil Consultatif de la Fondation".
The Slides Collection is arranged in two main sections:

(a) A general collection of over 10,000 slides covering a very wide range of subjects: the major Prehellenic sites, the Greek mainland and islands, Rome and Italy and the Roman Empire; sculpture, vases, painting, mosaic; coins; papyri.

(b) About 40 sets of slides on specific subjects, compiled by specialists who have also written notes to accompany the slides. These include Prehellenic Greece, Greek Gods and Heroes, Homeric Pictures, Greek Drama, Greek Sculpture, Greek Painting, Greek Vases, Athens, Greek Cities, Greek and Roman Architecture, Transport in the Ancient World, Ancient Furniture, Roman Portraits, The Roman Imperial Army, Rome, Ostia, Roman Gaul, Roman Britain, The Roman Wall.

Over 1000 colour slides (2 × 2 in.) are now available. There are sets, with notes, on the Athenian Agora excavations, Ostia and Pompeii; and a general collection which includes many sites in Greece, Roman Britain, Roman France and Italy: Etruscan tomb paintings, Roman frescoes and mosaics, and objects from the Greek and Roman Life room of the British Museum.

Slides are available to all members of each Society at a charge of 10s. a set, or 4d. each for individual slides, plus postage.

A film strip of Greek Gods and Heroes may be hired at a cost of 7s. 6d. Copies may also be bought for 17s. 6d., inclusive of notes.

The annual subscription to each Society is £2. SCHOOLS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR MEMBERSHIP. For particulars apply to the Secretary of either Society at 31–34 Gordon Square, W.C.1.
**Hellenic Air Cruises**

to Greece and the Aegean Islands, Asia Minor, Rhodes, Crete and Istanbul

from

70 guineas

The tour charge in each case includes the following:

- Air travel throughout the tour from London back to London.
- Hotel accommodation throughout the tour with full board. First- or second-class hotels are used.
- Meals on the flights and the services of the crew and air hostess throughout the tour.
- Coach journeys from the London air terminal to airport and vice versa; and between airports and hotels at every point of the tour.
- The services of our couriers or representatives, one of whom will be solely responsible for the passengers at each point.
- All gratuities and taxes at the hotels.

We have a limited number of single rooms for people travelling alone, on payment of a small supplement. In the case of each tour a comprehensive programme of excursions will be arranged, but if you prefer to undertake your visits alone you will not be pressed to participate in the excursions. We engage leading Greek archaeological guides to accompany the excursions.

|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

A fortnight’s Hellenic Air Cruise which provides the opportunity to see many of the outstanding classical sites on the Greek mainland as well as visits to islands in the Aegean.

|--------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

A 12-day air cruise which has been immensely popular and incorporates three-day visits to lovely Rhodes and historic Crete with a final night spent at Pisa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daphni—Corinth</th>
<th>Islands of Poros and Hydra—Izmir (Smyrna)—Ephesus—Selcuk—Panaya Kapulu—Kemelpasa—Istanbul—Salonika—Rome.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A 12-day air cruise which includes not only the Greek mainland but also visits of exceptional interest to the coast of Asia Minor, Izmir, and with three days in Istanbul before returning via Salonika and Rome.

**Libya, Egypt, The Middle East and the Holy Land**

19- and 20-day air cruises are arranged during the autumn and spring with accommodation in first-class hotels and with air travel throughout, visiting many places of religious and historical significance including the Lebanon, Damascus, Jerusalem, Petra, Cyrenaica, Memphis, Cairo and Luxor

from

155 guineas

Write or telephone for our Hellenic programme

**WINGS LIMITED**

48 PARK ROAD, BAKER STREET, LONDON, N.W.1

Telephone: AMBassador 1001

Telegrams: Wingavia, London
Society for Hellenic Travel

SPRING CRUISE

5th—21st April, 1961

in the

ss JERUSALEM

(10,000 Gross Registered Tons)

to GREECE AND THE GREEK ISLANDS, CYPRUS, TURKEY
AND THE HOLY LAND

will call at GYTHION (for MYSTRA), DIKILI (for PERGAMUM), VOLOS
(for the prehistoric site at DIMINI, MAKRINITSA, or an optional visit to
the METEORA), ATHENS, CRETE (for KNOSSOS and PHAESTOS),
LIMASSOL and FAMAGUSTA (for Crusader Castles and Classical Sites in
Cyprus), HAIFA (for sites in ISRAEL, with numerous alternatives including
MEGIDDO, CAESAREA, CAPERNAUM and BEIT SHE'ARIM as well as
NAZARETH, TIBERIAS and ACRE OF THE KNIGHTS), RHODES and
PYLOS. Special arrangements will also be made for an expedition from Cyprus into
Jordan to QUMRAN, JERICHO and JERUSALEM, rejoining the ship at Haifa.

The Cruise will be accompanied by five distinguished Guest Lecturers including a
specialist in Mediterranean flora.

Berths from 86 gns

including travel to and from Genoa

* * * * * * * *

The Society is offering one free place on the cruise for a
student member interested in Mediterranean archaeology.
This will take the form of a scholarship to be awarded on
the basis of an essay and entries will be judged by a panel of
the Society's Honorary Members. Full details of this,
and of the Society's general activities may be obtained
from the Assistant Honorary Secretary.

MISS M. W. McCALL,
4, Argyll Mansions, Chichele Road,
London, N.W.2

* * * * * * * *

Full details will be available in the New Year of the Society's

LATER HELLENIC CRUISES

* * * * * * * *

For bookings and all further particulars apply to the Organisers and Sole Agents

FAIRWAYS & SWINFORD (TRAVEL) LTD.

18, St. George Street, Hanover Square, London, W.1.
HELLENIC TRAVELLERS CLUB

1961 HELLENIC CRUISES

Cruise No. 22—31st March—16th April, 1961

Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey
Venice, Dubrovnik, Delphi, Mistra, Sparta, Athens, Daphni and Eleusis or Sounion, Santorini, Delos, Volos, Meteora, Cape Helles, Gallipoli Peninsula, Troy, The Bosphorus, Istanbul, Pergamum, Ephesus or Priene, Patmos, Knossos, Mallia or Gortyna and Phaestos, Olympia, Korcula, Venice.

Cruise No. 23—15th April—1st May, 1961

Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Lebanon and Cyprus
Venice, Dubrovnik, Pylos, Knossos, Antalya, Perge, Aspendos, Beirut, Byblos, Krak des Chevaliers, Baalbek (Optional Air Excursions to either Palmyra and Damascus; or Jerusalem and Bethlehem; or Petra), Famagusta, Salamis, Enkomi, Nicosia, Kyrenia, Rhodes, Kamos, Delos, Mykonos, Athens, Daphni and Eleusis or Sounion, Olympia, Korcula, Venice.

Cruise No. 24—30th April—16 May, 1961

Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey
Venice, Dubrovnik, Olympia, Knossos, Antalya, Perge, Aspendos, Side, Rhodes, Lindos or Philerimos and Kamiros, Ephesus or Priene, Patmos, Cape Helles, Gallipoli Peninsula, Troy, The Bosphorus, Istanbul, Delos, Athens, Daphni and Eleusis or Sounion, Nauplion, Mycenae, Tiryns, Asine, Epidaurus, Delphi, Venice.

Cruise No. 25—9th August—26th August, 1961

Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey
From Venice back to Venice. Details of itinerary will be available in the autumn.

Cruise No. 26—25th August—11th September, 1961

Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Lebanon and Cyprus
From Venice back to Venice. Details of itinerary will be available in the autumn.

Cruise No. 27—10th September—27th September, 1961

Greece, Egypt and Yugoslavia
From Venice back to Venice. Details of itinerary will be available in the autumn.

EACH CRUISE WILL BE ACCOMPANIED BY
5 OR 6 GUEST LECTURERS

Guest Lecturers who have accompanied previous Hellenic Cruises include:

PRICES FROM 90 GNS. TO 345 GNS.

For full details and reservations apply to:

W. F. & R. K. SWAN (Hellenic) LTD.
260 (HSJ) TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.I

Telephones: MUSEUM 8070 (12 lines)  Telegrams: Swanelnic, London Telex
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NOTES ON SOME POINTS IN XENOPHON’S 
ΠΕΡΙ ΙΠΠΙΚΗΣ

The following observations were made during a general study of Greek horsemanship, but, being somewhat controversial and turning upon points of textual criticism and the interpretation of technical terms, they may perhaps be of interest to scholars rather than to the public.


'It is not only to save the corn from being stolen that a safe stall is good, but because it becomes obvious whenever the horse is [not] carrying out his corn.'

This sentence evidently describes some clear symptom of disease, for Xenophon continues: ‘Should you observe this happening, you may know that the body, being overcharged with blood, requires attention, or is overtired and needs rest, or that barley-sickness (κραθίας) or some other sickness is making its onset. Just as with men, so with horses, all diseases are easier to cure at the onset than when they have established themselves and been treated mistakenly.’

The nature of ‘barley-sickness’ (colic) is excellently explained in Delebecque’s commentary, but that of the warning symptom is doubtful, and depends on the precise meaning to be given to ἐκκομίζῃ. The manuscripts insert a negative particle before it; this is deleted by modern editors on the evidence of Pollux i 209: "Εστι δὲ τι νόσημα ἵππων, κραθίας, καὶ ύπεραίμωσις, ὑπὸ πλημμονής. καὶ ὅτε ἐκκομίζουσι τὸν σίτου τότε χρὴ ὅφαιρεν, καὶ χῦρτον παραβάλλει μόνον ἡ τι ἄλλο τῶν κουφοτέρων.

‘There is a disease of horses, barley-sickness and congestion of the blood through surfeit. And when they “carry out” their corn, then one must remove it and feed grass only, or some other light diet.’

‘Carry out’ is here generally taken to mean ‘throw out of the manger’, ‘scatter on the ground’, or something of that sort. This special meaning is rather far removed from the normal usage of ἐκκομίζειν. Moreover, it gives the wrong sense. Excited, greedy horses burrow in their mangers with their noses, search at the bottom for titbits, and toss the grain on to the ground on either side. The sick horse is, as we say, ‘off his oats’, and want of appetite and indifference to food is the true danger signal.

Here it may be noted that P.-L. Courier’s practical experience of horses led him to reject the interpretation ‘throw out of the manger’. But his proposed emendation ἐκκομίζῃ cannot be right. As Delebecque justly observes, if the horse passes his grain out undigested the trouble lies in his inability to chew it properly—probably because his teeth need attention. Weiske’s proposed πη for μη is also to be rejected; the vague ‘in any way’ is quite out of place here, if not meaningless.

I believe that the sense ‘when the horse lacks appetite’ is to be obtained from the unamended manuscript reading, giving ἐκκομίζειν, a sense similar to that which it bears in Euripides, Andromache 1268–9 (ἐκκομίζειν το πεπρωμένον).

1 I am indebted to the Council of the University of Otago for allowing me the leisure in which to proceed with this work, and to Professor G. R. Manton for his advice and help. Miss D. H. F. Gray, Miss Sylvia Benton and Mr D. L. Haynes have discussed various points with me, and Dr Marian Stewart and Mr Henry Wynmalen have advised me on technical matters. But the responsibility for the views here advanced is my own.

The text used is the Oxford text of E. C. Marchant, but I have compared it continually with those of other editors, especially E. Delebecque (Xenophon: De l’Art Equestre (Paris 1950).
"Ὅταν μὴ ἐκκομίζῃ τὸν αἰτόν would then mean ‘whenever he does not finish his food properly’.

As for Pollux’s omission of the negative (setting aside the possibility of corruption in his text which here seems unlikely) I believe that modern editors have been too ready to rely on his authority rather than on the manuscripts of Xenophon. He himself seems to have known nothing about horses (which gives additional point to the opening of Lucian’s Lexiphanes if Pollux is indeed the target). He tells his patron Commodus, at the beginning of his tenth book, that he had seen a book purporting to explain Xenophon’s, and he certainly quotes directly from this work, often at some length. But the mere fact of its existence proves that many of Xenophon’s technicalities had become obscure long before Pollux’s time, and the commentator, though a practical man with a number of shrewd remarks to offer (as the present recommendation to substitute a light diet for corn), was not above abandoning Xenophon’s text and guessing wildly when he came across something that he did not understand. (This is most obvious from his paraphrase of ix 7, to be discussed later. A further example is iv 4, where Delebecque rightly prefers the manuscript ἀμφιθόμον to Pollux’s ἀμφιδιόχων, accepted by most editors.)

(2) vi 1. Ην μὲν γάρ εἰς τὸ αἰτό τε βλέπων τῷ ἦπερ καθαίρῃ, κύδυνοι καὶ τῷ γόνατι καὶ τῇ ὀσπῇ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον πληγήραι.

‘If one faces in the same direction as the horse while grooming him, there is a risk of being struck in the face both by the knee and by the hoof.’

This passage, which refers to the grooming of the front legs (it is unnecessary, in my opinion, to insert a particular reference to them, as Marchant does), is simply not true as it stands. It is quite impossible to be struck in the face by the horse’s knee (which is brought straight forwards and upwards when he lifts his foot) unless one is facing in the opposite direction.

Pollack’s suggested στομάτι for γόνατι recognises the difficulty without solving it, as the horse could turn his head to either side in order to bite (if he were not muzzled; cf. v 3) whichever way the groom was facing.

Xenophon continues (vi 2): ‘But if one faces in the opposite direction and sits clear of the legs when grooming him, on a level with the shoulder, and rubs him down, in this way one can receive no hurt and can moreover look after the frog by bending up the hoof.

‘A similar method should be employed in grooming the hind legs.’

Pollux advises differently (i 202–3). In grooming the front legs one should come up beside the horse (obviously well to one side) from behind, and face in the same direction as the horse, so that he cannot strike even if he wants to. But on passing to the hind legs one should turn round and face in the opposite direction to the legs that one is cleaning (that is, towards the tail).

Both writers are concerned with the fact, to which Xenophon (vi 3) draws express attention, that the points of danger in approaching the horse are directly in front of him and directly behind. But when squatting or sitting close to the horse in order to rub down his legs with the bare hands one may be injured quite accidentally, should the horse merely stamp, without the least intention of kicking. The danger of injury from the hooves is obvious, but accidental blows from the knee too can be extremely painful, if one is facing in the opposite direction to the horse—not indeed in the position recommended by Xenophon, but directly in front of the animal. Pollux’s commentator evidently supposed that this was the main danger when handling the front leg, and his advice therefore differs from Xenophon’s. I would suppose that Xenophon omitted all reference to the knee, and that the words καὶ τῷ γόνατι were at some time written in the margin either as a reminder or as a criticism. Hence they crept into the text, from which I would remove them (together with the second καὶ).
NOTES ON SOME POINTS IN XENOPHON’S ΠΕΡΙ ΠΙΠΙΚΗΣ

(3) vii 1.

‘We will now write how the knight, when the horse is brought for him to mount, may conduct himself with the greatest advantage in his horsemanship both to himself and to the horse.

‘First of all, then, he should take the lead-rope (βυταγωγεύς), which is attached either to the chin-strap (ὑποχαλινία) or to the cavesson (φάλαιν), conveniently in his left hand, and so slack that whether he intends to mount by grasping the mane near the ears or by vaulting with the help of a spear, he will not give the horse a jerk. And with his right hand let him take hold of the reins (ήνια) on the withers, at the same time grasping the mane, so that he may in no way whatsoever jerk the horse’s mouth with the bit in mounting.’

Though the general sense of this passage is clear, the exact meaning of the various technical terms is not.

For the φάλαιν there is a good deal of evidence. It was made of metal, as its jingling is mentioned by Aristophanes (Peace 154) and Aelian (De Nat. Anim. vi 10), and Pausanias (v 20.7) says that when the foundations were being dug for the trophy of a Roman senator near the pillar of Oinomaos at Olympia there were found καὶ ὀπλων καὶ χαλινών καὶ φαλαινον θραύσματα.

This suggests that the ψέλλων was distinct from the bit (which is probably the meaning of χαλίνως here, though the word is used for both bit and bridle). So also Maecilius (Anth. Pal. vi 233) mentions ‘the bite of the crooked ἐπιφύλαιον‘ quite separately from the γνωμηδόντα χαλίνω. That the φάλαιν imposed some additional restraint on the horse appears from Plato (Laws iii 692a; cf. Plutarch, Lycurgos vii), and still more clearly from Dio Chrysostom’s description of the more noble form of democracy, to be treated καθάπερ ἦπεν γεννημένος ἐξ ἦνιας εὔπελον πρῶτος ἄγοντα, ἀδενθε δεόμενοι φαλαινον (xxxii 27).

For these passages the translation ‘curb’ is appropriate, but this does not prove that this is the literal meaning. Here it may be necessary to explain that the snaffle bit acts by means of a mouthpiece. The curb bit has an additional element passing beneath the horse’s lower jaw, which is held between it and the mouthpiece. Nowadays this is usually an adjustable chain, but in ancient curb bits it is always a fixed wire or metal rod, which is not detachable from the bit and whose θραύσματα would hardly be mentioned separately.

Xenophon shows no knowledge of the principle of the curb, and in any case the curb itself would be a most unsuitable place to attach the βυταγωγεύς (whether this be part of the reins or, as I believe, a separate lead-rope).

Moreover, the earliest curb bits yet discovered are no older than the early third century B.C. when the curb was apparently introduced by the Gauls (hence it may be Arrian’s ‘Gallic bit’, Indika xvi 10 ff.).

Three other explanations of φάλαιν are known to me: (i) Stephanus² believed that the ψάλλων were the cheekpieces on either side of the bit, which served for the attachment of the straps of the bridle, and also to prevent the bit from being pulled sideways through the horse’s mouth. They are a usual feature of ancient bits (but not of modern ones). He quotes, besides the passages already noted, several from Euripides, which do not in themselves tell us more than that the φάλαιν was used in managing horses, and the scholiast’s explanation: ψάλλον Ἀρτικών, ψάλλον κοινῶς. ἐστὶ δὲ φάλαιν [sic] ὁ κρίκος τοῦ χαλίνου, ἡ ἀπλῶς ὁ κρίκος. ἐνταῦθα δὲ φάλαμα τῶν χαλίνων φησι, τι μέρει ἀντὶ τοῦ διὸν χρώμενος.

² Cf. E. M. Jope in A History of Technology (Ed. Singer, Holmyard, Hall and Williams) ii 558, where, however, the curb is wrongly said to force the horse’s head upwards. Besides the examples from Canosa (for which see Jacobsthal, Early Celtic Art i, pl. 258d and pp. 150 ff.); cf. CAH Vol. of Plates iii 73c; and later, simpler examples from Alesia, Pompeii, and Newstead. (Zschille and Forrer, Die Pferdetrense in ihrer Formen-Entwicklung, pl. vii 19; Curle, A Roman Frontier-Post and its People; the Fort of Newstead, pl. 71, 1–2; Gozzadini, Mors de Cheval italiques pl. 3, 2 and p. 24.)

³ C. R. St Petersburg 1865, 186 ff.; with some reservations in C. R. St Petersburg 1875, 123. He has been followed by E. H. Minns and, I believe, most English writers on South Russian antiquities.
The *psalio* is the ring of the *chalinos* or simply the ring. Hence the poet calls *chalinoi psalia*, using the part instead of the whole.4

This agrees with Hesychios (φάλαι· κρίκοι, δακτύλοι. — φάλαιοι ἦπτοι· χαλινοὶ ἦπτοι, κολυστρίως—φαλαόν· κολυστρίων, χαλινῶς.), and with Aeschylus’ use of πρόχειρα φάλαι for the fetters of Prometheus (PV 54). Suidas and the scholiast on Aristophanes (Peace 154) define φαλάον, less precisely, as χαλινῶς.

We are therefore to look for a part of the bridle, probably distinct from the bit (cf. Pausanias), imposing an additional restraint on the horse, and ring-shaped.

None of these conditions is fulfilled by the cheekpieces, which are an integral part of the bit. Stephani himself noted that ring-shaped cheekpieces were extremely rare in antiquity.6 The usual Greek form is straight or half-moon-shaped, the zoomorphic forms of Luristan, Skythia, Central Europe and Italy being almost unknown in Greece.6

(ii) Delbecque7 supposes the βυταγωγείας to be the reins, or part of them, under a different name, and takes the ψάλλον to be ‘le crochet mobile placé à la recontre de la branche du mors et du canon’—that is to say, the revolving arm, usually ending in a hook, for the attachment of the reins, fitted to some of the more elaborate Greek bits.8

This ‘crochet’ is not a κρίκος, though a ring often takes its place in Italy and Central Europe (and hence, I believe, the ring snaffle developed). Indeed Delbecque’s theory suits the literary evidence no better, or rather worse, than Stephani’s, and he has disregarded (apparently deliberately; pp. 174–5) the evidence of archaeology as to the fitting of ancient bridles. If he really distrusts vase-paintings, he might have made some use of the very elaborate and detailed sculptured monuments, Assyrian and Persian as well as Greek. His insistence that the ancients must have done everything the modern way has here led him seriously wrong.

(iii) Courier, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, suggested that the ψάλλον was a metal cavesson,9 and I believe that this is right.

The cavesson is a band or ring round the horse’s nose, used either by itself, in which case it guides the horse by pressure upon the outside of the nose (cf. the modern ‘hackamore’ bridle), or in conjunction with a bit, in which case it serves the additional function of preventing the horse from evading the bit’s action by opening his mouth and throwing up his head. It may be fastened to reins, or to a single lead-rope.

Metal cavessons are not uncommon in museums. They consist of two horizontal U-shaped pieces, of which one passed under the horse’s lower jaw and one round the front of his nose. These were connected by vertical pieces about 6 inches long, so that the cavesson, seen from the side, is roughly in the form of a letter Z, the upper horizontal being that which passed under the jaw and the lower that which went round the nose. This explains Maccius’ expression σκαλω δήματ᾽ ἐπιφθελίον, the bite of the crooked cavesson. The shape of the upper U is modified for the attachment of the straps of the bridle, and below the lower U are ring-shaped projections on each side, to which might be fastened either a pair of reins or a strap passing under the jaw with a single lead-rope joined to its middle. When the reins or rope were pulled, the whole device would pivot slightly about their point of attachment, pressing the lower U against the nose and the upper against the underside of the jaw, whereas a simple ring, with both its halves in the same plane, would merely press on the nose. But the double action and more elaborate form of this cavesson do not alter the fact that it is essentially a ring (κρίκος) round the horse’s nose.

---

4 Euripides, H.F. 380, Rhosos 27, Phoinissai 792 (with scholion).  
5 C. R. St Petersburg 1865, 188.  
6 See N. Yalouris ‘Athena als Herrin der Pferde’ in Museum Helveticum vii; and Blinkenberg, Fouilles de Lindos i 199, and pl. 24, 613.  
7 Op. cit., pp. 131, 175, and fig. 5.  
8 E.g. those classified by Yalouris (pp. 33–4 as ‘Type B’); add British Museum, Guide to Exhibition Illustrating Greek and Roman Life, fig. 206 (no. 508); Flinders-Petrie, Tools and Weapons pl. 71, 41.  
9 Cf. Lafaye, in Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. ‘Frenum’ 1336 n. 6. I have not seen Courier’s work.
This device may be of Assyrian origin. The oldest example known to me is from Sultantepe and dates from the seventh century B.C. I have found no others older than the Roman Imperial period, but as the Greeks almost certainly adopted their standard cavalry bit from Assyria it is probable that they provided the connecting link between Assyria and Rome. The form of the cavesson continued unchanged, and has, I believe, persisted in Italy until modern times.

This cavesson is made of metal, is in the form of an (irregular) ring, is part of the bridle (and a sufficiently important part to be used by metonymy for the whole), is not part of the bit, and imposes an additional (and severe) restraint upon the horse. It therefore fits the ancient references to the ψάλλων.

Further texts may be cited in confirmation. A corrupt passage in Pollux (i. 148) seems to contrast the ψάλλων [sic] which is stretched round (?) the chin with the χαλινός, which is put into the mouth. χαλινός, here obviously the bit, is also, and perhaps more accurately, used for the whole bridle; cf. LSJ s.v. This, if the text were reliable, would exclude either the cheekpiece or the 'crochet', but would suit either the curb or the cavesson. The curb itself, however, is not a κρίκος (though it might be thought of as forming one together with the mouthpiece). Pollux also says (x. 54; v. 99) that ψάλλων were women's anklets and ψάλλων part of horsemen's equipment, which seems to confirm that the ψάλλων-ψάλλων (however spelled) was ring-shaped.

One reference remains obscure. Dio Chrysostom (xxxv 3), remarking that long hair does not make a philosopher, adds that neither can asses become horses, not even if their nostrils are slit, ὀφθ’ ἀν τὰς γνάθους τρίσαντες αὐτῶν ψάλλων ἐφικτέων. This, taken by itself, appears to suggest that the ψάλλων was some device passed through a hole pierced in the jaw, a piece of cruelty which is not impossible, but seems to be contradicted by the rest of the evidence as given already. It is better to treat the participle as co-ordinate rather than subordinate; 'not even if one were to pierce their jaws, and put ἀνίκα them'. I am still at a loss to explain the piercing of the jaws, which has certainly nothing to do with the τροχίσι τινων of Hesychios—the wheel-shaped brand put by the Athenian Council on the jaws of horses that were too old for military service (Aristotle, Αθ. Πολ. 49.1).

To return to Xenophon; if the ψάλλων is the cavesson, the ἄνωγγονεος is obviously, as its name implies, a lead-ropes, quite separate from the reins and not fastened to the bit, in fact the ἄγγονεος of vi 5 and viii 3. The cavalryman would certainly need such a rope, both for tying his horse and for leading it on the march (cf. Hipparchikos iii 3). The warning that the groom must not lead the horse by the bit for fear of spoiling his mouth (Περί Ἰππικης vi 9) of course applies to the rider also. The use of a lead-ropes in addition to the reins is too common on Assyrian monuments to make it worth while citing particular examples, and it is also shown in Greek art.

The exact manner of fastening the lead-ropes is never quite clear, but it always seems to be attached under the horse's chin. The ἵπποψιλονια, to which it might be fastened instead of the ψάλλων, would seem therefore to be some sort of chin strap or the lower part of a leather nose-band. When the horse was being ridden, the lead-ropes could be kept out of the way if necessary by being tied round the horse's neck.

Xenophon's instructions for preparing to mount are now clear. The rider was to take the lead-ropes in his left hand near the horse's ears, leaving enough slack to avoid jerking the horse's head with the ψάλλων, and the reins in his right hand, grasping the mane.

---

10 Anatolian Studies iv, pl. 8, fig. 4 (wrongly described as a snaffle bit).
11 Lafaye, loc. cit.; add Curle, pl. 71, 4, with further references on p. 297 ('Headstalls').
12 Cf. Yalouris, op. cit.
13 I note the following clear examples (besides some doubtful ones), dating from the sixth to the fourth centuries B.C.: Pfuhl, MuZ iii, fig. 140; CVA Great Britain iv, pl. 167; CVA Great Britain ii, pl. 89; Trendall, Pashtan Pottery pl. 31a (no. 253; no. 344 in Revision and Supplemet); pl. 31b (no. 264; no. 356 in Revision and Supplemet).
in order to avoid jerking the *mouth* by means of the bit; this confirms that the *υπαγομένος* was not part of the *νίκη*, as if the reins were already held slack in the left hand no further precaution would be needed.

If the rider had a spear, it would be held in the left hand with the butt on the ground and so provide support for the left hand to pull him up. There is of course no question of using the spear to pole-vault with; this would mean approaching the horse from a distance with both hands on the spear and none on the reins and is not really a practical method of mounting even a quiet horse, though quite feasible as a riding-school exercise.\(^{14}\)

(4) viii 7. ᾿Αναβάλλων τὸν ἄναβατην. Throw the rider backwards (cf. ἀναπίπτειν, lean backwards, in next line) rather than *upwards*, as usually translated.

In interpreting this passage I agree with Delebecque, except that he is forced to postulate a *saut de mouton* which is not in Xenophon. If ᾿Αναβάλλω can bear the meaning here suggested this difficulty is removed.

(5) x 7. Οἶνον τε δὲ καὶ τὸν τραχύν παντοδαπὸν ποιεῖν, καὶ κατειλοῦντα καὶ κατατείνοντα.

Xenophon is here (x 6–11) making recommendations about the types of bit to be used. The horseman should have at least two, one rough (τραχύς) for schooling and one smooth (λείος) for ordinary use. He adds that, whatever the type of bits, they should all be flexible (ἄγροι), that is, jointed and with the interlocking parts moving freely, not stiff (ακληροί). Pollux gives an attempted paraphrase of the whole passage, presumably taken from his anonymous commentator on Xenophon, who evidently failed to understand it, as he treats τραχύς and ακληροί, which Xenophon so carefully distinguishes, as synonyms, both meaning ‘rough’, and entirely alters the order of ideas. The fact that he misunderstood the whole must be kept in mind when assessing the value of his paraphrase of the particular sentence under discussion. This runs (i 208): ἔστι δὲ καὶ τούτων (i.e. ‘rough’ bits) ἐμπραδεῖν, κατειλοῦντα καὶ κατακηροῦντα. ‘It is possible to make rough bits gentle too, by wrapping them round and by covering them with wax.’

κατειλοῦντα, whose basic meaning seems to be ‘press together’, as in rolling material into a ball, he understood as ‘wrapping up’. The ‘rough’ bit was fitted with ‘hedgehogs’ (ἐχθήνοι), that is, spikes intended to hurt the horse, and the bit might certainly be made smooth by covering these with cloth or leather, though some of its flexibility would be lost in the process.

Supposing this interpretation of κατειλοῦντα to give the key to the meaning of the whole, he then altered παντοδαπὸν ποιεῖν, ‘to make of all sorts’, to ἐμπραδεῖν, ‘to make gentle’. κατατείνοντα remained inexplicable. One cannot make a rough bit gentle by pulling. He therefore wrote κατακηροῦντα, ‘by covering with wax’. This can hardly be more than a wild guess, and if he had tried it out he would have found that the wax comes off in the horse’s mouth.

Most modern commentators reject Pollux’s text but retain his construction of the two participles with the subject of ὀἶνον τε.

This gives a meaning ‘It is possible to make the rough bit of all sorts by wrapping up and by pulling’. Pollux’s explanation of κατειλοῦντα is retained, and κατατείνοντα is explained with reference to ix 9, ἕκατον ἀν ἄν καὶ τραγῦς ἐμβληθῆ, τῇ χαλαροτητί λείψει ἃ τι τῶν ἀφομοιοῦν.

‘If a rough bit is put on a spirited horse, it must be made like a smooth one by leaving the rein slack.’ χαλαροτητί does *not* mean ‘by lightness of hand’ as it is so often translated. The meaning of x 7 is then taken to be ‘It is possible to make the rough bit of all sorts, smooth by wrapping it up, and rough by pulling on the reins’. This gives a false antithesis, as wrapping up is an alteration to the form of the bit and pulling the reins is a way

\(^{14}\) Cf. Lafaye, in Darenberg-Saglio s.v. ‘Equitatio’ 749.
of handling it. And it is the form only that is being discussed here. Moreover, deliberate pulling on the reins in order to ‘make the bit rough’ is quite contrary to all Xenophon’s teaching.

Sauppe’s κατατείνωτα, ‘by smoothing it down’, would hardly help, even if it were otherwise acceptable.

Delebecque, with some strong manuscript support, proposes to read κατειλιωτα κατατεινωτα, which he translates ‘Il est encore possible de fabriquer le mors dur de diverses façons, et de resserrer les parties qui le tendent’. But ‘to compress the pulling things’ can only mean ‘to tighten the straps that hold the bit’ if both the key words are given meanings quite unlike any that they bear elsewhere. Even if this interpretation were possible it would be quite irrelevant here. Xenophon has already, in vi 9, dealt with the correct adjustment of these straps, and the clear and sensible instructions there given prove that he would never have recommended increasing the severity of the bit by tightening the bridle.

Moreover, Pollux’s text, whatever he made of it, certainly contained two participles, not a participle and an infinitive.

I would myself propose to construe the participles with των τραχων, not with ὄλων τε, giving the meaning ‘It is possible to make the rough bit of all sorts, both compressing and pulling’. This suits the actual forms of surviving ‘rough’ bits, of which some have the ‘hedgehogs’ fitted to the mouthpiece and so act mainly by the direct pull on the bars of the mouth, and others have them on the inside of the cheekpieces, so as to compress the horse’s jaw between them when the reins are pulled. Bits of this second type were certainly still in use in the fourth century B.C., but I have found no later evidence for them, and suppose that they had gone out of use before the Roman period, and the meaning of this passage (in which Xenophon does not describe his bits, but only alludes to them, as something well known to his reader) was therefore lost.

(6) xii 8. ὀπλίζειν δὲ καὶ τὸν ἵππον προμετωπιδιώ καὶ προστερνιδιώ καὶ παραπλευριδιώσ. ταῦτα γὰρ ἀμα καὶ τῷ ἀναβάτῃ παραμηρίδια γίγνεται.

‘The horse too must be armoured with head-piece, breast-piece and side-pieces. These last serve also as thigh-pieces for the rider.’ παραπλευριδιώς is the unanimous reading of the manuscripts, both here and in the Cyropaedia (vii 1.1–2) where the armour of the fictitious Cyrus the Great and his companions is described in terms almost identical with the recommendations of Περί Ἰππικῆς. But in Cyropaedia vi 4.1 Xenophon tells of ridden horses furnished with παραμηρίδια and chariot-horses with παραπλευρίδια. Weiske, and, I believe, all subsequent editors, therefore emended παραπλευριδιώς to παραμηριδιώς in both passages where the word is used of the armour of ridden horses.

But nobody has yet succeeded in reconstructing a piece of armour that will serve as a παραμηριδιον at once for the horse and his rider, by covering the rider’s thighs as well as the horse’s ‘thighs beneath the shoulders’ (i 7), that is, his forearms, the upper part of his front legs. The difficulty is usually evaded by supposing that Xenophon, a veteran with a lifetime’s practical experience of cavalry equipment, was indulging in fantastic and unreal visions, without having any clear idea of what he was talking about.

---

12 E.g. those classified by Yalouris as Types A and B.

18 Including the earliest surviving Greek bit (Reichel Homermische Waffen 142, fig. 90). A later, more elaborate type has the spikes fitted, not to the cheekpieces themselves, but to small bronze plates just inside them. The only actual examples known to me are from Skythia (Stephani, C. R. St Petersburg, 1876, 132-3 nos. 32, 33, 36; cf. Minns, Scythians and Greeks 214 fig. 115 top left). But the spiked sideplates often appear in Greek vase painting from the time of Exekias onwards (examples from Pfuhl, Maz III figs. 228, 230, 505–7, 583, 627).
If we retain the manuscript reading the problem is at once simplified. It is not difficult to imagine a piece of armour worn by the horse and guarding at once his sides and his rider’s thighs, and such a piece is in fact shown on two monuments dating from Xenophon’s lifetime: (i) on the tomb of Payava in the British Museum are reliefs of two horsemen, wearing helmets and cuirasses of Greek type, and further protected by a sort of apron, whose front edge seems to be secured to a collar passing round the horse’s shoulders. This apron extends backwards to cover the rider’s thighs and the horse’s sides. (ii) A similar apron protects the legs of a horseman on a Thessalian coin in the Bibliothèque Nationale, who also wears a cuirass of the type recommended by Xenophon, the ‘Boeotian’ helmet, and—most unusual—a gorget rising from the top of the cuirass and guarding the lower part of the face (xii 2). This apron, used on both sides of the Aegean during Xenophon’s lifetime, I believe to be the παραμυρίδιον—παραπλευρίδιον here referred to. It does not cover the horse’s flank (κενεών) which was therefore protected by the use of a large saddlecloth (xii 8).

Chariot-horses might be protected by a single large cover, like those shown on the Egyptian, Assyrian and Hittite monuments, and on the Mycenaean ivory box from Enkomi. These covers protect almost the whole of the horse’s body, and are παραπλευρίδια pure and simple, whereas the aprons, being both παραπλευρίδια (for the horse) and παραμυρίδια (for the rider) are distinguished by being given the latter name only when the equipment of both chariot and rider horses is being described.

The word παραμυρίδια is used of a different piece of armour, worn by the rider, not by the horse, in Anabasis i 8.6–7 and in Arrian’s Taktika iv 1. Arrian’s παραμυρίδια belong to the Sarmatian cataphracts, and are clearly armoured breeches, like those shown on Trajan’s column. Those mentioned in the Anabasis were worn by the younger Cyrus and his guards and must have been something of the same sort, though, as the Persians concealed their armour under surcoats (cf. Herodotus ix 22; Plutarch, Artaxerxes 11.9), I have been unable to find a satisfactory picture of them.

The difference between the equipment of Cyrus in the romance and his historical namesake is to be accounted for by supposing that Xenophon in the Cyropaedia gives his heroes the arms and tactics that he would like to have seen in the Greece of his own day, magnified to heroic proportions and with some Oriental trimmings, such as chariots and ox-drawn towers, thrown in. The younger Cyrus wore trousers, like the barbarian that he was. The apron παραμυρίδιον was the answer of the trouserless Hellene, or Hellenised Lycian, and not an Oriental piece which Xenophon wanted to introduce into Greece. The metal thighpieces worn by a few Greek hoplites in the archaic period, which clipped round the upper part of the leg in the same way as the greave clipped round the lower, would have been unsuitable for horsemen, as their edges would have injured both rider and horse. The inside of the thighs was left unguarded and was a weak point of ancient cataphract cavalry (Plutarch, Lucullus 28.4). Greaves, which did not come into such immediate contact with the horse’s back, were sometimes worn by the mounted hoplites of the archaic period.

(7) iii 5; viii 13, 14. πέδη.

The interpretation of the ‘fetter’ as a figure-of-eight rather than as a simple ring is supported by the use of the word ἐποιεῖνδη by Eudoxos for a figure-of-eight curve apparently traced by the planets (cf. T. L. Heath, A History of Greek Mathematics i 333–4).

17 Smith, British Museum Catalogue of Sculpture (The Nerit Monument and Later Lycian Sculpture) 49 (950 no. 5) and pl. 9.
18 Lefebvre des Noettes, L’Attelage: le Cheval de Selle à travers les Ages, fig. 241. For the helmet, cf. P. M. Fraser and T. Rönne, Boeotian and West Greek Tombstones 66–8.
19 H. L. Lorimer, BSA xlii 88–9, 133, 135.
'If the thighs under the tail (i.e. the buttocks) are separated by a broad line the horse will carry his legs wide apart under him.'

I have nothing new to offer on this passage, but at the risk of seeming captious I must oppose the novel interpretation offered by Delebecque, who supposes the 'line' referred to to be the division between one set of muscles and another, most probably the so-called 'poverty line' (raie de misère), 'qui marque la separation entre la cuisse et la fesse'. This line receives its name from the fact that it is clearly visible on horses in poor condition, but, as Delebecque points out, is also apparent on horses that, hardened by work and training, have lost all superfluous flesh but developed their muscles. He therefore understands Xenophon to mean that one should choose a horse the muscles of whose hindquarters are strongly developed, so that he may the more readily collect his hindquarters under him, like a man who 'se campe sur ses jambes pour soulever un objet de terre, mais en les pliant' (his italics). But Xenophon says nothing about bending the legs; moreover, he is not speaking of a trained, collected, horse, but an unbroken colt. To say that one should choose a young horse with a strongly marked poverty line, as this indicates good development of the muscles of the hindquarters, would be absurd, and would moreover contradict i 13, as a horse with τὰ ἱγχία πλατέα καὶ εὔσαρκα would hardly show any poverty line.

Xenophon's horse, though small by modern standards, had to carry a full-grown rider and a lot of armour. Hence we should look for the points of a weight-carrying cob, rather than those of a racehorse. The horse with hind legs turned in lacks power, and may injure himself by brushing one hind leg with the hoof of the other, though admittedly there is not much danger of his bringing himself down by crossing his hind legs.

(g) At vii 11 I entirely support Delebecque's retention of the manuscript ἀναβαίνοι rather than Hermann's ἐμβαίνοι. The aids are to be given at the precise moment when the horse rises upon his right diagonal, that is, when, with his weight on the off fore and near hind feet, he begins to lift his near fore and off hind.

J. K. Anderson.

University of Otago.
EMPEDOCLES’ ACCOUNT OF BREATHING

EMPEDOCLES’ Fragment 100 contains an account of ‘the way that all things breathe in and out’. It may conveniently be divided into three sections:

A. Lines 1–5, the apparatus of breathing.
B. Lines 6–8, the manner in which breathing takes place.
C. Lines 8–25, an illustration taken from the working of the klepsydra.

I shall discuss the fragment under these three headings.

A. THE APPARATUS OF BREATHING

οδε δ’ ἀναπνεῖ πάντα καὶ ἐκπνεῖ· πάσιν λύφαιμοι
σαρκῶν σύριγγες πούματον κατὰ σώμα τέταναι,
καὶ σφιν ἐπὶ στομίῳ πυκνώς τέτρηναι ἄλοξον
μύνων ἐσχατα τέρθα διαμπερέ, ὡστε φόνον μὲν
κεύειν, αἰδέρι δ’ εὐπορίην διόδοιι τετμήσθαι.

These lines (1–5) are translated as follows by Diels-Kranz: ‘Also aber atmect alles ein und aus: Allen sind blutarme Fleischröhren über die Oberfläche des Körpers hin gespannt, und an ihren Mündungen ist mit vielen Ritzen durchweg durchbohrt der Haut äusserste Oberfläche, so dass zwar das Blut drinnen geborgen bleibt, der Luft aber freier Zutritt durch die Öffnungen gebahnt ist.’ Thus the picture which Diels gives us is of tubes running out to the skin all over the body, and at the ends of the tubes perforated flaps of skin which will allow the passage of air but not of blood. The tubes are, furthermore, only partly filled with blood.

This line of interpretation has been followed by most scholars since,¹ and it appears to derive some reinforcement from Aristotle, who in his comment on the passage at de respiratione 7, p. 473, b 1 ff., says: διὰ τὸ φλέβας εἶναι τινας... ἐχονοι δὲ πόρους εἰς τὸν ἔνε ἀέρα, τῶν μὲν τοῦ σώματος (αἰμάτος;) μορφών ελάσσως, τῶν δὲ τὸν ἄερος μείζους. ‘They have passages through to the outer air.’ The ‘outer air’ would appear to mean the outer air outside the body, and we might therefore be tempted to suppose that Aristotle meant to say that these tubes ended up at the surface of the skin.

However, if Aristotle meant this, he appears to contradict himself when he says (473 a 15 ff.) καὶ περὶ τῆς διὰ τῶν μυκτηρίων ἀναπνοῆς λέγων οἶεται καὶ περὶ τῆς κυρίας λέγων ἀναπνοῆς. This again is a direct reference to Empedocles, and Aristotle here tells us that Empedocles was talking about nostril-breathing. Diels says that this was due simply to Aristotle’s ‘laughable misunderstanding’ of μύνων in line 4 of the fragment, which according to Diels means ‘skin’ and not ‘nostrils’. But if Aristotle in fact took μύνων to mean ‘nostrils’, it seems odd that he should in the other passage talk of tubes ending up at the surface of the skin. Perhaps, therefore, we are wrong to suppose that these outlets to the outer air were holes in the surface of the skin. Why should they not be perforations in flaps of skin at the very back of the nostrils? The outer air might, after all, be considered to

¹ The most recent example is D. J. Furley in JHS lxxvii 1 (1957) 31–4. See also J. Burnet, Early Greek Philosophy (4th ed.) 219–20; Zaffiroplu, Empedocle D’Agrigente 142 n. 561, 158; E. Bignone, Empedocle 581, 621 n. 5. A notable exception is Antonio Traglia, Stati sulla Lingua di Empedocle (Bari, n.d.) 25 n. 43, to which Mr Furley refers.
be present at a point inside the body where the air is continuous with the air outside the body.

Not only does this seem to be what Aristotle had in mind; it may also be what Empedocles actually said. For, if we re-examine Diels’s translation: does πύματον σώμα really mean ‘the skin’? πύματον does not bear a primary meaning of ‘outermost’; perhaps, rather, ‘hindmost’. It is just as reasonable to suppose that, in this instance, πύματον meant ‘deepest down’, ‘inmost’, as to suppose that it meant ‘outermost’. ‘Outermost’ is supported by IIiad vi 118, perhaps; but then ‘nethermost’ is supported by Plat. Eleg. v 2, Luc. Traged. 295 (see LSJ).

So it may well be that we are to imagine tubes, partly filled with blood (λίθαιμον—not, presumably, ‘bloodless’), reaching deep down inside the body (μυχώνι, line 23). At the openings of these tubes (lines 3–5), the uttermost ends of the nostrils have been perforated with a large number of small holes. Why should not μυχώνι, in a passage concerning breathing, bear the expected meaning of ‘nostrils’?—and why should not ἐσχατα τέρπα mean the ‘utmost ends’ of the nostrils, i.e. their innermost ends? It is all a question of orientation; if we are looking at the body from the outside, and not from the inside, then πύματον and ἐσχατα are both likely to mean ‘furthest inside’, and not ‘furthest outside’. Diels assumed, without adequate reflection, that the orientation must be from the inside; this is not at all necessarily true.

If my view is right, not only is Aristotle vindicated—and we might at least expect him to know more about it than we do—but one other outstanding problem of the passage is solved. Scholars have wondered why, in explaining breathing, Empedocles should have omitted all reference to nostril-breathing; for if Diels’s explanation be accepted, then there is not a single reference to the nostrils. Mr Furley (loc. cit.) very properly raised this problem; and, if I may say so, he seemed to be almost falling over himself in his efforts to solve it. But clearly, once Diels’s translation is jettisoned, we are no longer in danger of shipwreck on this account.

We may add that in Fr. 101 (κέρατα θρείων μελέων μυκτήρων ἑρέων) Empedocles seems to be thinking of smell taking place through the nostrils; at all events tracking is done by means of the nostrils. Moreover, he appears to have connected smell with the breath; he talks of τρίαν τέ καὶ δεμών in Fr. 102.

I would accordingly suggest a translation along the following lines:

“This is the way that all animals breathe in and out.

‘In all animals tubes of flesh, partly filled with blood, are stretched out deep inside the body. At the mouths of these tubes the uttermost ends of the nostrils are pierced right through with numerous holes, in such a way that the blood is held inside, but the air has a free passage through the openings.’

B. The Manner in which Breathing Takes Place

There seems to be no difficulty about the next three lines: ‘Now when the blood rushes away inward from the mouths of the tubes, then the air rushes in (presumably through the perforations, which air can pass through but blood cannot, lines 4–5); but when the blood comes back, the air is breathed out again (and of course the blood stops at the perforations, since these are impervious to blood).’

It is important to realise the essential point which Empedocles makes here; for unless we bear this in mind, we may miss the point of the klepsydra illustration which follows. Empedocles’ essential point is that the motion inwards and outwards of the air depends entirely on the presence or absence of blood on the other side of the perforations. It is the movements of the blood on the other side of the perforations that account for breathing in and out.
C. The Klepsydra Illustration

The basic facts about the klepsydra have already been carefully examined by a number of scholars. The klepsydra was a skilful Greek device for 'stealing' water from one vessel to put it into another. It appears to have been a 'hollow vessel, covered at the top except for a narrow vent or tube which could be plugged with the thumb; the bottom was perforated to form a strainer' (I quote from Mr Furley loc. cit.). It was possible to fill this by dipping it into a vessel. After that, the klepsydra could be taken out, full of the liquid, and the contents transferred to another vessel—provided the hole at the top was kept plugged. The plugging of the top meant that there was no air pressure acting downwards on the liquid in the klepsydra; there was, however, strong upward air pressure on all the little holes at the bottom of the klepsydra, and this was sufficient to hold the water in during transit. If the hole at the top of the klepsydra was unplugged, then the air pressure acting downwards on the liquid (together with the weight of the liquid) would force the liquid out through the holes at the bottom of the klepsydra, and the liquid could thus be emptied into a second vessel.

These facts seem to be reasonably well established, and I make no attempt to dispute them. What I want to discuss is the way in which Empedocles applies the illustration.

Immediately before the account of the klepsydra comes the account of the manner of breathing, described in the last section: 'Now when the blood rushes away inwards from the mouths of the tubes, the air comes rushing in. And when the blood runs back, the air is breathed out.' Then he continues:

'It is just the same as what happens when a girl plays with a klepsydra. (8–9)

'When, after first blocking the vent at the top with her hand, she dips the klepsydra into the water, no water enters the klepsydra; it is kept out by the weight of the air inside falling on all the little holes in the strainer at the bottom... until she releases the air; then, as soon as the air is gone, in comes the water. (10–15)

'Likewise, when there is water in the klepsydra, so long as the vent at the top is closed by the girl's hand, for just so long will the air pressure from outside, exerted upwards on the strainer at the bottom, hold in the water... until she lets go with her hand; then, as air falls in through the vent at the top, out goes the water.' (16–21)

(There is something of an anacoluthon in lines 16–19, but the sense is obvious and not disputed.)

Now this account is clearly divided into two sections, lines 10–15 (water enters the klepsydra), and lines 16–21 (water leaves the klepsydra). The essential thing being said is: (A) water comes in, (B) water goes out. This is exactly parallel to the account of breathing given in lines 6–8, and again in lines 22–5:

'It is just the same with breathing. When the blood in the body rushes back to the innermost recess of the body, a stream of air enters; and when it runs back again, an equal stream of air is breathed out again.' That is to say: (A) air comes in, (B) air goes out. This is exactly parallel to the form we had before: (A) water comes in, (B) water goes out.

If we set out the parallelism more fully, we get the following structure:

(i) Breathing (lines 22–5 or 6–8):

(A) when the blood rushes inward (subordinate clause), the air enters (main clause).
(B) when the blood runs back again (subordinate clause), the air is breathed out (main clause).

---

2 See Prof. Last in CQ xviii (1924) 169–73; matik i 180 ff.; W. K. C. Guthrie, Aristotle on the O. Regenbogen, 'Eine Forschungsmethode antiken Naturwissenschaft', Quell. u. Stud. z. Gesch. d. Mathe-
(ii) Illustration (lines 14–15 and 21):

(A) as soon as the air is gone (subordinate clause), in comes the water (main clause).
(B) as soon as the air falls in (subordinate clause), out goes the water (main clause).

This parallelism makes it obvious that the air coming in and out of the body in breathing (in accordance with the movements of the blood inside the body) is intended by Empedocles to be paralleled by the water coming in and out of the klepsydra in the illustration (in accordance with the movements of the air inside the klepsydra). Thus the air in breathing is parallel to the water in the illustration; and the blood in breathing is parallel to the air in the klepsydra. And this, as Mr Furley correctly observes, means that air is used in two different ways in the two halves of the simile.

Mr. Furley objects to this. He says: ‘It seems extraordinarily unlikely that Empedocles would choose to make air play opposite parts in the two halves of the simile: to do this simply asks for misunderstanding.’ He wishes therefore to make air parallel to air, and water to blood. But this is impossible. First, the water goes in and out through the perforations in the bottom of the klepsydra, and in this it behaves exactly like the air in breathing, but not like the blood; Empedocles tells us distinctly that blood cannot pass through the perforations, whereas air can and does. Secondly, there is the clear parallelism of sentence structure which we have noted above. There can therefore be no doubt that Empedocles has done exactly what Furley complains of. Further, Empedocles can be defended for having followed this course. He is, after all, comparing two mechanical effects rather than the behaviour of substances *qua* the substances that they are. It does not very much matter what substances are used for the simile provided that the mode of operation is exactly parallel so far as it goes.

‘So far as it goes’ is an important limitation. Empedocles is concerned with his illustration only in so far as it illustrates the point which it is intended to illustrate—namely, that Substance A comes in and out according to the movement of Substance B on the other side of perforations. Beyond this, we can find no similarities. All the rest of the paraphernalia of the illustration—the vent at the top of the klepsydra, and the little girl putting her hand there and taking it away again—are not paralleled by anything in the account of breathing. The vent at the top is necessary in order to provide more or less air pressure inside the klepsydra, and this more-or-less air pressure is parallel to the presence or absence of blood on the other side of the perforations in breathing. But the plugging and unplugging of the vent have no parallel in the account of breathing; likewise the stipulation, in the case of breathing, that the holes must be such as to allow a passage to the air but not to the blood, has no parallel in the account of the klepsydra.

Furley suggests that Empedocles is giving an account of breathing in which air comes in and out at two points simultaneously, both through the skin and through the nose. Air comes in through the skin; the blood inside runs back from the skin; at the same time other air is pushed out through the nose by the blood as it runs back from the skin. The process is then repeated in the reverse direction. According to Furley, ῥυόν δὲ means ‘skin’; the strainer at the bottom of the klepsydra is parallel (but only roughly parallel) to the pores in the skin; the vent at the top is parallel to the nose; the water, having air on either side of it, is parallel to the blood in breathing.

This theory cannot be maintained. Empedocles gives his account of breathing in lines 6–8 and 22–5, and he says nothing of any such two-way process; even Furley’s highly dubious suggestion of τοῦτον in line 24 will not help him here. And we have already seen that it is impossible to take the water to be parallel to the blood, so that Furley’s account of the klepsydra illustration is the wrong way round. He has made an ingenious attempt to find a two-way account of breathing in Empedocles, but on available evidence we must conclude that it cannot be done.
Further Discussion. Plato and Aetius.

1. Bignone, in Empedocle 621 n. 5, suggests that there is a close parallel between Plato Timaeus 79 C ff. and Empedocles’ account of breathing. Now Plato gives a circulatory account of breathing. When air is expelled from the chest and lungs through the mouth and nose, the expelled air displaces the air outside the body. This displaced air has to have somewhere to go to; according to Plato it enters the body through pores in the flesh. So the whole time that air is leaving the body through the mouth and nose, other air is entering the body through the pores. Similarly, when air is breathed in through the mouth and nose, air is simultaneously expelled through the pores. And the whole motion is governed (79 D) by the motions of the hot element inside the body.

Furley wishes to find a similar circulatory account of breathing in Empedocles, and he thinks that the fact that Plato held such a belief is an indication that Empedocles held the same belief. He cites also Philistion, an early Sicilian doctor whom he declares to have been from the same school as Empedocles; Philistion, he says, also believed in breathing through pores in the skin.

Now it is, as we have seen, impossible to derive any circulatory account of breathing from the Greek of Empedocles Fr. 100. Whether the nose or skin is meant by ῥυόν, the air comes in and out through only one channel in this fragment. Any other view involves reading into the fragment matter which simply is not there, and it also involves a violation of the simple parallelism indicated by sentence structure. So if Empedocles did intend to give a circulatory account of breathing, including both breathing through the nose and breathing through the skin, all we can say is that he has not given it either here or in any other extant fragment.

If both Plato and Philistion believed that breathing occurred through pores in the skin, this is admittedly an argument in favour of Diels’s interpretation of ῥυόν as skin. But it is not nearly so strong as the arguments against: Aristotle’s evidence, the improbability of ῥυόν meaning anything other than ‘nostrils’ in an account of breathing, the still greater improbability of Empedocles having made no mention of the nose in an account of breathing.

There is, of course, a real difficulty here. If Empedocles did not believe in a Void (possibly he did not, see Diels-Kranz 31 A 87, under Philop.), then he must have supposed that something was displaced by the blood deep inside the body; this would presumably be air, which would then have to go somewhere. All we can say is that he has not given any explanation in this particular passage; we are left to assume either (1) that the difficulty never occurred to him, or else (2) that he gave an explanation elsewhere. Since Fragment 100 seems complete in itself, and since we have no evidence whatsoever of his having given an explanation elsewhere, I think that the first explanation is to be preferred.

2. Aetius, in Diels 31 A 74, says, with reference to Empedocles’ theory of breathing: τὴν δὲ νόστησιν κατέχονναι [sc. ἀναπνοήν] φερομένων τοῦ αἵματος ὡς πρὸς τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ τὸ ἀερὸς διὰ τῶν ῥυόν ταῖς ἐσωτερικοῖς ἀναθέμιστοι κατὰ τὴν ἐκχώρησιν αὐτῶν γίνεσθαι τὴν ἐκπνοήν, παλαιομομοῦσας δὲ ἐκ τηλ. It might be thought that πρὸς τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν here implies that, according to Aetius, Empedocles was thinking of pores in the skin. But Aetius immediately afterwards says διὰ τῶν ῥυόν, which can safely be taken to mean ‘through the nostrils’; no one reading a prose account could have taken it in any other sense, least of all in a passage concerned with breathing. Nor is ‘nostrils’ inconsistent with πρὸς τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν, if ἐπιφάνεια bears its normal meaning of ‘surface’. Blood moves up towards (in the direction of) the surface, and drives out the air through the nostrils. If ῥυόν bore a difficult and abnormal poetical meaning, Aetius would probably have changed the word; it is to be noted that he does not retain any of the other poetical terms used by Empedocles. So far from there being a conflict of evidence between Aetius and Aristotle, I would say that Aetius’ διὰ τῶν ῥυόν tends to confirm Aristotle’s nose-breathing interpretation.
Conclusion.  *Empedocles as a Scientist.*

Aristotle (Diels 31 B 100) criticises Empedocles (1) for having failed to say why breathing occurs (or what function it fulfils); (2) for having failed to say whether all animals breathe; and (3) for dealing with nose-breathing only, not with the whole of breathing (including mouth and windpipe). Now if this last criticism is correct (and on my interpretation it is), then it suggests that Empedocles was so much taken up with his general theory, that he failed to take account of certain facts (mouth-breathing and breathing through the windpipe) of which he might easily have gained knowledge, if only he had adopted a more empirical approach. We may well ask: how could Empedocles allow a general theory to blind him to the obvious facts of the case?

One of the chief reasons why scholars have wished to interpret Fr. 100 in an unnatural way, has probably been their desire to defend Empedocles on this score. In rather the same spirit some scholars have extolled to the skies his klepsydra simile, calling it a marvellous example of the empirical method; whereas in fact it is no more than a ‘persuasive analogy’, as Mr Furley correctly points out.

What must be realised is that we are dealing with a very early period in the history of science, and that we must not expect too much of these early thinkers. When this is realised, our admiration for them will not be diminished. We shall wonder all the more at the eager curiosity which impelled them to walk along these untrodden paths, and at the remarkable daring and ingenuity with which they attempted to solve the problems they encountered on the way. Empedocles’ account of breathing may seem stupid to us now; it may seem to us to be tainted by the Pythagorean and Eleatic tendency to prefer theoretical schematisation to observed facts. But within the context of his own times, it shows a remarkable appreciation of the facts of air pressure; and the theory of pores, such as will allow a passage to the air but not to the blood, is brilliantly ingenious.³

*London.*

³ A major point at issue in this matter is the validity of Aristotle’s evidence about the early philosophers. On this general subject, see W. K. C. Guthrie in *JHS* lxxvii 1 (1957) 35-41; for a particular application, see my article on Zeno in *JHS* lxxvii 2 (1957) 187-201.

I am indebted to Mr D. J. Furley for some generous help in private discussion.

I have only just seen, at the moment of going to press, Maria Timpanaro Cardini’s ‘Respirazione e Clessidra’, *La Parola del Passato* xii (1957) 250-70. This writer and I, working independently, have reached very much the same conclusions about the meaning of this fragment.
HOMERIC EPITHETS FOR TROY

The publication of the fourth volume on the excavations conducted at Troy by the University of Cincinnati in the years 1932–1938 enables us to review with more confidence the historical events which lie, no matter at how great a distance, behind the Iliad and to reconsider the Homeric epithets for Troy in the light of new knowledge. We may at the start agree with the writers that no other city in the Troad except Hisarlik has any reasonable claim to be the site of Troy, and it is now clear that Troy VI, which was gravely damaged by an earthquake c. 1275 B.C., was succeeded by Troy VIIA, which had a real continuity with VI and was largely a rebuilt version of it, until it perished itself from fire c. 1240 B.C. VIIA has thus a substantial claim to be the Homeric city, and the date of its destruction agrees with that given by Herodotus for the Trojan War as κατὰ ὄλκαιοσια ἑταὶ μᾶλιστα ἐς ἐμὲ (ii 145.4). We may ask how relevant the Homeric epithets are to Troy as we now know it and when they may have been introduced into the oral tradition which Homer inherited and used in the eighth century. At the start we may say that, while all of them are at least adequate for a walled city on the site of Hisarlik, and some are much to the point, not all are equally individual, and we may classify them according to their use for cities in general and for Troy in particular. In doing this we must remember that in the Homeric poems cities need epithets as much as gods and heroes do, and that there is bound to be a certain overlap between one city and another in the epithets applied to it. Though we may postulate a pool of adjectives suitable for cities from which the poet draws those that meet his needs most adequately, there are some which are confined to Troy and others which are specially appropriate to it.

1. CONVENTIONAL EPITHETS FOR PLACES

(a) The application of ἐυκτίμενον to Troy occurs in the formulaic ἐυκτίμενον πτολείθρου at Δ 33, Θ 288, Φ 433 and has recently come into prominence because of its possible connection with the Mycenaean ki-τι-με-na, which is used with reference to the ownership of land. But the Homeric use of ἐυκτίμενον for Troy does not conform to any of the meanings suggested for the Mycenaean word. It cannot be applied to ‘private’ as opposed to ‘communal’ land, or to ‘cultivated’ as opposed to ‘uncultivated’. If it is connected historically with ki-τι-με-na, it has changed its meaning. When it is applied to cities, such as Phere (Ε 543), Arisbe (Ζ 13), Iolchos (B 712), Lyktos (P 611), Pylos (γ 4), and Nerikos (ω 377), it can conceivably mean ‘well founded’ or ‘well built’, but it can hardly have this meaning for Lemnos (Φ 40, θ 283), Lesbos (δ 342, ρ 133) or Ithaca (χ 52). It seems therefore to have some rather vague meaning like ‘well established’, and this is supported by the words νήσου ἐυκτίμενα ἐκάμωντο (i 130) for Scherie. It clearly has no special significance for Troy, and looks as if it were drawn from a pool of epithets suitable for cities. Even if it has an ancient origin, its meaning has been distorted and dimmed with time.

(b) ἐρήμωλος (I 329, Σ 67, Ψ 215) is certainly applicable at least to the Trojan plain, but it is not very distinguishing, and it is not surprising that it is applied also to districts like Phthia (I 363), Paeonia (Φ 154) and Scherie (ε 34).

(c) ἐρυθώλας is a variant on ἐρήμωλος, used for its different scanion in its oblique

2 Troy iii 11.
3 Ibid. iv 11, 50, 90, 176.
4 M. Ventris and J. Chadwick, Documents in Mycenaean Greek 233.
cases, accusative at Η 74, 257, and dative at Z 315, Π 461, Ω 86. It is evidently common currency, since it is used for Larisa (B 841, Ρ 301), Phthia (I 479), Tarne (Ε 44), Askanie (Ν 793), Paeonia (P 350), and Thrace (Y 485).

(d) ἐπατευὴ at E 210 has an emotional connotation, but is in no sense descriptive, and is applied to places so various as Augeia (B 532, 583), AraithureΣ (B 571), Arene (B 591), Mantinea (B 707), Emathia (Σ 226), Maconia (Γ 491, Σ 291), Lakedaimon (Γ 239, 443), and Scherie (γ 79).

(e) ἐπείρα, used of Troy at N 433, Ω 256, 494, 774, a 62, δ 99, ε 307, λ 499, ν 256, is limited to regions with a certain amount of open land, and is therefore suited to countries like Lycia (Z 173, 210, Π 673, 683), and Crete (N 453), but also to cities with open land around them, appropriately so for Knossos (Σ 591) and Sparta (λ 460), but less so for Helike (B 575). It is certainly appropriate to the Troad.

(f) ἰπῖ is used twenty-one times in the Iliad for Troy and may be connected with it as the seat of a temple of Athene. It also lies behind the phrase Τροίης ἰερὰ κρήδεμα (Π 100). It too is common currency and used for Orchestoros (B 506), Thebe (A 366), Soumion (γ 278), Pylos (φ 108), Athens (λ 323), and the Echinades (B 625). Its frequent appearance in the Iliad is probably due to its happy and useful union with ἰλιος at the end of the line.

In these cases epithets applied to Troy are evidently drawn from a common stock which was available to deal with most places. They are all appropriate enough but never very individual or illuminating. (a) refers to the good work which has gone to the making of Troy; (b) and (c) to the fertile land around it; (d) to its general amenities; (e) to the extent of its territory, and (f) to its cults. All of them are consistent with what we know of Troy VI and VIIA, and indeed of VII B and VIII. But they do not differentiate it very firmly from other cities which are well founded, have lands around them, and are known for local cults. If the demands of oral composition meant that Troy had to have epithets, these are adequate enough but do not suggest any special knowledge.

2. Epithets Conferred to Troy

(a) ἐθνημός, which appears in the phrase ἐθνημοῦ πολυς at Φ 516, is normally used of towers (Π 700, X 195) walls (Μ 36, ν 302, χ 24, 126) and altars (A 448), but is applied in this single case to a whole city. It suggests the solid work which has gone to its building and is abundantly justified by the remains of Troy VI and VIIA. It is not used of any other city as such, and looks as if it were given special duties for a clear impression of Troy in its strength and solidarity.

(b) ἐνεῖξες at A 129, B 113, 288, E 716, Θ 241, I 20 is more specific than ἐθνημός. The walls of Troy VI, which survived with some patching in Troy VIIA, show how well deserved the epithet is, and it helps to explain why the Achaean took ten years to capture the city. Its absence from other cities does not indicate that they lacked walls but suggests that those of Troy were particularly noteworthy.

(c) ἐπυρώς at H 71 may be taken to refer not to walls but to towers in the fortifications, such as existed in VI in at least four places, known as VI g, VI h, VI i, VI k, and survived into VII A. We do not know how high they were, but they were an integral and important feature in the defences of Troy and must have presented an impressive spectacle. Towers also existed at Mycene and Tiryns, but, since they were built in connection with gates, and these were fewer than at Troy, the towers also were probably fewer. Their number at Troy certainly contributed to the impression which it made as a ‘well-towered’ city.

* Troy iv 6, 48, 73, 88.
(d) ὑφόνεσσα occurs only once in a highly dramatic passage, when the Trojans burst into lamentations as they see the dead body of Hector dragged behind the chariot of Achilles:

τῷ δὲ μάλιστ' ἄρ' ἐνυ ἐναλυγκούν ὡς εἰ ἀπασα
'Híios ὑφόνεσσα πυρὶ σαμύχοιτο καὶ άκρης. (X 410-411)

The adjective seems to be derived from such phrases as ἐπὶ ὑφρύσα Καλλικολώνης (Y 59) and is explained by the Townelean scholiast as ἐπὶ ὑφρύδεος τόπου κειμένη. It was used in the seventh or sixth century by a Delphic oracle for Acrocorinth (Hdt. v 92 β 3), and not only conveys a vivid impression of Troy on its ridge overlooking the plain but helps by contrast to strengthen the note of menace in its coming doom. It is a general comment on the forbidding aspect which the city presented, especially to any possible attackers.

(e) ἄστυ μεγά (B 803, H 286, I 136, 278, O 681, P 160, Φ 309, X 351) is not very appropriate to the site of Troy if it refers simply to extent. The remains of VI and VIIA measure some 200 yards at their widest diameter and cover not more than five acres, nor does it take more than a quarter of an hour to walk round them without hurrying. It is true that in the Iliad Homer suggests that a very large force is housed in this small area, and that we may well agree with Thucydides when he says εἰκός ἐπὶ τό μειζόν μὲν ποιητήν οὐτα κομίσας (i 10.3). But μεγά need not refer to extent, and may well refer to height and mass, as it is used for a tower (Z 386) or a mountain (Π 297). Such a meaning would be highly appropriate to Troy with its formidable fortifications and the look which these presented to anyone on the plain below.

(f) ἐφώλος belongs to rather a different category from the preceding cases, since it is concerned with Troy not for its appearance but as a place famous for its horses. As such it is connected with the epithet ἐπίδαμος, which is used of the Trojans twenty-one times in the Iliad. ἐφώλος is fully justified by history. Though no bones of horses have been found in the first five settlements, they are abundant in Troy VI* and VIIA*, but become rare in VIIA. It has been surmised with good reason that the people who built Troy VI owed their success to their use of the domesticated horse, and they seem to have left this legacy to their descendants who held the city till the destruction of VIIA.

The epithets in this class are more precise and more distinctive than in the preceding. Taken together they suggest actual observation and local knowledge. They are more than merely appropriate to Troy, and were surely chosen with an eye to its appearance and character. Since none of them is applied to other cities which seem to deserve them, it looks as if they were intended to give from different angles an impression of Troy in its striking individuality with its well-made walls and towers, its threatening appearance, and its reliance upon horses.

3. Epithets Suitable to Troy but not Confined to it

A third class of epithets differs from the first in not being obviously drawn from stock, and from the second in not being confined to Troy. None the less they suit it very well and are in this respect close to the second class. The aspects which they stress are shared with other places, but are none the less characteristic of Troy.

(a) ἀίνυ (N 625), ἀνύ (O 71), and ἀνεινύ (L 419, 682, N 773, O 558, P 328) all have the same meaning, and their usage is determined entirely by requirements of scansion. All are apt for Hisarlik, which rises steeply from the plain on the north and west side, and certainly must have risen noticeably, if not so steeply, on the east and south sides before the builders of Troy IX did their great levelling. ἀνύ is confined to Troy, but ἀνεινύ is also applied to Kalydon (N 217), Gonoessa (B 573), and Pedasos (Z 35), and is relevant
enough to what we know of these places. αἰρή has a similar range, and is justifiably used of Dion in northern Euboea (B 538), where the modern village of Lithada is set on the edge of a precipice; of Pylos (γ 484, ο 193), which deserves the adjective if the reference is to the Mycenaeian site of Ano Englianos; and of the mythical home of the Laestrygonian Lamos in a mountainous fjord (κ 87). Its application to Troy may have been suggested by the view which it presents to anyone who approaches it from the north or the west, as travellers who come by sea normally do.

(b) ὑψίστολος (Π 698, Φ 544) is explained by Hesychius as meaning ὑψηλὸς πύλαι ἔχον, and his assumption that it refers to the number, as well as the height, of gates is important for Troy. In Troy VI excavation has revealed the remains of gates VIr in the north-east, VIi in the east, VIr in the south, VIu in the south-west, VIv in the west, VIr in the south, and VIz in the south-west. Not all of these existed at the same time, but there must have been at least four at most periods in the life of Troy VI, and such seem to have lasted through Troy VIIA. Nor can we rule out the possibility that there were other gates in the north wall which does not survive. The only other city to which Homer applies ὑψίστολος is the Myrian Thebe (Z 416), and on this we are in no position to say whether it is justified or not, though Thebe had close relations with Troy and may have resembled it in the manner of its fortifications in its strategic position at the head of the Adramyttian Gulf. The adjective might, we would think, have been applied to other citadels such as Mykene, Tiryns, and Athens, but in fact it is not. The fortifications of Mykene, which present so striking a spectacle today, are not hinted at, nor are those of Athens, while Tiryns is called, very appropriately, τεῖχος (B 559) without any mention of its gates. The reason for this must be that Troy was unusual in the number of its gates, while these other cities had only one main gate and a postern entry. A series of lofty gates at Troy would earn the epithet ὑψίστολος. The nearest approaches to it are the Boeotian Thebes, which is called ἐπταπτολοῖο (Δ 406) in accordance with legend and the importance attached to each gate in the War of the Seven, and the Egyptian Thebes, which is ἐκατόμπυλος (I 383), as befits so remarkable a city outside the familiar limits of the Greek world.

(c) ἱμέρος, which is found in the formula Ῥών ἱμέροσαν (Γ 305, Θ 499, Μ 115, Ν 724, Θ 174, Ψ 64,297), is, as anyone who has visited Troy knows, remarkably apt, and engaged the special attention of Schliemann, who made meteorological inquiries about it. The north wind, which the modern Greeks call Θρακικός in the winter and μελτέμι in the summer, blows powerfully at most seasons of the year and provides ample justification for the epithet. But it is not attached uniquely to Troy. It is applied also to the mountain of Mimas (γ 172), which is on the Ionian coast near Erythrae and was the scene of a severe storm recorded by Thucydides (viii 34.5), and to Enispe in Arcadia (B 660), whose exact position is not known to us, as it was not known to Strabo (388). But of course in Arcadia the adjective may well be deserved.

(d) ἐφρύγων, which is applied to Troy eight times in the Iliad and twice in the Odyssey, presents a special problem. It used to be thought that it referred to Troy VI, in which there is an unusual unoccupied space between the walls and the buildings enclosed by them. This is indeed so unusual that it might well call for notice and deserve a special epithet. But this interpretation is hardly tenable, since the adjective is applied also to Mykene (Δ 52) and Athens (γ 80), where there is no such space. In VIIA this open space was covered with houses when the city was rebuilt after the earthquake of c. 1275 B.C., and this suggests that ἐφρύγων must have another meaning, which can only be 'with broad streets'. One of the most noteworthy features of the rebuilding done in VIIA is the construction of well-paved and well-drained streets, notably Street 710, which leads from the South Gate to the heart of the citadel, and may indeed have been one of the ways by which

11 I owe this information to Professor C. Trypanis.
12 W. Leaf, Troy 150–1.
the Achaeans entered Troy, since a bronze arrow-head has been found in it. This street, together with the remains of others, suggests that Troy VIIA was well planned for internal communications, and this alone would justify the choice of the epithet. It is significant that ἐσπευδόμενα is applied also to Mykene, where a royal road led through the Lion Gate to the summit, and to Athens, which had a well-made approach. Homeric notions of width in streets were not the same as ours, and it is likely that any city which had a system of streets would be noticed for them. In Troy, as in Mykene and Athens, the epithet is amply justified and seems to fit Troy VIIA better than Troy VI.

(Ε) ἐδωρόμενον which is applied to Troy in the formula ἐδωρόμενον πολιτήροιν (A 164, B 133, I 402, N 380), seems to mean 'well populated'. It is used also for the island of Kos, where Heracles arrives after the first Trojan War (Σ 255, O 28), and for Sidonie (v 285). The first may have been chosen to suggest a flourishing city worthy of capture by Heracles (Apollod. 2.7.1; Strab. 531; Eustath. 985,35), and the second, even if it is not the same as the historical Sidon, must surely be a city of the Phoenician coast and as such assumed to be prosperous and suited to such an epithet. Hisarlik VI cannot have been very populous, as its small area left room for houses to stand in their own space without overcrowding, but VIIA was different. Houses are smaller and more crowded; empty spaces are covered by them; their stores are kept indoors in jars below the surface of the floor. When the city was re-fashioned after the earthquake of c. 1275 B.C. special steps were taken to make it accommodate more inhabitants without extending the circuit of its walls. It is therefore possible that this is what is meant by ἐδωρόμενον.

Even if some epithets for Troy are so conventional as to be not very informative, others are much to the point and chosen with an eye for what Troy really was. Just as Pylos is called ἰμαθέας because of the sandy beaches below the hill where the 'Palace of Nestor' stands, and Mykene has been abundantly justified in its epithet πολυχρόνιον by Schliemann's discoveries, so Troy has epithets which are always consistent with its site and appearance and often illuminating and picturesque. They indicate that at some stage or stages a poet or poets knew the site and found appropriate adjectives for it. This need not have happened within a single, short space of time, but we ought to be able to decide roughly when some of these epithets were brought into poetical use. We can do something for this by asking how appropriate they are to the different cities on the site of Hisarlik. Of these VI and VIIA, which may be treated as a continuous settlement, provided obvious opportunities. The walls and towers and gates, the well-made streets and the crowded houses, even the breeding of horses, are all reflected in the epithets. Troy VI—VIIA was in contact with the Mycenaean world, as the finds of pottery show, and if information from travellers was not enough, it could be supplemented by warriors who fought at Troy in the middle of the thirteenth century. This is the obvious Troy for the epithets, but we must first inquire whether some of them might not come from a later date. Troy VIIb continued in a diminished and presumably poverty-stricken form the life of VIIA and maintained some relations with mainland Greece. It is therefore not impossible that wandering bards, who had already parts of the tale of Troy in their repertory, added to the existing epithets others formed from a knowledge of the site, which might indeed be partly ruined but still suggest something of its former glory. This period would be from c. 1240 B.C. to c. 1100 B.C. In it falls the beginning of the Dark Age and the vast destructions of c. 1200 and the subsequent movements of peoples, but the poetical tradition, which was already at work in Mycenaean days, survived the catastrophes, and there is no a priori reason why poets should not have known Troy and made use of their knowledge in songs of the glorious past. From c. 1100 B.C. to a little before 700 B.C., when it was refounded by Greek colonists, it seems to have been deserted, and even if poets visited it, which must
have been rare at the best, its remains would hardly have conveyed much to them. Nor is it easy to believe that the poet of our Iliad could have seen much of the ancient town. If, as is likely, he lived in the eighth century, he would in all probability have found nothing but a desolate, overgrown heap of rubble, and certainly not sufficient ruins to provide him with the exact knowledge which the more special epithets imply. He might see the actual position where Troy had stood and grasp its relation to the surrounding country, but he would not see towers or gates or houses or streets. We are forced to conclude that in so far as the epithets reveal a real knowledge of Troy, this must have been gained during the existence of VI or VIIA, with perhaps some small reinforcements from VIIb.

We need not shrink from the notion that some Homeric epithets go back to Mycenaean times. An oral, formulaic style, like that of the Iliad and the Odyssey, may last for many centuries and preserve in fixed phrases much information which dates from a remote past. Just as the poems carry unexpected details about Mycenaean civilisation \(^{19}\) into a time when some of them must have been almost unintelligible, so they preserve information on Troy and the Trojan War which must go back to men who knew about them at first hand from their own experience. We cannot say exactly for what kind of poem these epithets were chosen and fashioned into formulae, but they look as if they were made for hexameters, and this suggests that the hexameter existed in Mycenaean times, and the poems containing them would have been κλέα ἀνδρῶν, which, whether they were sung in praise of the living or as tales of the heroic dead, told of great doings at Troy. That the one kind of poem passes easily into the other is proved by poetical practice in many parts of the world \(^{20}\) and is indeed a natural process as the high exploits of the present recede into the past. It is clear that the tale of Troy became a subject for song at an early date, and it is no less clear that certain details and episodes, which are fully intelligible only in the light of what we know about Troy VI–VIIA, were preserved for centuries as an integral part of the tradition, despite their minor relevance to the main story. It is no accident that the faulty structure of the western fortifications of Troy, which have been revealed by excavation, \(^{21}\) were known to Homer’s Andromache:

\[
λαὸν δὲ στήσειν παρ’ ἐρυμένοι, ἑνθα μάλωτα
ἄμβατὸς ἄτι πόλις καὶ ἐπιθρόμον ἐπλετοὶ τείχοι. \quad (Z \text{ 433–4})
\]

or that the batter of the walls, which is not nearly so steep as at Mykene and Tiryns and provides an easy climb up to the angle, or ἄγκων, where the perpendicular battlements on top of them begin, \(^{22}\) was enshrined in Patroclus’ attempt to scale them:

\[
τρίς μὲν ἀπ’ ἄγκων βῆ τείχεος ύψηλοι
Πάτροκλος, τρίς δ’ αὐτὸν ἀπεστυφέλξεν Ἀπόλλων. \quad (Π \text{ 702–3})
\]

If the tradition preserved details such as these from Mycenaean times, and it can hardly have done so from any other, it is even more likely to have preserved formulae for the city itself, since these were indispensable instruments for any oral song about Troy.

In trying to decide which of these epithets are likely to be early we may start with those which gave a visual impression of Troy as a fortified citadel. They are ὀφρωσσα, εὐεῖχεος, ύψηπλος, ἐπίπυρος, ἐδυμμός. Some of these may well be Mycenaean words. The prefix εὐ– occurs a number of times in proper names from Linear B tablets from Knossos and Pylos. \(^{23}\) –τείχεος looks as if it were related to to-kó-do-mo (toikhodomoi, ‘builders’), \(^{24}\) and –δυμμός to de-me-o-te (demeontes, ‘who are to build’). \(^{25}\) All five of these epithets are suitable

---

\(^{19}\) T. B. L. Webster, From Mycenae to Homer 64–90.

\(^{20}\) Troy iii 87; cf. D. Gray in J. L. Myres, Homer and his Critics, 258.

\(^{21}\) C. M. Bowra, Heroic Poetry 9–23.

\(^{22}\) Ventriss–Chadwick 418.


\(^{24}\) Id. 182 (PY An20).

\(^{25}\) Id. 174 (PY An14).
for Troy VI–VIIA, and if we add ἔφρονύια and εβ ναιόμενον, which we have seen to be peculiarly suitable for VIIA, we get a fairly comprehensive picture of Troy as it would look from without and within in the middle of the thirteenth century. έπουλος also must be early, since it comes from the time when the Trojans were renowned for their horses, and this does not seem to have been the case after the destruction of VIIA. It, too, may be an ancient word, since the dual po-ro appears on a tablet from Knossos. All these epithets look as if they went back to Mycenaean times and were adapted to poetry when the events of Troy were still fresh in men’s minds, and the memory of the city which the Achaians had besieged and burned was fixed in these apt and convincing words.

Against these we may set other epithets which cannot be ascribed with equal confidence to Mycenaean times and may indeed come from any period when men knew that there had once been a city of Troy on a hill in the Troad. They none the less record impressions of the actual physical scene and setting. Of these the most striking is ἵρεμόθεσθαι, which at least looks like an ancient word, since it is related to the Mycenaean a-ne-ro and may well embody the memories of men who knew the hardships of a campaign in the Troad. But we cannot rule out the possibility that it might also convey an impression formed at a later date by travellers who knew the site of Troy and marked its wind. Its highly restricted use in the text suggests that it is perhaps less fully acclimatised than, for instance, ἔφρονύια, which is used in more than one formula, and that its entry into the poetical tradition did not come very early. αἰμενή and its cognate words suggest knowledge of the hill but not necessarily of the city, while ἐρμβώλας and ἐρββαλος refer only to the countryside, and for this reason we cannot assign them with confidence to Mycenaean times and must concede that they could have been added to the repertory at any time up to Troy VIII.

Once the right epithets for Troy had been found, it was helpful, for reasons of composition, to supplement them with others, and some of these look as if they were introduced by men who did not know the look of Troy and therefore used words like ἐστίκτημος, ἰφατεμή, ἐφαία, ἵρη, which come from a general stock of epithets for cities and their territories and imply no specific knowledge of Troy. Some of them may indeed be ancient words, but others have a more modern air, as ἐστίκτημος seems to have lost any close connection with the Mycenaean ki-τί-me-na, and ἵρη in its contracted form is later than the Mycenaean i-je-ro. But whether ancient or recent, these unspecific epithets were evidently adapted to poetry when bards had no actual acquaintance with Troy and, feeling a need to widen the range of phrases for it, made use of more or less standardised words which would be appropriate enough but not very distinctive or revealing. None of them makes an unusual point. They belong to traditional methods of introducing cities, and their application to Troy may have come when the city and the landscape were no longer familiar and had to be treated with cautious vagueness.

If we think that the Iliad was composed in the eighth century by a man called Homer, it is clear that he had very little part in bringing these epithets for Troy into the epic language. They belong to a tradition which he inherited and no doubt expanded and improved. In this matter, as in others, he seems to have been content to operate with formulae which were for the most part fixed and regularised before he began to compose, and his task was rather to use them with the utmost effect for his own vision of the wrath of Achilles and its dire consequences. It is out of the question that Homer saw Troy in its heyday or even enough ruins of it to give him a clear notion of what it had been some five hundred years before his own lifetime. But this does not mean that he did not know the country round the hill where Troy had once stood. Indeed it is difficult to imagine how he could have composed the Iliad unless he had in his mind a far clearer picture of the Troad than that of Ithaca in the Odyssey, and the clarity of the picture, which helped him to some of his

26 Ventris–Chadwick 210 (KN Ca825).
27 Id. 306 (KN Fp1).
28 KN Fp363.
dramatic effects, must have been due in some degree to personal knowledge. Though it is more than questionable whether he lived to see Troy VIII, he may have seen the Troad when Greeks were beginning to visit it again as a possible site for a colony. But all that is another question. For the moment we must be content to recognise that the Homeric epithets for Troy go back in part to the Mycenaean age and reflect the sight which the city must have presented to at least one generation of Achaeans.  

C. M. Bowra.

Wadham College, Oxford.

29 I am grateful to Professor A. Andrewes and Mr W. G. G. Forrest for helpful criticism.
PLUTARCH’S STYLE IN THE MARIUS

In writing on Plutarch as a literary artist there is a tendency to confuse Plutarch’s personality, which appears from his writings as ingenuous and somewhat naive, with his style, which has all the sophistication of the classical renaissance of which his writings form a part. Actually, extensive acquaintance with many aspects of literary craftsmanship is visible in his work. His careful avoidance of hiatus was noticed as long ago as 1841 by Benseler. More recently it has been discovered that Plutarch writes rhythmical prose, with a great preference for certain definite forms. He is thoroughly versed in the various schemata for the presentation of material. Boissonade termed his style a mosaic because it is so well adapted for dealing with the various themes occurring in the Lives; Plutarch has in fact perfect command over matter and form as a result of a thorough acquaintance with a rich literary tradition.

The metaphors and similes which appear in this Life seem on a first reading in ill accord with the sophistication of its general craftsmanship. They are stereotyped into the thought-content, and even the diction, traditional for the symbolism they express. Their infrequency and the elaboration of the metaphors in particular makes them stand out starkly. This conspicuousness and careful articulation is significant. The metaphors and similes are in fact strikingly put so that they emphasise the passages in which they occur, and recall one another vividly to mind. Analysis reveals that they are used in two ways: as points of reference and emphasis (they occur only at important junctures) and to indicate the unity of lengthy passages. Long and elaborate metaphors occur at 11.1, 35.1, and 46.4, marking respectively the Germanic war, the civil war, and Marius’ fate and death. A metaphor and simile grouped together, at 23.1 and at 32.1, 3 respectively, tell of Catulus’ reverse and the Social War; two similes commence the developments which are to lead to Marius’ death at 45.1–2. Less striking metaphors anticipate the civil war (10.5) and the Marian massacre (43.4).

To take the latter use first, the unity of the German wars, which occupy seventeen of the forty-six chapters of the Life (11–27) and contain many digressions, is retained by two strands of symbolism, referring respectively to a billow and a storm cloud, which thread through the whole. At 11.1 the Germans are referred to as ‘a deluge of war’; at 14.1 they ebb back; at 20.6 their onrush seems to be compared to breakers in surf, and at 26.2 it is likened to ‘a vast sea in motion’. So at 11.3 they fall upon Italy like a cloud; at 16.1 Marius declares it his aim to ward off ‘this cloud and thunderbolt of war’, and at 23.1 the Cimbri appear like a cloud in calm, clear weather. These symbols are carefully chosen so that they link developments in their respective chains of events and supplement the symbolism of the ship of state which runs through the Life and binds it together: at 11.1 the state looks for a helmsman to weather the storm (at 23.1 a cloud comes upon it out of a calm, clear sky); at 45.1 there is, as it were, a change in the wind’s direction, and at 45.2 Marius begins to founder as if waterlogged (so at 2.3 and 45.6 he is said to ‘run aground’—if ἡξοκέλλω is not used as a catachresis).

In their capacity as means of emphasis and cross-reference the tropes demarcate digressions, calling attention to commencement and closure. At 11.8, to complete the symbolical

1 De Groot, CQ ix (1915) 231 f.; cf. Shewring, CQ xxiv (1930) 164 f.; Sandbach, CQ xxvii (1933) 194 f.
2 Forster and Webster, An Anthology of Greek Prose (1933) 19.
3 Metaphors (Loeb paragraph notation): 10.5; 11.1; 16.1; 23.1; 32.3; 35.1; 43.4; 44.4; 46.4.
4 Similes: 11.3; 11.8; 14.1; 23.1; 32.2; 32.1; 45.1; 45.2.
references to elemental forces, the Germans are likened to fire in a simile which marks the end of a geographical and ethnographical digression commenced by the deluge metaphor of 11.1. So at 14.1 and 16.1 a simile and a metaphor respectively flank an anecdote (the aristea of Trebonius) and a digression (the Fossa Mariana) which are static elements in the onward progress of the narrative. More important is the use of the metaphor for cross-reference. The symbols of billow and cloud refer the reader to the progress of the Cimbri, linking that part of the narrative which deals with this progress in spite of a number of relatively unconnected digressions. The symbol of the ship of state links various incidents in Marius' career: his youth (2.3); his tremendous achievement in attaining his second consulship (11.1); the anticlimax of Catulus' reverse after his success in Transalpine Gaul (23.1); his approaching downfall (45.1), break-down (45.2), and death (45.6). The most striking example of Plutarch's use of symbolism in this way can be seen in the symbolism of organic disorder occurring at 10.5, 32.3, 35.1 and 44.4. The ill-feeling between Marius and Sulla is represented as a disorder in the state; at 10.5 the first seed is sown; at 32.2 the disorder almost bursts out but is anticipated by another; at 35.1 the long secret disorder comes to a head; at 44.4 it is at its height, thirsting and going through the citizen body causing many deaths.  

This last use of metaphor and simile is merely an aspect of a more general technique of internal reference, namely that done by sustained verbal echoes. Thus at 10.1, 2 Metellus leaves Africa rather than meet Marius returning by popular vote, and at 31.1, 2 Marius leaves Rome rather than meet Metellus returning by popular vote. These two incidents are parallel, and, with his readiness to see the paradoxical turns of fate, Plutarch sought to underline the parallelism by a number of word echoes, similar words or slightly dissimilar compounds being used. The following passages are linked by this device: 10.4-40.5, 37.1-40.7, 10.5-32.3, 35.1. A more complex group of linked passages is 2.3-3.2-34.2-5-45.6-7. Here 3.1-2 is markedly linked with 34.2-3 as are 2.3-34.4-5: 45.6-7. The three passages are linked (a) by echoes occurring in all three, and (b) by echoes occurring in two only but so as to connect all three.  

These word links produce a number of balances and responses which are meant stylistically to underline the vicissitudes of Marius' fortunes. Thus 32.2-3 cannot fail to refer the reader back to 10.5-6, where the same situation of private feud between Marius and Sulla was also only averted from bursting into civil war by an external war. There is clearly some sort of schematism in these two parallel passages which flank the narrative of the German wars. Similarly at 34.2 the reference to 3.1 marks Marius' advance from his humble origin to his goal of greatness, while 34.4-5 hints at and 45.6-7 marks the anticlimax, Marius' end as a frightened, raving murderer. Schematically, these three passages mark the beginning, the high-water mark and the final low-water mark of Marius' tempestuous career.

---

5 The use of ἅμαρτοντι and ἀδραίαν suggest the disease metaphor. Λύξιν offer no parallel for ἐγκάθω ἔπι, meaning 'killed', as used here: the use is probably figurative and the passage meant to integrate into the overall symbolism which refers to this civil war as a disease.

6 ἐξεπείγοντες εἰς (10.1): ἐξεπείγοντες εἰς (31.1); θρίαμβον (10.1); θρίαμβον (31.2); ἔθραμμος (10.1) and 31.2; οὐχ ἐπέμενεν (10.1); οὐχ ἐπέμενεν (31.1); ἄφθισθε (10.2): ἀφθίσθησθαι (31.2).

7 Linking words are: ἀδόξων 3.1: φαλοῦσαν 34.4-5: ἀδόξων 3.1 and 34.2; γυναῖκα 3.1 and 34.5; διώκτος 3.1, 3.2, and 34.2; ἔδρα 3.1 and 45.7; ὁδόσω (34.4); ἐδίκητος 2.3 and 45.6; ἐνδος 34.5 and 45.7; ἐξουκλεία 2.3 and 45.6; ἔρρησι 2.3 and 34.4; Μιθριδάτος 34.5 and 45.6; οἰκία 34.2 and 45.7; παντάκαταστα 3.1 and 45.6; ἔρρησι 3.1 and 34.4; πλινθέων 2.3 and 34.4; τῶν πράξεων αὐτῶν 2.3; ταῦτα πράττειν 34.4; τῶν πράξεων ἐκείνων 45.7; πλινθέων τοσίνιος 34.4; πλινθέων 45.7; πολεμικέα 3.2 and 34.2; στρατιάς 3.2, 3.4 and 34.5; στρατηγόν 3.2; στρατηγεύτης 34.5; σάμιος 3.4 and 45.6; τρωφαίος 3.2 and 34.2 (twice); ψυλλεύχος 2.3 and 45.6; φυλλυπεία 34.4 and 45.6 (ψυλλεύχος 34.3); ὀσκέ 2.3, 34.5 and 45.6.

Marius was the type-figure to illustrate the ups and downs of fortune; cf. Val. Max. i 7.5, ii 10.6, iii 6.6, vi 9.14, viii 15.7, ix 2.2; Seneca the elder, Controv. i 1.3, i 1.5, i 6.3-4, vii 2.6; Seneca the Younger, Ad Paul. 17.6.
For schematic handling Plutarch seems to have conceived of Marius' career as having two climaxes, a major and a minor: his successes in the German wars and in the counter coup of 87; and two anti-climaxes: Sulla's capture of Rome and Marius' death through fear of Sulla's imminent return. Thus the German wars are the central piece in the first rise and fall of Marius' fortunes. They are flanked by accounts in increasing detail of the Numantine and African wars, to represent Marius' ascent to glory, and by accounts in decreasing detail of the Social War and Sulla's first coup d'état, to represent his descent therefrom. The two quarrels with Sulla, coming just after the African and just before the Social Wars (i.e. at the beginning and end of the German wars), are another pair of flanking devices.9 The second climax and anticlimax is represented in a similar schema. Again the central group in the presentation—the detail is much less than in the first group as befits the less paradoxical nature of this one—is a war, that in which Marius and Cinna recaptured Rome. This centre piece is flanked by two brief character studies (of Marius, 41.4, and of Octavius, 42.4–5) and by two short romances, the Flight and Exile and the Marian Massacre, parallel in that they represent Marius cruelly persecuted when out of power and cruelly persecuting when in it. The Sullan coup, with which the first group terminated, marks the initial low ebb of Marius' fortunes from which they rise to the high-water mark of the Marian counter-coup. In spite of all Plutarch's anticipations of Sulla's return in chapter 45, there occurred in Marius' time no third engagement to mark the low-water mark to which Marius' fortunes again ebbed. Hence the inclusion in the narrative of the death of Marius' son in the war of Sulla's return from the East. This war completes a third and outermost pair of flanking devices, responding to the Sullan coup. Overall unity of structure is effected by the triple group 2.3–3.1, 34.2–5, 45.6–7, which traces the vicissitudes of Marius' career and by the heavily emphasised parallelism of the opening and closing chapters of the Life. In these even similarity of the passages of moral generalisation and the citation of authorities (Posidonius and Plato) is used to reinforce the parallelism. Moreover, the inclusion of Marius junior's campaigns and death in the final chapter exactly balances the introductory chapter on Roman proper names in that neither is organically related to the subject-matter of the Life.

Stylistic aims are in this way responsible for two of the historical problems of the Life. Chapters 10.5–11.1 tell of a quarrel between Marius and Sulla and his supporters among the nobilitas, which was nearly to overthrow Rome and which bade fair to ruin Marius' reputation at the time—apparently 105. This is an historical anticipation. Sulla is quite an unimportant figure at this date. He had held only a quaestorship, proquaestorship and propraetorship and had not played the large part in the surrender of Jugurtha that lapse of time was later to allow him to claim.10 He remained on Marius' staff till 103 (Plut. Sull. 4.1–2) being too minor a figure to annoy Marius and much too small a fry for association with the Metelli (who are not mentioned in connexion with this incident at Sull. 3.4). Sulla did not become a member of the Metellian clique till c. 89.11 This was the time when Sulla had Bocchus dedicate the monument representing the betrayal of Jugurtha as done through Sulla's agency,12 and when the support of Sulla by the Metellian clique nearly resulted in civil disturbances in Rome. The antedating of Sulla's importance and the significance of his quarrel with Marius is caused by the desire to effect schematic parallelism. So also the interpretation of Marius' death as caused by a breakdown due to worry over Sulla's imminent and victorious homecoming (ch. 45) and the compression of the events of 86–82 into what appear to be those of 86 (46.5–6) are caused by a desire to complete a

---

9 Three conflicts with Metellus, two before and one after the German wars, the central piece in this pedimental structure, and three underhand negotiations with Saturninus, one at the beginning of and the others after these wars, are others.

10 Passerini, Athenaeum xii (1934) 33–4.
11 Carcopino, Sylla ou la monarchie manquée (1950) ch. 2. fin.
12 Sull. 6.1; Mar. 32.2; Passerini, 333.
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stilistic pattern. At the time of Marius' death (January 13, 86) Sulla was in a critical position in Greece and, as Plutarch elsewhere knows (Sull. 12.3), was afraid of the expedition that Marius was mounting against him. Sulla did not in fact intimate that he was returning until the end of 85 and did not actually invade Italy until 83. Plutarch, however, reconstructed the death of Marius as an anticlimax to his successful counter-coup seeing it the final reverse of the vicissitudes of Marius' career (cf. Mar. 45.5). The narrative of the Marius from 41.16 is chronologically confused and relies on an antedating of Sulla's success against Mithridates.

Another instance of the perversion of historical fact in the interests of stylistic presentation occurs in Plutarch's depiction of the Marian massacre, an incident which, as Bennett has shown (pp. 24–35), has been grotesquely overdrawn by Plutarch. The account (43.3–44.6) is presented in a chiastic schema. The narrative opens and closes with mention of the Bardyaee and of Cinna's attitude to them; he is represented as sated with their blood-letting (43.4) and finally executing them for indisclipline (44.6). Immediately following the first mention of the Bardyaee and Cinna and preceding their second mention occur generalised, rhetorical accounts of the many pitiless murders perpetrated during the massacre (43.5 and 44.6 respectively). Within this schematic bracket are set a trio of anecdotes concerning Cornutus (43.6), Antonius (44.1–4) and Catulus (44.5). The arrangement is pedimental, the elaborate Antonius anecdote being flanked by the two shorter and less ornate anecdotes. The overall pattern might be represented: ABcCBA.

In dealing with the Marian massacre Plutarch uses what is very noticeably a technique of character delineation. Character drawing can be regarded as static (the pen-portrait) or mobile (the character in action). Wilmer has reconstructed a method of character drawing by 'the contrasting reactions of persons under consideration in situations calculated to exhibit such contrast' and by the repetition of episodes and of details within an episode. Both techniques are employed by Plutarch. The clearest examples of the first occur at 28.1–29.8 and 45.6–46.2. In the first passage Marius is contrasted with Metellus as a self-seeking, unscrupulous coward with a high-principled, philosophical statesman. In the second Marius' undisciplined desires and unhappy end are contrasted with the philosophical control and peaceful deaths of Plato and Antipater. In both cases the contrast brings out the delineation of Marius' character more forcibly. Other instances of this technique occur at 42.1–4, where a character drawing of Marius in action (using treachery and attacking his country ruthlessly) is contrasted with another of the constitutionalists in action (Metellus rigidly obeys the constitution and Octavius refuses to adopt underhand means), and at 43.1–44.6, where the conduct of Marius is unfavourably contrasted with that of Cinna in the Marian Massacre. The second technique occurs when at 42.4 Octavius is represented as 'keeping the dignity of the consular office free from undue influence,' a remark that is inorganic in its context but refers strikingly to Marius' lowering of the dignity of the consulship at 28.1. By the implicit contrast drawn within the same sphere of reference another aspect of Marius' character is recalled and strongly illuminated. So Marius' clashes with Metellus (8.2, 10.1, 29) repeat and further illustrate the idea of the former's duplicity and unscrupulousness. Likewise, Marius' collusive activities with Apuleius (14.6–7, 28.5, 30.2) play on this theme.

Using the technique of source-analysis evolved by Last for the Bellum Jugurthinum, one might argue that Plutarch, drawing on the biographical writings of Rutulius, Catulus and Sulla, is merely presenting a patch-work composition of extracts from these sources run

---

13 CAH ix (1951) 246 f.
14 Bennett, Cinna and his times (Diss. Chic., 1923) 29.
15 CAH ix 269 and 271 respectively.
16 Here Sulla is represented as fighting in Boeotia (86 B.C.; cf. Broughton, Magistrates of the Roman Republic ii (1952) 55) while Cinna and Octavius quarrel in Rome before Cinna's deposition (87; Broughton, ii 46).
17 CP xxv (1930) 56 f.
18 CAH ix 113–16.
together. Certainly it is true that such writers wrote up history in terms of conflicts between their subjects and other leading political figures. It is also true that for much of the *Life* Plutarch seems only to have information on Marius' activities when these coincide with those of the optimate worthies upon whom the above centre: Marius' activities in the Numantine war are told in anecdotes centring on Aemilianus; Metellus and Sulla are the true victors in the Jugurthine War, Catulus and Sulla in the Cimbric campaign, and Sulla in the Social War, and Marius' tribunate and sixth consulship are negatively represented as conflicts with the Metelli. This argument would, however, be unsound. None of the above accounts centred on Octavius, still less on Cinna or on Plato, yet these figures also are contrasted with Marius. Moreover it is clear that Plutarch supplemented these biographical writers with extensive further bibliography and, so far from being hypnotised by them, inserts material which conflicts with their evidence (e.g. 28.2 and 32.3–4). Also the technique is used in the paired *Life*: at *Pyrrh.* 20–21 Fabricius' moral strength and statesmanship is contrasted with the moral bankruptcy of the Macedonian king. The contrasts are thus clearly not the result of the domination exercised over Plutarch by his source material.

The operation of this technique tends to misfocus the centre of moral interest and to set up a sort of secondary hero, for Plutarch disapproved of Marius. Consequently all the contrasted figures are—Cinna included—examples of good qualities used to underline Marius' faults more distinctly. It also results in historical misrepresentation. Plutarch had a conventionalised picture of good conservatives and bad demagogues. Lack of experience in and understanding of political affairs made his interest concentrate all the more strongly on the individual man and his private life.

The bias in the primary sources for this period suggested an interpretation of historical events as caused by private conflict among leading personalities. The results can be seen in the presentation of black and white contrasts, over-simplifications, and over-drawing in moral terms—for inevitably the behaviour or attitude of the two parties is made more extreme to sharpen the contrast. It is upon such a naively drawn picture (28.1–2) that the orthodox interpretation of Marius relies. Passerini thought that this character sketch was subjectively inserted by Plutarch because Peripatetic technique required it at this point in the *Life* (pp. 260–1). That the sketch is produced by some variety of schematism is obvious from the number of inconsistencies within the *Life* that it causes: for Marius' dissimulations *cf.* 14.7–8, 17.3, 25.5, 32.1, 33.1, 34.5; for his resolute opposition to public pressure, *cf.* 4.2, 14.5, 28.2, 38.4. These inconsistencies indicate that this secondary hero technique gives an incorrect appraisal of Marius; certainly all other estimates of him in the sources tell against it.

The Marian massacre affords yet a further instance of subjective reworking of historical fact in the Antonius anecdote. This incident is recounted elsewhere at App. BC i 72.2–3; *Epit.* lxxv; Vell. ii 22.3; Val. Max. ix 2.9; Florus ii 9.14. The longest of these accounts is that of Appian, which is 120 words in all. Appian's account is as full of essential detail as is Plutarch's—in 245 words—and gives the additional fact that Antonius had fled to a farmstead and was being entertained by a farmer. A comparison of the two passages shows that there is in Plutarch a great deal of duality of expression (twelve examples to Appian's three), and that each character in the anecdote is given a brief pen-portrait

---

19 Passerini, 377–8; *cf.* Smith, *CQ* xxxiv (1940) 7–8.
20 *Cf.* 2.3 and 45.7–46.4.
21 Gomme, *Commentary on Thucydides,* i (1945) 59–60.
22 Ziegler in *RE* xxi 2 (1951) 999–10.
23 *E.g.* Metellus in 100 is described by Passerini as a 'coccio conservatore' and his opposition as injudicious and on purely personal grounds: p. 279 and n. 1; Cinna, not Marius, seems really to have been principally responsible for the Marian Massacre: Bennett, 31–2; *cf.* Croiset, *Histoire litt. grecq.* v (1901) 532–3.
24 *Cic.* *Att.* x 8.7; *Epit.* lxix; Dio xxxvi 89.2; Vell. ii 23.1; this estimate recurs nowhere else in Plutarch (*cf.* Badian in *Historia* vi (1957) 342–4).
sketching his personality. The friend is a good man; though poor and of the lower orders he entertains Antonius beyond his means. The slave, who takes undue trouble selecting the wine, is a simple, officious, trusting fellow. The innkeeper enters with a sneer; he is an unprincipled rogue who betrays his own close acquaintance at the double at an unseasonable hour. Marius shows immoderate, almost phrenetic joy at the betrayal; Plutarch conceived of him at this point as mentally unhinged and shortly to break down. Annius is characterised by contrast with his soldiers: their humanity, pity and respect heighten his brutal, callous haste. It should be noticed that the characters thus drawn in are morally appraised (e.g. the friend is good, the innkeeper a villain).

Now duality in expression, either in the form of word pairs or duplicated word runs, appears extensively only in chapters 9, 15, 16, 19, 20, 28, 29, and 43–6, and is used in passages of fine writing for purple passage painting. In the Antonius anecdote these dual expressions largely convey intimate little details which are not in Appian and seem to be subjectively inserted, being too trivial to have been recorded in any known history. Dignity and fullness in language and handling seem to be part of the technique for the working up of anecdote. Another part seems to be the brief sketching in and appraisal of character. Dramatisation of the action and emphasis of crucial points is done by the insertion of reported speech. The whole makes a vivid and memorable picture and contrasts strikingly with Appian, where all the incidents leading up to the betrayal of Antonius are narrated in one sentence. No appraisals of actions, motives or character are attempted. There is one hint of pathos in the word used of the slave’s confidence to the innkeeper (ἀγαθόπορος), but that is all. The rest of the narrative is contained in another sentence in which there is mention of Marius’ joy at the betrayal but no comment on this joy. The slaying of Antonius is not attended by Plutarch’s little touches, which seem to be subjectively inserted for their dramatic value, e.g. ‘running in to him’ and ‘abusing the troops’. All this sketching in of atmosphere seems to be done subjectively from Plutarch’s intuitive feel for the situation. The skeletal figures of other accounts become endowed with character and personality. The result is a passage complete in itself, which could stand on its own as a story without loss of force or significance: the last sentence—terse, hurried and abrupt in keeping with the incidents at the end of the story—is a perfect closure.

To substantiate this reconstruction of this technique, analysis follows of another point where the narratives of Plutarch and of Appian touch on the same ground and thus allow of comparison. This occurs in the accounts given by Plutarch and Appian of Marius’ meeting with the old fisherman in the course of his flight.25 Again Plutarch’s expression and detail is the fuller and a passage of indirect speech has been inserted; again Plutarch has many little touches that are lacking in Appian—in fact his reconstruction goes so far as to differ radically from Appian’s account of the sequence of and sequel to the incident in the course of Marius’ flight. Yet a better opportunity for comparison occurs in the incident of Trebonius, which occurs in original note form in the Apophthegmata.26 In the latter passage there are added a stately periphrasis designating Lusius’ rank, two antitheses, and two passages in indirect speech. A dramatic scene is set by making the act of homicide occur by night in the officer’s tent. Marius’ feelings are sketched in.

Another feature of Plutarch’s style which is not generally appreciated is his ability to orchestrate the action of a passage in the words used to express that action. Thus at 37.1 ὅρων ἵππων ὅλην πρώωθεν εὐλαβοντος is an all but complete Iambic Septenarius or Octonarius. Its jogging rhythm is meant to represent the sound of the cavalry riding towards the Marian. The subject was one that traditionally required such treatment. This onomatopoeic effect is generally heightened by the use of tropes which psychologically implant in the reader’s mind the atmosphere in which the action takes place. Thus at

---

25 Mar. 36.5–37.2 and BC 1.62.3–4 respectively.  
26 P. 202 under Marius; for their form, cf. Gomme, 3-5.  
78 n. 1. The reworked version occurs at Mar. 14,
23-3 the Cimbri climb up one side of the mountain range and toboggan down the other on their shields. The consecutive clause in which this feat is described tells of the ascent in short, jerky clauses with many monosyllables and disyllables, the main construction being constantly interrupted by qualifying asides; the descent (εὐρὰ ἀφιέντες ... ἄχανεις ἐγώντων) is expressed in an easy, flowing, simply constructed clause culminating in a weighty word run. The ascent and descent of a hill is another locus classicus for the employment of onomatopoeic effects.87

A good instance of a prolonged passage of orchestration occurs in the description of the first engagement at Aquae Sextiae (19.1–7). In this chapter there are several oddities of syntax unusual in Plutarch: two marked breaches of formal concord (πληθὸς ... ἔχοντες, 19.1 and μέρος ἄνθρωπος, 19.2), an odd pendant accusative (μέρος τι ... τοὺς βαρβάρους, 19.2) and a nominative constructed as though indeclinable and put in apposition to an object accusative (προσηγορίαν Ἀμβρωνες, 19.3). There is also a development of the sense of βῆμα at 19.2 that is unique in Plutarch and a rather strained use of the preposition πρὸς at 19.3. The aim of such strained expressions is to suggest to the mind of the reader the confusion of the activities described in the narrative. This confusion is suggested to the mind by the use of complicated sentence structure, difficult constructions (i.e. logical rather than grammatical concords), and the use of words in extensions of their normal significance. The difficulty thus caused in following the Greek heightens the idea of its complexity and thus that of the incident described. Speed of action is suggested by stark simplicity of construction and brevity in expression. Another device used is the rhythm of the word groups themselves—a feature of prose writing which Plutarch everywhere considers. Thus the massed onrush of the Ambroines is depicted with a plethora of polysyllabics whose mounting weight suggests the idea of the oncoming horde. At 19.1 when the camp-servants straggle down to the river, they do so in a high proportion of disyllabic and trisyllabic words which read in a broken, indeterminate fashion. At 19.3–4 the idea of echoing is suggested by the repetition of identical words and words of similar sound, which describe shout and counter-shout in semi-onomatopoeic fashion. Contrast of the confused and straightforward styles is used to heighten their effect. The general outline of the chapter is as follows. The servants straggle down to the river in a long straggling sentence. They engage in an initial skirmish, expressed in short, staccato main clauses. This becomes a confused mêlée, expressed in a long complicated sentence. Then comes the rush of the Ambroines, expressed in a periodic sentence, terminating with a double clause. This introduces the echoing passage which describes the shouting. The fighting is described in terse, short main clauses. These change to a more lengthy and complicated sentence to express the confusion when the Ambroines are pushed back into the river. Then follows a long, complicated sentence describing the rout. Here again the diction helps to convey the ideas required. Unusual and poetic words, duplication in expression, and frequent polysyllabic words all heighten the tragic and confused effect. The concluding sentence, hard, matter-of-fact and tersely put, contrasts strongly in tone and severe simplicity of expression, and marks the conclusion of the passage.

A splendid analysis of another aspect of the subtle literary craftsmanship of which Plutarch is capable is given by Sandbach,88 who shows how Plutarch, in setting out lengthy and difficult technical subjects, alternates to prevent boredom between scientific exposé and discursive treatment interspersed with anecdotes. Now, in the account of the battle of Vercellae at 26.4–5, analysis of the causes of victory becomes necessary as otherwise, after the débâcle narrated in 26.3, it would be incomprehensible. These causes on the other hand require a great deal of closely argued explanation. Yet a systematic and scientific exposé inserted at this point, the middle to end of the narration of the battle, would rob

87 Cf. Atkins, Literary Criticism in Antiquity ii (1934) 127–8. 
88 CQ, xxxiv (1940) 207 f.
the finale of the battle of vitality and impact. The passage 26.4–5 is in fact an analysis of the factors militating for the Romans and against the Cimbri but very skillfully done so as to avoid rigidity and dullness. At 26.4 occurs the phrase ἑρωεῖ τη μετὰ ἄσθματος; this is echoed in ἑρωεῖ τη μὲν ἀσθμαίνοντα of 26.5—a sentence which continues, in the likeness of that in which the echoed phrase occurred, with a genitive absolute on to which an explanatory clause is tacked. In these sections an indication of the atmospheric conditions introduces a digression on the physical shortcomings of the Cimbri and the causes of these shortcomings. Another statement of the atmospheric conditions brings the reader to a discussion on the physical advantages of the Romans. Thus an underlying parallelism and a latent pattern of restatement and echo direct the mind unconsciously through the explanation, while a discursive charm, essential in a non-technical treatise, is maintained. In this way the explanation is embodied in the description of the progress of the battle in such a way that it does not disturb the tenor of the narrative and even adds to its drama. Within the larger framework of the narrative of the whole battle (25.1–27.3) a vast amount of dull, technical information is crammed. This is by far the fullest exposition of the battle of Vercellae and includes information on pilum construction, numbers of troops, their dispositions and equipment, plans and actual tactics, as well as the explanation just discussed and a pathetic closure on the rout and deaths of the Cimbri. Yet all this detail has been absorbed into the flow of Plutarch’s narrative style without discordant passages of dry scientific writing; this passage has been cited as containing one of the most brilliant purple patches in Plutarch.29 Plutarch is frequently berated for failures to include this or that detail of a battle or an incident and for discursive, unscientific writing. He can, however, when he so wishes, write continuously in an expository, scientific style (cf. 11.2–9). He can also write sustained passages of high dramatic interest and include much apparently intransigent material in them in a thoroughly readable fashion. In these his apparently unsystematic, discursive charm is the product of a most skilfully exercised literary craftsmanship.

T. F. Carney.

University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

29 Trench, Plutarch, Five Lectures (1873) 55–7.
'Daphnis & Chloe: A most sweet & pleasant Pastoral Romance for Young ladies by George Thornley, Gent. . . . 1657.' The well-known title-page of the first English translation of Longos from the original\(^\text{a}\) is characteristic of the attitude which has always prevailed towards this work. If we turn to the present day we find that the latest translator into English\(^\text{b}\) writes in his introduction 'Daphnis and Chloe was only meant to be "a source of pleasure for the human race", and might have been described by a second-century Graham Greene as an "entertainment"'. The intervening three centuries provide some acknowledgments of Longos' skill in individual departments—the description of nature, for example, or the management of plot—but taking the work as a whole scarcely any reader seems to have regarded it as more than an amorous triviality with a country setting; enjoyable in its pastoral descriptions; enjoyable in its amorous passages (or shocking, according to the taste of the reader); essentially trivial.\(^\text{c}\)

It is my object to argue that this view, by taking account of only one side of the book, misrepresents it as a whole. Longos meant us to find in his work a serious import, as well as entertainment, and the way in which he realises this intention in all the details of the story makes it a serious work of art.

Before offering an interpretation of these details I take my stand on Longos' own statement of his intention in the Prologue. The sentence already referred to by Turner to justify his interpretation reads in full, τέταρτας βιβλίου εξεπουσώμενα, ἀνάθημα μὲν Ἐρωτι καὶ Νύμφασι καὶ Πανί, κτήμα δὲ τερπνὸν τὰς αὐθέρωπος (Pr. 2). The use of the particles μὲν . . . δὲ . . . means that the two functions of the book, as 'dedication' and as 'pleasant possession', are regarded as equally important; or, if slightly more weight be attached to the δὲ component, the words ἀνάθημα μὲν still remain valid.\(^\text{d}\) I shall therefore make it my first task to elicit

---

\(^\text{a}\) Based on a paper read to the Scottish Classical Association at St. Andrews, February 1958. I am very grateful to the late Professor A. W. Gomme and to Mr W. F. J. Knight for their encouragement and advice.

\(^\text{b}\) Angel Daye's free version (1587) is based on Amyot's French translation.

\(^\text{c}\) Paul Turner (Penguin Books 1956) 15. I have borrowed or adapted many of his renderings.

\(^\text{d}\) Many of Longos' modern readers have been unable to achieve the σωφροσύνη which he himself prays for at the end of the Prologue (2), but have been bemused by the few chapters which some translators have seen fit to render in Latin, and so failed to judge the work as a whole. I suspect that Rohde's interpretation (Der Griechische Roman 1900/1914, discussed fully below, p. 110; still the most influential) is prejudiced by his having been shocked by Longos. He consequently goes to extremes in condemning his plot construction (usually praised), his style (rhetorical, but not 'sillier than that of almost any other late Greek rhetorician'), his formal concepology and his sincerity (both of which I shall attempt to vindicate). Schüssel (RE s.v. 'Longos') sees no other motive in Longos' choice of episodes than a desire to achieve γλαρόνως—at times of a disreputable kind. S. L. Wolff, The Gk. Romance in Elizabethan Prose fiction (Columbia 1912), despite a partial realisation of the importance of Eros, and of the Town as well as the Country in Longos, still passes the verdict 'the point of the story still remains in the piquancy of the children's experiments . . . heightened by the charm of their surroundings' (p. 130). Geo. Moore (Translation with Introduction, 1924) is impressed by the book's being 'of such voluptuous subject'. L. Castiglioni (Rendiconti d. Real Ist. Lombard. d. St. e Lett. Ser. 2. 61 (1928) 203) speaks of the secondary importance of the events owing to 'la tenuezza di materia'. A glance at the interpretations of artists and musicians will confirm an excessive overemphasis on the sensual. J. Lindsay's Appendix to his translation (London, 1948) is exceptional in the awareness it displays of some deeper meaning behind Longos' charm. P. Turner's insistence (op. cit., 11, 15) on Longos' wit is a valuable corrective to the traditional view, whose most charitable judgment may be summed up in the words of the Rev. Roland Smith (introduction to translation, 1835): 'In reading the work of Longus we must remember that he was not probably a heathen or at any rate that he describes the heathen state of morals.'

\(^\text{e}\) Denniston GPP§ 370. Types (i) (μὲν . . . δὲ ἐπὶ τε καὶ) (ii) (greater weight on δὲ clause). For the distinction of different kinds of narrative according
from the details of the story its serious import: and secondly I shall argue that this interpretation of the book as a ‘dedication’ affects the quality of our enjoyment of it as a ‘delightful possession’.

A modern reader reared on Victorian Romantic novels might easily make the mistake of treating Longos’ book as a simple love story, where the hero and heroine are the beginning and the end of the matter. But this assumption makes irrelevant nonsense of a large part of Longos. The lovers and their pastoral life may be charming enough: but what happens in the world of men around them will seem largely a distraction; and the gods who intervene to control the events of the story through dreams or divine epiphanies, have been found absurd or improbable, the dreary figments of a miracle-mongering sophist. Some critics have been logical enough to point out that such a story lacks unity, but no one seems to have observed that these difficulties all arise from the initial mistake of assuming Longos to be concerned first and last with the two young lovers Daphnis and Chloe.

In fact, however, the subject of the book is Eros. In the Prologue Longos describes how he came upon a picture in a grove of the Nymphs, and resolved to write a book ‘the verbal equivalent of the picture’ (Pr. 2 ἀντιγράφαι τῇ γραφῇ). The subject of the picture was Eros—ἰστορικὴν Ἐρωτος. Young lovers are indeed represented there, but they are unnamed, only one, and not the first item in a list of many other ἐρωτικά.

At the beginning of Bk. ii Longos puts into the mouth of Philetas a lengthy description—the only direct one—of this god. ‘Eros is a god greater than Zeus himself. He has power over the elements, he has power over the stars, he has power over his fellow gods—far more than you have over your goats and sheep. The flowers are the handiwork of Eros. These trees are his creation. It is because of him that rivers run and winds blow’ (ii 7-1 cf. whole of ii 4-7). A short extract is sufficient to show what type of god we are dealing with; one which is paralleled in numerous syncretic monotheisms of the early centuries of our era; a competitor with the Great Mother in all her forms, with Mithras, and with many others, for the office of supreme controller of the cosmos. Such deities are in general developments from simple fertility gods, who have been given a mystic significance embodied in elaborate rituals and dogma, and whose worshippers require initiation into these mysteries. These characteristics of supremacy, fertility, mystery and initiation will all be found in the Eros of Longos as I shall now attempt to show.

That Eros is the supreme controller of the events in Longos has been pointed out by Wolff. This distinguishes the plot of our work very sharply from that of the average Greek novel. There the writer goes out of his way to ascribe events to chance; but in Longos to their intention see S. Trenkner, The Greek Novella in the Classical Period, Cambridge (1938) xiii-xiv.

* Especially as almost all translations call the work ‘The Story of Daphnis and Chloe’. Cf. Thornley, Lowe, Lindsay, Turner. The title in the colophon reads ποιημαντινά τῶν περὶ Δ. καὶ Χ. λευκακάν λόγω τέσσαρες. Geo. Moore’s ‘Pastoral Loves of Daphnis and Chloe’ is inaccurate. Turner (p. 14) wisely warns the reader against ‘regarding the book as a crude attempt at a modern novel’. See also n. 91.

7 For a full discussion of the question of unity (and especially Rohde’s objections), see below pp. 48ff. Schäff (RE) represents the work as primarily a string of hardly related τότου. Cf. Wolff (p. 199) ‘No strict unity is to be expected of a writer who professes to offer only a succession of pictures.’

F. A. Todd, Some Ancient Novels (1939), chap. ii 46. see 4ff to excise the divine interventions on the grounds that few readers would have ‘felt that there was any inartistic violation of probability’.

8 Pr. 1. Note also here τέχνη ἐρωτική: in Pr. 2 πινατα ἐρωτικοι . . . ἀνάθημα Ἐρωτη . . . ἐλπίς τὴν Ἐρασθέντα ἁμαρτύρει, τὸν οὐκ ἐρασθέντα παυθεῖσα, πίνακα γὰρ ὅπως Ἐρωτα ἐρευνή.

9 Pr. 1. γυναικεῖς . . . τίκτουσα καὶ ἄλλα σπαργαίως κομμόσια, παύσα εἰκέκεισα, ποιήσα τέρφοτα, ποιμένα ἄναιρομενοι, νίοι συντελέμενοι, λῃστῶν καταθέμεναι, πολεμίων ἐμβολί. These all, of course, figure in Longos.

10 Wolff, 121-6. He also perceives the connexion of this with the painting in the prologue. Cf. Rohde, Gr. Rom. 547 n. 1.
the story forms a consistent pattern of cause and effect taking its origin from Eros. Where he does not intervene directly events are arranged by one of the subordinates expressly associated with him in the Prologue—the Nymphs, or Pan. These, in fact, figure more obviously in the story than Eros, who is seldom directly mentioned himself. This too is characteristic of the supreme deity in contemporary philosophy and religion. God is the highest of many orders of being and acts through δαίμονες who convey his will to the humble sublunary level inhabited by man. The daemonic agency of the Nymphs in our story is too obvious to require argument. Pan is specifically introduced as a 'stage-manager' at ii 23, and the whole of the rest of this Book is devoted to him. Thereafter Daphnis and Chloe, previously unaware of Pan, honour him regularly.

There is another god, Dionysos, whose name does not occur with the others in the Prologue but whose role is hardly less important than that of Eros himself. Dionysos is the only Olympian to receive more than ornamental mention: significantly, for we are not here concerned with the Olympians, nor with the Dionysos who was received late and unwillingly into Olympus: but with the Dionysos who played a central part in Graeco-Oriental mystery religions—in particular in the Orphic-Dionysiac mysteries.

For it is, seems, to an Orphic-Dionysiac context that we must look for the source of Longos' theology; primarily, indeed to a Dionysiac context, and I include the word 'Orphic' with some hesitation. It is obvious that Longos was no other-worldly ascetic. The god he is concerned with is Dionysos unreformed, though comparatively polite. But after many centuries Orphic terms had become familiar in Dionysiac contexts to more than the small body of strict Orphics, and Longos could use them where they suit his purpose without committing himself to Orphic doctrine proper. That Dionysos, not Eros, was there thought of as the supreme god is not a difficulty. In the first place, although the name Dionysos may have been that primarily used to denote the supreme god, the religious thought of Longos' age had universalised god's nature far beyond the limits suggested by any one name. This god was Διόνυσος πολυώνυμος (Soph. Ant. 1115) μωροδόμος (AP ix 524, 13), addressed and worshipped in countless forms; and amongst

11 Eros instructs the foster parents to send Daphnis and Chloe out with the flocks, i 7: arranges the situation which results in their falling in love, i 11-13; manifests himself to Phileas, and says he makes it his daily task to bring them together, ii 4, 5; gives the final permission for their marriage, iv 34, 1.
12 Pr. 2. The formula is echoed at end of last book (iv 36 and 39). Divine control implied in such phrases as i 6 θεῖον ἄθικτος ήταν τὸ εἴρημα: i 8 προφοράς θεῶν: i 15 Ἐθεῖ καὶ Δάφνοι γυναῖκα τὸ ἔργον Ἐρωτος: ii 26 οὐκ ἔχεις: ii 27.1 Χλόη . . . παιδέων ἐς Ἡγοῦσα μεθον ποιήσω θεᾶς: iv 24 προφοράς θεῶν (recognition of Daphnis): iv 36 προφοράς θεῶν (recognition of Chloe). At ii 10-11 they nearly chance on the consummation of love, but are prevented by the Methymnaean invasion: for with a chance conclusion the story would no longer have been an ἀκόλουθος to Eros, representing his controlling power.

13 Cf. T. R. Glover, Conflict of Religions in Early Roman Empire 94 ff. For a brief account of Poseidonius as the source of this idea, see A. H. Armstrong, Architecture of the Universe in Platonius (1940) 53 and Introduction to Anc. Philosophy (1947) 143 ff. The unusualness of the direct manifestation of Eros at ii 4-7 justifies the weight I attach to this passage below, under Final Autumn and Initiation.

14 The Picture is found in the groove of the νυμφῆς (Pr. 1) and this groove is the setting of almost all Daphnis' and Chloe's meetings (cf. ii 2, iii 12); Chloe found in the groove (i 4); Nymphs present Daphnis and Chloe to Eros in dream (i 7); save Chloe from raiders (ii 20-3); grant money for Daphnis' wooing (iii 27): receive sacrifice of Daphnis' ποιημένα κτιστά (iv 26): arrange the marriage (iv 34) which takes place at their shrine (iv 37).

15 Pan (λόγος πάν μετρόν Pl. Crat. 408b) is identified with the Stoic Zeus, Orphic Phanes as 'All-God': see Wernicke in Roscher, s.v. 'Pan' 1405, 1467-8. Pan is the 'Hellenistic counterpart of Eros' (Wernicke, 1443-4; cf. 1456, 1464, 1469-70, 1472).

16 iv 26 associates Dionysos formally with Pan and Nymphs. An Index Nominum will reveal that the Olympian gods are named almost exclusively in Bk. iv by the town dwellers, rather than by 'pastoral' characters. The few exceptions which occur elsewhere are literary allusions.

17 For a view of the relationship between Orpheus and Dionysos, see W. K. C. Guthrie, Orpheus and Greek Religion (London, 1952) 41-8.

18 Macrob. Sat. i 18.2: Orpheus . . ait . . . ἄλλον δ' ἄλλα καθάδων ἐπισκοπῶν ἀρθρῶν. | πρώτος δ' εἷς ὁ πόσος ἡθείοι, Διόνυσος δ' ἐπικλήθη | . . . ἄλλοις δ' ἀνυμ' ἔχει προσανάγας πρὸς ἔκαστον | παντοτικά κατὰ καύροιν ἀμεμομένου χρόνον.
these Eros occupied a position, based on the traditional Orphic cosmogony, of prime importance. So that Longos would find ample justification for emphasizing that aspect of the supreme god most congenial to his particular purpose. Secondly, Longos does represent the more usual position in the part which Dionysos plays in his story. At present we may observe that Dionysos is not, like Pan and the Nymphs, mentioned with Eros in the Prologue, because he is himself Eros. In the last Book, which is especially concerned with Dionysos, we find the same list of gods as in the Prologue, only with Dionysos taking Eros' place. And later we shall discuss this role of Dionysos more fully (p. 45).

The conception used by Longos of Eros as a prime cosmic force was already known to Hesiod (Theog. 116–22), and there were temples dedicated to him at Thespiae, Leuctra and Parion. But during the classical period this Eros goes 'underground'. He is subordinated to Aphrodite as far as the main stream of literature and art are concerned, and emerges only occasionally in the lyric poets and Attic drama. For our purpose it is unnecessary to discuss what relationship all of these passages may have with Orphism; but we shall be concerned with the lines in Aristophanes (Av. 692–702) where, with some additions, the Hesiodic Birth of Eros is repeated with a generally admitted Orphic reference. The Eros of the Orphic cosmogony was evidently a development of the Cosmic Eros of Hesiod and the cults mentioned; as one might perhaps see in the case of Phyla, where Eros was worshipped with other fertility gods, and where hymns accompanying ritual were sung in his honour by the Lykomids who controlled the Orphic mysteries. In later Greek and Roman times this Eros is still more thoroughly obscured by the putto of elegy and anacreontic. But occasionally the putto claims connexion with his cosmic predecessor; and in Longos we find him telling Philetas ουδενοι παις έγοι, και ει δοκαι παις, άλλα και τον Κρόνον πρεσβύτερος, και αυτον το θαλασσαντω (ii 5; he is like the Eros of Xen. Symp. 8.1). Despite his Hellenistic exterior Eros in Longos is the Orphic Protagonos who 'in the beginning sprang gleaming, golden-winged from the wind-born egg that black-winged Night brought forth in the bosom of Erebus' (Ar. Av. 694) and himself begot Kronos and the Olympians.

If this identification of Longos' theology be correct, we can see why in the Prologue

---


20 iv 26. Cf. iv 1–Eros' place taken by Demeter (only here) and Dionysos. This is to be explained as referring to the action of city dwellers, cf. n. 16.


22 The evidence is collected by Furtwängler in Roscher s.v. 'Eros'. Cf. also Harrison, ch. xii.


25 E.g. Luc. Am. 32. σο δαίμονον ὀφθαλμίς ἢ ἑρωκάντας μουστράτων 'Ερως, οὐ κακὸν νίπτων ὀλοπλών ζαγγάρων παῖζοντα χεῖρες ἀλλ' ἃν ἐν πρωτάσσω τούθεν ἐγένετο θρήνο κ.τ.λ. Am. 37. ἐτερος δὲ Ἔρως 'Οργιαῖον πιθαρ χρόνων. Cf. the group of Epigrams, A.Pl. xvi 200–2, 207, 214–15, also ἈΠ ΧΝ 24 (Simmias' 'Ερωτος πτέρυγας). It is worth comparing the 'Amor rure natus', origin of fertility and music, in Perg. Veneris 78–88. Venus is here the principal cosmic power, but in the whole poem she offers a close parallel to Longos' Eros, in power, and in ritual (cf. especially Proem. 2 with Perg. Ven. refrain).

26 The Orphic Eros is also Κρόνον πρεσβύτερος (cf. Orph. Arg. 424 πρεσβύτατον τε καὶ αὐτοτέλει πολέμητιν 'Ερωτα; Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.26. For Eros represented as πρεσβήτης on the wall of the Telesterion at Phyla see Harrison's suggested interpretation of Philosophoumena ν 3 (p. 645).
it was necessary for Longos to call upon an ἐξηγητὴς to interpret the picture of Eros. He required instruction in a mystery and in his turn proposes to instruct us. His work might almost be called a handbook since he proposes that it shall ‘cure him that is sick, it will cheer him that is depressed, him that has loved it will remind, and him that has not it will instruct’ (Pr. 2). But Longos is not in fact writing a discursive religious handbook. We shall find Dionysiac beliefs and rituals, but not baldly tabulated. As a μουσταγώγος Longos states them allusively. As a writer he uses them as raw material for his dramatic themes, and as the basis and framework of his structure.

I therefore propose next to interpret certain of Longos’ individual themes and situations from this point of view; then to show that the book is constructed on a number of frameworks, all expressive of the nature of Eros and his worship—a framework of seasons, the embodiment of a fertility god; a framework of the progress and experiences of human lovers, expressive of his nature from man’s standpoint; and a framework of initiation leading from innocence to recognition and acceptance by the god.

The proper function of Longos’ plentiful descriptions of animals and birds, rocks, rivers, springs and caves, trees and plants is not merely to provide a picturesque background for a love-story, though they may strike the superficial reader as being no more. These things are, rather, descriptions of Eros himself. All natural things are embodiments of a universal nature god, and the unity of all creation, for which Euripides’ description (Bacch. especially 723–68) is a locus classicus, was a commonplace of Orphic belief. There ‘the divine powers . . . have’, as Rohde says, ‘absorbed the whole universe into themselves in order to bring it forth anew, animated with one spirit, and, with all its infinite variety, a unity’. The attempt to interpret the details of Longos symbolically is therefore legitimate. But it must be pursued with caution. Nothing is easier than to find an esoteric significance in the names of plants or animals where none was intended by a writer; since every other living thing had divine significance for somebody in antiquity. And nothing kills art like ruthless allegorising. So I shall confine myself to discussing a few themes which Longos used with a consistently symbolical significance.

The one epiphany of Eros takes place in a Garden (ii 3 ff.) where he has come to enjoy the plants, and where he bathes in the spring. διὰ τὸν καλὰ καὶ τὰ ἀνθή καὶ τὰ φυτὰ, he says, τοῖς ἐμοῖς λουτροῖς ἀφόρμαν (ii 5). In the Prologue, too, in the grove of the Nymphs, μία πηγή πάντα ἔτρεψε καὶ τὰ ἀνθή καὶ τὰ δέντρα (Pr. 1). This fountain is evidently the fertility god himself, whom we see portrayed on a red-figured vase in Athens watering plants from a hydria in company with two nymphs and Dionysos.

There are other visitors to the garden of Philetas. ὄρθιον ἀγελάς συνέρχονται τῷ ἐσθιόν, τῶν μὲν ἐσ τροφῆν, τῶν δὲ ἐσ φωνή (ii 3): and the winged Eros who sprang from the Egg has a close affinity to birds. In Ar. As. 699 birds were his first children. In Longos we are told τὰς φυκὰς ἀναπτεροὶ (cf. LSJ s.v. ἀναπτερόω, 2), an idea which was first fully exploited in Plato (Phaedrus 246c–249e), and elaborated in late religion and philosophy. In

77 ἀναπτερόμενος ἐξηγητὴ τῆς εἰκός (Pr. 2). For ἐξηγητὴς as interpreter of sacred rites, etc., see LSJ s.v. ἐξηγητὴς II.
28 Cf. ii.7 τὰ ἀνθή πάντα "Ερωτος ἔργα τὰ φυτὰ ταῦτα τοῦτοι ποιήματα . . . ποιήματα . . . ἄειμοι . . . ταῦτα ἐρασθεῖται καὶ τράγος φιλάστατα. Belief in Winds as fertilising agents (cf. Guthrie Orpheus 94, 144 p. 17) also lends significance to i 4 ποῖς ὑπὸ τῆς νοτίως τροφοδοσίας: iii 12 ὁ ἐξηγητὸς τρόφων: i 23 (see my comment, under First Summer).
29 E. Rohde Psyce* (tr. Hillis) chap. x ‘The Orphics’ 339.
30 Athens NM 1852, reproduced in Harrison 636, fig. 172, and Hesp. Suppl. viii pl. 5.2, where M. Bieber (p. 31) discusses this and other fourth-century vases depicting Eros and Dionysos. Cf. also A.Pl. xvi 14 Eros by a fountain. In A.Pl. xvi 202 Eros is ‘born of a nymph, country-bred, the helper of the husbandman, who is crowned by the four Horae’.
31 Most obviously in Apuleius’ Cupid and Psyche (Met. iv 28 ff.). Also when Lucius became ‘the ass who bore the mysteries’ (Ar. Ran. 159) he had intended to become a bird, as Pamphile did become, for erotic purposes (Met. iii 21, 25). Apul. like Longos is aware of different levels of the same Eros. For archaeological evidence for mystic allegories of
Philetas' eyes the apparition in his garden resembled a bird, and Daphnis and Chloé in innocent perplexity ask τί ἐστι ποτε Ἐρως, πῶτερα παῖς ἡ ὁρνίς; (ii 7). For this reason bird-song characterises the birth of the new year (i 9, iii 12); and when Daphnis goes bird-catching in winter it is really his pretext for catching his love, Chloé. The device succeeded. The two lovers met, and together θόρνων πλέθος οὐκ ἠλίγαν οἰνόβουν. ἦν δὲ αὐτῶς καὶ φαλάμαστοι ἄπόλαυσοι συνεχής (iii 10). In the conversation which accompanied this, Daphnis tells Chloé διὰ σὲ ἄλθους· διὰ σὲ ἄπολραυ τοὺς ἄθλους κοφικοὺς. It is the song of birds which is remarked on in many of these passages; and music was commonly a symbol of the ordering of the universe. It was the characteristic activity of Orpheus himself, and representations of Eros as a musician are plentiful in literature and art. Such, it has been suggested, is the significance of the Dionysiac title Πρωτευρωθηκός. In Longos the role of musician is delegated chiefly to Pan and the Nymphs and in their dancing, singing and piping Daphnis and Chloé are likened to these gods. The principal musical occasion, at the end of Bk. ii, is in honour of Pan, when Daphnis and Chloé begin their worship of the god by miming the legend just narrated by Lamon, of Pan and Syrinx (ii 37). Philetas pays essentially the same honour to the god by playing on his σύριγξ and εἰκάσεων ἀν τις εἶναι ταῦτην ἑκείνην ἦν ὁ Πάν πρῶτον ἐπίθετο. We already know the importance of Philetas as the only witness to the epiphany of Eros (ii 4-7) and the expounder of this mystery to Daphnis and Chloé; and when Philetas presents this almost divine σύριγξ to Daphnis (ii 37), who had previously asked him μεταδοθεῖ νῆς τῆς τέχνης (ii 33.1), this is the gift of the man most favoured of Eros in his generation to his successor, the gift of the music of Eros. The gift confers the possession of εὐνομία μουσική— an intentional double entendre on the part of Longos (ii 36). With this pipe Daphnis conveys detailed instructions to his flock, instilling εὐνομία in it as well. He had already begun to instruct his goats in the different pastoral modes before being given the pipe of Philetas, and in so doing was playing the part of Pan who imposes his will on flocks and men according to the manner of his piping.

To return to the Garden: many flowers and trees grew there, as elsewhere in Longos' countryside. For most of them one probably could find a symbolic connotation suitable for the nymphae, whose statues represent them dancing (i 4), are πᾶσαι μουσικαί (iii 23). μουσική τέχνη = ἔρωτική τέχνη (cf. p. 119 for τέχνη); and αὐτίκες, like bird-catching, is love: cf. especially i 24. For Philetas as Daphnis' predecessor in representing Eros, cf. Philetas' opening words (ii 3) and the story of his youth (ii 5), and (ii 37) τὴν σύριγγα χαρίζεται καὶ εὐήγεται καὶ Δάφνην καταλείπει αὐστρίν ὤμοιο διαδόχῳ. Ph. does this in admiration of Daphnis' representation on the σύριγξ of a story of Eros. Cf. also the list of 'erotic' modes played by Daphnis (37.2) with the 'pastoral' modes played by Philetas (35.2) and Daphnis (iv 15). For music in Orphic initiation cf. Arist. Quint. de Musica 3, p. 158 (Meib.).

36 The nymphae, whose statues represent them dancing (i 4), are πᾶσαι μουσικαί (iii 23).
37 Μουσική τέχνη = ἔρωτική τέχνη (cf. p. 119 for τέχνη); and αὐτίκες, like bird-catching, is love: cf. especially i 24. For Philetas as Daphnis' predecessor in representing Eros, cf. Philetas' opening words (ii 3) and the story of his youth (ii 5), and (ii 37) τὴν σύριγγα χαρίζεται καὶ εὐήγεται καὶ Δάφνην καταλείπει αὐστρίν ὤμοιο διαδόχῳ. Ph. does this in admiration of Daphnis' representation on the σύριγξ of a story of Eros. Cf. also the list of 'erotic' modes played by Daphnis (37.2) with the 'pastoral' modes played by Philetas (35.2) and Daphnis (iv 15). For music in Orphic initiation cf. Arist. Quint. de Musica 3, p. 158 (Meib.).
38 iv 14 πεπόιηκε δ' αὐτά; καὶ μουσικάς σύριγγας γούν ἀκούουσα ποιοῦσα πάντα, καὶ iv 15 passim.
39 i 10 σερείζεται ἁμαρτάνων having made his first pipe: i 13 his flocks already attentive to the sound: i 22 frightened flocks soothed by pipe: i 32 elated when Daphnis returns and pipes. Similarly the cattle of Phassa (i 27) and Dorkon (i 29) are trained to obey the σύριγξ.
40 E.g. ii 29, 30. τὸ σερίματα ἁμαρτάνον τὸ πολεμικόν καὶ τὸ εἰρήνηκον, cf. also n. 15 and p. 47 for the different aspects of Eros·Pan.
to the context.\textsuperscript{41} for some at least the most cautious interpreter would scarcely deny that Longos intended us to do this. Eros was first seen by Philetas υπό ταῖς βούταις καὶ ταῖς μυρίναις μήρη καὶ βούταις ἔχον (i 4.1); he pelted Philetas with myrtle berries (4.2); and disappeared from sight under the myrtle leaves (ii 6).\textsuperscript{42} Myrtle groves are the haunts of the initiate in Ar. Ran. (156–8),\textsuperscript{43} and a myrtle garland was worn by Iacchus at the mysteries (Ar. Ran. 330, cf. Schol. R.). Is it an accident that Daphnis caught the winter birds as they fed on the berries of two myrtle trees and an ivy (again sacred to Dionysos) which Longos describes with an elaboration designed to attract attention?\textsuperscript{44} He caught the attention at least of Dalmeyda, who points out the similarity of this description to that of the Garden of Philetas;\textsuperscript{45} and we may add that it is equally reminiscent of the description of the ivy and vine supported on fruit trees in another important garden, the Garden of Lamon and Daphnis, which was the precinct of the temple of Dionysos\textsuperscript{46} (iv 2–4).

Another modern reader has been impressed by the frequent mention of the Pine.\textsuperscript{47} The reason is its association with Pan (the story of Pan and Pitys is referred to explicitly and by implication);\textsuperscript{48} or, in terms of Longos’ Erotic mystery, because it was used as a part of Dionysiac ritual. And when Chloe wears a crown of pine twigs and a fawn-skin she is herself playing the initiate.\textsuperscript{49}

If to the sceptical the allegorical interpretation of individual creatures or activities seem an arbitrary imposition on Longos, we may now turn to observe that another embodiment of the Cosmic Eros prescribes the very structure of the plot. If the natural world embodies Eros in Space, in Time he is embodied in the movement of the events which make up the story.

The framework provided by the Seasons is obvious to the most cursory reader. The story occupies most of two years: Bk. i carries us through spring and summer to autumn; Bk. iii presents winter, a second spring and summer; Bk. iv the ultimately fruitful autumn.

Some critics have also recognised that there is the closest correspondence between this cycle and the purely erotic experiences of Daphnis and Chloe.\textsuperscript{50} The reason for this will emerge from the hypothesis we are now exploring: it is that Daphnis and Chloe are part—in this story the most important single part—of the natural world which embodies Eros. They are at once themselves and more than themselves. They are the Year god, and their experiences are his annual ravishing, death or imprisonment, and re-birth.

Finally, interwoven with these two corresponding cycles, there is a third which has not been recognised. The events and episodes which make up the rest of the story—dreams,

\textsuperscript{41} Fertility symbolism will readily occur in connexion with apples, figs, pomegranates (cf. Schol. Luc. 280.20 Rabe (Kern Orphica, test. 218): list of Orphic σπάργηθα headed by ὑμάλη, μῆλα). The rose is Love’s flower. Daphnis’ and Chloe’s regular meeting-place was an oak i 12.2, i 13.2 (τῷ ἐν τῇ ἐν τῇ), i 11.30, 38.2, i 12.16. Also Philetas’ (ii 5). Dryads (ii 23.1) are beloved of Pan (i 30.2). Daphnis was found in a δραμος (i 2); Chloe’s father named Αρδας (i 4).

\textsuperscript{42} G. Valley (\textit{Uber den Sprachgebrauch des Longos} (Uppsala, 1926) ch. vi) suggests that Longos’ description of the garden of Philetas is based on that of the garden of Alkinoos (Hom. Od. vii 112 ff.). The fruits mentioned are identical except that Longos has ὁμορφεις for Homer’s ὁμορφην and, for ἐλαΐαν, μῆρα. At iv 3 Philetas swears κατὰ τῶν μήρων.

\textsuperscript{43} Also in \textit{Perig. Ven.} 28 (cf. ii. 6, 44 myrtle arbours) Μουράδας was Daphnis’ mother (i 3). Note also significance of μήρων, μήτηριν Ar. Eq. 964, Lys. 1004.

\textsuperscript{44} iii 5. Note the ivy clusters are μέγας ὡς βάτραχος.

\textsuperscript{45} G. Dalmeyda, ‘Longus et Alciphron’ in \textit{Mélanges Glotz} (1932) i 277–8, 284 n. 3.

\textsuperscript{46} This garden discussed p. 46. Ily grew over the dell where Daphnis was found (i 2), the only plant mentioned here: it also sprouted from the horns of his goats (i 26).

\textsuperscript{47} H. Reich, \textit{De Alciphronis Longique actate} (1894) 53.


\textsuperscript{49} i 23. So too Phassa, i 27. On such κοράδον see F. Cumont, \textit{AJA} xxxvii (1933) 256. Pine in initiation, see F. Cumont, \textit{Les Religions Orientales dans le paganisme Romain} (1929) 201–2 with fig. 13 and pl. 16.

\textsuperscript{50} E.g. Castiglioni, 204. Rohde, \textit{Gr. Rom.}\textsuperscript{2} 544 recognises a correspondence of the seasons with man’s life and labour, in general, but not with Daphnis’ and Chloe’s love in this book.
battles, pastoral occupations and festivities, mythological anecdotes, and the rest—have been regarded as, at best, a foil to set off the pastoral love-story; at worst, an irrelevant and distracting excuse for the display of rhetoric. But they too are an integral part of the total description of Eros, just as they made up the details of the picture of Eros (Pr. 1).

In offering the following analysis, I cannot hope to bring out the most intricate relationships of the three components—seasons, lovers’ experiences and events—but I aim at demonstrating their complete integration within the fundamental framework of the seasons. Together they form the basic pattern of Longos’ narrative. He commonly states them in the order

(a) Description of season
(b) Reactions of lovers
(c) Events and episodes arising from it;

although naturally he does not adhere to the pattern with monotonous regularity, and in the cases of the two autumns, each of which occupies a Book or more, he complicates the pattern, or (in the case of the second) abandons it almost entirely.

First Spring. (a) Description of Season. i 9 ἡρός ἄρχη described. The selection of living things in this passage is not fortuitous. The connexion of bird-song and flowers with Eros has been discussed, and his particular connexion with flocks is explained later. The traditional connexion of bees and flies with Love probably accounts for Longos’ fairly frequent allusions to them in this Book. Thus: μελήστα i 9 characteristic of spring and imitated by lovers; i 14 Chloe compares pangs of love with bee-stings; i 18 so too Daphnis of Chloe’s kiss (cf. i 17 ὁστὲρ ὁφ’ φιλιθείς ἀλλὰ δηθεῖς suggests the ὀστρος). ὀστρος may connote any passion (LSF s.v. ὀστρος II), but love, like that of Io, is clearly alluded to at i 13 (βοὸς ὀστρων πλαγεῖσαι); cf. ii 7 ταύτων ἐρατήν καὶ ὁς ὀστρων πλαγεῖς ἐμύκατο. At i 17 Chloe compared by her lover to a βοὸς. At i 23 μνημεία pester Chloe as she makes cheese.

(b) Reaction of Daphnis and Chloe, i 9–10. They play together. It is important that in doing so they are said to μυμηταί of nature.

(c) Events (i) i 11–13. Eros devises the situation which becomes Ἐρωτος ἄρχη. Daphnis falling into a wolf-trap is muddied and washed in the spring of the Nymphs. We have noted the Erotic properties of the spring. It makes Chloe aware of Daphnis’ beauty, and the impression is strengthened by another revelation of Eros, the sight of Daphnis playing the σφραγῆ. Her praise of him is ἔρωτος ἄρχη (the closing words of the incident echo the opening of i 9 ἡρός ἄρχη).

(2) The kiss which Chloe gives as a prize in a ‘love contest’ between Daphnis and Dorkon is an equally potent instrument of Eros in its effect on Daphnis.

The soliloquies of the two lovers (i 14, 18) together with the instruction of Philetas

31 My object is to deny not that Longos uses the τῶτοι of the schools (that he does so is clear, cf. Rohde, Gr. Rom. 6 on Longos, and Part iii (Gr. Soph.) sect. 4; Schissel, RE, loc. cit.) but that he does so indiscriminately and irrelevantly. The same could be argued, against Rohde, of his style. For objections of lack of unity, cf. n. 7 and p. 33. J. C. Dunlop (History of Fiction, 1814, ch. i) points to the effect of the opposition between dramatic excitement and pastoral calm. This is true so far as it goes, but does not guard against such an objection as that of Rohde (see n. 110) who sees in just this opposition an inevitable cause of lack of unity.

32 See LSF for μέλησα as name of poets, priestesses and neophytes (s.v. μέλησα II). The bee in religious belief, especially connected with Aphrodite, Harrison, 444.

33 Not an appealing touch of realism (Turner, 14): ‘natural’ flies are δεινοὶ λιπηδοί, but would not δακεῖν εἰ διόκομεντο. In the Delphic Paean to Dionysos the god is invoked ἔκθεσις σαν ὅ τοι ὁ τροφ. (Weil BCH xix 403). Cf. A.Pl. xvi 196 Ἐρωτα τὸν ὀστρων κυμάνανα θεῖος: Oryth. Hym. xi (to Pan) 23 Παναίδων ἐκκλήσων ὀστρων. 34 Cf. n. 119.

35 The kiss is important: ii 7, it is the first of the three precepts of Philetas: i 17, its effect on Daphnis (cf. i 22): i 29–30, Dorkon’s kiss (see n. 105) is similar to that at ii 2—both are potential causes of ἔρωτος λύπη (cf. n. 96): ii 18, 30.1, its curative properties.
(ii 4 ff.) form the principal direct descriptions of Eros; and the language here is designed to concentrate attention from the outset on the god’s unique character. Other direct references to Eros, his name and deeds, and the inexperience of Daphnis and Chloe, are especially plentiful in this passage, and will be discussed later under Initiation. 57

(3) i 19–22. Dorkon’s attempts to woo, then to ravish Chloe are premature—in spring-time. She is not to be won until an autumn season, when of the country guests at her wedding γένοντας, ος απεκτησεν τα επι φρονις σκοιμιματα (iv 38); and ου γενον γην των βυθων (sc. του βαλαμου) γην . . . καθαπερ πταινων αυτης ουχ υμεναι των ουν γονεως (iv 40). 58

First Summer. (a) Description. Summer inflames all natural things with love, including (b) Daphnis and Chloe. Description and reaction interwoven emphasise the unity of lovers and nature (i 23).

The words έξεικαν αυτων και η φροντις του έτους (cf. i 11.1 "Ερως ένακαν") exemplify a play of ideas between Eros and Helios (the god’s visible counterpart) regular in Longos, especially with the words καλος and θεμος. That the word play represents an intentional play of ideas is strikingly shown in the dialogue at iii 10. Cf. also i 12 (sun), 13 (φως).

The natural objects in i 23, themselves significant of Eros, are all described as acting at the impulse of Eros. Apples fall to the ground φροντις and the sun is φιλοκαλος. The mixture of allusions to Pitys and Syrinx in των ανεμων συριττες τας πλην έπινεωσας is typical of Longos. 60

(c) Events. Amorous games and stories, especially τεττις and χειλδων episode (i 26) and φασον legend (i 27). The superficial relevance of both τεττις and φασον as love gifts is familiar. 61

The φασον legend is one of three legends in Longos and fulfills a function and a position, near the end of Bk. i, analogous to that of the Pan-Syrinx legend at ii 37 and the Echo legend at iii 23. All have a significance proper to their own context; the φασον legend perhaps least obviously so; but it can be interpreted as an appropriate comment on the stage reached by the love story. We notice that the maiden Phassa both is musical and becomes a bird; that crowned with Pine she sang the story of Pan and Pitys. That is, she evidently corresponds to Chloe as a representative of Eros, and her story represents the stage reached in the development of Chloe’s love. This has not yet reached the extreme stage represented in the violent love-legend of Echo (second summer). The metamorphosis of Phassa was not because of love. But it was a youth—και αυτων καλος και ωδικος—who caused her sadness by his superior skill in Music. 62

56 The paradoxes here are designed to represent Eros as different in his effect from (secondary) natural causes. The physical effects are consequently unique and unexpected.
57 The refs. are i 13.3, 15.1, 15-4, 17.1, 19.1.
58 Note that when Dorkon proposed to her father, he was setting his vines (i 19). He was threshing his grain when asked by the successful Daphnis (iii 29).
60 The words are adapted from Theocr. i 1 (Rohde Gr. Rom. 534 n. 1): but the implication of the words συριττες, η συριττετα, which are not in Theocritus, is Longos’ own and typical of his constructive use of his sources. Cf. also iii 24 διν (sc. Άρνης) συριττετα όμοιον υμών προς τας πτης. Εμπειρις is regular of the συριττες (i 24, ii 33, 35).
61 D’Arcy Thompson, Greek Birds, s.v. φασον. For τεττις connected with Eros cf. Boettiger Kleine Schriften ii pl. 7.1 (gem showing Eros with moon (?), sun and torch, in chariot drawn by τεττιτες).
62 It seems just possible that Longos’ choice of φασον in particular is based on ritual practice. Porphyry A.Bst. 416 says that οι πολλοι των θεολογων derive the name Φερεφασον . . . παρα το φερενε την φαταν.ιαρν γαρ αυτης η φατα.δι’αι και αι της Μαιας ιερως ταυτην αυτην άναπλειναι.
Persephone was the mother of Dionysos-Zagreus και δι Φερεφασα παιδα ταυρομορφων (Clem. Protrep. ii 16) and Dionysos is about to appear in the chapter following the φασον legend (i 29 see my interpretation below p. 46). Although not part of my present thesis it may be of interest to note that the folk story used by Longos, with its eight
First Autumn. (a) Description (ii 1) of vintage at which Daphnis and Chloe assist. 

As autumn carries off the fruits of summer, Daphnis and Chloe’s summer love is ended through their being carried off (1 and 3).

(1) By pirates (i 28–32). Daphnis.

(2) Philetas announces the epiphany of Eros (ii 4–8). Autumn, the fulfillment of the year, is the proper season for the revelation of himself by the Year god. The point is fully discussed below under Final Autumn. See also on Dionysos, p. 45.

(3) Chloe carried off by raiding soldiers (ii 20–30).

(b) Reactions of Daphnis and Chloe. Developments in the growth of love are here provoked by the events rather than by the season directly. (Thus (b1) arises from (ct) and so on.) The variation is justified because the events represent the season:

(1) Love attacking the heart of Daphnis more fiercely is a pirate raid. ἐνόμιζε τὴν ψυχήν ἐτι παρὰ τοῖς λησταῖς μένειν, οἷα . . . ἐτι ἄγνωσθαν τῷ Ἕρωτος λῃστήριον (i 32).63

(2) The revelation of Philetas inspires them with frenzy and greater boldness in love. (ii 8 τὸς ψυχῶς συνεστάλησαν ὑπὸ λύττης. Cf. ii 9.1.)

(3) Saved by Pan from the raiders they play the part, overtly erotic by this stage, in the presence of their families, of lovers, in miming the legend of Pan and Syrinx (ii 37): and by themselves they swear by Pan and their goats perpetual fidelity (ii 39).

Winter. (a) Description at iii 3–4.

(b) For Daphnis and Chloe this is the winter of their love,64 and as when they were carried off in autumn they were playing the role of the Year god, so here τῷ ἢρωτὸν ὥραν ἀνέμενον ἐκ θανάτου παλαγγελοῦν (iii 4).

(c) Events (1) iii 4–8. Daphnis devises the plan of bird-catching as a means of meeting Chloe (discussed p. 37; cf. p. 47 on hunting).

(2) iii 9–11. With Chloe’s family he celebrates the winter Dionysia. This was the festival which celebrated, at the winter solstice, the promise of the resurrection of the year: just as Eros, in allowing this temporary reunion, kept alive the lovers’ hopes—ὁπερ αὐτῶν (sc. Δάφνων) οἰκτείνατο τὸν Ἕρωτος65 (iii 6).

Second Spring iii 12–13. (a) Description. (b) Daphnis’ and Chloe’s return to pasturing is a return to their service of Eros, the Nymphs and Pan, and their love is renewed with the renewal of the flowers and of the song of birds (iii 14). In particular Daphnis is inspired by the example of sheep and goats to love.

(c) Events (1) iii 15–20. But he is ἀμαθέστερος εἰς τὰ Ἕρωτος ἔργα (iii 14) and Lykainos provides him with practical instruction. The effect on Daphnis is only to make him hesitate from ravishing the purity of Chloe.66 But

(2) (iii 21–3) the legend of Echo, another musical maiden, favourite of the Nymphs and cows, is reminiscent of our own nursery explanation of the wood-pigeon’s call: ‘Take two cows, Taffy’; and equally of a legend quoted by J. Fisher in British Birds, xlv, 1953 (a reference I owe to the kindness of Professor M. F. M. Meiklejohn) on the Collared Dove, streptopelia decaocto. There a maid-servant was turned into a dove for sorrow at being paid no more than eighteen a piece a year. This fact the bird still proclaims (hence its scientific name).

Cf. Longos, i 27 ἐτι νῦν δόσασα μηνεῖς τὴν συμφορὰν, ὡς βοῦς ἐγείρει πελαργάνες. Longos’ source might have explained the call as πω ἐμαυρώθη, ὡς ὁ ὑπέρτατος! (Cf. Aristoph. fr. 760 for the contraction βοϊς—βοῦς.)

63 For Love as Pirate cf. A.Plat. Β 309 τρις ληστῶς ὁ Ἕρως: ν 161 τὰ ληστικὰ τῆς Ἀρεστήτης. Love is traditionally associated with the sea which figures largely in Longos: cf. A.Plat. Β 207 ὀποῖοι μάλα παλαγγεῖν κατέχει δηλαδή καὶ ἄθος τῇ μὲν γάρ γαῖᾳ τῇ δὲ διόλους ἔρχεται. Cf. also Luc. Dem. Enc. 19 for the distinction of Ἕρως χαλάσατος and Ἐ. ριφόνως. Note the use by Longos of δίωμος both in piratical contexts: i 32 also erotic), ii 20: and erotic: ii 5, ii 34, iii 13–14. The Methymnaean raid is tantamount to an act of piracy both in its symbolical function and in the eyes of Longos’ characters (iii 21; cf. ii 19 παλαγγεῖν ἀκρόμηνον).

64 Just as it is the cessation of the music of σφέρος and bird (cf. iii 12 ἐκ μακρῆς εὐφορίας).

65 The direct mention of Ἕρως is sufficiently rare to attract attention in Longos.

66 The childish innocence of Chloe is emphasised at 20.2 in sharp contrast to what precedes.
Muses, and beloved of Pan, who met her Zagreus-like end 67 φιλοῦσα τὴν παρθένιαν, reminds us that with Eros, as in Belloe’s William Shand, ‘The moral is that mortals must . . . obey or bu’st’. Compare ‘Phassa’ (First Summer) and ‘Pan-Syrinx’ (First Autumn).

Second Summer iii 24. (a) Description. (b) Reactions of Daphnis and Chloe. As the warning of the legend might suggest, in the heat of summer the resolution of Daphnis is nearly overborne by natural warmth. In fact, if the work had been merely a story of human love, no other development would have taken place: we have reached the normal consummation of any love story. This particular one is to end in marriage.

(c) Events (1) iii 25–33. Consequently preparations are begun for the marriage, and suitors come for Chloe’s hand. But amongst them Daphnis in his poverty ranks low (25–6). The Nymphs provide the necessary dowry and the betrothal is made: καὶ ὡς γυναῖκα λοιπῶν μὴ λαθάνως κατεφιλεῖς (33.1). The public ritual of marriage is something separate from the story of personal love: it calls for a separate season and Book to itself (iv).

Meanwhile, (2) iii 33–4, the climax of the simple love story is marked in a descriptive passage analogous in its function to the three legends. After the betrothal Daphnis and Chloe wander out to look for ripe fruit. A simple golden apple is left on one leafless tree. Chloe tries to prevent Daphnis, but he climbs and fetches it, and running after her as she walks away sulking 68 he lays it in her bosom, to be rewarded by a kiss. Chloe, like Aphrodite, has won the traditional prize from her shepherd (Daphnis alludes expressly to Aphrodite and Paris). She is herself the apple, won by the best picker, as in the Sapphic Epithalamion, which Longos’ wording, like his situation, echoes 69. And the apple, consigned by Daphnis to her keeping, is their love, which ἐφυσαν ὄραι καλαί καὶ φυτῶν καλῶν ἐθρέψε πεπαινόντος ἤλιον καὶ ἐτύμησε τύχη 70 (34.1).

Final Autumn, Book iv. But the end of the simple love story is not the end of the book about Eros. The noticeable difference between the atmosphere of Bk. iv and the others is caused by a change of emphasis from the lovers to Love. 71 Autumn, the season of fulfilment, is especially the season of Eros’ self-revelation. Therefore, as the first autumn received more than a whole book to itself and included the Epiphany of Eros (ii 4–8), so there is given to the second a whole book concerned with the revealing of Eros as Dionysos. The two lovers and their wedding are at once overshadowed by preparations for the arrival of the lord of the estate. In the love story this arrival is important because his permission is to be the condition of the marriage: in Longos’ ‘mystery of Eros’ the arrival of the lord of the estate is καθ’ ὑπότινων the arrival of Eros, who gives to the Nymphs final permission for the marriage (iv 34). He is the autumn season of fruition, and the lovers’ regularly recorded reactions to the advents of the seasons are in this case reactions to the arrival of this lord. Their embraces are tinged with fear and anxiety καθάπερ ἤθη παρόντα τῶν δεπότην φοβουμένων ἦ λαθανότων (iv 6, cf. the whole description which ends with these words). When he arrives Chloe hides herself in the wood; in his presence Daphnis ἐπεν

---

67 λυκοὶ διασαίραν αὐτὴν καὶ βιπτοσων ἐς πάσαν γην ἐτι ὄδοστα τὰ μέλη (iii 23), where the pun has significance for the ‘mystery’.

68 ὀργαμένη, the first mention of this emotion in their relationship.

69 ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀκροίς (τοῖς ἀκροῖς Edmonds) ἀκρότατον (33.2). Cf. Sappho fr. 116 Diels, and Himerius’ interpretation Or. i 16. The apple is also Chloe in the words πέτα μαία καὶ ἦ πολίμων κ.τ.λ. (34).

70 Note in the sentence which follows this Daphnis is impelled to take the apple, ὀρθαλμοὶ ἐχον. Love is first seen in the picture which this book represents (Pr. 1). Love gives eyes to Chloe i 13.1, to Daphnis i 17.1, cf. i 24.32. For the entry of love through the eyes as a literary convention see Wolff 168.

71 Hence too the virtual abandonment of Longos’ regular arrangement. (a) There is no sustained description of autumn. (b) Reaction of Daphnis and Chloe see especially iv 6.2, 14.1. (c) Events make up virtually the whole book, the salient ones being: Lampsis’ ‘rape’ of the garden (iv 7), Gnathon’s attempt on Daphnis (iv 11), recognition of Daphnis (iv 19), Lampsis’ attempt on Chloe (iv 28), betrothal and recognition of Chloe (iv 30), marriage (iv 37).
Perhaps cf. the ritual silence of initiates. (Cumont \textit{AJA} xxxvii 262 who quotes Suidas s.v. θεόναον; Diogenian, iii 43 βάζεις τρόπον επί τῶν στεγάζων καὶ συντηλίων· αἱ γὰρ βάζεις εἰσήλθον.)

Particularly over the garden, for the ὑπόπτης was τῷ παραδεισῷ τετράπονοι (iv 7). Cf. ii 6 (Eros speaking) εἰς τὸν σῶν ἐρχομαί κῆπων καὶ τέρσομαι τοῖς ἄνθεσι.

Diod. Sic. i 11.3. No doubt Longos is also thinking, in his choice of name, of the common use of φαίνομαι for the manifestation of a god. For the significance of many of the names in Longos cf. p. 102 of the suggestive Appendix to J. Lindsay’s translation. Other writers have noted Longos’ debt to New Comedy for names and plot. This is true, but not relevant to my present theme.

Who thereby sets him free, just as he does Chloe, Dryas and Nape, Lamon and Myrtale. For freeing by Dionysos λόγος as the culmination of initiation cf. Olympiod. ad Pl., Phaedr. 32 Fisch. ὁ Διόνυσος λόγος ἄντει αἰτέως· διὰ καὶ λυτέσεις ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ Ὀρφεῖς φησί... ὡς κ’ ἱθελέσθη λόγες ἐκ τῶν χαλεπῶν καὶ ἀπέρφοις ὀστέον. (Kern fr. 232, q.v. for bibliogr.) See also Rohde \textit{Psyche} 342.

For initiation regarded as adoption by the divinity cf. Rohde \textit{Psyche} App. xii 601.

Specifically at i 22 ήνδικαι τι, ἦντον δὲι θέλοναι.

Hence the common representation of initiates as children, e.g. Cumont \textit{Rel. Or.} 202 fig. 13, pl. 16. So Cupid and Psyche are often represented as children (cf. Collignon, \textit{op. cit.} 346). The importance of lustration as a part of ritual purification is a basis for the noticeable part played by bathing in the fountain in Longos, especially i 19, 32 (washing induces love rather than cleanliness); cf. also i 22, 24: also in rivers and the sea (i 23, i 30, iii 24). The fountain is peculiarly the gift of Eros (above, p. 36). Sexual abstinence was sometimes forced on an initiate by means of hemlock (\textit{Philosophoumena} p. 170, Crusie) and ritual purity is the reason for Dionysophanes’ insistence on Chloe’s virginity (iv 31). For virginity in other novels cf. Wolff 127 and R. M. Rattenbury \textit{Proc. Leeds Lit. and Phil. Soc.} 1925–1928 58.

were pure but lacked knowledge. They knew neither τὰ ἔργα Ἕρωτος nor even his name; unlike Daphnis’ dangerous rival Dorkon—Δόρκων εἰδὼς ἐρωτος καὶ τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὸ ὅνομα (i 15).

Their instruction comes partly from nature, partly from man. How the imitation of nature led them to the practice of love we have already seen. But imitation of nature alone is not enough. Harmony with nature may be the goal for man; but an informed not an unconscious harmony. Children like Daphnis and Chloe are, no doubt, nearer to animals in this respect. They are inhabitants of the Golden Age, as readers of Longos have always been aware. But as they grow up their very innocence becomes the source of their unhappiness. As Lykainion points out, man cannot learn love by imitating goats and sheep, as the innocent Daphnis had thought to do. Therefore man too instructs: and chiefly in the persons of Philetas, who divulges the name and nature of Love (ii 7); and of Lykainion, who gives instruction in τὰ ἔργα (iii 18–19). That marriage was an initiation and initiations were marriages was a familiar example of the kind of allegory dear to the ancients; and our initiation is fulfilled at last by the marriage of the initiates, which completes the revelation of Lykainion—as Longos shows by recalling her name in the closing words of the work (iv 40).

Such an analysis of the structure of the book, even if it inadequately represents Longos’ skill as a writer, may at least help to clear him of the frequently made charge of indulging, sophist-like, in irrelevant τόσο purely for their own sake. From the position which it seeks to establish follow certain consequences regarding the characterisation of the principal figures, human and divine. To these I now turn.

The type of characterisation employed by Longos is best understood if we take as our starting-point the scheme of initiation just examined. It was the aim of the initiate to identify himself with his god. He enacted the actions of the god, and at the climax of the ceremony was thought of as an incarnation of him. The observation of T. R. Glover that by this stage of ancient thought ‘the old myths seemed capable of every conceivable interpretation and everything a symbol of everything else’ puts the position nicely. Daphnis and

79 For ignorance of (specifically) ὅνομα and ἔργα Ἕρωτος by Daphnis and Chloe see i 13–3, 15–14, 16–3–19, ii 8.1, 14. Cf. also i 22 ἀπειρία ἐρωτικῶν, ii 8 ἐρωμέν ὅσα εἰδότες, ii 11 εἰδότες οὐδὲν, iii 14 οὐδέν ἐπισταμένος. The convention of ignorance is extended to their parents (i 8.2) and to Philetas (ii 4—before his enlightenment).

80 iii 17.1. Cf. iii 14, where Chloe too points out that men differ from goats and sheep.

81 (a) The idea of instruction (introduced in Prologue, 2, παιδεύσεις) is especially prominent in the use of παιδεύνει and διδάσκω in connexion with: Philetas ii 8.1 παιδεύσεις; iii 14.1 παιδευσάσθαι. Lykainion iii 17 διδασκόμενα τὰ ἐρωταὶ ἔργα ... μεθῆσαι ... διδάσκω, iii 18.1 διδάσκαλοι ... διδάσκωσθαι ... παιδεύεται iii 19.1 παιδαγωγία ... ἐπαιδεύεται φίλας; completes Lykainion’s instruction ἐπαιδεύεται iii 18. Cf. i 9.1 παιδευτήρων (in dreams). Previously Chloe was ἄδδακτον (i 17). Cf. also the end of this paper.

(b) The παιδεύσαι data listed by Philetas at ii 7 (φίλημα καὶ περιβολὴ καὶ συγκατακληθήναι γεγονὸς σῶμα) form the pattern of instruction followed by Daphnis and Chloe (ii 8, 9, 10, 11, iii 14) and it is their failure to interpret it which Lykainion assists.


83 For Harrison 475 (who connects the belief specifically with the pantomimic character of ancient ritual) and her discussion (479 ff.) of Eur. fr. 475 (καὶ κοινωτέρας βάκχοις ἐκλήθησαν ὑστερεῖς). Cf. also Schol. Ar. Eq. 408. βάκχοις δ’ ἐν τοῖς Διώνυσοι ἐκάλουν μονοὶ ἀλλὰ καὶ πίνακις τοὺς τελευτάτας τὰ ὅργα βάκχοις ἐκάλουν. On the status of βάκχος see Cumont AJA xxxvii 258.

85 T. R. Glover 111 (my italics). The same opinion—Harrison 625: ‘We feel that everyone is changing into everyone else.’ The baffling result could be fruitful in the hands of a sufficiently clear-headed writer, as Longos shows.
Chloe are initiates, and if we treat them as mere individuals in a simple historical narrative their characterisation will seem weak to the point of absurdity. But we are not to judge them by Aristotelian canons of ἰθος. When Rohde complains that 'we can look for no deeper psychological development of their passion' (Gr. Rom. 2 549) he reveals that he is looking for character studies of Daphnis and Chloe. But it is in the study of Eros that we find depth in Longos. Again, Wolff (137) remarks that 'plot is more important than character in Longos'; Castiglioni (203) that Longos has 'un carattere decisamente psicologicorispetto al quale gli eventi hanno un valore affatto secondario'. These partial truths can be reconciled only if we recognise characters and events as equally expressions of the nature of Eros. Daphnis and Chloe are archetypes. What they do (and we shall find it with other characters in Longos), they do because they are playing a divine role—as was Dionysophanes in Bk. iv.

The function of Chloe as a character is precisely defined in the vision of Bryaxis: she is παρθένον εξ ἵηος ἴδος "Ερως μὲν θυμὸν ποιήσας ὀλεθρείς (ii 27.1). She is a character with an ulterior significance in the same way as Phassa, Syrinx and Echo are significant in their μυθοι. Daphnis we have already observed in one divine role: throughout the book he acts the part of Pan the musical shepherd. Consequently Chloe is represented as Syrinx and as Echo. But the shepherd Pan is only a ‘function’ of Eros; and accordingly the shepherd Daphnis is also directly equated with Eros himself. After his marriage Daphnis honours the god under the title of Ποιμέν "Ερως. When he appears to Philletas Eros says Δάφνης ποιμαίνω καὶ Χλόην (ii 5); and Philletas in his ‘sermon’ likens the authority of this god to that of Daphnis over his flocks (ii 7). In the second spring the lovers outstrip the other shepherds in driving out to pasture οὐκείων δούλωντας ποιμέν (iii 12); and in the ‘Apple’ passage (iii 33) Longos characteristically leaves us hovering between Eros and Daphnis in the words ἑυφλαίτητο καλὸν μένον ἑρωτικόν ποιμέν. Daphnis also enacts the part of Dionysos, and Dionysos, who is himself equivalent to Eros, calls for closer study. Dionysos is especially associated with autumn, the season of fruition and revelation, whose importance causes Longos to devote to it more than half his work. To represent the meaning of autumn Longos uses many related themes of which

86 Arist. Po. 1450b8 ἐστιν δὲ ἵθος μὲν τὸ τοιοῦτον ὁ δηλοὶ τὴν προαιρέσσαν ὀποῖα τις ἐν ὑαίς ὠς ἄκρι τὴν προαιρείται ἀφ' ἑξελέο. By this criterion too much of Daphnis' action consists of bewailing his misfortunes in tears (e.g. i 12, ii 21, 23, iii 24, iv 26, iv 28) instead of choosing or avoiding anything (as Longos humorously hints iii 27.1).

87 Cf. ii 6 "Ερωτι καταπεωθε. The legends of Φάτα, Δόρις εἰς ἰδ看得 (ἐν 27.1, ii 33, iii 22). When on the other hand Philletas saw Eros face to face and gave a direct explanation of his name and nature, Longos invites us to smile at Daphnis and Chloe because πάνω ἄπεγρατα ὀποῖα μέθον ὧν λάγων ἀκούστην (ii 7). 89 Cf. the discussion of Music, pp. 371. Also i 16.2 and iv 4 (Daphnis compared to Pan): ii 32, ii 29 (behaviour of Daphnis' flocks as though before Pan): iii 37 (Daphnis mimics Pan).

88 i ii 14, Chloe wishes to be Syrinx; i 37 mimics Syrinx; iii 11.1 Chloe compared to Echo; iii 23 Echo legend; Chloe also compared to Nymphs (i 24.1) and Bacchae (i 15, 23, ii 2).

86 ἰθόντι εἰς αὐτόν Ποιμένος "Ερωτός (iv 39). For Eros as shepherd cf. A.Pl. 703 (1 c A.D.), Nonnus Dionysia 79. Longos' thought may have been assisted by the metaphorical use of ποιμαίνων occurring at: Theocr. xii 80 (Ποιμάνως ἐπιμαίνων τὴν ἔρωτα: cf. 65): A.Pl. xii 99 (Ὑπ' ἑκείμον ποιμαίνων θερμὸν ὑπὸ κραδίας): Orph. fr. 82 (Kern) (ποιμαίνων προκειόμενον ἀνθρώπου ὡς "Erwta [sc. ὁ δημιουργός]). The idea of God and King as Shepherd goes back to Homer's ποιμῆν λαῶν, but in Longos' age had already received the mystical implication which it retained in Christian tradition.

88 Other expressions implying the identification of Daphnis and Chloe with the Year god are: i 18 Δάφνης μαραίνεται (compared with violets and hyacinths): i 17 he is χλωρότερον πώς θερμής (A1 so corrects Ακρίβης) — cf. the similar description of Dorkon quoted in n. 102: Daphnis' life is endangered in the first autumn (i 28 ff.) and again in the second (iii 26.1, late summer; iv 8-9, 23, autumn). Chloe, a cult title of Demeter (LSJ s.v. Χλόη II) lit. means 'the first green shoot of plants in spring'.
Dionysos is the chief. Dionysos is a violent god. For all his superficial γλυκύτης Longos does not shrink from recognising as fundamental in life, and in Eros, the elements of violence, pain and contradiction. The fruition of the year is the death of summer: harvest the despoiling of the fruit. The scenes depicted on the temple of Dionysos in Daphnis’ garden were scenes of violence and rape: the events in the last Book, pre-eminently the book of Dionysos, are events of rape, and apprehensiveness on the part of Daphnis and Chloe. Initiations, marriage, is their goal; but it is also an ordeal and a sadness. It ends for ever the Golden Age of innocence. Already in the first autumn Daphnis and Chloe, helping at the vintage, became sensible of the λύτη "Ερωτος and gladly left the δύναμιν βοή of Dionysos (ii 2.2) for the music of the pastoral Eros (ii 3). Next summer, from the time of Lykainion’s revelation of τὰ ἔργα "Ερωτος Daphnis was instinctively reluctant to face the ordeal; as Chloe was reluctant for him to pick the apple (iii 34) and as, throughout the last book, both lovers shrink in apprehension at the approach of their lord—δεσπότην οὗ πρότερον μόνον ἴκους τὸ ὀνόμα (iv 6).

Other contexts and other themes represent this aspect of Eros. Rape is not confined to the last book but begins in the first spring with the beginning of ἔρως. Then, Dorkon attempts Chloë (i 20 ff.), as does Lampis in the final autumn (iv 27). Daphnis is not literally assaulted, until Lykainion insists ὅτι σε ἐγώ ἄνθρωπο πρὸ τῆς Ἀλκυος πεποίθηκα (iii 19); and Gnathon makes his less successful attempt (iv 11–12): but indirectly the autumn assaults of the pirates are the assaults of love, as we have observed. In the case of Daphnis (i 29), Longos connects the episode with Dionysos in a characteristically allusive manner. The Homeric Hymn to Dionysos (the story of which is mentioned at iv 3.2) is here suggested in a situation where Daphnis μειράκιον μέγα καὶ καλὸν καὶ κρείττον τῆς ἐξ ἀγρῶν ἁμαρτίας... ἀλόντα παρὰ τὴν ἀλαττᾶν is carried off by Τύρων ἀγοραῖοι—to their own discomfort. So too we should perhaps account for the miraculous saving of Daphnis on the backs of the cattle. Longos records the rather absurd episode with less wit than we should have liked for our peace of mind. But perhaps he intended that the affair should be helped out by the suggestion that Daphnis, cattle-borne, coming from the sea, was playing the part of Dionysos now, as when he was carried off.

In this context of autumn’s despoiling of summer we should probably also interpret the trampling of the garden by Lampis (iv 7) who is also Chloë’s would-be ravisher (iv 28). Its elaborate description and prominent position at the beginning of Book iv are deceptive as far as the plot goes. As an episode it peters out in a parenthesis (iv 13). Longos has been less skilful than usual at integrating the two levels of his story, and the only motive left is for the trampling of the garden, sacred to Dionysos, to suggest the Dionysiac character of the book which follows. The garden (whose Erotic importance we have seen) suffers,

---

93 Cf. the common equation of marriage and its consummation with death.  
94 iv 3.2 Σεμέλην τικότοισαν ‘Ανίφανη καθελόνσας, Λεκονόεις δεδεμένον, Πεσθήκα διαρχόμενον... ἢδον νικώσας καὶ Τύρρης προσπετήμενο. Wolff (168) misses the point when he accuses Longos of ‘inserting into his description of the garden... an irrelevant list of the paintings or sculptures in the temple of Bacchus’.  
95 Cf. the list in n. 71.  
96 ii 2.1 Χάλων ἐλατήσας... Ἀφρίνης ὢ ἐλευθερ. Cf. i 22 and for formal descriptions i 14 (Chloë), i 18, 32 (Daphnis), Philetas is affected ii 7–8. Note in this context that Pan is ἐρωτικός καὶ ἄστις (ii 38).  
97 Hym. Hom. vii 1–12. The miraculous vine (line 38) is perhaps echoed in the corresponding episode of the capture of Chloe (ii 26.1).  
98 The ‘element of self-mockery’ which Turner invokes (quite rightly seeing the need to save the absurdity here) does not seem to me quite strong enough alone. Why did Longos choose such a method of saving Daphnis? He could have sworn ashore.  
99 For Dionysos coming from the sea as a bull and on bull-back cf. Elean hymn to Dionysos Diels’ Carm. Pop. 46. Harrison 432–7. Rohde Psyche 272 n. 35 to ch. viii. For Dionysos coming in a wagon (cf. Longos i 30. ὀπασὶν ἐλατήσας θυμάσαι) M. Bieber Gk. and R. Theater 96–7, figs. 139–42. Cattle do not often occur in Longos: it may therefore be significant that Philetas, Dorkon and Lampis are βοῦκολοι. βοῦκολος was a title in the Dionysiac hierarchy (Cumont AJA xxxvii 247).
and for that Daphnis, dreading his master's arrival, fears death. But Daphnis gets married; only the garden is trampled.

The equivalent in the first autumn is the pirate raid, when Daphnis was preserved for Eros, and Dorkon was killed instead. The assaults of pirates are a hazard of the shepherd's life (ii 32): but since Love is a shepherd, pirate-raids are included in the picture which is also allegorical of Eros (Pr. i)—the warlike Eros who plays his part in the person of Ἀνδρεπτότης. The paradox which arises here is common to the whole pantheistic way of thought which Longos assumes. Eros, Dionysos, Daphnis or whoever is the god’s expression for the moment is both aggressor and sufferer, pirate and shepherd, trampler and garden; and Longos is evidently glad to assume in the reader and use for his own purposes the ability of his age at once to reconcile opposites in one symbolic figure and still to remain aware of their opposition.

Another hazard is mentioned almost in the same breath with that of piracy—the raiding wolf (ii 32). That Eros should be wolf as well as shepherd is again only another way of saying that he acts through the violent Dionysos as well as through those maternal protectors, the Nymphs. It was by adapting to his own ends a trap designed to catch a raiding she-wolf that Eros brought about ἐρωτος ἅρπη (i 11–13). It was by means of the important part played by Lykainion, of the significance of whose name Longos was well aware, that Eros helped to bring about the final revelation. At an earlier stage this function of Lykainion is paralleled by that of Dorkon; and he dressed as a wolf to make his attempt on Chloe (i 20). Further the wolf is like the pirates, like Dionysos, like Pan; a hunter. And hunting is itself treated as one of this complex of autumnal themes. We have noticed it already in the Bird-catching scene (iii 5 ff.). It was the autumn hunting-expedition of the Methymnean nobles which gave rise to the carrying off of Chloe (ii 12.2). So Astylos, precursor of Dionysophanes, also hunts the hare (iv 11.1). And although

100 iv 3.1 (πεπολυμένος τὸν δεσποτήν) and 8.9.1, on which see Dalmeyda 286 on κρεμμυ, κρεμμυστέα. Daphnis is intimately associated with this garden and with Eros as having found the spring in it, which waters its plants, iv 4.1.

101 If Valley (chap. vi) is right in suggesting that the description of the trampled garden (iv 7–8) draws on Sappho fr. 117, we may suppose that Longos used Sappho’s words here to refer, as in their original context, to the trampling of virginity. Cf. his use of Sappho fr. 116 in iii 33 discussed above.

102 Dorkon is in effect a scapegoat, like the garden. The pirates κατέκοπαν ὡς βωτ (i 29): cf. his own words θεξ αμα κοιτιος ας ης τρεις μέλλοι αμάσαβι (i 16.1) with the descriptions of Daphnis quoted in n. 92. Valley (p. 86) points out that this passage is modelled on Theocr. vi 2: it is the more significant that the words ὡς τρεις μέλλοι αμάσαβι are Longos’ own addition. So are the words λευκος ὡς ἕ σις αμάς γντι (applied to him by Daphnis 16.2), for whose significance see below n. 105.

103 iv 39, altar dedicated to Pan Straties. Cf. ii 23 ανδυφή γὰρ στρατεύσας. Pan was associated with war from Marathon on (Hdt. vi 105), but I have not found any other case of this as a cult title. For Pan as στρατηκὸς Λυκούν, the role of Warrior developing from that of Hunter, see Wernicke in Roscher s.v. ‘Pan’ 1388.

104 LSJ s.v. λήκων, -ον. Cf. Latin lupus (Lewis and Short s.v. II). Probably Longos is conscious of this innuendo at ii 39 (Chloe’s speech). Double meanings as characteristic of Longos’ irony are discussed below, p. 49. Obvious puns occur at ii 15 αγας, iii 6 ὄντων αιτος, iii 23 μέλη, iv 12 χεραγογια.

105 Dorkon’s attempt and kiss and Lykainion’s instruction are similar (a) in description: setting and subterfuges of both are similar (wolves hiding in thickets): both are experienced in ἐρωτικῇ τέχνῃ, both prosperous and ply their innocent victims with gifts: note i 16.2 (Δφρεος) λευκος ὡς ἕτες αμάς γντι; iii 15 (Ἀκανίων) γίνεται ἐπακόου ἔτες αμάς; cf. n. 102; (b) in function. The two episodes are moments at which love is revealed as a universal not a purely private experience (the different degrees of revelation being due to merely practical necessity). The lovers’ reactions (these are the only two experiences which they consciously conceal from each other) are part of their ultimate hesitation to leave their private Golden Age and face marriage. The language suggests that a parallel is to be drawn also between the wound which fatally shed the blood of Dorkon (i 29) and that described at length in connexion with Lykainion (iii 19–20).

106 Pan is a hunter regularly from Hym. Hom. xix 13 on, e.g. especially A. Pl. vi 11–16, 106, 107, 109. Dionysos is hunter and hunted (as Zagreus, Rohde Psyche 352 n. 27, 353 n. 35 to ch. x). Cf. R. P. Winnington-Ingram Euripides and Dionysus, ch. x, ‘The hunt’.
hunting is not listed as part of the original picture of Eros in the Prologue, it was when hunting in Lesbos that Longos originally came upon the picture, in the grove of the Nymphs.\textsuperscript{107}

Those who have followed my interpretation so far may well be asking what has become of Longos' κτήμα τερπνών? The tendency to see vegetation gods lurking in every work of classical literature is rightly regarded with suspicion. The drama of Sophokles and that of Karkinos were alike based on vegetation rituals, but one was good art, the other frigid. The brief answer to this objection would be that Sophokles might have been a little surprised to be told that Oidipous was really a vegetation god: but the point about Longos is that he would not have been surprised; in fact it is he who tells us at some length that this is what his hero is.\textsuperscript{108}

But still it would not follow from this alone that Longos' work is a κτήμα τερπνών. To show how this follows it will be necessary to demonstrate an integral relationship between the generally admitted 'charm' and the 'serious import' for which I have been arguing. Now it may, I hope, already have emerged even in a cold-blooded analysis that Longos' own allusive handling of the themes and patterns provided by his religious subject is characteristic of the poet rather than of the ponderous mythographer. In short, the work is not a κτήμα τερπνών in spite of being an ανάδημα (indeed if we isolate the pastoral lovers they are charming, but trivial): but if we appreciate the constant play between the story of the lovers and the patterns dictated by the theme of Eros, the charm remains, but it is deepened. We have an ανάδημα which is also itself τερπνών.

This emerges most clearly if we consider Longos' management of the pastoral mode in which he presents his work. Pastoral is a particularly clear example of a common principle—that according to which the ideal world which it is the compulsion of the artist to express is embodied in some place, time or society other than that of the writer himself. The ideal world may be shown as perfect country, as rich palace, honest poverty, the age of childhood, youth, love, or the remote past. All of these ideals, as well as the pastoral, are used by Longos.\textsuperscript{109} But Longos was a sophisticated and intelligent man, and the more intelligent the writer of pastoral the more consciously will he express the relationship between his ideal world and reality. For him the world of the Town is a necessary and relevant complement to the Pastoral world; which, indeed, only acquires its significance in so far as it is contrasted with the harassed life of the city-dweller.

It is necessary to emphasise that Longos controls both of his two worlds in this way, because on just this score he has been attacked by Rohde for lack of unity. Rohde praises Longos' descriptions of the country, but holds that they are isolated by the love scenes (which shock him) and by the 'intrusions' of the outside world, whose only raison d'être is, Apuleius provides a parallel for the love story with a religious νόμον.

\textsuperscript{107} ἐπὶ Λησβοῦ θηρῶν (opening words of Pr.). Why Lesbian Pastoral? I hope my interpretation may suggest a new line of approach to the vexed question of Longos' identity. The head of Orpheus was washed to Lesbos where it gave oracles. Later it became part of a shrine of Dionysos (Phil. Her. v 3, Vit. Apoll. Tyan. iv 14, Lucian adv. indoct. 11). Cf. Kern Orphic. Fr. testim. 118, 130, 134, with 77 l. 18. Lesbos was the home of the old-established cult of Dionysos Brisaecos, and of the family of Dionysiac priests, from whom was descended Pompeia Arrippinilla, Bacchic priestess of the Torre Nova inscription (Cumont AFF xxxvii 232).

\textsuperscript{108} My interpretation makes Longos a successor to the tradition of the Virgilian Pastoral with an ulterior allusion, carried on by Calpurnius, Nemeanian and the Einsiedeln Eclogues. For the pastoral ideal in Longos (as in some other novelists). For the pastoral ideal in Eisner-xy cf. J. Huizinga The Waning of the Middle Ages (Penguin ed.) 38-9, 130-9. For Eisner-xviii cf. W. Empson Some Versions of Pastoral (1935). The idealisation of childhood has been a more popular form of pastoral than that of the shepherd's life since Wordsworth and Blake, cf. especially Lewis Carroll, J. M. Barrie, A. A. Milne. E. Lewis Dew on the Grass provides a pastoral of childhood within a framework of seasons. There, as in Milne, the final 'initiation' consists in leaving home for school.
in his view, to prolong the love story by hindering its consummation. But this modification of his general theory of the structure of Greek novels will not work for Longos, who does not use the Town merely as a hindrance. On the contrary, most of the decisive actions in the story of the lovers occur at precisely the point where their world and the outside world impinge upon each other. Daphnis and Chloe are the children of city-dwellers, exposed and brought up in the country. We have seen the importance of Dorkon, Philetas, the pirates and raiders from Methymna, and of Lykainion (γυναικών ἐπακτῶν ἐξ ἀστεοῦ... ἀγγελία παρατηρητική στοιχεία του Κύκλου άιτιον (i 13)). The mutual interpenetration of Town and Country in the last Book is complete: town-dwellers come to celebrate the vintage in the country; adopt Daphnis and Chloe, who renounce their former country life as herds and go to stay in the town; but are married in the country and subsequently live there.

In this balancing of Town against Country, a tension is set up, in Longos as in all pastoral, between real and ideal, which gives rise to a legitimate irony. The pastoral writer tells us that certain simple people are better than ourselves: yet at the same time he smiles with us at their simplicity. We must not sentimentally imagine that Longos did not feel sympathy for the town-dwellers ἐπεὶ ἄλοι ἒν τῶν καθ' ἀγγελίον ἐφετῶν (iv 33): or that he did not regard the wedding-feast, and Daphnis' behaviour towards his guests, the goats, as ludicrous and uncouth (iv 33). It is this sophisticated irony which saves Longos from the insipidity of countless later pastoralists. It also saves him from the tedium which the ponderous mumbo-jumbo of his Erotic mystery might easily have induced: when he is at his most serious he is simultaneously at his most cynically witty. Thus Chloe is first led to realise the beauty τοῦ λαυτρον ἐνόμισε τοῦ καλλίου αἰτίου (i 13). of Daphnis, when he washes in the spring and

110 Rohde Gr. Rom. 549. (I have not had access to a later edition than that of 1900 (Leipzig) to which I refer.) Rohde's interpretation of Longos has not been challenged as a whole. He is followed by, e.g., Wolff, 124; Castiglioni, 204; Turner, 11. His position may be summarised as follows:

(i) His general theory of the Greek novel is that of a synthesis of love story with adventure story (ii 1: this is no longer tenable; see especially W. Schmid, Neue Jahrb. für das Klass. Altertum. 1904, 465).

(ii) In Longos' case (531 ff.) the synthesis is of love story with pastoral (537, 543).

(iii) But pastoral is intrinsically without history, timeless (547).

(iv) To supply a basis for the story the 'Town' and adventures from the outside world are therefore imported (548). They are thus a frigid intrusion, no integration being possible, by definition, between the two elements.

The view of Pastoral which I suggest differs in toto from Rohde's at (3). Rohde's distinction of idyll, romance, drama and epic seems too brash. We might as well argue that it is impossible to integrate choral lyric with dramatic episodes. But in any case his argument fails if we do not assume initially the mechanical conflation of Pastoral plus Love story/Town plus Adventures. Rohde's great skill in dissecting Longos' origins and sources has left him with a corpse. But such dissection should follow, not initiate, interpretation. First we should look for the single conception from which Longos starts (in the Prologue). This is Eros, i.e. a total conception of Nature with Man/Town with Country, including

111 Not, as Rohde (pp. 549–50) accuses Longos, to a gratuitous and detestable sophistry. That the subject of the irony is frequently love is prescribed by the subject-matter. So Wolff recognises the play between sophistication and innocence but regards it merely as a salacious game (130–1): again he correctly recognises the 'envelopment' of the Country by the Town (122–3) but writes 'In Longos there is very little irony: in fact very little place for it' (215).

112 Longos laughs at the conventions of his own love story, especially iii 17 (Lykainion's cynicism about dreams from Nymphs); iii 27 (Daphnis, in trouble, τὸ συνήθεις ἐρωτάτω: τὸ ἀνάκρισεν; iv 13 (Gnathon's λόγοι καὶ ἐρωτικά καὶ μακρῶν—Longos is drawing near the end of his own λόγοι ἐρωτικάς). Turner (11) draws attention to other examples and to the commencement of this self-mockery in the prologue, with Longos' prayer for σωφροσύνη. And Longos is not only mocking himself, but the ideal of σωφροσύνη which is a leading motif in the Greek novel (Rattenbury Proc. Leeds Phil. Soc. 1925–1928, 59). But the prayer is simultaneously serious. In the same spirit Lykainion offers Daphnis σωφροσύνη (iii 15 cf. iii 17 σῶος). Cf. Hadrian's invocation at Thespieae of 'Ερως σωφρόνος (G. Kaibel Ehr. Gr. 811). Kaibel's sceptical comment on the adjective is unjustified. As Euripides' choruses knew (Med. 627–34, 1A 543–57), there are two kinds of Eros. Longos' τελετή is to help us to the beneficent Eros. Perhaps one might note that Daphnis' original nurse was called Sophrone (Courier, MSS. Σωφροσύνη).
Next day she sees him playing his syrinx καὶ ἀδήσις αἰτίαν ἐνώμιξε τὴν μονοχήν τοῦ κάλλους: and she takes the pipe in hopes that she may herself become beautiful. We are invited to smile at her simple confusion of post hoc and propter hoc: and at the same time her simplicity is right. The true cause, Eros, is the spring and he is the music—'And he is oft the wisest man who is not wise at all'.

So also in the accounts of the exposure of the two babies (i 2-6) we are to laugh at the mercenary instincts of Lamon, the credulity of Nape who thought a goat had born a boy, and their simplicity at learning charity from sheep and goats: but sheep and goats—as the story makes clear—are the natural ministers of πομήν "Eros". This attitude of Longos makes it possible for us to accept the (literally) absurd ignorance about Eros on the part of the lovers and their parents (cf. n. 79); and all the foolish innocences of Daphnis and Chloe which Longos announces with variations on the formula οὐ νέος καὶ ἀγροικὸς καὶ ἄγνων. Longos, like Aristophanes or, to come nearer his own times, like Apuleius, though with greater detachment than Apuleius, has the ability to laugh at what he has used his most poetical language to describe, without destroying it. So Daphnis and Chloe, solemnly instructed by Philetas that they must, according to the mystery, καταφλούν χαμαί staunchly remark—it is autumn—κρύος μέν, ἄλλα καρπετήθησομεν δεκτεροι μετα Φιλητάν (i 8). Longos knows that Eros is a noble mystery: but he does not pretend that for human beings he does not also bring sensuous pleasure. Hence the swift play between mystery and delight, Town and Country, innocence and sophistication, so infuriating to Rohde.

From this it follows that in Longos the Town as well as the Country plays a part in representing the Good Life. The true goal for Longos' initiates is harmony with nature, and it might be thought that this is to be found exclusively in the Country. Eros himself and the principal 'good' characters are shepherds and country-dwellers. Typically 'bad' characters, on the other hand, are the rich young city-dwellers from Methymna, the soldiers they send, or the lecherous Gnathon. But this view is an over-simplification for the whole work and an impossibility for Book iv where Town and Country are equally recommended and reconciled in a rite satisfactory to the claims of both nature and human society, the rite of marriage. Evil may be found in the Town, the specifically human world: but this human world is not exclusively evil; harmony with nature is attainable by man too. But (as was said) an informed harmony, which cannot be found exclusively in the Golden World of Daphnis' and Chloe's childhood. They needed the instruction of those who 'know'. Here Longos' use of the words τέχνη, σοφιζέων and their derivatives is informative. Art or artifice, broadly expressed by this group of words, is the contribution of the Town to the mystery of Eros. There is truth in the mockery, as usual, when Astylos

---

113 Note the statement which follows immediately (i 13.3) that Eros is the true cause. Daphnis' perplexity after the kiss (i 18) is the equivalent to Chloe's here.

114 Cf. ii 39.3 νομίζων τὰς αἰγὰς καὶ τὰ πρόβατα ποιμένων καὶ αὐτῶν ἰδίων θεώς.

115 E.g. i 13, i 15, i 32, ii 39 (twice), iii 18. Note that the convention of Daphnis' innocence is abruptly dropped at iv 28.

116 E.g. Ran. 391 καὶ πολλά μὲν γελοῖοι μὲ εἰστείν, πολλὰ δὲ ἀπονείπαι κ.τ.λ.

117 I here oppose the view of Rohde which is a corollary to his position stated in n. 110. As Rohde separates the Pastoral element from the rest of the story, he believes that Longos is advocating an escape from the 'world' into a kindly 'nature' (Gr. Rom. 545). If the need for producing some story had not prevented him Longos would, he thinks, have liked to represent the Golden Age exclusively: as it is he paints a nature exclusively pretty; man childish in character; the gods only benevolent. There are obvious and fatal exceptions to all three statements, for reasons which I have tried to show. Rohde's earlier remarks on the attitude to nature of the Greeks in general (544—not dealing specifically with Longos) would be more consistent with the juster conclusion that the harmony with nature aimed at is fusion of self rather than loss of self. For Longos man is certainly part of nature: the issue is 'a rebellious or harmonious part?' In either case nature is greater than man, not merely pretty (Eros is an object of awe for Philetas (ii 7); Pan of terror to the soldiers (ii 25 ff.).

118 Cf. on φήσις n. 81. Also iii 18.4 ἡ φήσις ἐπαιδευτεῖν, iv 23 οὕτω φήσις ταχέως πιστεύεται.
EROS AND THE LESBIAN PASTORALS OF LONGOS says to Gnathon ὃς μεγάλους ὅ "Ερως ποιεῖ σοφιστάς. So τέχνη περιττή is remarked in the prologue as an attribute of the picture of Eros (Pr. 1). It is τέχνη which Daphnis and Chloe lack, and Philetas and Lykainion offer to provide. The garden, proper dwelling-place of Eros, exhibits the perfect union of nature and art. From the garden could be seen the open country and the sea with shepherds and sailors (iv 3.1). In the garden τέτγυρτο καὶ διακέκριτο πάντα... ἐν μετεώρῳ δὲ οἱ κλάδοι συνέπιπτον... εἶδοκε μέντοι καὶ η τοῦτων φύσεω εἶναι τέχνης (iv 2.2). And Longos gives us an epitome of the whole work when he opens his first Book with a description of Mitylene and the surrounding country—a city set in country by the sea, admitting the water into its precincts and adorning its waterways with architectural skill—διειδοτι τί γὰρ εὐρίποις ἐπεισερούση τῆς θαλάττης καὶ κεκόσιμηι γεφύρως ἕστοι καὶ λευκοὶ ὅλου (i 1).

This mutual interpenetration of Country and Town, in their broadest sense, means that Longos is not, therefore, merely indulging in empty rhetorical paradox for its own sake, when he relies on the sophistication of his reader to form a just assessment of his praises of the unsophisticated countryman. He is giving an artistic unity to a single, though complex, concept, the nature of Eros; and can reasonably claim that in consequence his work becomes ἀνάθημα μὲν "Ερωτ... κτῆμα δὲ τερπνῶν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις.

H. H. O. CHALK.

University of Glasgow.

119 So too it is Chloe’s ἐπιφοίνος of Daphnis which is ἔρωτος ἄρχη (i 13.2). Gnathon is not, like Daphnis, a perfect embodiment of Eros. But as one of the creations of Eros he necessarily (but imperfectly, as we can see from the lack of success which Longos arranges for him) represents him. Hence he plans λόγων καὶ ἔρωτικῶν καὶ μακρῶν (iv 13); he is πᾶσος ἔρωτικὴς μεθολογίας πεπαιδευμένος—but ἐν τοῖς τῶν ἀσώτων συμποσίως (iv 17). He represents, in fact, what Eros becomes in the man whose initiation is perverted by coming exclusively from the Town and not at all from the Country.

120 Chloe’s first kiss is ἀδύνατον καὶ ἀτεχνον (i 17); Daphnis and Chloe, separated in winter, τέχνην ἐξήτων δὲ ἦς ἀλληλοις θεάσαται... καὶ τούτων σώφριμα εἱρεν (sc. Δάφνις) (iii 4); the meetings are repeated ἐτ' ἄλλως τέχνας (iii 11). Lykainion ἐπιπετηγκαὶ τι τοῦτο (iii 15) cf. iii 18.1 ὑποτελέσας ἐπέτεχνος. Daphnis asks Philetas μεταδονταὶ τῆς τέχνης (i 33.1). Also (i 11) note the unusual phrase γῆς σεισμισμένης in connexion with the wolf-trap. Cf. n. 81 on παιδέυον, διδάσκω.

121 Cf. Rohde’s summary of the significance in philosophy and art of the garden as the proper setting for man’s communion with nature (Gr. Rom. 537 ff.).
THE BURGON AND BLACAS TOMBS

(PLATES I-VII)

There are in the British Museum two groups of Greek vases, from two burials, which may for convenience be called the Burgon and Blacas tombs, after their finders. The present article gives the evidence for their discovery and an account of the individual vases; for those which have already been published in the Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum and in the Corpus Vasorum, I confine myself to major additions to the bibliography and to supplementary comment, while the unpublished pieces receive fuller treatment.

Thomas Burgon (1787–1858), a Turkey merchant who lived in Smyrna till 1814 and returned to the Aegean on various occasions after that date, made good use of his opportunities for excavating and collecting antiquities; he was no dilettante but a knowledgeable and careful worker, and when his business failed in 1841 he and his collection found a refuge in the British Museum. His name has long been familiar to the student of Greek vases from the Burgon amphora, the earliest known Panathenaic amphora, which is conspicuous both for its own merits and for its importance for the chronology of black-figure vase-painting; very conveniently, the Burgon amphora came from the Burgon tomb, in which it was associated with six much smaller vases.

The amphora and the circumstances of its finding were discussed in an article by the Chevalier P. O. Brondsted, entitled 'On Panathenaic Vases, and on the Holy Oil contained in them; with particular reference to some Vases of that description now in London'. There are no illustrations to this article, or at least the copy which I have seen has none, but a French translation was made by Burgon's son, John William, under the title Mémoire sur les vases Panathénaiques adressé en forme de lettre à M. W. R. Hamilton par le Chevr. P. O. Brondsted et traduit de l'anglais par J. W. Burgon (Paris, 1833); in what follows the two versions will be distinguished as Mémoire and Panathenaic Vases. The Mémoire has six plates, one of them showing the small vases already mentioned, whose identification is therefore beyond all doubt. The detailed account of the discovery is given in a letter from Thomas Burgon to Brondsted, which deserves quoting at length:

'My dear Brondsted,

In the course of our last conversation about my Athenian Prize Vase, you expressed a wish, that I should communicate to you, in writing, all the circumstances of its discovery, as well as the particulars of its contents and condition when first found; and knowing so well the great degree of interest which you take in everything that may assist in forming a correct opinion of this curious monument, I feel peculiar pleasure in giving you the following statement.

The Vase was found, in my presence, on the 16th May, 1813, in the course of an excavation which occupied about two months, on some waste ground outside the ancient wall of Athens, close to the Portae Acharnicae, about one hundred and sixty yards north-east of the modern gate called Gribos-kapesi. This ground is bounded on the east by the road

---

1 The photographs in plates I to VII, taken by myself, are published by permission of the Trustees of the British Museum.
3 Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom (London, 1892) ii 102–35.
4 I am much indebted to Dr Dietrich von Bothmer and Dr G. Roger Edwards for providing photostats of these plates.
5 Panathenaic Vases 109 ff.
leading to Thebes, and on the southern side by a chasm, forming the bed of the torrent. The exact position of the spot may be seen by referring to the "Plan of the Antiquities of Athens", among the plates illustrative of Lieutenant-Colonel Leake's interesting "Topography of Athens", published in 1821. The Vase in question was found about thirty yards north of the spot where the initial letter A (of the word Acharnicae) stands on the plan referred to. That this ground had been anciently a cemetery, is proved by my having explored an area of near two hundred yards in circuit, and found there about forty-five well-defined tombs of various kinds. It was among these tombs that the Vase was discovered, deposited in the earth, about three feet below the surface, in a nearly upright position; and having a heavy rude slab, of schistus rock, about three inches thick, and twelve inches square, placed on its mouth. It retained its shape and position perfectly, after the earth was cleared away around it, although it was cracked all over in every direction, and was taken up in about forty pieces. . . .

On carefully examining the earth, to ascertain whether any thing had been deposited in the Vase, I found some remains of bones, which appeared to have been burnt, and also six earthen vessels. They consisted of three black two-handled cups of different sizes,—a small bottle-shaped vessel of yellow earth,—a pitcher-shaped vase with a handle,—and, lastly, a Lekythus, of inelegant form on which is painted, in very rude ancient style, a runner or dancer between two standing figures.

I might here close this narration; but as the recent discovery of so many Panathenaic prize-amphorae in Italy, with inscriptions analogous to that on mine, has given rise to discussions, in some of which the genuineness of my Vase (especially its inscription) has been called in question, it becomes necessary for me to state that I washed and joined the fragments myself, with the greatest care, at Athens. The Vase was never out of my possession, and has not been restored, in the Italian sense of the word; the inscription is, therefore, in every respect genuine, and is exactly as engraved, on a reduced scale, in the valuable work of our friend Millingen (Unedited Monuments, Series 1, Plate 1).

It is also to be observed that this Vase, when found, was complete. The fragment wanting on the neck of the Horses, was crumbled by the blow of a small pick-axe, at the first moment of its discovery. The larger and more unfortunate deficiency between the Charioteer and the Horses, was occasioned at the same instant by the labourer having detached, and carelessly thrown away, two or three of the fragments, while I was occupied in removing the earth; these pieces I could never succeed in recovering, although the most diligent search was made for them. In advertising this misfortune, I must explain, that the labourer was under an impression that the amphora was not worth preserving,—as no painted vase had ever been discovered of so large a size, and previous experience had induced the common belief among the excavators, that thick and large vases were always of ordinary red earth and coarse fabric. It was, therefore, usual to disregard them, when any such were found, and they were consequently never washed or examined. In fact, I had myself imbibed this erroneous notion, and did not suspect this amphora to be painted, till, on scraping off the earth from one of the fragments, I saw the legs of the Horses. This circumstance alone led to its preservation; for the calcareous incrustation, which attaches itself to vases deposited so many centuries in the earth, had almost precluded the possibility of seeing its surface.

I have detailed all these particulars, in order to explain how it happened that, nineteen days before, I had found and thrown away (without washing) four amphorae, exactly similar to this in size and shape, each containing burnt bones and smaller vessels of various forms. These last were preserved and washed; and from a subsequent consideration and comparison of these objects, with those already described as having been found in my

---

*That is, East of Aeolus Street, about half-way between the National Bank and Sophocles Street.*
Vase, I was led to the mortifying conclusion that four Panathenaic prize-amphorae had been destroyed, owing partly to the incrusted condition in which they were found, but principally to the erroneous notion just explained. This circumstance I shall never cease to regret, and only relate it to you, because it leads to the reasonable hope that future excavations at Athens may bring to light more of these interesting monuments.

Hoping that this long letter may not be found too tedious, believe me to be my dear Brøndsted,

Yours very sincerely,

Thos. Burgon.

11, Brunswick Square, November 26th, 1831,
To the Chevalier Brøndsted, etc. etc.

The vases from the Burgon collection which are not in the published catalogues are given the numbers assigned to them in the manuscript list of his collection which is in the library of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum; to avoid confusion these numbers are preceded by the letters TB. They are marked on the vases in ink, and so is a second series which runs from 48 to 48 F; the list seems to have been drawn up in preparation for the sale of the collection to the British Museum, and the second series, 48, 48 A, etc., must refer to an earlier inventory, now lost, for item 834 in the manuscript reads, 'The Athenian Panathenaic amphora, 2 ft. high', while for 835—40 the entry is, '6 small cups and vases found in it No. 48'. These two notes also give additional evidence that all seven vases were found together.

(1) B 130. Panathenaic amphora. PLATES I and II. Height, 0.613 m. Maximum diameter of body, 0.423 m. Diameter of mouth, 0.204 m. Diameter of foot, 0.138 m. Maximum internal diameter at narrowest part of neck, 0.105 m. Mémoire pl. 1 and 5, no. 7. ABV 89, Burgon Group, no. 1. The vase is 569 in the old Catalogue of the Greek and Etruscan Vases in the British Museum by Birch and Newton (London, 1851), where a brief account of the discovery is given; it is also stated that the vase 'contained some remains of burnt bones and also a Lékythos and five other small earthen vessels of various forms, see nos. 2603, 3039, 3047, 3056, 3056, infra', but the section of the catalogue which includes these numbers was never published and exists only in manuscript.

A, Athena. B, racing cart. The vase had not been completely freed from incrustation, and the joints were not well made, but Burgon had too much discrimination to emulate the Italian restorers of his time in filing down the projections left by faulty mending, so that no harm had been done. The photographs published here were taken after the vase had been cleaned and re-mended in June 1951. On the underside was written in ink, 'No. 48. Found May 16, 1813, Athens'; the writing was on a layer of incrustation, not on the body of the pot, and was therefore lost during cleaning.

(2) B 586. Attic black-figured lekythos. PLATE III. 1. Height, 0.146 m. Maximum diameter, 0.071 m. Small parts of the mouth and foot are restored. Mémoire pl. 5, no. 1. E. Haspels, Attic Black-figured Lekythoi 195, Group of the little black-necked lekythoi, no. 13.

A running youth, nude save for a cloak over one arm, between two draped youths; all three hold spears or long staffs. Red is used for the youths' hair, their cloaks, and for dot-rosettes on their chitons. Two red lines run right round the vase beneath the picture, and there is a third line just above the foot; the moulding round the neck is red, and so is the top of the mouth. The glaze has fired orange-brown in most places, with occasional small patches of black; there is in fact a thick orange-brown layer, over which in some places a thin black layer has formed, the black being much more lustrous than the brown. Marked under the foot in ink, 'TB 835. No. 48 A. Athens 1813'.

(3) TB 836. Attic black-glazed olpe. PLATE III. 3. Height as preserved, 0.133 m. Maximum diameter, 0.071 m. Mémoire pl. 5, no. 2.

Almost all the rim is lost except for a little piece by the handle; some of the neck is also missing, and the handle and upper part of the body have been broken and mended. Two red lines run round the body just below the lower handle-root. The glaze has flaked a good deal and has fired grey and orange in places. Marked under the foot in ink, 'TB 48 B. Athens 1813'; we know from the illustration in Mémoire that the vase belonged to the tomb group, and it can be identified as 836 in the list by elimination.

Compare a vase from the Athenian Agora, Hesperia 25 (1956) pl. 18 g; it differs from ours in having no foot, but other examples found with it in the same well do have feet; other minor differences are the presence of a third red line round the body, lower down, and the unglazed handle.
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(4) TB 837. Hand-made aryballos. Plate III. 2. Height, 0·063 m. Maximum diameter, 0·056 m. Mémoire pl. 5, no. 5.

The neck and handle have been broken and mended; parts of the lip and neck are missing. The bottom is flattened to form a resting-surface. Un-glazed; creamy-brown, micaceous clay, less friable than many examples of this class. Marked on the bottom in ink, 'TB 837. 48 C. Athens 1813'.

For similar vases from other graves in Athens, see Hesperia xx (1951) pls. 39-42, 42-4. On this class, 'Argive monochrome', see the discussion in Hesperia xxi (1952) 202 ff., with the bibliography in n. 45; C. M. Robertson in BSA xliii (1948) 44, 52-3, 76, 80; S. Weinberg, Corinth vii. pt. 1, 8.

(5) TB 838. Attic black-glazed skyphos of Corinthian type. Plate III. 5. Height, 0·081 m. Maximum diameter, 0·119 m. Mémoire pl. 5, no. 3.

Broken and mended; part of one handle is restored, and a chip is missing from the foot. There are two red lines round the body just below the handles, and a third at the top of the reserved zone above the foot. The glaze has fired dark brown in places; the underside is reserved, with two glazed circles and a dot. Marked under the foot in ink, 'TB 838. No. 48 D. Athens 1813'. Compare Hesperia xxv (1956) pl. 18a.

In his letter to Bröndsted Burgon says explicitly that all the small vases were found inside the large one, but it will be observed that this skyphos is too big to go through neck of the amphora. If it is placed right way up in the mouth of the amphora, its handles rest on the rim and the rest of the vase is unsupported; if a slab of stone a foot square and three inches thick were then placed on top, one would expect to find the handles and rim of the skyphos crushed, while the lower parts would be undamaged. In fact the breaks are clean, and the wall and base of the vase are broken into a number of pieces. From what is known of Burgon it is very unlikely that he was telling a deliberate lie; moreover, the vase is not out of keeping with its associates, as can be seen by the reference already given to a similar example from the Athenian Agora, so if it is a fraudulent addition, Burgon must have made an incredibly lucky choice, considering the state of knowledge of Attic black pottery in his day. If it had been thrown on the funeral pyre and then swept up with the ashes, the evidence of vases from other burials would lead us to expect that parts of it would be missing, and that adjacent fragments would show different degrees of discoloration; in fact it is almost complete, and uniform in colour. Possibly it was really found beside the amphora, not in it, and Burgon's memory played him false after twenty years, or it may have been deliberately broken at the time of the burial; a possibility that comes to mind is that no one considered the question of its size till the time came to put it in the amphora with the others.

(6) TB 839. Attic black-glazed skyphos of Corinthian type. Plate III. 6. Height, 0·057 m. Maximum diameter, 0·075 m. Mémoire pl. 5, no. 4.

Broken and mended. There are two red lines round the body just below the handles, and a red band in the reserved zone above the foot. The underside is reserved, with two glazed circles and a dot. Marked under the foot in ink, 'TB 839. 48 E. Athens 1813'.

See Hesperia xxv (1956) pl. 18b for a similar vase, whose shape is only slightly different, with the comment on pp. 58-9: 'Rays are the normal decoration above the foot of “Corinthian” skyphoi and are found throughout the long history of the shape from the late seventh to the early fourth century B.C. Added red on the reserved band above the foot is confined to the early period and is hardly to be found after the middle of the sixth century.' The history of this type of skyphos does not in fact end in Attica till the latter part of the fourth century.

(7) TB 840. Attic black-glazed skyphos. Plate III. 4. Height, 0·038 m. Maximum diameter, 0·063 m. Mémoire pl. 5, no. 6.

Undamaged except that one handle is missing and has been restored in plaster. The vase has no foot; the bottom is slightly concave, and it and the lowest part of the wall are reserved. The clay has fired grey-brown. Marked on the underside in ink, 'TB 840. 48 F. Athens 1813'.

By a careful analysis of details Langlotz established the position of the Burgon amphora in the development of black-figure painting, and there has been general acceptance of his conclusion that it is earlier than the work of Exekias and the Amasis Painter, about contemporary with the early work of Lydos, and rather later than the François vase; in absolute terms, some ten to twenty years before the middle of the sixth century. The lekythos has been assigned by Miss Haspels to her Black-neck class, and nine other examples of this class were found in two graves at Rhithsona which Ure dated around or just after the middle of the sixth century. Beazley accepts Ure's dating, and lists various vases from thinking of a date very long before 550 B.C. There are other considerations which suggest a date little after it'; in Sixth and Fifth Century Pottery from Rhithsona 39, that they 'may be dated in the middle of the sixth century'.
which are related in style to the Black-neck lekythoi, among them a cup in Athens which is dated 'soon after 550 B.C.' by Bloeche, 'around 540' by Lullies; to judge by the style, this cup and our lekythos are contemporary. On the other hand Miss Haspels and Beazley point out the similarities in make and drawing between the Black-neck class and a miniature amphora in New York; the use of red on the amphora, the pose of the figures and their proportions, and the black and red tongues above the pictures suggest that it cannot be far distant in time from the early work of Lydos and his associates. It is therefore just possible that the lekythos was made a little before 550 B.C. In consequence the unfigured vases may be dated from their context to the second quarter of the sixth century or early in the third quarter. Examples similar to nos. 3, 5, and 6 were found in a well in the Athenian Agora together with figured pottery and other material of which the report says, 'The date of the deposit is the second quarter of the sixth century B.C., and there is nothing in it that need be later than the five-sixties'. There is no real discrepancy between the evidence of the two groups of pottery; the little vases from the tomb could well be as early as, or even a little earlier than, the Burgon amphora, or as late as the lekythos. The lower dating would imply that the development of the skyphos and the olpe was rather slow in the middle of the sixth century; the idea is quite plausible, for the shapes are simple ones, and the production of plain pottery was not at that time the vigorous, expanding business of later days.

The dating of these black vases depends in the last resort on the figured pottery found with them; for the first half of the sixth century such finds are at present comparatively uncommon, so that one must allow for the possibility of being misled by the accidents of survival, and even if associated finds were plentiful, their chronology could only be established with the same degree of accuracy as the chronology of Attic black-figure, and no more. The dating of the figured vases is of course based on the study of style; starting from examples where there is no doubt which is earlier and which is later—as for instance the work of Lydos and of the Leagros group—it is possible to define the various stages between one group and the other, to distinguish more and less developed work by a single hand, and to place one artist in relation to his fellows. These estimates of relative chronology are objective because they are based, not on one or two details, but on a whole number of features which all tell the same story and can often be reinforced by the evidence of the shape of the vases concerned. Sometimes the differences between the pieces are slight, and it may not be possible to decide whether they indicate a genuine separation in time or are simply the result of contemporary variations; where they are marked, it is safe to regard the works on which they appear as of different dates, but any attempt to express that difference as a definite number of years can be no more than an estimate. The situation cannot improve unless secure absolute dates can be fixed for a number of vases so that the degree of progress which took place over a given period can be defined beyond all doubt, and even then what is found to be true of one or two artists will not necessarily apply without qualification to all their contemporaries. The most reliable fixed point in the sixth century is the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi, built shortly before 525 B.C.

---

9 Beazley in *Hesperia* xiii (1944) 57 speaks of two tombs at Rhitosona, nos. 49 and 50 'which from the rest of the contents must be dated, with Ure, shortly after the middle of the sixth century'. *ABV* 454 ff., in particular 456, no. 5. Lullies in *Jdl* lix-lix (1946-1947) pl. 9, 24 and p. 62. Bloeche, *Formen attischer Schalen* 3.

10 *ABL* 27; *ABV* 455; *CVA* Gallatin Collection, pl. 35-1.

11 *Hesperia* xxv (1956) 37.


13 Cf. H. R. W. Smith, *University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology* i, no. 10, 272 n. 87; Beazley on the date and style of a vase by the Triptolemos Painter in *Charities: Studien zur Altertums-wissenschaft* 138 f.

14 The evidence is given by Langlotz, *op. cit.* 17-18. From the wording of Herodotus' account the treasury can only have been erected a few years before the Samian attack in 525 B.C.
Langlotz has shown that in style, in the treatment of drapery, and in the proportions of the figures the sculptured frieze of the treasury shows the same degree of development as the work of the Andokides Painter, the earliest red-figure artist known to us, but apart from the difficulty of making exact comparisons between works in two very different media, it would be hazardous to assert that an Athenian vase-painter and sculptor from the Greek islands reached the same stage in the evolution of their respective arts at exactly the same time; here again there is inevitably an element of uncertainty. On the evidence so far considered it seems wisest, when suggesting absolute dates for Attic vases earlier than the middle of the sixth century, to allow a margin of at least ten years either way.

The relevance of this discussion to the Burgon tomb is that the tomb contained the earliest Panathenaic amphora which has survived,\(^\text{18}\) naturally enough attempts have been made to connect it with the change made in the Panathenaic festival in 566 B.C. Langlotz argued that as this change consisted of the addition of an athletic contest to a meeting which already included chariot races, the Burgon amphora, with its racing cart, might be earlier, but that a Panathenaic amphora in Halle cannot antedate the change because it bears a picture of a foot race; he showed that in style and shape there is no great distance between the two vases, so that they cannot be many years apart and may even be contemporary.\(^\text{16}\) In view of the uncertainties in the chronology of black-figure, the importance of his conclusions is so great as to justify a re-examination of the foundations on which they are based. Fortunately most of the ancient literary evidence has recently been set out and analysed by J. A. Davison; in what follows a knowledge of his discussion is presupposed.\(^\text{17}\)

There are three points which may be relevant to our present purpose; that the Panathenaea was instituted in the archonship of Hippokleides; that the athletic contest was added to the festival in 566–5 B.C.; that Peisistratos established the Great Panathenaia, whereby the various contests were only held every fourth year and the festival as a whole was on a grander scale than in ordinary years. As Davison has pointed out,\(^\text{18}\) there is no evidence to connect these three items with each other, apart from the fact that they all refer to changes made to the Panathenaia in the sixth century. The statement about Peisistratos occurs only in the scholiast on Aristeides, who gives no authority; we cannot judge the reliability of his information, but there is no good reason to reject it. As regards the origin of the festival, the ancient sources agree in ascribing it to the earliest times,\(^\text{19}\) so it must surely have existed in some form before the sixth century. In addition the Marmor Parium says that at the first Panathenaia Erichthonios 'yoked a chariot and demonstrated the contest', and there is a somewhat fuller account which states that Erichthonios, the inventor of the horse and chariot, 'conducted the Panathenaic festival with care, driving his chariot and having beside him an escort with a small shield and on his head a helmet with a triple crest; and the so-called apobates is in imitation of him'.\(^\text{20}\)

15 In archaeology, as in fishing, little trust can be put in claims about 'the one that got away', but one cannot help thinking of the four vases which the unfortunate Burgon had discarded, and wondering what they were like.

16 Langlotz, op. cit. 9; similarly Ashmole, Transactions of the International Numismatic Conference, London, June 30–July 6, 1936, 21 n. 2; Beazley, Development 88 ff.; von Braunich, Die Panathenäischen Preisamphoren 76–9, while attempting to relate the Burgon amphora to the history of the festival, rejected the connexion with the change of 566 B.C. and assigned it to the earliest years of Peisistratos' tyranny.

17 JHS lxviii (1958) 23 ff., 'Notes on the Panathenaia'; hereafter referred to as Davison.

18 Davison, 24 and 29.

19 Davison, 23 ff.

20 Marmor Parium, Ep. 10; ἀρ' ἀδ Ἐριχθώνιος Παναθηναίος τοῖς πρώτοις γενομένος ἀρμα ἐξήνυκεν καὶ τὰ ἀγάνα ἔδέκικεν. . . . (Eratosthenes) Kataster. 13; ήρας δὲ (sc. Erichthonios) ἐπιμελεῖ τὰ Παναθηναῖα, καὶ ἀμα ἄνυξον (ἠνυξόν; Michaelis; ἀνυξός Μommssen) ἠγὼν παροβάτην ἀσιδίων ἔθητα καὶ πλεοβίᾳν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς· ἀπ' ἐκέινον δὲ κατὰ μίμησιν ὁ καλοφεύς ἀποβάτης.
and *apotabtes*, was thought to have originated when the festival was founded. The Marmor Parium is, however, direct evidence for the belief that ordinary chariot races formed part of the proceedings from a very early date, and it is surely hard to believe that if in reality they were first incorporated in the festival in the sixth century, their institution could be ascribed to mythical times; moreover, the ancient sources say nothing at all about chariot races when speaking of the changes made in the sixth century. We must therefore still accept the qualification that the Burgon amphora may belong to a year before the introduction of the athletic events, but even so the year 566 does not thereby lose its value as a fixed point, for the conclusions drawn from the amphora in Halle are unaffected.

As for the statement of Pherekydes which comes down to us at third hand in Marcellinus’ *Life of Thucydides*, apart from the reservations so rightly expressed by Davison about its reliability,21 there is the fact that in its existing form it says that the Panathenaea was established in the archonship of Hippokleides; we can only accept this account as it stands by rejecting the strong ancient tradition about the early origin of the festival. Alternatively, it might be claimed that Pherekydes’ words have become distorted or curtailed in transmission; for example, some have supposed that the event which he placed in the archonship of Hippokleides was the institution of the Great Panathenaea, but even if this conjecture is accepted (and it is no more than a conjecture), on the present evidence it assigns the archonship of Hippokleides to the time of Peisistratos, and the names on the fragment of the archon list found in the Athenian Agora should make one hesitate to say that he could not have been archon under the tyranny.22

For the introduction of the athletic contest in 566–5 B.C., the sole authority is Eusebius.23 Even if the three pieces of evidence do in fact refer to one event, a single reform whereby the Great Panathenaea, with the athletic contests, was instituted in the archonship of Hippokleides, the result is to date that archonship from the evidence of Eusebius; it in no way reinforces Eusebius’ dating. The position would be different if we already had a complete archon list for the period, but as it is the reliability of Eusebius proves to be the important point for our inquiry, since his statement is the only piece of historical evidence for the date of the amphora in Halle, and so for the Burgon amphora. Our confidence in him is seriously undermined by the fact that for a later and more celebrated incident in the history of Athens in the sixth century the versions of his work which have survived are badly out; Jerome dates the murder of Hipparchos to 520–19, the Armenian version to 518. The source of the error is not known, but its presence means that the date 566 cannot be accepted without question; it may be correct, but it too may be several years out, and until further evidence is forthcoming there seems no way to decide. In consequence the same degree of error may be present in the absolute dates which have been deduced for the two early Panathenaic amphorae, and it is therefore necessary to allow for this possibility when working out the chronology of early Attic black-figure.

The second of the two tombs with which we have to deal was discovered by the Duc de Blacas; he was a close friend of Louis XVIII and his favourite minister in the first restoration, but he became so unpopular that Louis could not keep him in France and gave him various diplomatic appointments outside the country. He found some consolation in archaeology, and when he died in 1839 he left a considerable collection which was inherited and augmented by his son; the younger Duc died in 1866 and the collection was purchased from his heir by the British Museum, the negotiations being conducted by the Keeper of the newly created Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Charles Newton.

The evidence for the composition of the tomb-group comes from a manuscript catalogue of the Blacas collection which was made before it was purchased. The various objects

21 Davison, 28. 22 *Hesperia* viii (1939) 59 ff. 23 Davison, 27.
are described in detail, so that their identification is certain; no. 51 is the Attic red-figured cup E 129 (BMC iii), and the account of it closes with these words, 'Ce qui donne à ce vase, déjà si curieux, encore un plus haut prix, c'est que M. le Duc de Blacas a trouvé dans le même tombeau les quatre vases suivants (52–55), tous ornés de sujets bachiques, s'expliquant les uns par les autres'. Of these vases 52 is F 90, 53 is F 156, 54 is F 129, and 55 is F 130 (BMC iv). In his Guide to the Blacas Museum (London, 1867) 20, Newton describes E 129 and says of it, 'This cup was found in a tomb at Nola by the elder Duc de Blacas', and he notes that F 90 was found with it; the discovery cannot have been later than 1899.

(1) E 129. Attic red-figured stemmed cup. PLATES IV. 2, V–VII. Height to top of handle, 0·090 m. Maximum diameter, 0·247 m. The individual parts of the vase are quite well made, but the body has not been put squarely on the foot, so that there is a difference of 0·004 m. between the highest and lowest points on the rim. I, Jfdl xxv (1910) pl. 4, whence Metzger, Les Représentations dans la Céramique Attique du IV Siècle pl. 11; A, Jfdl xxv (1910) 130 fig. 1; B, ibid., 129 fig. 1. ARV 873, Meleager Painter no. 42 (characterised as 'Early'). Metzger, 115 no. 11. I, Dionysos with Ariadne and Eros. A and B, Dionysos with satyr and maenads.

Metzger groups together several scenes, including the reverse of the Pronomos krater, as showing the abduction of Ariadne; 'Le dieu deu imberbe entraine sa nouvelle conquête dans une course rapide', but it is Ariadne who leads the way and guides the god’s steps, his enthusiastic and experienced partner, not a raw initiate.

(2) F 90. Attic red-figured hydria. PLATE IV. 4. Height, 0·391 m. Maximum diameter, 0·265 m. CVA pls. 101.2, 102.1. Schefold, Untersuchungen zu den Kertscher Vasen 138. ARV 874: 'Related to the Meleager Painter'. Metzger, op. cit. 54, no. 37. Under the foot, graffito ΥΔΠΙ, perhaps to be understood as υδρινὶ ἕνα rather than υδριά (a). On the body, chariot drawn by Erotes in the presence of satyrs, maenads, seated women and other Erotes. The passenger in the chariot has a long chiton which reaches well down the calf, the bottom hem being hidden by the side of the chariot; as the Meleager Painter does not normally represent men wearing the long chiton, one might suppose the figure to be female; if so, it is surprising that although she is one of the two central figures she differs from all the other women in having no bracelets or necklace. The drawing of the chest is indeterminate and might serve for either sex, so the evidence is inconclusive. The left-hand winged figure in the top row has a necklace and bracelets, and is therefore female; she must be either Nike or Iris.

(3) F 156. Paestan red-figured hydria. PLATE IV. 5. Height, 0·377 m. Maximum diameter, 0·264 m. BMC iv pl. 5 (a drawing). CVA IV Ea pl. 3-4. JHS lv (1933) pl. 1. Main scene, satyrs and maenads; on the shoulder are two youths and two women, all seated.

The vase is discussed in detail in JHS lv (1935) 36 ff. by A. D. Trendall, who amplifies and corrects Walters’ account; in his Paestan Pottery 11, Trendall groups this hydria with some other vases 'which, if not actually by the Dirce Painter himself, are at least closely allied to his style'. BSR xx (1952) 4, no. 27.

(4) F 129. Paestan red-figured skyphos of Attic type. PLATE IV. 3. Height, 0·220 m. Maximum diameter, 0·249 m. CVA IV Ea pl. 4-4. JHS lv (1935) 49 fig. 9, 38 fig. 12. A, two women. B, the same. The ivy-bough and wreath on A, the ivy-wreath and tambourine on B and the taenia in the field on each side surely indicate that these women are in fact maenads; note also that like the satyr on B of no. 5 and the seated woman in the Dionysiac scene on no. 3, the right-hand woman on B holds a pomegranate.

JHS lv (1935) 45-6, 52 no. 13. Paestan Pottery 11 no. 5, 12. BSR xx (1952) 4 no. 29. Assigned by Trendall to the same general group as no. 3.

(5) F 130. Paestan red-figured skyphos of Attic type. PLATE IV. 1. Height, 0·224 m. Maximum diameter, 0·248 m. CVA IV Ea pl. 4, 7. JHS lv (1935) 51 fig. 10. A, satyr chasing maenad. B, satyr and maenad.

JHS lv (1935) 45-6, 52 no. 14. Paestan Pottery 11 no. 6, 12. BSR xx (1952) 4 no. 30. Assigned by Trendall to the same general group as no. 3.

The earliest work of the Meleager Painter can be dated around 400 B.C. or very soon after;24 for example, the hydria by him which has passed from the Hearst collection to the Metropolitan Museum in New York does not seem more advanced in shape than vases by the Meidias, Kadmos and Semele Painters,25 and so can hardly be much later than them. The cup from the Blacas tomb is another of his early works; on the hydria, which is not by him but surely comes from the same workshop, the slap-dash drawing and the proportions

---

24 The chronology of Attic red-figured pottery from the late fifth century onward is well discussed by Miss Talcott and Miss Philippaki in Hesperia Supplement x 7-11.

25 ARV 872, 22; 831-2, 1; 805, 21 and 22; 851, 1.
and attitudes of many of the figures suggest a rather later date. The evidence of the shape points to the same conclusion; in such features as the comparative slenderness of the body and the height of the neck and foot, F 90 is closer to a hydria by the Erbach Painter than to the one by the Meleager Painter which has already been mentioned. For these reasons it must be assigned to the first quarter of the fourth century. The three other vases from the tomb all belong to the same early Paestan group, which Professor Trendall puts in the second quarter of the century, so they may be as much as thirty years later than the cup. It is interesting to note that the vases from another tomb in Campania, some of them in the British Museum, range in time from 490–80 B.C. to around 460 B.C. Here too we have to do with imported vessels, and the earliest ones in both groups are the best made; imports and things of good quality are often handled with care and so may be expected to last longer than ordinary products. These two instances are a further reminder of the dangers of laying too much stress on the evidence of isolated tomb-groups. In this connexion it is perhaps worth mentioning a tomb near Trebbia which was opened in the presence of Sir William Hamilton; unfortunately it has not so far been possible to identify all the objects from this burial, so they cannot be presented as a group. The tomb itself is illustrated in d’Hancarville’s publication; it contained a bell-krater by the Lykaon Painter, of the third quarter of the fifth century, and the contents seem also to have included an Italiote black-glazed two-handled decanter which looks as if it belongs to the fourth century, and possibly also a Gnathia lekythos and jug. If these objects are correctly identified, the Attic vase must have been almost a hundred years old at the time of the burial.

The two Paestan skyphoi from the Blacas tomb are almost identical in size, weight and capacity, as the following table shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Maximum diameter</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 129</td>
<td>0.220 m.</td>
<td>0.249 m.</td>
<td>4 lb. 3 oz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 130</td>
<td>0.224 m.</td>
<td>0.249 m.</td>
<td>4 lb. 2 oz.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They are obviously a pair and were surely made by the same potter. Their size makes it unlikely that they were ever intended as drinking vessels, for they hold more than many small bell- and calyx-kraters; no doubt they were used for mixing.

Dionysiac subjects are of course extremely common on Greek vases of the fourth century, but not to the exclusion of all other themes, and the fact that all five vases from this tomb represent Dionysos or his followers is perhaps the result of deliberate choice, and not fortuitous. The pictures may simply reflect the convivial habits of their owner, but one cannot help recalling that in Greek belief there was a connexion between Dionysos and the world of the dead; it is therefore just possible that these vases were selected as funeral furniture because the figures on them were felt to be appropriate to the grave.

P. E. CORBETT.
ΔΕΚΑΤΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΣ

1. ΤHE Problem

No one doubts that Perikles enjoyed exceptional moral authority. Whether or not this authority was reinforced by legal powers superior to those of his fellow-generals—that is to say, by occasional grants of extraordinary powers, or by election to a generalship differing by definition from other generalships—is disputable.¹ It has been held on the following grounds that he did possess such powers:

(i) In certain years Perikles and another member of his own tribe were generals together, one of the remaining nine tribes being unrepresented. To be elected εκ άπαντων must have been an honour, because it was election against competition from the whole community, not from one-tenth of the community; it follows that when there were two generals from the same tribe it was the more eminent of the two who was elected εκ άπαντων; and it follows from that that Perikles was elected εκ άπαντων.²

(ii) In Th. i 116.1 and ii 13.1 Perikles is described as general δεκατος αυτός.³

(iii) Th. ii 21.3–22.2 describe actions of Perikles in terms which are hard to reconcile with the supposition that he was acting in concert with nine other generals each with the same authority as himself. This is notably true of 22.1 έκκλησιαν τε ουκ έποιεί ουδέ έξωλόγιον ουδένα τὴν τε πόλιν έφίλασο και δι’ ήμερας μάλιστα δανο εδύνατο έλευν.

(iv) Th. ii 65.4. After his temporary disgrace in 430, στρατηγον έλευντο και πάντα τα πράγματα έπέτρεψαν.

It will be argued in this paper:⁴

(i) Election εκ άπαντων conferred upon the man so elected no authority over his colleagues except the authority of prestige.

(ii) The expression δεκατος αυτός, so far from implying that Perikles possessed superior authority, is intended to remind us that he did not.

(iii) The terms in which Th. ii 21.3–22.2 are expressed lose their significance for the problem of Perikles’ constitutional position when properly related to certain aspects of Greek usage in general.

(iv) Th. ii 65.4 is shown, by comparison with other examples of the word έπέτρεψεν, to make no statement about legal authority.


² Hignett, 352 ff., points out that superior powers cannot necessarily be inferred from election εκ άπαντων. No one has explicitly said that they can, but a relation between the two was assumed by K. J. Beloch, Die Attische Politik seit Perikles (Leipzig, 1884) 275 ff., because he held that some men known to have been elected εκ άπαντων could be shown on other grounds to have been invested with superior powers, and vice versa; and his assumption has been influential.

³ This formula is regarded as indicative of superior standing by Beloch, 281; Hignett, 247, 352 ff.; Jameson, 78 ff.; Schwahn, RE Suppl. vi col. 1080, and M. Scheele, ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΙ ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ (Diss. Leipzig, 1932) 7.

⁴ My conclusions have something in common with those of A. H. M. Jones, Athenian Democracy (Oxford, 1957) 127 (on Th. ii 22.1) and a great deal in common with U. Kahrschedt, Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen (Stuttgart, 1936) 148 ff. Since, however, Kahrschedt gives only a few of his reasons, and I do not know what the rest of them are, I have thought it worth while to give mine.
2. Election ἐκ ἀπάντων

We do not know whether election ἐκ ἀπάντων was as old as the strategia itself, or was first devised during the ascendency of Perikles; for though there are years during and after his lifetime of which we can say for certain that one general was so elected, there is no year of which we can say with equal certainty that one was not.

If the anecdote in Plut., Cim. 8.8, is of respectable antiquity—and I can see no reason why it should not be—we can say at least that in 469–468 the ten generals were drawn each from a different tribe. Now, since it does not appear, from inspection of the years in which we know there was an election ἐκ ἀπάντων, that any system of rotation determined which tribe should be unrepresented, it is possible that now and again the general elected ἐκ ἀπάντων would not have a colleague from his own tribe. If the generals of 469–468 were exceptional in that, although including one elected ἐκ ἀπάντων, they nevertheless represented all ten tribes, the archon’s happy idea of substituting the generals for the judges in the theatre is more easily intelligible. Thus Plut., Cim. 8.8 does not suffice to disprove the hypothesis that election ἐκ ἀπάντων was regular by 469–468; nor, of course, does it on any interpretation disprove the hypothesis that these elections had already occurred as extraordinary measures before that date.

The belief that election ἐκ ἀπάντων conferred superior authority rests on four considerations:

(i) Evidence which suggests that in 480 and 479 the Athenians elected a supreme commander. This evidence is of a most unsatisfactory nature, and will be discussed in a different connexion in Section 5. Even if it were wholly acceptable, its bearing on the problem of Perikles would still be very limited; it does not tell us that the generals invested with supreme command were elected ἐκ ἀπάντων, still less that they owed such command to this manner of election. The assumption that there was a necessary connexion between election ἐκ ἀπάντων and supreme command is modern, and its cogency is actually weakened by the only case in which the two were associated, namely:

(ii) In 407 Alkibiades was ἀναρρηθεὶς ἀπάντων ἔγεμιων αὐτοκράτωρ (X., HG i 4.20). He was elected ἐκ ἀπάντων, since his colleague Adeimantas was of the same tribe. Xenophon, however, is describing a grant of special powers made some time after the election (cf. i 4.10) and therefore not implicit in the election.

(iii) Plutarch tells an anecdote (Nic. 15.2) about Nikias and Sophokles. They were generals together; on an occasion when the board was deliberating, Nikias asked Sophokles, as being πρεσβύτατος, to give his opinion first; Sophokles declined, saying ἐγὼ παλαιότατος εἶμι, σὺ δὲ πρεσβύτατος. Let us disregard, for argument’s sake, any chronological difficulties and assume that the story is true just as Plutarch tells it. Nikias is elected ἐκ ἀπάντων, since he and Sophokles are members of the same tribe. Here, then, is a general ἐκ ἀπάντων acting as chairman. Now, it would be captious to object that Plutarch does not actually say that Nikias asked the question ‘from the chair’, or indeed that anyone was ‘in the chair’. It would be less captious to say that Sophokles’ πρεσβύτατος could be no reminder of Nikias’ constitutional position but a compliment to his distinction; that, at least, is how Plutarch took it. And it would not be at all captious to point out that the story is completely as we should nowadays think desirable, if the implications of Lys. iv 3 are to be taken seriously, as I think they must be.

---

5 The evidence does not even justify Accame’s conjecture (Riv.Fil. N.S. xiii (1935) 349) that no tribe was allowed to go unrepresented in two successive years.

6 However great the θόρυβος, I doubt whether an archon who allowed a tribe to be unrepresented in the judging would have met with the approval of the audience; judging was not as objective in character as we should nowadays think desirable, if the implications of Lys. iv 3 are to be taken seriously, as I think they must be.

7 Scheele’s interpretation (p. 9) of this passage ignores ἀναρρηθεὶς, which makes it hard to believe that Xenophon is referring to a purely moral ascendancy.

8 Cf. Westlake, 112.
compatible with a rota of chairmanship in which the general ἐξ ἀπάντων took his turn with the rest. It is not as if we were picking one day as a random sample from a whole year and finding that the general ἐξ ἀπάντων was in the chair—that would be a striking result—but rather that the incident described could not take place unless and until Nikias was on some occasion in the chair.⁹

(iv) There remains a powerful a priori argument. If any one member of a board of generals was ‘commander in chief’ or ‘chairman’ throughout his year of office, it is unlikely that this would be anyone other than the man who had received the honour of election ἐξ ἀπάντων. If, on the other hand, supreme command or chairmanship was subject to a rota, or if there was no supreme commander or chairman, cadit quae sit. Decision between these alternatives will be facilitated by the evidence adduced below.

3. Eponyms

Attic writers, including composers of Attic documents, refer to a board of officials, or a portion of a board detached for a particular task, in a variety of ways:

I. By complete enumeration.

II. By an enumeration in which one name is emphasised.

E.g. X., HG iv 8.13 (Ambassadors, 392–391) ἀντιπέλαπυοι ... μετὰ Κόνωνος Ἕρμογένη καὶ Δίωνα κτλ.

From this category we must exclude, as being only a special case of a general syntactical phenomenon,¹⁰ many passages in which a singular verb of commanding has a multiple subject, e.g. Th. i 45.2 ἐστρατηγεῖ δὲ αὐτῶν Λακεδαιμόνιον ... καὶ Διότιμος ... καὶ Πρωτέας.

III. By naming two members and referring to the others generically.

This is rare, but the following are prima facie examples:

(i) IG ii² 302.11 f. (Hellenotamiai, 418–417) Ἕρμογένη Ἀριστείδο Βέσσαιε [ ... (17) ... Ἀλ[ε]γηνε καὶ συνάρχοντες.

(ii) ibid., 314.2 (Curators of the Eleusinium, 407–406) Ἑψίδη Αὐθαλόδη Χα[ ... c. 30 ... καὶ] γυναῖκισσι (where conceivably three members were named).


IV. By naming two members and making no mention of the rest.

This too is very rare; perhaps the only certain example is IG ii² 313.2 (Curators of the Eleusinium, 408–407) ... (9) ... τὸν Πειραιῶν Μενεκλῆς ἱπποτομάδης, ὡς κτλ.

V. By naming one member and referring to the others generically.

(a) αὐτὸς with an ordinal numeral.¹¹

(b) ὁ δείκη μετὰ (tà) ἄλλων (στρατηγῶν, πρέσβεων, etc).

E.g. Th. vi 75.4 ἀθλομένου ... Ἐυφήμου μεθ' ἑτέρων. X., HG i 5.20 Κόνων ... ἀναγγέλομεν μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων στρατηγῶν.

(c) ὁ δείκη καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ vel sim.

E.g. X., HG ii 2.21 Θηραμένης καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῶ πρέσβεσι: IG ii² 1494.4 f. Κηφισο[ ... (13) ... καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ: ibid., 1487.92 f. στρατηγοὶ οἱ μεθ' Ἡγησίου στρατηγήσαντες καὶ Ἡγησιάς.

¹° I would therefore agree with Jameson, 70, that ‘it can hardly be a coincidence’ that the general elected ἐξ ἀπάντων is in the chair on the occasion described, but not for his reasons.

¹⁰ Kühner-Gerth, i 79 f.

¹¹ Th. iv 27.3 αὐτὸς μετὰ θεατῶν; belongs in this category; for the idiom ἐτέρων αὐτῶς see Section 4 below.
VI. By naming one member and making no mention of the rest.

(i) The use of this category is demonstrable in cases where one and the same board is referred to in one passage by a single member’s name alone and in another by a formula of categories I–V. Some of these examples will be given below.

(ii) It is also demonstrable in cases where we know, from abundant independent evidence, that the office described was collegiate, e.g. ὁ δεῖγα ἑλπητακίας ἴν in ATL Lists 13–23.

(iii) Its use is virtually certain in passages which describe action by a member of a board on such a scale that we cannot believe that all his colleagues were left behind with nothing to do, e.g. Th. ii 31.1 Ἀθηναίοι πανδῆμει ἔσθελαν ἐς τὴν Μεγαρίδα Περικλέους τοῦ Ξανθίππου στρατηγῶν.

(iv) There are many other passages which are similar to (iii) but permit a greater variety of opinion on the likelihood of action by a single member, e.g. the campaigns of Kimon mentioned in Th. i 98 ff.

In complete enumeration, the ceremonial order of tribes is often followed, especially when the board is composed of ten members and the tribes are equally, or almost equally, represented; e.g. IG ii² 359 (Treasurers of Athena, ε. 443), where only the demotic of the last member is lost; SEG xii 100.2 ff. (Polemarch 367–366); IG ii² 1544.1 ff. (Curators of the Eleusinum, 335–333 to 333–332 and 332–331 to 329–328). In many cases tribal order is reconcilable with the legible remains of a list, e.g. SEG x 39.41 ff. (Generals, 439–438), ATL List 34.2 ff. (Hellenotamiai, 421–420). Tribal order, however, may be distorted in various degrees; there is no clear-cut division of documents into those which observe tribal order completely and those which do not observe it at all. The list of the Curators of the Dockyards of 369–368 (IG ii² 1617.72 ff.) is so nearly in tribal order that Koehler was tempted to make it perfect by suggesting that Θοραυῖς in 1. 76 might be an engraver’s slip for Θορίκος; those of 368–367 and 367–366, on the other hand (ibid., 93 ff., 111 ff.) could not be so easily corrected. When only the first name is out of tribal order, as in IG ii² 370.14 ff. (Treasurers of the Other Gods, 418–417), the list might properly be regarded as falling under Category II; when the first two are out of order, as ibid., 7 ff. (421–420), we might consider an affinity with Category III. Where the board numbers substantially less than ten, chance begins to play a part; it is therefore not surprising that some pairs or trios of generals are named in tribal order (e.g. IG ii² 295.18 ff., 302.29 ff.) whereas an approximately equal number are not (e.g. ibid., 2957 ff., 302.49 ff.; the longer the list, the more positively we can say whether or not tribal order has exercised an influence on the order of names. It then becomes necessary to ask: when the choice of the first name in a list is not determined by tribal order, by what is it determined?

When a board is referred to by formulae of categories V and VI, we must similarly ask: what determines the naming of only one member of the board? The ceremonial order of tribes appears to play no larger a part in this selection than chance gives it. It has been so generally assumed that categories V and VI indicate some kind of seniority12 that the member named is often referred to as ‘chairman’ of the board. There will be less danger of begging the question if I adopt Kahrstedt’s non-committal ‘eponym’, and ask: what determines the choice of eponym?

It must first be observed that the same board is often referred to in different contexts by different formulae, and in some cases the first name in an enumeration is the name of the

12 So Beloch, 280 f.; Scheele, 71; Jameson, passim. Hignett, 353, is more cautious, and Schwahn, col. 1080, doubtful.
man who is chosen as eponym elsewhere. There is therefore a case for treating all the
formulae of categories I–VI as synonymous. The relevant examples are:

(1) Generals, 432.
Va: Th. i 61.1 πέμπουσι ... Καλλίαν τὸν Καλλιάδου πέμπτον αὐτὸν στρατηγόν.
Vd: ibid., 62.4 Καλλίας ὁ αὖ ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγός καὶ οἱ ξυνάρχοντες.

(2) Generals, 430.
I: Th. ii 58.1 "Ἀγνων ... καὶ Κλέοπομος ... ξυστράτηγοι οἴντες Περικλέους.
VI: ibid., 58.2 ἀπὸ τῆς σὰν "Ἀγνων στρατιάσει.
Ibid., 58.3 ὁ μὲν οὖν "Ἀγνων ἀνεχώρησε ταῖς ναυσὶ.
Ibid., vi 31.2 ἡ αὐτὴ (sc. παρασκευὴ) ἐς Ποσειδᾶναν μετὰ "Ἀγνωνος.

(3) Generals, 428–427.
Va: Th. iii 19.1 εἴσεπεμβαν ... Λυσικλέα πέμπτον αὐτὸν στρατηγόν.
VI: ibid., 19.2 ὁ δὲ ... ἡγουρολόγει καὶ περιέπλει.

(4) Treasurers of the Other Gods, 423–422.
Vd: IG i² 324.155f, 1771 ἵνα τα μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν Γόργοιν, Οἴνικοι Ἰκαρεῖς καὶ
ξυνάρχοντες.
VI: ibid., 324.94 ἐπὶ Γόργοιν ἄρχοντος.

Vd: IG i² 267.90 [... (23)] ... καὶ ξυνάρχοι, παραδεχασμένοι κτλ.
VI: ibid., 283.130 Χαρίνοι Ἀλεξιμαχό [ΠΠ]έλει.

(6) Hellenotamiai, 418–417.
III: IG i² 302.11 'Εργυκλῆι Ἀριστείδῳ Βέσαιει [... (17)] ... Ἀηδ[α]σία καὶ συνάρχοι[ν].
Vd: ibid., 302.19 ἡλλένωτα[μαίας 'Εργυκλῆι Ἀριστείδῳ Βέσαιει καὶ ξυνάρχοισι.

(7) Generals, 406.
I: X., HG i 5.16 στρατηγοῦς εἰλοντο ... Κόνων, Διομεδόντα, κτλ.
II: ibid., 6.16 Κώνων ... καταφεύγει εἰς Μυτιλήνην ... καὶ σὴν αὐτῷ τῶν δέκα στρατηγῶν
Λέων καὶ Ἐρασινίδης.
Ibid., 17 Κώνων ... ἡμαγκάσθη ναυμαχήσαι.
Ibid., 19 Κώνων ... δίδο (sc. ναῦς) ἐπλήρωσε.
Ibid., 22 Διομέδων δὲ βοηθῶν Κόνων πολυκομένω ... ὄρμιστο.

(8) Ambassadors, 404.
Va: X., HG ii 2.17 (sc. Θραμαμένης) ἵππηθα προσβευτῆς ... δέκατος αὐτός.
Vc: ibid., 19 Θραμαμένης καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πρόσβεσις.
Ibid., 21 Θραμαμένης καὶ οἱ σὴν αὐτῷ πρόσβεσις.

(9) Spartan commanders, 423.
I: Th. iv 132.3 'Ισχαγόρας ... καὶ 'Αμενίας καὶ 'Αριστεύς ... ἀφίκοντο.
VI: ibid., 132.2 ἐτύχανε ... 'Ισχαγόρας ... στρατιάν μέλλων ... πορεύεσθεν.

(10) Spartan commanders, 422.
I: Th. v 12.1 'Ραμφίας καὶ 'Αυτοχαρίδιας καὶ 'Επικυρίδιας ... βοήθειαν ἔγον.
Vc: ibid., 13.1 διήλθον οἱ περὶ τὸν 'Ραμφίαν.

(11) Spartan ambassadors, 421.
I: Th. v 21.1 πέμπτοντες ... πρόσβεσις 'Ισχαγόρας καὶ Μηναῖ καὶ Φιλοχαρίδαν.
Vc: ibid., 21.3 ἢν κατηγοροῦσαν οἱ περὶ τὸν 'Ισχαγόραν.
(12) Spartan commissioners, 398.

I: X., HG ii 2.6 ἐρχονται . . . Ἀρακός τε καὶ Ναυβάτης καὶ Ἀντιοθένης.  
Ve: ibid., 2.8 ἐπεμνησθῇ τις τῶν περὶ τῶν Ἀρακῶν.

The fact that in several of these cases we are concerned with Spartan officials, from whose practice we can draw no direct inference concerning Athenian methods of command, does not detract from the significance of the linguistic equivalence, in Attic writers, of the different categories of description.

Let me now suggest three possible answers to the question: what determines the choice of eponym?

(1) The eponym is at least chairman of the board, and perhaps possessed of authority superior to that of his colleagues, throughout the year of office.

(2) Chairmanship, or superior authority, passed to all members of a board by rota, and the eponym is the chairman at the particular point of the year with which the writer is concerned.

(3) The eponym is neither chairman nor superior.

There is one item of evidence which has a most important bearing on the relation between ‘chairmanship’ and election εἶ ἀπάντων. Athenaeus 218b dates to the archonship of ‘Euthydemus’ (i.e. Euthynus, 426–425; cf. Diod. xii 58.1, etc., for the confusion) the battle at Tanagra (Th. iii 91.4 f.) in which Hipponikos Καλλιόν Ἀλαπεκιθεν was killed. But Aristophanes Τιμοκράτιος was also general in 426–425 (Th. iii 105.3), and his tribe was almost certainly the same (Antiochus) as that of Hipponikos; an Aristophanes was hellenotamias from Antiocis in 421–420 (ATL List 34.5), the Aristophanes who was one of the Thirty Tyrants was from Antiocis if the list in X., HG ii 3.2 is in tribal order (and the position of identifiable individuals in the list indicates that it is), and there is an ἔλεος Θοραμείς in SEG x 226.6. Therefore either Hipponikos or Aristophanes was elected εἶ ἀπάντων.14 Yet in SEG x 227.3 ff. payment is made on Pryt. ii 4 of 426–425 στρατήγων ἡπτοκράτει Χαλαργεί καὶ χανθγροσι. It follows that we cannot say both that the eponym is chairman throughout the year and that the general elected εἶ ἀπάντων is chairman throughout the year; in other words, if the argument from formulae is pressed as evidence for Perikles’ powers, the argument from election εἶ ἀπάντων cannot be pressed, and vice versa.

There are, however, less conditional objections to answers (1) and (2). They do not explain categories III and IV; we should require the hypothesis that on certain occasions, though not normally, the office of chairman was shared, or that a deputy chairman was appointed. Even more serious is the consideration that if (1) were true we should not expect ever to find the same board referred to by different eponyms, and if (2) were true we should expect variety of reference to be very common. In fact, this variety of reference is common enough to throw great suspicion on (1) but not common enough to support (2). The examples are:

(1) Generals, 432–431.

(a) IG ii 296.31 f. στρατήγων Σοκράτει εἰς Προτείαν Αἰχμον καὶ Καρκινοῦ Θερμίδοιοι.

Ibid., 296.39. Σοκράτει ἡπτοκράτει καὶ χανθγροσι.

(b) Ibid., 1361, 138τ Καρκινοῦ Θερμίδοι καὶ χανθγροσι.

Th. ii 23.2 ἐστρατηγεῖς ἐκ Κάρκινος τε ἐν Σεντίμοι καὶ Πρωτείας ἐν Ἔπικλέους καὶ Σωκράτης ἐν Ἀργαγένως.

(2) Generals, 423–422.

(a) Doc. ap. Th. iv 119.2 οἱ στρατηγοί Νικόστρατος Διεισφέρους, Νικίας Νικηράτον, Αὐτοκλῆς Τολμαίου.

(b) Th. iv 129.2 ἐστρατηγεῖς ἐκ Νικίας Νικηράτου καὶ Νικόστρατος Διεισφέρους.

13 For the demotic see B. D. Meritt, Hesp. v (1936) 410. 14 Sealey, 67, and D. M. Lewis ap. Sealey, 82.
(3) Generals, 417-416.
   (a) IG ii² 302.129 f., 131 f. ὀστρατηγοὺς ἐς Μέλον Τεισίναι Τεισιμάχο Κεφαλέθεν Κλεομάδει Ἀὐκαὶ μέδοινΦυλείν.
   (b) Th. v 84-3 οἱ ὀστρατηγοὶ Κλεομήνης τε ἐν Λυκομήδου καὶ Τεισίαν ἐν Τεισιμάχου.

(4) Generals, 406.
   (a) X., HG i 5.16 ὀστρατηγοῦς ἐδοντο ἄλλους δέκα, Κόνωνα κτλ.
   (b) Lys. 21.8 τοὺς δὲ μετὰ Θρασύλλου δέκα ἐπέσθε.

   (a) IG ii² 241.101 Φοικίδας ἐς Οίο καὶ χωνάρχουτες SEG x 227.16 f. ὅτι τα[μαίνοθαι Φοικίδας ἐς Οίο] καὶ χωνάρχουτες.
   Ibid., 23 επὶ τῆς Φοικίδοις ἀρχές καὶ χωναρχάντων.
   (b) IG ii² 240.93 f. τοὺς τα[μαία ... (20) ... καὶ χωνάρχουσι,] ἑνῶς κτλ.

(6) Treasurers of Athena, 418-417.
   (a) IG ii² 1244.134 f., 1268.102 Πυθιδοτίτις Ἡλακτίζῃ καὶ χωναρχήσιν.
   Ibid., 302.8 τοὺς ταμίαν τέσσερις θεᾶς Πυθοῖ.
   (b) Ibid., 283.130 Χαρίνη Αλεξισμάχο πρὸς ἑλκι.
   Ibid., 267.90 [. . . (23) . . . καὶ χωναρχήσι, παραδεχάσεθαι κτλ.

(7) Treasurers of Athena, 414-413.
   (a) IG ii² 241.194 νακ. ε. 40 Μελη[π].
   (b) Ibid., 248.211 Τεισιμηνοῖ Παναν[εῖ] (cf. 271.147 f. ? 272.151 f.).

(8) Hellenotamiai, 410-409.
   (a) IG ii² 304A. 8, 11, 13, 18 Περικλῆ κολαρεῖ καὶ συνάρχον.
   (b) Ibid., 304A. 15, 18, 22, 29, 32 Διονυσίου Κεφαλέθεν καὶ συνάρχον.
   (c) Ibid., 304A. 16, 30, 33 Θρασίδων Βουτάδει καὶ συνάρχον.
   (d) Ibid., 304A. 17, 24 f., 28 f., 31, 37 f. Προχινδών Φελινάδι καὶ συνάρχον.
   (e) Ibid., 304A. 19 Σπουδίας Φυλίκα καὶ συνάρχον.
   (f) Ibid., 304A. 23 f. Φελινάθοι Λοπεκεθεὶ καὶ συνάρχον.
   (g) Ibid., 304A. 25 f. Ἑὐσπολεὶ Φελινάδι καὶ συνάρχον.
   (h) Ibid., 304A. 26 f. Ἐλληνα Ἑλπίδει καὶ συνάρχον.

(9) Hellenotamiai, 407-406.
   (a) IG ii² 304B. 41 f., 45, 51, 54 f., 56, 58, 63 f., 71, 83, 89 f. Λυσιθδεὶς Θυμαιτάδει καὶ συνάρχον.
   (b) Ibid., 304B. 43 f., 53 Θρασυβουλίς Θυμαιτάδει καὶ συνάρχον.
   (c) Ibid., 304B. 47 f., 61 f., 84 Προτάρχος Προβασίλιο Καὶ συνάρχον.
   (d) Ibid., 304B. 72 f. Ἀθηναίων Μελητεῖ καὶ συνάρχον.
   (e) Ibid., 304B. 85 f. Κοπρέτος Καὶ συνάρχον.

(10) Curators of the Brauronium, 351-350.
   (a) IG ii² 1524.55 f. [ ] τοῦ Λαδῆς τοὺς συνάρχουσιν.15
   (b) Ibid., 1524.70 f. ['] ἔκτασις Αθηναίων καὶ συνάρχουσιν (τεσ).

(11) Curators of the Brauronium, 350-349.
   (a) Ibid., 1524.72 [ ] Προπεργές Κεφαλέθει καὶ συνάρχον.
   (b) Ibid., 1524.82 Θράσους Μαι[π]τεροῖς καὶ συνάρχουσιν.

Two of these cases can be disposed of without difficulty. Case (3) concerns only two

---

15 I reproduce these lines as they are printed in IG. Their mutilation, in a context otherwise so legible, seemed highly suggestive of deliberate erasure, but Dr Mitsos kindly informs me that the damage appears to be accidental.
generals, and it may be that the question of chairmanship or seniority does not arise there, the orders adopted by Thucydides and the composer of IG ii² 302 being equally arbitrary. In case (2), (a) and (b) do not refer to the same occasion, and permit only the inference that of the two generals Nikias and Nikostratos neither held throughout their year of office a position superior to the other's. These explanations can be applied to case (1) only if we refuse to see in the αὐνάρχουσες-formula any indication of superiority.

Chairmanship or superiority throughout the year of office is irreconcilable, prima facie, with (1), (4) or (5)–(11). It may be argued that in (5), (6), (7), (10) and (11) the man who was chairman at the beginning of the year of office was dead or deposed before the end of the year, and replaced by a different chairman. This involves us in a striking coincidence in (10) and (11), which belong to the same board in successive years, and it does nothing to account for a singularity of (6) discussed below. In any case, the argument does not touch (1), (4), (8) and (9).

A rotation of chairmanship would explain (1), and (1) alone. It does not explain (4) or (5)–(11), since:

(a) In the traditio generally, the eponym is the same at the end of the year as at the beginning.

(b) In IG ii² 1524-49, 53, the eponym at the beginning of 352–351 is the same as at the end.

(c) In IG i² 304 the exact dates of the payments made to the Hellenotamiai in 410–409 and 407–406 are preserved in sufficient detail to rule out any imaginable system of rotation. In particular, the eponyms Thrason and Phalanthos both received payments on the same day (Pryt. VII 7) in 410–409 (304A.22 ff.).

There is, in my submission, only one general principle which accounts for all these cases: the eponym, in any reference to a board, is that member who for any reason is uppermost in the writer's mind at the time of writing. 'Any reason' may include:

(i) Habit. Unless he has a positive motive for acting otherwise, any writer will tend to refer to a board in the same terms as he used when he referred to them previously, or in the same terms as his predecessor in secretarial office, or in the terms in which he thinks he has normally heard the board described.

(ii) The facts of the case. In any group of colleagues, one may be a more impressive man than the others; this group will then be thought of as 'So-and-so and the rest', and different writers will tend independently to choose the same eponym. The facts may impose themselves equally on contemporaries and on historians.

(iii) Personal knowledge, interest or predilection. When money is paid by one board to another, the secretary of the disbursing board will naturally tend to choose as the eponym of the receiving board that individual who actually took the money. This will account for cases (1), (8) and (9), in which ὁ δέην καὶ ὁ συνάρχουσας means 'ὁ δέην as representative of the board of which he is a member'. In speaking of the past, different writers may adopt different views of what and who was significant. This will account for case (4); to Xenophon, as an historian with a predominant interest in the handling of armies, there could be

36 A. Andrewes, JHS 1xxiii (1953) 5 f., suggests that 'particular groups of hellenotamiai habitually dealt with the particular types of business', and that after the fifth pry.ny of 410–409 the eponym is the representative of such a group. This theory is not altogether free from difficulty, since in IG i² 304B 41–63 payments ἐς τὴν διοικηλίαν are made to three different eponyms during the same pry.ny, and in 84 f. Protarchos, who received payments ἐς τὴν διοικηλίαν in the first pry.ny, receives a payment [ε]: Θυρα[κ]ὼν in a later pry.ny (cf. Andrewes, 5 n. 16). But in any case Professor Andrewes is not arguing that καὶ τοῖς συνάρχουσι each case refers only to the other members of the eponym's group, for this would require us to posit at least eight groups in the latter half of 410–409. Therefore, whether or not particular individuals or groups handled different types of business, ὁ δέην καὶ τοί συνάρχουσας in these documents will mean 'So-and-so as the representative' (not 'as the chairman') 'of the board of which he is a member'.
no doubt that Konon was the most important of the generals of 406; Lysias, on the other hand, writing for a speaker who was anxious to associate himself with democratic sentiment, naturally gave pride of place to Thrasyllus. Case (6) removes the problem from the plane of constitutional law to that of personal relationships; Charinos is the only eponym in the traditions who has a patronymic,\(^{17}\) the only one whose secretary has no patronymic, and the only one with whose name καὶ οἱ συνάρχοντες is once omitted. If Charinos was a man who took an unusually high view of his own importance and of the importance of his office, and a correspondingly low view of the importance of the secretary, if he succeeded in imposing these views on the composer of the documents recording the receipt of the treasure by the board of 418–417, and if his colleagues later in the year put him in his place, then case (6) becomes intelligible. Cases (5), (7), (10) and (11) may be of similar origin, though less exaggerated in character.

The hypothesis which I have suggested, that the eponym is the man uppermost in the writer's mind at the time of writing, is not refuted, nor even invalidated, by citing the many cases in which a board is described on different occasions by reference to the same eponym. If a writer has once decided that one member of a board was a worthier or more important man than his colleagues, he is not likely to change his mind on this between one chapter and the next (especially if he is obviously right). The composer of a document which is an item in a series (e.g. a traditio) will also tend to retain the style of a reference contained in the previous item. When we consider that of the extant fifth century traditions only a certain proportion ever contained an eponym's name, and that in those which do so the name is often lost beyond restoration, it is no matter for surprise that there are only three examples of variation of eponym within this series, but rather that there are any.\(^{18}\) As for the financial records IG i\(^2\) 304AB, no other extant records of disbursement are comparable in preservation and detail; there is no positive justification for treating the variety of reference in 304AB as exceptional.

4. Formulae

Of all the formulæ listed in the preceding section, not one is a 'technical term' in the sense that it is confined to the description of boards of officials.

Xenophon's description (HG v. 4.2 f.) of the recapture of the Kadmeia in 379 is instructive in this respect. The government of Thebes is in the hands of τῶν περὶ 'Αρχιαν πολεμάρχου (4.2); this is the normal formula of category Ve. But the members of the conspiracy initiated by Melon (4.2 f.) are τῶν περὶ Μέλιοντα (4.5) or τῶν ἀμφὶ Μέλιοντα (4.7), and their conspiracy is not merely against the polemarchs in office but against the pro-Spartan party as a whole, τῶν περὶ Λεωκητίδην (4.19). Elsewhere in Xenophon, the formula Ve may refer as well to a politician and his associates (e.g. HG iii 5.4, v 4.29, vi 5.6, 7.36) as to a commander and the troops under his command (e.g. iv 5.15, v 1.12). In ii 3.46 οἱ ἀμφὶ 'Αριστοτέλου καὶ Μελιάνθου καὶ 'Αρισταρχοῦ στρατηγοῦντες is not a description of a whole board of generals, but of a group within the generals of 411 united by a common political interest. Similarly in Mem. i 1.18 τῶν ἀμφὶ Θράσυλλου καὶ 'Ερασινίδην does not refer to a complete board or to a portion of a board in any official capacity, but to the eight generals—i.e. the board of 406 minus Konon and one other—condemned to death after Arginousai. The non-technicality of the formula is not confined to Xenophon; Th. v 46.4 τῶν περὶ τῶν Σωτῆρι τῶν ἔφορων must mean 'Xenares the ephor and those who

\(^{17}\) IG i\(^2\) provides a six-letter patronymic in 240.93 in order to avoid the conclusion that the eponym is not the same as in 241.101. I have preferred to assume that the eponym is not the same and thus to avoid supplying a patronymic.

\(^{18}\) For these reasons, Jameson's contention (p. 72) that Kahrstedt's theory (and mine) is weakened by 'a great number of inscriptions to the contrary' is not as weighty as it sounds.
were in sympathy with him’, and Pl., Thit. 170c οί ἀμφι Πρωταγόραν ‘the Protagorean school of philosophy’.

In καί οἱ συνάρχοντες it would seem from similar expressions that συν- means simply ‘the other’, and its use implies not that these others are legally subordinate to the man named but that they are subordinate to him in importance in the writer’s estimation. Allkibiades escapes to the Peloponnese μετὰ τῶν ξυμφαγώδων (Th. vi 88.9), Aphobos misappropiates Demosthenes’ estate μετὰ τῶν συνεπτρώσων (D. xxviii 4, 59). In Aeschines ii any members of an embassy may be described as συμπρέσβεις of any member of the same embassy; the First Embassy as a whole is ‘we, οἱ συμπρέσβεις’ (21); in Φιλοκράτους καὶ Φίλινως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμπρέσβεως (8), συμπρέσβεως includes all the envos except Aeschines and Demosthenes; in ἀτυμαιείς ὑπὸ τῶν συμπρέσβεως (121), συμπρέσβεως includes Aeschines but excludes Demosthenes. Demosthenes himself (xii 188) speaks in similar terms: ‘τι δ’ ἐν εἴποι περὶ Δημοκράτους, ἃ τῶν συμπρέσβεως κατηγορεῖ;’

The αὐτός-formula is not confined to Attic, nor is it confined to descriptions of boards of magistrates. We read in the Gortyn Code (II 37 ff.) αἱ δὲ καὶ ποινὲ δολοσαθῆαι, ὁμοιὰ τῶν ἑλώντα . . . πέντεν αὐτῶν . . ., τὸ δ’ ἀπεταίρῳ τρίτων αὐτῶν, τὸ δὲ Φοικίδος τῶν πάσης ἄστεραν αὐτῶν, μοικιν’ ἐλευ, δολοσαθῇ δὲ μέ, ‘the one who caught him shall swear, with four other men, or, in the case of an απέταυρος, with two other men, or, in the case of a serf, the serf’s master with one other man, that he caught him in adultery’. Demosthenes says of Aphobos (xxviii 16) ἔλεεοι καὶ νῦν θρ’ ομοί αξίωσε, μόνον θρ’ ἔβδομικουν’ ἡμία ἄρτις αὐτὸς ἀπαθεδωκώς. It is quite clear from Demosthenes’ description of the relations between his guardians in xxvii 4 ff. that Aphobos, although he had the major share and is treated by Demosthenes, for the purposes of the case, as morally the dominant partner, was not regarded by anyone concerned, or by the law, as possessing legal authority over his fellow-guardians. He was ‘one of my guardians’ (xxvii 55, xxix 47), his share of the property was precisely defined (xxvii 5, xxviii 16), and the boy Demosthenes was entrusted to the three of them κοινῇ (xxviii 10, 15). If we compare with xxviii 16 two other passages in which the same point is made, xxvii 59 εἰ . . . ἦμοι μὲν μὴν ἐβδομίκοντο μᾶς παραδεδωκώς καὶ xxviii 11 μόνον δ’ σεβ’ ἐβδομίκοντ’ ἀξίαν μοι παραδεδωκάν πρεσὶ δινές, it seems that τρίτων αὐτός does not mean ‘as the senior of my three guardians’, but rather emphasises the smallness of the sum in relation to the fact that it was the total payment made by all three; hence ‘he, and the other two with him’, or ‘all three, between them’.

This concessive implication of the αὐτός-formula emerges even more plainly in Aeschines ii 178 δέκατος δ’ αὐτός προσβέβαις μόνος τὰς εὐθύνας δίδωμι. The translation ‘since I was chairman of the ten ambassadors, I alone am required to give an account of our conduct’ would be repugnant to the sense of the context, which is ‘I am being victimised because I am an advocate of peace’; note especially the immediately preceding words ἐμι δ’ οὐχ ὥς προεβάλετε κρίνονται, ἀλλ’ ὥς ἐγκαταφερεῖν Φιλίππωι. Hence: ‘although there were nine others with me on the embassy, I am the only one.’

There is also, I think, a concessive point in Hdt. vi 103.1 ἔνων δὲ σφαγας στρατηγοῦ δέκα, τῶν δ’ δέκατος ἕν Μιλησίας. Herodotus cannot mean that Miltiades was superior in authority to the other nine, for this would spoil the point of his story in 109 f.; on the contrary, he is setting the stage for this intensely dramatic story by emphasising that Miltiades was only one of ten; the definite article is used as in τὸ τρίτον μέρος, τὰ δύο μέρη, etc., and δ’ δέκατος is to be analysed ‘a (masculine) tenth part’.19

19 How and Wells (ad loc.) say vaguely ‘the phrase suggests δέκατος αὐτός . . ., which suggests superiority over colleagues’. Stein’s explanation (ad loc.) that Miltiades commanded the tribe which was on the left wing, seems to me to deprive Herodotus’ obvious emphasis of its point and to make his expression extraordinarily obscure. Eduard Meyer, Geschichte des Alterthums iii (1901) 201 A, is so sure that Miltiades was supreme commander at Marathon that he does not give proper consideration to Herodotus’ point and expression.
Now it is consistent with the practice of Greek or any other language that an expression should bear in some particular connexion an implication quite different from that which it bears in general. Therefore the αὐτός-formula with the name of a military commander could, theoretically, bear an implication of superior authority even if it does not imply that elsewhere, and the same is true of the other formulae discussed. Furthermore, there is a difference between ὁ στρατηγὸς τρίτος αὐτός used of a man in joint command of an expedition, when the writer is informing us how many generals were in command, and ὁ διάκοτος αὐτός, when the reference is to a man’s relationship to a whole board for its whole year of office. We must therefore consider next what evidence there is, other than formulae, for chairmanship or seniority in Athenian magistracies, and, if the results of that inquiry are negative, διάκοτος αὐτός must then be explained.

5. The Collegiate Principle

(a) πρυτάνεις.

A collegiate board naturally requires a given member at a given time to be ‘on duty’, i.e. immediately available as its representative. Arguing from the analogy of the relationship between epistates and Prytaneis and between Prytaneis and Council, we should expect to find acknowledgment and adoption of this principle in Athenian magistrates generally, and in fact πρυτάνεις or ὁ πρυτανεύων is attested for the Treasurers of Athena (IG ii 3.20 f., 4.23 f.), the διαταγή (D. xxi 87) and the παλαιστήριον (Pollux viii 99). Yet whatever the precise functions of ὁ πρυτανεύων, it does not follow that they were such as to override other considerations in determining the choice of eponym, and we have already seen in Section 3 that it would be difficult in some cases, and in others impossible, to identify the eponym with ὁ πρυτανεύων.

(b) Rotation.

It was an acceptable principle in the Greek world that ἡγεμονία should be held in rotation by the members of a board, the evidence for this practice at Athens is uniformly suspect:

(i) Hdt. vi 109 ff. says that the generals in the Marathon campaign held command (πρυτανεύει, 110) each for a day at a time. This is not reconcilable with much else in his account, which suggests that the generals were all subordinate to the polemarch, whose command was not subject to rotation; nor is it reconcilable with the dedication of Kallimachos the polemarch (IG ii 609, cf. SEG xii 54).

(ii) Diod. xiii 97.6 describes ‘Thrasyboulos’ (i.e. Thrasyllus) at Arginousai as being ἐπὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἐκεῖνην τὴν ἡμέραν, implying a daily rotation of command. This is not reconcilable with Xenophon’s description (HG i 6.29 f.) of the disposition of the fleet in divisions at Arginousai, and it is hardly credible that if one individual had possessed ἡγεμονία on that day this would have played no part in the arguments for and against the condemnation of the generals (ibid., 7).

(iii) Diod. xiii 106.1 makes Philokles ἀφηγούμενος ἐκεῖνην τὴν ἡμέραν at Aigospotamoi. Since he also (104.1) represents Philokles and Konon as κοινοὶ ἀφηγούμενοι the Athenian fleet, and throughout his narrative of Aigospotamoi mentions no other Athenian generals, he implies that Philokles and Konon held ἡγεμονία on alternate days. Xenophon, however,
names other generals as present (HG ii 1.26, 32, cf. i 7.11, ii 1.16) and nowhere suggests that Philokles held superior powers. Apart from Xenophon, we cannot accept both the statement of Diodorus and the implications of Lysias ii 58 ἀπολογίων τῶν νεὼν . . . εἰτε ἤγγειλον κακία εἰτε θεών διανοια, for the ἤγγειλον whom Lysias has in mind must be either Adeimantos, who was blamed for the disaster (Lys. xiv 38, X., HG ii 1.32, D. xix 191) or possibly Konon (cf. the tone of ii 59). 22

Herodotus’ account of Marathon is an attempt to reconcile his belief (true or false) that at that date the polemarch commanded the army in the field with the Athenian tradition which represented Miltiades as the author of victory. Lysias is using a word which can, in some circumstances, bear a precise, technical meaning; he is using it in a context of a type in which the technical meaning might be expected; nevertheless, he is not using it with that meaning. He means by ἄγγειλας κακία ‘by the delinquency of a leader’, i.e. of some person who was on that occasion in a position, morally or politically, to take an effective lead. Diodorus exemplifies a Hellenistic tendency to import into the history of the Athenian democracy the authoritarian principles taken for granted in a later age; the supposition of a rotation of command is one way of doing this. 23

These explanations of references and apparent references to rotation of command will, I think, be greatly strengthened by consideration of the related problems discussed below.

(c) Supremacy.

(i) According to Aeschines ii 89, Demosthenes said of him that he was τῆς προσβείας . . . ἤγγειλας . . . καὶ κατενημερηκός παρ᾿ ὑμῖν. If ἤγγειλας is here technical, Aeschines was a very self-effacing ‘leader’; he claims (108) that the members of the embassy should have addressed Philip in order of age, as they had arranged among themselves (συνετάξαντι πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, 22) on the First Embassy. But Demosthenes xix does not say that Aeschines was ‘chairman’ or ‘in command’; he speaks in the plural of the ambassadors who resisted his own pleas (154, 173), save in 157, ὃ δὲ τούτους ἀντιλέγων . . . ὁδὸς ἦν. This is the allegation to which Aeschines ii 89 replies; that is to say, Aeschines is scornfully exaggerating his opponent’s words, in accordance with rhetorical technique, in order to rebut them more effectively. He shows by the words καὶ κατενημερη τοῖς ὑμῖν that he is dealing not with a hypothetical allegation that he was officially appointed ‘in command’ but with the allegation that by virtue of the people’s confidence he was in effect in command, i.e. able to make his fellow-ambassadors fall into line and thus responsible for the actions of the embassy as a whole. Demosthenes makes similar rhetorical use of a ‘technical term’ in xix 173 ὅν . . . αὐτοκράτωρ ἦν ἐγώ.

(ii) Aeschines Socraticus fr. 8 says ἔστι Σαλαμίνα ἔφυγον ἐλόμενοι Θεμιστοκλέα στρατηγὸν, καὶ ἐπέτρεψαν ἃτι βούλοιτο τοὺς ἐναυτῶν πράγμασι σχετισθαι. This is the earliest statement of the belief that Themistokles was appointed ‘supreme commander’ in 480. It underlies Plut. Them. 6.1 f., Reg. Imp. Apophth. 183D, and has been taken seriously, 24 although Plutarch is telling a silly story which is dressed in the concepts of a later age. For the moment, I will remark on Aeschines Socraticus only that he was referring to a period long before his own, that the nature of his evidence for Themistokles’ authority is extremely doubtful, and, above all, that he was writing after the idea of ‘supreme command’ had been made familiar by the extraordinary powers granted to Alkibiades in 407.

(iii) Plut. Reg. Imp. Apophth. 185A and Arist. 11.1 says that Themistokles was elected

---

22 Hude prints ἤγγειλας, which is a marginal variant in the Aldine edition and (to judge from other Aldine marginalia in this speech) may not be a Byzantine conjecture in origin.

23 Elsewhere Diodorus seems to confuse election to the office of general with appointment (by vote) to a particular command; the effect of his phraseology; e.g. in xi 81.4, 85.1, is to suggest that a man only became a general when he was given such a command.

24 E.g. by Beloch, 281.
στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ in 480 and Aristeides for the battle of Plataea (ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην). No reliance can be placed on the use of the word αὐτοκράτωρ by a writer of Imperial date.²⁵

I remarked in (b) above on the tendency of Hellenistic writers to describe military commands in authoritarian terms. The operation of this tendency, through which late sources impose a complex structure of command and seniority upon the Classical period, may be discerned in detail in Plutarch's treatment of the Sicilian Expedition. He converts collegiate command into a chain of command. After the departure of Alkibiades, Nikias, he says, λόγῳ μὲν ἀποδειξεὶς δεύτερος ἡγεμόν, δυνάμει δὲ μόνος ὧν οὐκ ἐπάναστο καθήμενος (Νεόχ. 14.4), τὸ πάν ἱδαν κράτος . . . ἔγραψε (15.1), τὸν Λάμαχον ἄγων υἱ' ἑαυτῷ (15.3). Plutarch here treats Alkibiades as commander of the expedition, Nikias as second in command, Lamachus as third; which does not deter him, incidentally, from reversing the situation for dramatic effect in 12.4 στρατηγὸν ἐλέοςθαι πρῶτον ἐκείνον μετ' 'Αλκηβιάδου καὶ Λαμάχου. When we turn to Thucydides, Plutarch's chain of command vanishes. There is no suggestion in Thucydides that the Assembly made any distinction in powers of command between the three generals (8.2). Even if it did, the distinction does not seem to have meant anything to the generals themselves, who discuss their plans and take action only when two of them have outvoted the third (46.5–50.1). Plutarch's chain of command is an illegitimate interpretation of the order of names in Th. vi 8.2 (in IG ii 302, which Plutarch is unlikely to have read, Lamachus is consistently named before Nikias) and of the fact that it was Lamachus who gave way at the conference in favour of Alkibiades' plan.

6. Agency and Responsibility

Lysias xii 62 ff. describes the embassy of Theramenes to Sparta in 404 in these terms: 'he promised that he would make an honourable peace (68) . . . you entrusted to him (ἐπετρέφατε αὐτῷ) your fatherland, your children, your wives, yourselves (69) . . . he promised the Spartans that he would put an end to the democracy (70) . . . on his return he would not let (οὐκ . . . εἴαση) an assembly be convened until the date arrived which the Spartans had chosen (71)'. Reading this description, no one would guess that Theramenes had any colleagues. Yet Xenophon's account shows that (HG ii 2.17 ff.) he was one of ten envoys. In describing their movements, their dealings with the Spartans and their report to the Assembly, Xenophon uses plural verbs throughout, until he comes to the detail (2.22) προσηγορεῖ δ' αὐτῶν Ἐρημαῖνος.

Lysias' treatment of the subject is, of course, rhetorical and malicious. We may suspect equally rhetorical usage (with the opposite tendency) in [Lys.] xx 13, where it is said of Polystratos that as καταλογεῖν in 411 he listed 9,000 citizens. Whatever the relation of this activity to the provision for cataloguing mentioned in 'Αθ. π. 29.5, it is unlikely that Polystratos was the sole cataloguer and hardly less unlikely that as a member of a board he drew up single-handed a list of 9,000 while each of his fellow-cataloguers drew up a similar list. The speaker's meaning would therefore seem to be that the board of which Polystratos was a member catalogued 9,000 citizens; but he says simply that Polystratos did it.

The boundaries of rhetoric are hazy. Misrepresentation by a speaker in a lawcourt is one of its extreme forms, but it includes also the phraseology with which a narrator seeks to illuminate the important and obscure the trivial. A tendency towards the rhetorical is inherent in the Greek language, notably in the use of the active voice to describe action which one encourages, induces, persuades, enables or permits another to perform,²⁶ e.g.

²⁵ Cf. Schwahn, col. 1079.
²⁶ Kühner-Gerth, i 99 f.; Schwzyzer-Debrunner, ii 220. It is interesting to observe that although the distinction between active voice and middle voice is often a distinction between action performed by oneself and action effected through an intermediary, the active is sometimes used where we should expect the middle, e.g. Pl. Meno 94b τοιτόν . . . ἵππες μὲν ἐδίδαξεν οὖν ὁδόσις χειρός Ἀθηναίοι καὶ μονοκχήν καὶ ἀγομαν καὶ τάλλα ἐπάιδευεν ὁ σα τέχνης ἔχετα
Pi. P. 1.53 f. Πολιάτος ύλον τόνταν, δε Πράγμου πόλων πέραν (‘enabled the Greeks to sack Troy’); Th. vi 2.5 τούς τε Σικανοὺς κρατοῦντες μάχη ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς τὰ μεσομβρινὰ (‘compelled them to migrate’); 22 And. i 58 Διοκλέσης ... ἱεράμονας ἄριστος (‘was the cause of their being imprisoned’); Ios. c. xiv 10 Δεκελείαν ἐπέτειμον (‘persuaded Sparta to fortify Dekeleia’); Lys. ii 49 Καράφιοι ... ἵγαιμοιν η ἢ ἐς ἐρήμιν τον χώραν ἐμβαλνην ἢ ἂν Ἀγάλμης δέξεσ το στρατόπεδον (‘induce the Athenian force to leave Aegina’); xii 68 ὑπέσχετο δε εἰρήνην πονηράς μὴ ἤπειρα δυοις μῆτα τα ἕλθος καθελόντος μῆτε τὰ πόλην παραδεισάτ’ (‘without agreeing to the surrender of hostages’, etc.); xxx 11 δεδομένα μη οὐκ ἀποκτεῖναι εν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ (‘secure his condemnation on a capital charge’); X., HG iii 2.20 εποιόθηκαν εἰρήνην ἢ τὰ τε μακρὰ τείχη ... καθελόντας ... καὶ τοὺς φυγανάς καθένας ... Λακεδαιμονίων ἐπέσεθαι κτλ. (‘permit the exiles to return’). In Ar. Pl. 5β2 f. a god is described as performing actions which men perform in his honour: ο Ζεὸς ... πῶς ἐν ποιῶν τὸν Ὄλυμπων αὐτὸς ἄγωνα, ἵνα τοὺς Ἐλλήνας ... ἐνναγείρει, ἀνεκιρττεν ... τοὺς νικώτας στρατιώτας;

These phenomena help with the interpretation of some passages in which it appears at first sight that a general is superior to other generals:

(i) Th. iv 28.2: Nikias, nettled by Kleon’s criticisms of the generals, says that τὸ ἐπὶ σφᾶς εἰναι Kleon may take what forces he wishes and try to capture Sphakteria. Even without the criticisms made above of the concept of ‘chairmanship’, there is no warrant for thinking that Nikias has a legal right to speak for the generals in circumstances in which another member of the board would not have had the right. Nikias speaks as representative of the generals because Kleon has made him so (27.5: Kleon ‘indicated Nikias, whose enemy he was, and said that if the generals were men they would capture Sphakteria’), because he does not believe that Kleon will take his offer, and because he is speaking in the presence of the Assembly, which will do as it likes whatever his status.

(ii) Ibid., 29.1 f.: Kleon, appointed to command at Sphakteria, sails off τῶν ἐν Πόλω στρατηγῶν ἕνα προσελέγετο Δημοσθένη ... τὸν δὲ Δημοσθένη προσέλαβε ‘because he had heard’, etc. Later in the narrative Kleon and Demosthenes are treated (30.4, 36.1, 37.1 f.) as equal colleagues. What happened, presumably, was that Kleon asked the Assembly to appoint Demosthenes and himself jointly to this command.

(iii) X. HG vi 3.3: Kallistratos ὑποσχόμενος Ἰφικράτης, εἰ αὐτῶν ἀφείη, ἢ χρήματα πέμπῃ κτλ. went on an embassy to Sparta. Kallistratos was a colleague of Iphikrates in the strategia; Iphikrates had asked the Assembly (2.39) to give him Kallistratos and Chabrias as colleagues. ‘If he let him go’ means ‘if he made no objection to his going’, ‘if he approved of his going’.

(iv) Th. iv 77.1: Ἰπποκράτης ... τὸν Δημοσθένη προσελέγει ... εἰ τὴν Ναυπακτον; ‘successfully suggested to him that he should go’ or even ‘agreed to his going’, rather than ‘ordered him to go and sent him off’; in i 137.1 ἀποστέλλων is used of a host enabling a guest to go on the next stage of his journey.

Turning now to the language in which Thucydides describes Perikles’ strategy in 431, we find the crux of the matter in ii 22.1 ἐκκλησίαν τε οὐκ ἐποίει ὧδε ξύλλογον οὐδένα. As

οδόνοι τειροὺς ~93d Θεμιστοκλῆς Kleôfántos τῶν ὀνωπιά μεν ἐνδιάδασε ἄγονων ... καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ καὶ ὔποικα ἐφεύγον ἐκ τούτου αὐτὸν ἐπαιδεύτω καὶ ἐποίησε σοφόν, διὰ διδασκάλων ἀγαθῶν εἰγετο. 27 This is the MSS. reading, which I have defended in Main N.S. vi (1953) 12 f.

28 The date of Kallistratos’ election is uncertain. Iphikrates replaced Timotheos (X. HG vi 2.13 f.) at the end of 373 (D. xlix 22). Xenophon describes Iphikrates’ campaign as if it had been conducted by a single commander, but in the general commendation at the end of his account (2.39) says that Iphikrates asked for Chabrias and Kallistratos as colleagues. His ‘release’ of Kallistratos for the embassy must fall early in 371, since the peace was made on 14 Skirophorion 371 (Plut. Aeg. 28), after which Iphikrates was recalled from the North-West (HG vi 4.1). Kallistratos may have been a colleague of Iphikrates throughout the campaign of 372, and ignored by Xenophon in his narrative of that campaign; but the possibility that Iphikrates did not obtain Kallistratos and Chabrias as colleagues until the end of that campaign should be considered.
a general, Perikles had a right to ask the prytaneis to convene an Assembly, as Th. ii 59.3 reminds us: ἔδολαγον ποιήσας (ἐτι δ’ ἐστρατηγεὶ) ἐβουλεύτο ταρασθαί. There is no difficulty in the hypothesis that while the Peloponnesian army was in Attica an assembly could not be convened without the consent of the generals, for the city temporarily φρούριον κατέστη and to collect the citizens was to denude the walls.29 Yet ἐκκλησίαν οὐκ ἐσποίει cannot mean simply ‘he did not convene an assembly’, for the clear implication of the passage is that none of his colleagues did so; that is to say, he prevented the convening of any assembly. In the light of the passages discussed in this section, I feel no difficulty in interpreting Thucydides’ words as meaning that Perikles prevailed upon his colleagues (at least half of whom are likely to have been men with enough experience of war, and a sound enough judgment, to see the situation as Perikles saw it) to convene no assembly, and this interpretation receives some slight support from a linguistic singularity. The co-ordination of ἐκκλησίαν τε οὐκ ἐσποίει with τιν τε πόλιν ἐφύλασε is abnormal if it is antithetical in character (‘he did not do this, but he did do that’) would normally be expressed by Thucydides by the use of οὐτε ... τε), but normal if the point is ‘to the Assembly he did this, and to the city that’, investing οὐκ ἐσποίει with a positive character, despite its negative form.30 This relates οὐκ ἐσποίει to expressions such as οὐκ ἐάν (‘urge ... not to ...’), e.g. Th. vii 48.2 οὐκ εἰς ἀπαντησαθαί, ‘urged him not to depart’), οὐ φάντασι δένυ, and Hdt. vii 46.1 οὐ συμβουλεύσαν Σάρμενστρατεύσατε, ‘advising Xerxes not to attack’. I therefore suggest the interpretation: ‘he was opposed to the convening of any assembly or meeting’.

Th. ii 65.4 πάντα τά πράγματα ἐπέτρεψαν presents no difficulty. Certainly, if the Athenians had granted Perikles the exceptional powers which they granted a generation later to Alkibiades, Thucydides could have described the event in just those words; but he could equally use the words to describe the confidence with which the Athenians took Perikles’ advice and followed his lead.31 We may recall the general use of ἐπιτρέπειν in the senses ‘allow’ and ‘(en)trust’, and in particular vi 15.4: ‘they declared war upon Alkibiades, καὶ ἄλλοις ἐπιτρέφαντες soon brought their city to grief’.

7. TRADITION AND PEDANTRY

Popular tradition magnifies the impressive individual. It does not say that so-and-so and Kimon and so-and-so won the battle of the Eurymedon, but that Kimon won it. Hence Athenian tradition spoke of Miltiades as the victor of Marathon, Themistokles of Salamis, and Aristeides of Plataea, consigning their less distinguished colleagues to oblivion. The remarkable career of Perikles and the enormous moral ascendancy which he enjoyed throughout a large part of it no doubt contributed to a magnification of his own role in warfare, so that men said that Perikles reduced Samos. In the latter part of the Peloponnesian War the idea of a supreme commander became increasingly acceptable to the Athenians. We know from IG ii 98.1.1 that there was a serious proposal to entrust the Sicilian expedition to a single commander (not, I think, to Nikias; Athenian fears of Alkibiades ὡς τυραννὸς ἐπιθυμοῦτι were not altogether nonsense), and in 407, possibly for the first time in the history of democracy, a grant of overriding powers was actually made. This example permanently affected interpretation of tradition about the Persian War, and the statement of Aeschines Socraticus about Themistokles is our first evidence of such an effect. In Hellenistic and Roman times the true state of affairs in Classical

29 Gomme in his note on ii 22.1 and G. E. M. de Sainte Croix in Historia v (1956) 3 n. 12, while sceptical about any grant of special powers to Perikles, do not seem to me to make enough allowance for the tactical situation.

30 In Th. i 37.2 f. ἔπι τε in the participial clause ἐστρατηγεὶν τοῦκλ. looks forward to καὶ in the following finite clause.

31 Cf. Gomme on ii 65.4 and de Sainte Croix, op. cit., 3.
Athens was heavily and consistently concealed by translation of collegiate command into terms of individual authority.

Tradition is not uncommonly correct in its emphasis, even when the implications of its detail are incorrect, and the facts to which Greek tradition gave prominence imposed themselves also upon historians, whether they were writing about their contemporaries or about remoter times. So Herodotus writes of Themistokles and Aristeides as if they had no colleagues, and Thucydides (on occasion) writes in similar terms of Kimon and Perikles. Few authors are so interested in the real sources of influence as Thucydides, or so concerned to separate the essential from the inessential. Yet there is also a clear streak of pedantry in him. Writing for posterity, and for a panhellenic reading public, he takes pains to give us information, unnecessary for an Athenian reader, on Athenian institutions, festivals (i 126.6, ii 15.2, 4), topography (ii 18.2, viii 90.1, 97.1, 98.2) and idiom (ii 15.6). It is therefore not surprising that on two occasions, the revolt of Samos and the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, both of them occasions liable to be distorted in tradition by exaggeration of the role of Perikles, he thinks it necessary not only to inform us that Perikles was general but to remind us that he was not an autocrat but a member of a board of ten generals. The insertion of the words δέκατος αὐτός in i 116.1 and ii 13.1 achieve this purpose.

8. Conclusion

When all is said and done, is the answer credible? I have said of one item of evidence after another ‘this is rhetorical exaggeration’ or ‘that is Hellenistic misrepresentation’; and a hypothesis in support of which so much has to be explained away is suspect simply because the succession of explanations necessarily obscures the chief asset of the rival hypothesis, its cumulative weight. I hope, however, that my hypothesis may be regarded as an example of a method which Collingwood described as ‘isolating the preconceived idea which has acted as the distorting agent, reconstructing the formula of the distortion, and re-applying it so as to correct the distortion’. In the case of Perikles’ generalship, the ‘distorting agent’ is the consistent assumption that a collegiate board of officials must always have a chairman, president, leader or commander. The ‘formula of the distortion’ has been the interpretation of many passages of Classical literature and documents, including all occurrences of eponym-formulae, as indicating the legal superiority of one member of a board over his colleagues; an interpretation which rests solely on a ‘preconceived idea’ and cannot be justified linguistically. In its defence, it may be urged that purely collegiate office cannot work, especially when it is military. The answer to this is that, like some other Greek institutions, it did not always work. The Athenians certainly meant it to work; they insisted that all members of a board should be held equally guilty in law if any official action of the board were regarded as a misdemeanour, and they looked with disfavour on any attempt by a member of a board to dissociate himself from the decisions of his colleagues; but no one can read the history of the fifth and fourth centuries without perceiving that there were crippling disadvantages in a system of collegiate military command, and the increasing tendency in the fourth century to entrust commands to single generals suggests that the Athenians learnt from experience.

I suggest that in considering the evidence which I have adduced in this paper we substitute for the former ‘preconceived idea’ the following propositions, which may perhaps claim a higher status. First, that the Athenians correctly observed, and accepted as natural and inevitable, that the moral domination of a majority by a persuasive and influential individual was always significant and could be overwhelming. Secondly, that they

---

32 We must also consider the possibility that Thucydides had no means, other than oral tradition, of discovering who were the generals in the earlier years of the Pentekontaetia.
took it for granted that all members of a board were at all times of equal standing and responsibility before the law. Thirdly, that precisely because they took this for granted they were free to speak about collegiate commands in terms which represented the realities of influence and deceived no one except the historians of a later age.\textsuperscript{33}

University of St Andrews.

\textsuperscript{33} I am deeply indebted to Professor A. Andrewes, Miss Ursula Ewins, and Messrs I. G. Kidd, D. M. Lewis, R. Meiggs and D. C. C. Young for reading and criticising drafts of this paper.

K. J. Dover.
REPRESENTATION OF MAENADS ON ARCHAIC RED-Figure VASES

There have been two works of major importance dealing with the characteristics of Greek maenadism, separated by seventy years of rapid advance in the study of comparative religion. The first, which appeared in 1872, is Rapp's detailed study 'Die Mänade im griechischen Cultus, in der Kunst und Poesie'. This has remained valuable long after the contemporary theories of nature-symbolism have been abandoned, and the distinctions he drew between the 'artificial' maenads of poetry or art and the actual cult-practice of Dionysiac religion in historical Greece is still on the whole valid. The second work is E. R. Dodds' article 'Maenadism in the Bacchae', published in 1940, which has supplemented, but not basically altered, Rapp's principles by showing that, although it may be doubted whether anything very much like the ecstatic possession depicted in the Bacchae took place in classical Greece, sufficiently strong parallels exist between the presentation of maenads on vases and in the Bacchae on the one hand, and historical and clinical descriptions of hysterical excitement on the other, to suggest that the maenad had been at some time more than an imaginary creature; and in fact Bacchic practices of some types, apparently traditional, can be proved to have occurred in Hellenistic times. Somehow, it seems, some practical knowledge of religious hysteria reached Euripides and the vase-painters of the late sixth century, either surviving from the past or brought in from other parts of the Greek world. It is not, however, Dodds' purpose to do more than indicate the startling coincidence of certain characteristics in maenad vases with those of well-authenticated mass hysteria, and though a considerable amount of work on certain aspects of the subject has been done, in particular by Lillian B. Lawler, H. Philippart, and E. Coche de la Ferté, that part of Rapp's work which deals with the depiction of maenads in art has long been outdated and remains unreviewed. This present study, though not attempting a comprehensive revision of Rapp's work— which the volume of evidence now available would make an enormous task— gives a summary of the features of representations of maenads on vases during what is, I think, the most significant period, from about 530-480 B.C. (that of Beazley's 'Early and Late Archaic' groups) and offers as results an illustration of the ways in which originally separate elements were confused by continued use of the same motif and

1 RhM xxvii (1872) 1 f., 562 f.
2 HThR xxxiii (1940) 155 f. The first part is reprinted as an appendix to the author's The Greeks and the Irrational (Berkeley, 1951) and the evidence is further presented in his introduction and notes to the Bacchae (Oxford, 1944).
3 Lawler, in 'The Maenads' (MAAR vi (1927) 69 f.), has published useful descriptions and statistics of occurrences of attributes on red-figure vases from 480-330 (I think the upper date limit would now be put earlier); Philippart, 'Iconographie des Bachantes d'Euripide' (Rev. belge de philol. et d'hist. ix (1930) 5 f.) covers the illustrations of the stories of the Bacchae and is good for maenad-reliefs generally; G. E. Rizzo's Thiasos (Rome, 1934) is limited to discussion of bas-reliefs of a later date. E. Coche de la Ferté's unpublished thesis Les Ménades: origines et réformé de leur type dans l’art grec I know only from a résumé given in Bull. des Musées de France xi. 6 and 7 (1946) 10-13, but he appears to have restricted his work almost entirely to black-figure, where his general conclusions agree with mine; his article 'Les Ménades...' in RA xxxviii (1951) 12 f. is concerned only with representations in which the icon of Dionysos appears. R. Ganszyniec in his now superseded article 'Dionysos et les Ménades' (Przeglad Historyczny xi (1934) 279 f., 309) anticipated Dodds' work in part by stressing the realistic nature of the representations but attributed the delirium to a form of epilepsy or 'psychic paroxysm' for which, because of its similarity to drunkenness, Dionysos was held responsible. The works of larger scope on Greek religion or Dionysos do not examine the vases in detail.
4 The substance of this article formed part of a M.A. dissertation submitted to the University of Bristol in 1956. It was written under the supervision of Professor T. B. L. Webster, to whom I am greatly indebted.
a proof of certain definite changes both in character of the scenes and in details shown therein, in particular in the occurrence of the thyrsos. Some of these changes, though noticed long ago, have still not been explained nor, I think, properly appreciated.

Representations of groups of figures with certain common characteristics and now known as satyrs, 'padded dancers' or komasts, and nymphs or maenads, appear on the vases of several fabrics from the first quarter of the sixth century onwards, and the general features of these must be quickly reviewed in order to show the changes later introduced at the beginning of the red-figure technique. No comprehensive study of Dionysiac scenes on black-figure vases has been published, but development of the different types of figure has been established fairly firmly.5

The padded dancers appear on Corinthian vases in the last quarter of the seventh century, but it is not until the first quarter of the sixth that they become involved in obvious mythological scenes. Then, in the next quarter of the century, female figures, always naked, join their revels. On the Attic groups of vases on which similar figures appear,6 beginning in the first quarter of the century, female figures occasionally appear in the dance, either wearing a short chiton, different in style from the Corinthian-type chiton which the men wear, or naked.7 On later Attic vases the character of the scenes becomes freer and the women may be naked or wear a chiton reaching to the buttocks, mid-thigh, knees, or feet, and sometimes the men are ithyphallic and the whole approaches the wild indecency of the contemporary satyr-nymph antics. Amongst the non-Attic fabrics female figures occur with the dancers only on a Caeretan hydria of the last quarter of the century and on occasional Boeotian vases, in both cases probably under Attic influence.8 Different interpretations have been put upon these figures,9 but though in a few cases the male dancers appear with Dionysos in presumably mythological representations10 there is no clear indication whether the females are thought of as human worshippers (whether or not genuinely naked), nymphs, or mythical maenads, and I think they may safely be

5 A complete bibliography to that date of studies of the padded dancers is given by H. Herter in his Vom Dionysischen Tanz zum komischen Spiel (Iserlohn, 1947) 43, 47 n. 45, to which should now be added T. B. L. Webster’s Greek Theatre Production (London, 1956) 28–35, 128–44, and the same author’s more detailed article in Rylands Bulletin xxxvi (1954) 569 f. My knowledge of representations of dancers on Corinthian vases owes much to a list of such vases compiled and indexed by Mr. Axel Seeborg of Oslo University. I know of nothing of importance added to knowledge of satyrs since the definitive work of F. Brommer, Satyroi (Würzburg, 1937). A. Greifenhagen in his valuable work Eine attische schwarzfigurige Vasengattung und die Darstellung des Komos im 6 Jhdt. (Königsburg Pr., 1929) treats the interaction of komos and satyr-maenad scenes on vases of the third quarter of the century with great skill and brevity (pp. 49–52).

6 List and references, Beazley, ABV 23–37; interpretations, Greifenhagen, 1 f.; and Webster, Greek Theatre Production 28–35, and Ryb. Bull. xxxvi (1954) 582 f.

7 Chitons, a vase in the manner of the KY Painter (ABV 33/1) and those by the Palazzolo painter (ABV 34–5); naked, ABV 36, vases ‘connected with the Komast Group’ nos. 2 and 3 (no. 1 here, which Beazley describes as ‘naked woman dancing’ shows only a naked leg and is not conclusive). Webster suggests that there may have been a native Attic komast type of naked men and women in short chiton, and it seems very possible that the type of men in Corinthian chiton and naked women may have been borrowed. Actually these Attic vases are dated to the first quarter of the century and the Corinthian to the second, but the number of vases is small and, I imagine, the dating not sufficiently precise to make this an insuperable objection.

8 The Caeretan hydria, Louvre Ca 10227, published Mon. Pirot xli (1946) 29 f. (women in very short chiton and naked men). Boeotian vases, Ure, Black Glaze Pottery pl. 7.266–7; CVA Gallien III G pl. 8.2 (naked); Athens C.C. 821, pl. 33 (in long robes). I exclude from consideration, in all fabrics, both the common long-robed flute-players, whether or not they are definitely female, and also the ‘Reigentanz’ of walking long-robed women which is found on some vases in most fabrics (it has been treated by A. Brinkmann in Bonner Jahrb. 130 (1925) 118 f.).

9 E.g. Greifenhagen, 57–62; Brommer, 22; Herter, 12; Webster, especially Ryb. Bull. xxxvi (1954) 580.

10 On three Return of Hephaistos scenes, quoted by Webster, op. cit., 590, and Greek Theatre Production 133; and three instances are known of a padded dancer wearing a panther-skin, Webster, Greek Theatre Production 134–5.
disregarded for the present purpose. It should be noted, however, that beyond doubt female figures are involved in dances which are probably in some way Dionysiac, that the quantity of extant evidence is enough to show that their appearance in these scenes is sudden, and that already there can be seen the strong tendency in vase-painting to concentrate upon a fashionable motif.

From their earliest appearances in art and on most vase fabrics satyrs are accompanied by female companions, who may, at least until the middle of the sixth century, safely be called nymphs.\(^{11}\) From Attic work of the first quarter of the century there are a few examples of nymphs, clad in long or short dresses, pursued by satyrs\(^{12}\) and in the next quarter-century, though this type of scene is still not so common relatively as it later becomes,\(^{13}\) the chief mythological motif with which the satyrs are connected occurs—the Return of Hephaistos, several instances of which are found in this period, including the magnificent frieze of the François vase.\(^{14}\) Though on this occasion the nymphs assist the revelry with hand-clapping and cymbals they are still, here and elsewhere, quite certainly un-maenadic figures. This is likewise the case in the only instance of their occurrence in Corinthian vase-painting, a vase of the second quarter of the century\(^{15}\) showing an obscene group of satyrs and naked nymphs; satyrs are rare and highly individual on Corinthian vases, and the nakedness of the nymphs, rare even in Attic and only found here outside that fabric, may be due to the influence of the contemporary padded-dancer scenes. On other non-Attic fabrics from the middle to the end of the third quarter of the sixth century nymphs occasionally occur dancing or in more or less obscene groups with satyrs,\(^{16}\) but it is important to note that, with the exception of a Caeretan hydria (to be discussed below), the nymphs are robed figures with no distinguishing attributes whatever; nor does Dionysos, outside Attic and Caeretan vases, ever join the company.

But on Attic vases of about the mid-century, or a little earlier, an important change takes place that seems to require the use of the term ‘maenads’ thenceforth instead of ‘nymphs’. Figures appear wearing the κακρις, or fawnskin, over their robe and carrying snakes in their hands.\(^{17}\) Nymphs have appeared sufficiently often before this for the change to be quite striking, and though in black-figure the κακρις is not entirely confined to Dionysiac scenes,\(^{18}\) its appearance together with that of snakes, common in later Dionysiac scenes

\(^{11}\) The terms require some definition. ‘Satyr’ I use as synonymous with ‘silen’ and indicating the male figures, sometimes labelled Συλίνος on vases, having usually a horse’s ears and tail or, failing these, the hairy pelts which is characteristic of many equine satyrs. ‘Nymph’ I use for a female figure, clothed or not, accompanying satyrs but not having any Dionysiac attribute such as the κακρις, pārdalis, snake, or thyrsos. These are the Νυμφαί of the François Vase:

\begin{quote}
τάσιν δὲ Συλίνος καὶ ἔσσοκος Ἀργεωτάτης
μύτων & ζυλίτω μηχυκό σπείρων ἐπότων.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(Γυμνό με Αριοδίκη 262–3.)
\end{quote}

\(^{12}\) ABV 23 (Athens), 42/37, 12/22.

\(^{13}\) There are, for instance, only five Dionysiac scenes (nos. 107–11) among the 121 Tyrrenhian-neckamphorae listed by Beazley in ABV.

\(^{14}\) Return of Hephaistos representations have been listed, and many reproduced, by Brommer in JdI lii (1937) 198 ff.

\(^{15}\) The Corinthian satyrs and nymphs, Payne, Necrocorinthia no. 1372: other Corinthian satyrs, Payne nos. 1282a, 1258, and 1432.

\(^{16}\) Chalcidian, Rumpf Chalk. Vasen (Berlin, 1927) nos. 2, 13, 20, 57, and 111, and also separate figures or pairs of figures, of many types, on eye-cups. Clazomenian, BM 88.2–8, 75a and 88.2–8, 76a (= CVA II Dn pls. 2, 3); BSA xlii (1952) pl. 29, 4; AA (1936) 398 nos. 31, 32. Northampton group, Louvre E 706, published Mon. Piot xliii (1949) 32 f. Kymean, BM 1904.5.1.1 (= CVA II Dn pl. 11). Caeretan, Webster, JHS xlvii (1928) nos. 7, 8, and 18, and a hydria in the Villa Giulia published in Mon. Piot xlv (1950) 1 f. (‘Hydra “B”’).

\(^{17}\) The first strikingly maenadic scene is that on a Tyrrenhian amphora in the Louvre, no. E 831 (ABV 103/108) which, though badly repainted (see Pottier, V. A. du Louvre (Paris, 1901) 76), seems certainly to show six maenads with Dionysos; one of the maenads holds a snake, another a panther-cub, and a third holds her hands to her head as if overwrought with some emotion. The vase has a band of dicing, which according to von Bothmer (AJA xlvii (1944) 164) would seem to place it lateish in the group. The κακρις, together with snakes, appears on the Metropolitan Museum Lydos crater (ABV 108/5).

\(^{18}\) I distinguish the κακρις, or fawnskin, from the pārdalis, the skin of some feline; there are various
but rare elsewhere, must have some significance. From this time down to the introduction of the red-figure technique these attributes are quite common, and a little later the pardalis or panther-skin, which is rather rare in black-figure, is first shown. 19

Only on a Caeretan hydria, amongst the non-Attic fabrics, are such attributes found; this instance is a Return of Hephaistos scene 20 on which a running female figure holds a snake, and this, together with the very prominent association of Dionysos himself with the panther on these vases, may perhaps be due to Attic influence. The vine-harvesting and riderless-mule motifs 21 are found at about this time on both fabrics.

Nevertheless the nature of the scenes on the Attic vases remains quite unchanged by the presence or absence of the attributes or of Dionysos himself; this lack of distinction is clearly apparent, for instance, on the fine crater by Lydos in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, 22 one of the earliest vases on which these characteristics appear, where the maenads, nebris-clad and brandishing snakes, are also holding bunches of grapes, which hardly conforms to the usual conception of them, and are obviously on quite affectionate terms with the satyrs. In fact the only change in the actual character of the scenes depicted is that well pointed out by Greifenhagen, 23 a gradual confusing of komos and satyr scenes; he shows the effects on the komos of the satyrs and their mythical associations, and also the frequency in the third quarter of the century of certain stereotyped and now hackneyed motifs—the Return of Hephaistos tale degenerated into a meaningless donkey-rider, vine-harvesting scenes, and rows of three or five figures framed by ivy-branches. One last burst of originality in this technique emerges, the ‘enlevement’ theme of satyrs carrying nymphs, 24 which is widespread in the transition period. Then the themes, like the old technique, are played out, and artistic inspiration starts in a fresh direction with the red-figure style and the new development of the thiasos theme.

It is the maenad scenes which occur on early red-figure vases of about 530–480 B.C. (Beazley’s ‘Early and Late Archaic’ periods) which are always used as illustrations of Bacchic rites and which begin the long series of artistic depictions of this theme. For the present study inspection was made of as many as possible of the vase-scenes whose subject as given in ARV included ‘maenads’, the distinction between Early and Late Archaic being retained. 25 The frequency with which Dionysiac subjects occur is less than might be expected, and probably less proportionately than in the preceding quarter of a century;

ways of wearing each, but in almost all cases the hoods or paws, or the head if visible, are sufficiently clearly drawn to leave no room for doubt. The nebris is the common wear of warriors, Hermes, the Gorgons, Iris, and Nike, and on five vases known to me is worn by a woman among naked men in what seem quite clearly scenes of actual life (BM B37, a ripe-black-figure mastos, not in ABV: an eye-cup in the Vatican, Beazley Race. Guglielmi no. 66, pl. 23: a lekythos of about 540–530, Castellani no. 536, Haspels ABL 34 no. 3: a kotyle of about 530, Mingazzini, pls. 88, 7, 8, not in ABV: a lekythos in Leningrad, Haspels ABL 37, published AA 1913, 205 fig. 51). Nebris also occurs as a woman’s name on a Corinthian cup (Payne no. 995). These vases may, of course, indicate nothing more than a bored and careless painter.

19 E.g. the vase by the Amasis Painter in the Bibl. Nat. (ABV 152/25) on which two maenads appear alone with Dionysos, and fragments by the same painter (ABV 156/72).

20 Vienna 218, Webster in JHS xlvi (1928) no. 7, published by van Lücken pls. 62–3.

21 Concerning the vase in Rome (Conservatori, Webster, op. cit., no. 8) Plaoutine’s plausible suggestion (RA xviii (1941) 18), made from study of a photograph only, that the apparent running maenad behind the mule is a repainted riding Hephaistos was not supported by my own not very expert examination of the vase.

22 Mentioned above, n. 17.


24 This is the theme traced out by Picard in his ‘Groupes d’enlevement dans l’art grec’ (Genaja xiii (1935) 63 f.), though he does not deal with vase-painting.

25 The actual numbers of scenes considered, either from the vase or from reproductions, were: Early Archaic 68, Late Archaic 112. Listed in ARV but unpublished were: Early 29, Late 55. Seen but disregarded because of fragmentary condition: Early 10, Late 9. The black-figure sides of bilinguals were found indistinguishable, for this purpose, from black-figure vases, and were ignored.
very often only one or two examples of this subject are found in the surviving work of a painter, and very few painters show any special predilection for it. There is, however, a pronounced increase in the proportion of scenes in which two or more maenads occur alone or with Dionysos, without the presence of the satyrs; some of these are doubtless due to limitations of space, but it may be significant of a shift in conception. Men are probably never found with maenads, though occasionally the figure of Dionysos could well be interpreted as a male, as human as the maenads.

The simple thiasos of maenads and satyrs, often with Dionysos, is by far the commonest theme among these vases, but some mythological and artistic motifs are from time to time carried over from the black-figure period; such are the Return of Hephaistos, which is still quite common, or the donkey alone; Pentheus appears, and the 'attack on a sleeping maenad'. Occasionally (at a slightly later date) maenads take over the nymphs' duties of nursing the child Dionysos or mothering young satyrs. The 'enlevement' motif, like the 'row' arrangement also common in late black-figure, is often found on the black-figure sides of bilinguals but is almost never taken over into the new technique. The lecherous temperament of satyrs remains unchanged, but the red-figure maenads never respond as they did on black-figure work; this is a marked difference in spirit between the black-figure and red-figure representations, but in view of the strong similarities in attributes I do not see that this can be used as the distinguishing characteristic between maenads and nymphs.

The manner of depicting the dance or revel changes little. The usual komos 'Knielauf' movement remains very common, especially for one or two figures in the inside of a cup, and occasionally a satyr and a maenad dance as a pair. On a vase by Oltos the thiasos on one side and the komos on the other are in very similar positions. Often simple walking processions are found. Ecstatic dancers, with the head-flung-back movement which Dodds describes, are not very common in this period; besides the well-known examples in the work of the Kleophrades Painter there are a few by the Brygos Painter and Makron. Much more common is a forward-bending movement of the body, with head down and arms stretched out, which is quite distinct from the backward-turning movement of the komos.

The attire of maenads is almost always the long, flowing Ionian chiton, though the old black-figure variants of a chiton reaching only to mid-thigh, to the knee, to mid-calf, or even nakedness, are occasionally found. Very common from the time of Epiketos

---

26 Eight scenes out of 68 seen in the Early period, 20 out of 112 in the Late.
27 A very good example is ARV 267/2, by the Briseis Painter (published by Farnell, Cults v pl. 45). Jeanmaire in his book Dionysos (Paris, 1950) 494 section 4 mentions another, BM E439, which I have not traced.
28 It occurs eight times in the period considered.
29 E.g. ARV 80/2, 109/10.
30 ARV 19/5, 130/112.
31 Seven times; Beazley, Attic Vases in Mus. of Fine Arts, Boston (Oxford, 1954) ii, text to no. 113, gives a list of these representations, the only black-figure one being that on the crater painted on the Amasis Painter fragments from Samos, Beazley, Devel. of Attic B.-F. pl. 26.1.
32 ARV 302/17; Brommer, Satyrspiele (Berlin, 1944) figs. 33-4, 36-7 (= ARV 401/3, 420/21, and a bell crater in Ancona, not in ARV).
33 The only examples I have seen are ARV 47/35 and 288/118. The first is influenced by the komos of men and naked women on the exterior.
34 Though this is suggested by Nilsson; 'Die Satyrn, welche so oft mit den Mänaden zusammen dargestellt werden, bühnen nicht mit ihnen, sondern mit den Nymphen: die Mänaden wehren sich gegen ihre Zudringlichkeit' (Geschichte (Munich, 1941) i 540 n. 1).
35 ARV 13/gamma, 33/5, 58/3.
36 ARV 37/42.
38 Kleophrades Painter, ARV 121/5, 124/40; Brygos Painter, ARV 247/14, 247/15; Makron, ARV 303/31.
39 It is found especially in the Brygos Painter (ARV 247/14, 247/15, 253/132), Douris (285/78), and Makron (304/37, 313/221). It has been noticed by Beazley, BSA xxx (1930) 109.
40 Mid-thigh, ARV 37/33, 41/86, 80/2; knee, 69/20: mid-calf, 205/8; naked, 47/35 (influenced by komos on exterior), 71/Munich, 214/12, 227/6 (symposium scene), 104/4 (maenads drawing satyrs in a chariot), and a lekythos by the Sappho painter, Boston 98.885, Haspels ABL 106, 236 no. 81.
onward is a manner of hiding the hands by clutching the ends of the long full sleeves of the chiton (not a himation), causing the outstretched arms to resemble wings.\textsuperscript{41} It is carried over into contemporary black-figure and ‘Six’s Technique’\textsuperscript{42} and continues into the vase-painting of the middle of the century and perhaps much longer.\textsuperscript{43} In at least two instances Dionysos himself is in this attitude.\textsuperscript{44} The only case I know of in which no Dionysiac significance is present is on an astragalos in the British Museum\textsuperscript{45} where the mannerism is adopted by one of the female ‘Clouds’ or ‘Breezes’, and this I suppose indicates the reason for it—it was a natural gesture in cases of rapid movement, strong wind, and cold.

Snakes, as in black-figure, are common in the work of most painters, and drinking-vessels are absent (except in the case of sacrifices to the god), again as they are in later black-figure work. Trailing ivy branches occur with Dionysos as early as the François Vase, vine branches from the time of the Metropolitan Museum Lydos crater onwards, and both continue at least into Late Archaic red-figure. Other types of branches, often formalised and unrecognisable, are common throughout the whole period too, and are often called pine-branches, which in view of Xenophanes fr. B17 (Diels) and Euripides Bacchae 109 and 1097 is reasonable. These branches are not, of course, confined to Dionysiac scenes.

An unexpected feature which emerged from the investigation was that maenads of this archaic red-figure period wear the nebris considerably less often than the pardalis.\textsuperscript{46} There are also a number of instances of satyrs wearing the pardalis against very few of the nebris.\textsuperscript{47} Considering this together with the fact that the panther or pardalis is frequently found, at all periods, with Dionysos himself, and that the nebris is not confined exclusively to maenads (as has been remarked above), it seems that more importance should be assigned to this attribute than has been done, and that in spite of Nilsson’s remark ‘Die charakteristische Tracht der Mänaden und auch des Gottes [Dionysos] selbst ist die Nebris, das Rehkalbsfell’\textsuperscript{48} the pardalis might well be substituted as the typical indication.

This suggested shift in emphasis from the nebris to the pardalis would have certain advantages. It would better fit the mid-century black-figure satyr and maenad scenes, where, as has been pointed out, the nebris appears on un-maenadic characters whilst the pardalis-clad figures tend to be less affected by this difficulty. Perhaps it is also fair to include on the supporting side the instances where a komast is shown wearing the pardalis.\textsuperscript{49} (It is impossible here to consider the results of this change from prey to feline, from hunted to hunter, on interpretations of the conception of the god and his followers.) But the insufficient quantity of extant evidence from the early sixth century, to say nothing of the obvious imprecision of the artists’ minds on the subject, makes it impractical to attempt to establish a firm delineation by means of this approach, and in fact I have not ventured to use this distinction in this paper. It may at least be safe to say that tradition rather than practice was the predominant cause of the adoption of such a characteristic by the painters.

\textsuperscript{41} I have seen it in the work of Epiktetos (\textit{ARV} 47/31); Kleophrades Painter (124/40, and a hydra in a private collection, \textit{Antike Kunst} i (1958) 6); Copenhagen Painter (193/10); Brygos Painter (247/14, 247/15, 247/17, 253/132); Briseis Painter (267/2, 267/4, 269/39); Dokimasia painter (272/24); Douris (285/78, 286/91, 287/112). Usually several, and sometimes all, figures in a scene show this action. It is not found on the vases I have seen of Makron, whose maenads usually hold some attribute in their hands.

\textsuperscript{42} Haspels \textit{ABL} 264 no. 33; \textit{ABV} 560/518: Six’s Technique, Haspels \textit{ABL} 236 no. 49.

\textsuperscript{43} Lawler found thirty-five cases in her ‘conventional’ group, and declared the motif appeared almost always in the ‘free’ period, which I think would now be called the early classical. I have noticed it on a maenad on a phlyakes vase published by M. Bieber, \textit{History of Greek and Roman Theatre} (Princeton, 1939) 295 fig. 400.

\textsuperscript{44} \textit{ARV} 362/8: also New York 41162.10, not in \textit{ARV} (said to be by the Cleveland painter).

\textsuperscript{45} \textit{ARV} 542/15, published in \textit{JHS} xiii (1892–1893) 135.

\textsuperscript{46} I have seen the nebris on 7 Early and 10 Late scenes, the pardalis on 16 Early and 45 Late; only the pardalis is found in the work of Makron.

\textsuperscript{47} Two cases of the nebris known to me (\textit{ARV} 121/5, 285/78) and 19 of the pardalis. On \textit{ARV} 128/90 the centaurs attacking Iris wear it, perhaps to stress this unusually satyric nature in them.

\textsuperscript{48} \textit{Geschichte} (1941) i 538.

\textsuperscript{49} See n. 10 above.
I have left to the last the most characteristic attribute of the followers of Dionysos, from 530 onwards; this is the thyrsos, the staff, sometimes clearly shown by stem-divisions to be a narthex, with a bunch of ivy-leaves bound to or inserted in the end and sometimes with ivy tendrils sprouting also from the stem itself. The development of the different ways of drawing this implement has been comprehensively set out by von Papen,\(^{50}\) who also points out the most important fact, never sufficiently explained nor even, I think, properly appreciated—and indeed somewhat obscured by von Papen’s own inclusion of ordinary branches under the same term—that it is on vases of early red-figure work, about 530, that the thyrsos appears for the first time.\(^{51}\) The thyrsos is not found in the vases I have seen of the Andokides Painter or Psiax and only once on those I know of Oltos, but it is usual in others of this early group such as Smikros and Phintias. Thereafter it becomes universal and, for some time, standardised in type, though of course the carefulness and detail of the drawing varies considerably. Rarely do characters other than Dionysos or maenads carry it.

This sudden innovation is important enough to justify a short excursus. Neither von Papen in the work mentioned above, nor A. Reinach in his learned study ‘L’Origine du Thyrse’\(^{52}\) has justified, in my opinion, the use of the word thyrsos for the naturalistic ivy, vine, or other branches carried by many figures, Dionysiac and other, on black-figure vases, and the scanty uses of the word in literature often indicate clearly that the ‘artificial’ thyrsos described above alone is intended by the Greek.\(^{53}\) This view is supported again by the absence of the word from literature before the time of Euripides,\(^{54}\) for the word ἱστρία which occurs in a Dionysiac context in Iliad vi 134, though often considered (for example by Rohde\(^{55}\)) as equivalent in meaning to θόρος, is not certainly used in that sense there and was understood and used by later authors only in the etymologically more correct sense of ‘sacrifices’ or ‘sacral rites’.\(^{56}\) I think it safer to restrict the meaning of the word entirely to the so-called ‘artificial’ thyrsos, and similarly would restrict to the ‘natural’ branch Nilsson’s remarks on the connection of the implement with the May-bough and fertility.\(^{57}\)

I would like to suggest, in passing, two hypotheses; the first that the important part of the thyrsos might have been not the ivy-leaves but the narthex-stem, as is suggested by the occasional use of the word νάρθηξ as substitute for θόρος.\(^{58}\) And I cannot resist the further suggestion that the origin of this implement may have lain not in ancient tradition

---

\(^{50}\) F.-G. von Papen, Der Thrysos (Berlin, 1905).

\(^{51}\) The only black-figure vases known to me on which the thyrsos is found are later than 530 B.C.; perhaps the translation to black-figure drawing was not easy, as is also suggested by the variety in style of the instances found. The examples are: Hapsels, ABL 53, Vienna 196, published by Jacobsthal, Orn. pl. 5: several vases by the Diosphos painter, e.g. CVA Robinson Collection i pl. 30, 1, CVA Gallatin Collection i pl. 7, 7, CVA Goluchow i pl. 13: and three quoted by de la Ferté (RA xxxviii (1951) 15 n. 6).

\(^{52}\) Rev. de l’Histoire des Religions ixi (1912) 1 f.

\(^{53}\) E.g. Euripides Helen 1360; Bacchae 176, 1054. Once at least thyrsos are explicitly distinguished from branches; Palaiphatos xxxiii (= Myth. Gr. iii 2 p. 50 Festa), describing the Bacchae following Orpheus; αἱ δὲ νάρθηκας τότε πρῶτον ἐκοινοὶ κατέβαινεν ἐκ τοῦ δρόμου καὶ κλώνας δεκάρων παντοδαπῶν.

\(^{54}\) Anacreon fr. 113 Diehl (= 108 Bergk) is dubious; see Weber, Anacreontica (Göttingen, 1895).

\(^{55}\) E. Rohde, Psyche (English tr., Oxford, 1925) 127 n. 4.

\(^{56}\) Reinach, in the article referred to above, gives references to the word in three later writers (Lykophron, Alex. 459, 720, 929; Oppian, Kyneg. i 26; Orphic Argonautica 907, 1089, Hermann). The most obvious meaning would be ‘sacrificial victims’ in Lykophron, where the context is not Dionysiac, and ‘sacral rites’ in the others. Reinach carries his argument far beyond the evidence in including the sense of τῆς ῥᾶς ‘rage’ in the word and concluding with the meaning ‘branches’ since they are the only portable sacrificial implements. Etymologically the suffix would seem to suggest ‘things with which . . .’


\(^{58}\) E.g. Euripides Bacchae 251; and the mystery-saying quoted below.
or primitive orgiastic rites but in the mystery-cults. For this view there is a very little
evidence: the mystery-saying ναρθηκοφόροι μὲν πολλοὶ, βάκχου δὲ τε παθροὶ and the presence
of a narthex amongst the contents of the mystic cista.59 (Nilsson's last article in the Lenaea-
Anthesteria controversy, over the occasion of the scenes before the icon of Dionysos, has
prevented reference to the possible association of both thyrsoi and mystery-cult influence at
the Lenaea.)60

This completes the presentation of the concrete evidence upon which arguments must
be founded. From this point clear demonstration becomes almost impossible and I am
well aware that much of the following can be radically altered by shifts of emphasis and much
must be considered purely speculative. But in my opinion two important and fairly clearly
defined characteristics present themselves.

The first of these is the lack of clear distinction, in the minds of the black-figure painters
in particular, concerning the features of the beings whom they drew; the female companions
of the satyrs pass gradually from figures who would without hesitation be called nymphs
into those who, because of the addition of certain attributes, it would probably be agreed
should be called maenads, just as in the Homeric Hymn xxvi (to Dionysos) the nurses of the
child-god become his ecstatic worshippers. But there is otherwise little change in the
character of the scenes, and the presence or absence of the nebris, pardalis, or snakes makes
no perceptible difference. A little later, the question of exactly what is being depicted
becomes still more difficult to decide because there is most obviously further confusion
between the satyr-maenad motif and the originally quite separate development of komast
or padded dancer scenes. To a lesser extent this continues into red-figure; some mytho-
logical or other motifs are carried on, including above all the qualities and habits of the
satyrs, and the same names are often used for black-figure nymphs and red-figure maenads.61
It seems that the artists' conceptions of the figures they were drawing constantly became
blurred after the motif had been in use for a period of time, which is more likely to happen
when the scene is legendary and there is no definite association in the artist's mind between
the mythological beings whom he drew and the actual practice of cult with which he was
familiar.

The second and even more interesting feature is the sudden appearance from time
to time of certain innovations, which often rapidly become widespread and endure for
greater or lesser lengths of time. This is a common occurrence in vase-painting of any
period, but seems particularly striking in Dionysiac scenes. Sometimes the changes are
simple introductions of fresh scene-motifs, of which a good example is the sudden popularity
of the 'enlacement' theme at the transition period, which breaks in as the older themes—the
Return of Hephaistos and vine-harvesting—have become debased and played-out; others
are apparently changes in conception of the characters, perhaps the best examples of which,
in different associations, are the introduction of naked female figures into the Corinthian
komast vases and the change, in the classical period, to the depiction of Dionysos himself as a
youth instead of the stately, bearded, Zeus-like figure of pre-classical painting. The more
important of these innovations falling within the scope of the present study may conveniently
be grouped here. They are: the introduction of women into the komast vases of Attica
and Corinth, in the first and second quarters of the sixth century; the introduction of snakes
on Attic vases of about the middle of the century; the introduction of the nebris and a little
later of the pardalis (these, like the snakes, are found only on Caeretan hydriae amongst

59 The mystery-saying, Plato Phaedo 69C (text of
Burnet, OCT); the cista, Clem. Alex. Protrept. ii 19,
Potter, quoted by Reinach loc. cit.
60 Nilsson, 'Dionysos Likites' (Bull. Soc. Royale des
Lettres, Lund, 1951-1952 i f.). On the Lenaea, the
evidence is given by A. Pickard-Cambridge, Dramatic
61 See C. Fränkel, Satyr- und Bakkhenamen (Halle,
1912) 43.
the non-Attic fabrics); some changes in dance-movement at the introduction of red-figure, together with the more frequent appearance of maenads alone, the lack of response shown to the lascivious designs of the satyrs, and the appearance of the hysterical behaviour to which Dodds has drawn notice; and the introduction, again at the beginning of red-figure, of the 'artificial' thyrsos.

The causes of these changes, again, must remain little more than suggestions. Some may be attributed to sudden inclusion of fresh, but traditional, mythological material, a parallel instance to the adoption of the theme of the Return of Hephaistos; here one might include those less practical and almost exclusively Attic attributes, the snakes and the pardalis, and, in agreement with Dodds, the portrayal of ecstasy or hysteria, which the painters could hardly have known first-hand. Some are brought about by gradual over-familiarity with a theme and lack of comprehension of its significance, like the frequency of the donkey-rider, the abandonment of the exclusively ithyphallic nature of the satyrs, and perhaps the continuation of satyrs even in the probably realistic scenes of ritual before the icon of Dionysos; possibly too the absence of men from the thiasos scenes. To these might be added the gradual change which seems to occur in female figures, from nymphs to mythical maenads to maenads with realistic traits. And finally there is evidence that the depiction may have suddenly included material of actual life and common knowledge and combined it with traditional elements; for instance, with fair certainty, the representations of the worship before the icon of Dionysos, the mannerism of clutching the sleeves which has been mentioned above, the later occasional appearance of the chorus-men satyrs of the satyr-play and, I suspect, the use of the thyrsos itself. It is possible that the big changes of motif at the introduction of red-figure are only concomitants of that same innovation in painting technique and arise, like it, from exhaustion of previous inspiration and an influx of new; but although it is clear that the representations are intended to be depictions of traditional tale, not of actual cult-practice, it is nevertheless tempting to suppose that the changes which have been noticed are reflections of innovations in cult-practice, including possibly drama, which have been suggested on other grounds.

As sources for the nature of the legendary tradition or for the current conception of maenadism or of the god Dionysos himself the confusion of elements drawn from different sources and the prevalence of the use of a fashionable motif make the vase-paintings worth very little; just as in the literature of the time (for instance in the juxtaposition of disparate ideas in Herakleitos' words on mystery-mongers) the confusion of different elements proceeds too rapidly to enable much information to be extracted except by theory. This has been amply shown above by the plentiful evidence for the mixing of originally separate characteristics within the period from early black-figure to Late Archaic red-figure. There are also, however, certain facts observable in the sudden appearance of new elements, several instances of which have been described above, and from these it is possible to infer certain definite changes in conception and sometimes, as with the introduction of the thyrsos, even to accept them as evidence for a change in cult-practice. Further knowledge of the actual

---

62 A debatable point, however; see Dodds, HTHR xxxii (1940) 170 n. 71 and references there. But it is not easy to go against Herakleitos fr. B15 (Diels) where Ἑράκλειος are mentioned, and the adventures of Scyles in Herodotus iv 79.
63 See Brommer, Satyrspiele (Berlin, 1944).
64 E.g. by T. B. L. Webster, Bull. London Inst. of Classical Studies v (1958) 43-6.
66 Cf. de la Ferté, op. cit., 13: 'Au disparate des origines correspondent une certaine complexité de caractère sans qu'on puisse dire pourtant que l'évolution typologique se soit conformée à ce que nous savons de l'histoire du culte dionysiaque; au contraire, les divergences sont frappantes.'
cult-practice which may underlie the mythical scenes will most probably come from discovery or interpretation of particular vases, and may well reveal eventually the changes in cult or drama which were reflected in these innovations in the paintings.

Brown University.

Mark W. Edwards.
THE GALLUS AND THE LION

Anth. Pal. vi 217–20, 237

(PLATE VIII. 1)

A GROUP of epigrams extending in the sixth book of the Anthology from 210 to 226 and seemingly derived from the Garland of Meleager includes four on the subject of a Gallus, or emasculated attendant of Cybele, who is preserved from the unwelcome attentions of a lion. They are ascribed as follows: 217 τοῦ αὐτῶ (= Simonides), 218 Alcaeus of Mitylene, 219 Antipater, 220 Dioscorides. A fifth epigram at 237, by Antistius, comes from the later Garland of Philip of Thessalonica and is inspired by the earlier poems. The alleged authors of the first three need only a word. The Alcaeus of 218 is evidently the Messenian and not the Lesbian; in a group from Meleager Antipater must be the Sidonian, not the Thessalonian; and whether with Reitzenstein and Geffcken we trace the ascription of 217 to Simonides to deliberate imposture, or with Wilamowitz to a scribe’s careless repetition of the heading of the four preceding epigrams (where τοῦ αὐτῶ meant Σιμώνιδος), it is patently ridiculous, for the style is plainly Hellenistic and Γάλλος do not appear in earlier Greek. Dioscorides seems to have flourished towards the end of the third century B.C., Alcaeus was writing about 200 B.C., and Antipater perhaps half a century later. ‘Simonides’ is naturally not datable. Reitzenstein said that his epigram was obviously (*jeder empfandet*) based on Dioscorides, Geffcken that it was Dioscorides’s model; and as the epigrams are connected only by their common subject, we are free to believe either or neither. In any case the whole group of these four epigrams cannot be widely separate in date. They belong to the period in which the Phrygian orgiastic cult of Cybele, the repens religio of Liv. xxix 10.4, was spreading abroad. It was in 204 B.C. that Attalus allowed the stone representing her to be removed from Pessinus to Rome, and thirteen years later that her temple on the Palatine was dedicated and the *ludi Megalenses* were established.

AP vi 218, by Alcaeus, though not the earliest of the four, differs in detail from the others. In it the Gallus, here called Myrpos ἄγαργης, encounters the lion on Ida and beats his timbrel in terror. The lion, inspired by the sound, closes his jaws and, like Cybele’s lion in Cat. ixiii 83, whirls his mane with the enthusiasm of a devotee; whereon the relieved Gallus dedicates him to Rhea, no doubt as a welcome addition to her stable of carrion-lions. There would seem here to be some connexion with a fragment of Varro’s *Sat. Menippeae* (364) preserved by Nonius (p. 775, Lindsay): *non uidisti simulacrum leonis ad Idam eo loco ut quondam subito eum cum uidissent quadrapedem Galli tympanis adeo fecerunt manusum ut tractarent manibus?* Leonidas, in an epigram which follows these four and is on a similar theme, relates how an elderly lion took refuge on a wintry night among the goat herds in the fold and when the storm was over withdrew without harming them; whereon they dedicated a picture of the scene to Pan. Alcaeus’s epigram at any rate might be epichrestic and inspired by such a picture.

1 I write the word Gallus with a capital G but without prejudice, and call his patroness Cybele unless Rhea or Mater Deorum or Magna Mater is prompted by the context. The testimonia for the cult are collected in H. Hepding’s *Attis* (Gieszen, 1993).
3 RE iii A 196.
4 Sapph. u. Sim. 203. It is perhaps as likely that the epigram was transferred from some other context to join the three others on the same theme and brought with it the heading τοῦ αὐτῶ which in the original context had another meaning. I have illustrated the confusion which such transfersences may cause in ‘The Gk Anth., Sources and Ascriptions’ (*JHS* Suppl. Paper no. 9) 35.
5 Wilamowitz (*Hell. Dicht.* ii 292) thought Dioscorides’s the earliest of the epigrams.
Antistius follows Alcaeus in staging the episode in a wood, but in the three remaining epigrams of the earlier set the scene is a cave. In ‘Simonides’ and Antipater the Gallus is taking shelter from a snowstorm; in Dioscorides he is seeking a resting-place for the night. In all three, as in Antistius, he beats his timbrel, and the lion, unable to face the uproar (increased in Antipater by the howling of the Gallus), retires in disorder. In Antipater the Gallus makes no dedication in gratitude for his preservation, and the epigram therefore should not be in Bk. vi. In ‘Simonides’ he dedicates to Rhea ἐνυτά καὶ ξανθῶς πλοκάμους, in Dioscorides θαλάμων and his timbrel. Before we consider the meaning of ἐνυτά and θαλάμων it will be well to look at the get-up of Galli, for we chance to have evidence of appropriate date.

In the year 190 B.C. when a Roman army under C. Livius Salinator appeared before Sestus, ἕξελθόντες μὲν Γάλλοι δύο μετὰ τῶν καὶ προστηθίων ἔδοιν χιλιόν ἄνικεστον βουλεύονται περὶ τῆς πόλεως. 6 In the following year, when the consul Cn. Manlius Vulso crossed the Sangarius, παραγίγγοντας Γάλλοι παρὰ, Απτίδος καὶ Βαττάκου τῶν ἐκ Πεισιονύτος ἱερῶν τῆς μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν ἔχοντες προστηθίδα καὶ τῶν τῶν 7 and promise him success. The word τῶν seems to be almost technical in this connexion, for in Dion. Hal. ii 19 we hear that a Phrygian man and woman carry the goddess about the streets of Rome to the sound of pipes and timbrel μυργαρούροντες τῶν παρὰ τις περικείμενοι τοῖς στήθεσι. Cornutus 8 says that the worshippers of Rhea τῶν περὶ τῶν αὐτῆς περιτριθείας, and when Heliogabalus Ματρὶ Deorum sacra accept et tauroboliation est ut typum eriperet et alia sacra quae penitus habentur condita 9 it was perhaps her pectoral rather than her image (or sacred stone) which he was after, for among his whims was to drive a team of lions and proclaim himself the Mater Magna. 10

Some light is thrown on these insignia by Herodotus at a much earlier, and by Roman monuments at a much later, date. Anarcharsis, we are told, returning to Scythia via Cyzicus after his travels, happened there on a festival of the Mother of the Gods and made a vow that if he got safe home he would establish such rites in his own country. In due course he retired to a woodland retreat in Scythia, and τῶν παρὰ τῆς έχον καὶ ἐκδημάμενος ἄγαλματα set about fulfilling his vow. The king of Scythia, however, fetched by a prying observer to witness these proceedings, brought them to an abrupt close with an arrow. 11 Anarcharsis imported no train of dervishes, but evidently he modelled his costume on what he had seen at Cyzicus, and his ἄγαλματα were what the later writers call τύπου. They were reliefs of divine personages, and may be seen on Roman monuments, two of which are here reproduced. Plate VIII. is a relief of Antonine date in the Palazzo dei Conservatori 12 and represents a man whom we may safely call a Gallus. In his right hand he holds a spray of foliage and a pomegranate; in his left a bowl of fruit with a pine-cone, 13 about him are the instruments of his cult—cymbals, scourge with heads of Zeus carved on the handle and astragali knotted into the thongs (the μάστις πολυστράδας of a Gallus in AP vi 234), cista, Phrygian pipes, timbrel. Long thin locks with bindings at frequent intervals fall on his shoulders. He wears earrings and necklace; on his head a circlet with a roundel of Zeus flanked on either side by one of Attis; on his chest a pectoral shaped as a naiskos containing a bust of Attis. Fig. 1 is the upper part of a life-size figure which was taken from Rome to Paris and published by Montfaucon in 1719. 14 It was then at the country seat of a M. Foucault but has since disappeared. The man wears two necklaces; on his

---

6 Polyb. xxi 6.7 (μὲν Π. Toup, μεγάλοι codd.). Livy (xxxvii 9.9) says of this incident fanatice Galli cum sollemn habitu.
7 Polyb. xxi 37.5 (see p. 92 n. 30). Livy (xxxvii 18.9) says cum insignibus suis.
8 N. D. 6.
10 Ibid. 28.
11 Hdt. iv 76.
12 Stuart-Jones Catalogue 254, pl. 100.3.
13 For the pomegranate see Arnob. v 6, for the pine ibid. 7, Ov. Met. x 109, al.
14 Antiquité Expl. i pl. 4, from which my figure is an excerpt. Carcopino's suggestion (Méll. d'Arch. et d'Hist. xl 237) that the statue is a forgery seems highly improbable.
breast two roundels of Attis, and below them a naïskos-shaped pectoral with Attis asleep in the pediment, over a figure of Cybele in her crenellated headdress holding a timbrel and flanked, if the drawing can be trusted, by Hermes on her right and Zeus on her left.

FIG. 1. From Montfaucon, Antiquité Expl. i, pl. 4.

To these two representations may be added a pectoral not in naïskos-form, and a naïskos which is not a pectoral. The first is an oval medallion worn by Laberia Felicina, a high priestess of the Magna Mater, and representing a bust of a bearded figure, presumably the Idaean Zeus. The second appears on a monument in the museum at Ostia assigned to the second half of the third century a.d. On the lid of the sarcophagus is the recumbent figure of a man who wears a Phrygian cap and has a cista at his feet; on one of two reliefs belonging to the same monument the same man is seen sacrificing to Cybele, on the other to Attis. He carries no ornaments on his breast, but in all three representations wears on his right forearm a kind of armlet on which is a naïskos enshrining figures. The carvings are rough, but Mr G. Rickman, who has kindly examined them for me, reports that on the lid of the sarcophagus the naïskos contains a seated female (no doubt Cybele) who wears a crown and is flanked on either side by an unidentifiable standing figure; and that the naïskoi on the smaller reliefs appear to conform.

Fortified by this information we may return to the ἐνδυρά of 'Simonides' (which appear

15 Amelung Cat. of Vatican Sculpture ii 614, pl. 58.
16 Calza Necropoli del Porto di Roma 205, to which Sir John Beazley kindly drew my attention. The differences in the ornaments of these men presumably indicate differences of sacerdotal rank, but we know next to nothing of the organisation. On Archigallii see Carcopino, loc. cit.
17 I note in passing that on the armlets the figures in the naïskoi have their heads towards the man's wrist, their feet towards his elbow, as though they were intended for his contemplation rather than a spectator's. Also that in the third century B.C. the ornaments worn by Cybele's attendants would seem sometimes at any rate to have been of gold; for in Ap. vii 709 Alexander Aetol. makes Alcman say that if he had remained in his native Lydia κέρας ἤ τις ἀν ἡ μακέλας χρυσοφόρος. The priest from Pessinus who appeared before the Senate in 102 B.C. was wearing χρυσοθούτα στέφανα ὑπερμεγάθη καὶ σταλήν ἀνθίνην διάχρυσον (Diod. xxxvi 6).
again in Antistius) and the θαλάμη of Dioscorides, on both of which the commentaries of Jacobs and Dübner are silent. The translators, Latin, English, French, agree that ένδυτά are garments, and as Galli on sacrificing their manhood assumed female dress,18 their costume, as well as their long hair, was distinctive. All the same, it does not appear very likely that it would be dedicated, and since the word means merely ‘things put on’ and is used, for instance, of armour19 and fillets,20 I suggest with some confidence that it here means ‘trappings’ and refers to the τύποι and ornaments we have been considering. θαλάμη is more difficult. Lapauwe (in Dübner) translates aedem, and Waltz ‘sacrautre’, but the conjunction of timbrel with a shrine as yet non-existent is awkward, and Waltz was reduced to translating ἀντίδεμαί ‘je fais voue de te considérer’. Paton, no doubt feeling this difficulty, said ‘I dedicate to thee my holy thalame’, adding in a footnote ‘These were receptacles in which the organs of these castrated priests were deposited’. He cited no authority but was, I suppose, relying on Nic. Al. 7, where Nicander, speaking of Cyzicus, says ἰχει τε Ρέας | Λοβρίνης θαλάμαι τε καὶ ἀργαστήριον Ἀττεω, and his scholiast explains that Λοβρίνης is a mountain near Cyzicus, and the θαλάμαι are τόπου ἱεροί ὑπόγειοι ἀνακείμενοι τῷ ’Ρέα ὡς θείοις τὰ αἰώνια κατείθεντο οί τῷ Ἀττε εἰς τῇ ’Ρέα λατρεύοντες. But Nicander’s θαλάμαι are places, not receptacles, and they lend no support to this interpretation; moreover we are told by Prudentius,21 and could have guessed without being told, that the act of mutilation itself constituted a dedication of these relics to the goddess, and the scholiast’s κατείθεντο does not encourage the belief that the devotee retained them.22

The word θαλάμη (μαί) is used of secret places—lairs of animals,23 the cave of Trophonius at Lebadea,24 and, more surprisingly, τόπου ἱεροῖ Διοσκούριον.25 Nicander and Dioscorides alone use the word in connexion with Cybele, but as Dioscorides calls his hero Κυρέλως θαλαμύσσος and Rhianus in AP vi 173 uses the same word of a female votary, θαλάμη may have had more connexion with the now appears.26 Dioscorides wrote ιρὴν σοι θαλάμην . . . καὶ λαλάγμα | τοῦτο . . . ἀντίδεμαί and since the demonstrative may go with both nouns, and ιρὴν be proleptic, he could mean ‘I dedicate this cave to be sacred to you’. I think however that we should consider whether θαλάμη does not denote one of the ένδυτά, namely a naiskos-ornament such as those described above. The word is no doubt more suitable to a cave or grotto in which Cybele was worshipped (as at Cyzicus) than to an architectural façade, but the name would remain after pious hands had embellished its setting. One thinks of Lourdes and the Sacro Speco at Subiaco. It is true that we do not know what the τύποι and προστρήδια worn by Galli in the second century B.C. were like and cannot be sure that naiskoi were among them, but there is nothing improbable in the supposition, and pectoral and tambourine make a much more congruous pair than cave and tambourine.

Whether the θαλάμη is or is not part of the votary’s outfit, the timbrel is so, and so are ένδυτά and θηκαμοί in ‘Simonides’; and since they are marks of vocation their dedication is surprising, for to part with them would most naturally mean that the dedicators were

18 Ἡθολυχίτων says Antipater of his hero.
19 Eur. I.A. 1073.
20 Eur. Ion 224, fillets round the omphalos; and Troad. 257, worn by Cassandra, no doubt, as Beazley points out, on the neck (cf. Aesch. Ag. 1265).
21 Peristeph. x 1666; Schol. Luc. p. 60 (Rabe) says they were dedicated to Atiss.
22 Arnob. v 14 might imply that they were buried, as also a mysterious gloss in Hesychius, θαλάμαι στήλαι ἐπικαλάμενα τοῖς αἰδεόις τῶν ἀποκόσμων.
23 E.g. Od. v 432.
24 Eur. Ion 394. The word is there plural and shows that Nicander’s θαλάμαι need not be more than one sanctuary.
25 Ael. Dion. fr. 199, Phot. and Ammon. s.e. In that sense the word is said to be oxytone. According to Ammonius this information comes from Tryphon; it is therefore of respectable antiquity.
26 In 173 (Rhianus) a female votary on retirement deposits her hair at the shrine; cf. 165. In view of the three epigrams mentioned above Wilamowitz ought not to have said (Hell. Dicht. ii 293) that castration sentenced a man to the service for life. In 234 the retiring Gallus seems to be a mere novice (νεήτους).
abandoning the service of the goddess. Thus in AP vi 51 (anon.) a Gallus, χαλκοκοτοὺς παναρμένου μανής, dedicates cymbals, pipes, timbrels, knives, and hair; another in 94 (Philip), λυσιητήρα γυμνάσας πώδα, the same except the hair (as he is old perhaps he has none); and in 234 (Eriuci) a third, ἐκ λοίπους ἀρτια παναρμένους, timbrels, scourge, cymbals, and hair. That can hardly be the implication here, for these two Galli cannot be so ungrateful as to abandon the service of a goddess who has just rescued them from lions. Some other dedications in AP vi however present a similar problem. When workmen dedicate the tools of their trade they most commonly do so because they are retiring from it, but there are epigrams in which huntsmen,27 a farmer (41), women (288), and others (118, 305) add to such dedications a prayer that they may be more successful in future; and since they are therefore not going out of business they might be supposed to need its implements. A modern might take them to church to be blessed and retain possession of them, but if that was ancient practice also, the language of some of the epigrams makes it plain that they do not envisage it.28 It is possible that we are to think of representations or models of the objects (like the model oxen in 40), a view favoured by 288, where the gifts are ἐργάνον ἐκ δεκάτας, or of discarded specimens, but the dedication of hair (at any rate) rules out such an explanation in the case of the Galli, and I cannot solve the problem.

The poem of Dioscorides raises some other questions, to which partial answers may be found. Dioscorides calls his hero Πάλλος (v 8), but his opening words are:

Σάρδος Πεσσανόντες ἀπὸ Φρυγὸς ἔθελ’ ἱκέσθαι
ἐκφρῶν μανωμένην δῶν ἀνέμοια τρίχα
ἀγνὸς "Ἀτος, Κυβέλης θαλαμίπτωλος.

"Ἀτος is the name of several members of the Lydian royal family;29 the godling of the Phrygian cult is called "Ἀτης and "Ἀττις, and we have already met this word as the name or title, not of the godling, but of a high dignitary of the cult at Pessinus.30 According to Strabo (xii 567) the priests at Pessinus ἔτοι παλαιὸν μὲν δυνασταὶ τω̂ς ἤσων, and we possess letters written by Eumenes II to an Attis in 163 B.C.31 In Catullus’s poem (Ixxiiii) however Attis, though introduced by that name even before his self-mutilation, is evidently neither the godling32 nor an important functionary but a novice33 who takes the name of his patron deity as Βάκχοι take the name of theirs.34 "Ἀτος in Dioscorides is generally, and I think rightly, equated with "Ἀτης, "Ἀττις, and might therefore be either godling or devotee. There is however among the varied accounts of Attis one which appears to be in Dioscorides’s mind. According to Hermesianax35 Attes was the son of a Phrygian named Calaus and was born impotent (οὗ τεκνοποιοῦ; note that Dioscorides says that he was ἀγνὸς, not that he was castrated). When he grew up he removed to Lydia and Ἀνδοῖς ὄργα ἐξέλει

---

27 13, with the imitations (11, 15 f., 179-87).
28 118, 152, 183, 305.
29 Hdt. i 7, 34, 94; vii 27, 74; Strab. v 219, 221.
30 According to Strabo one of them was father of Tyrrhenus who led the Lydian settlers to Etruria. Hence perhaps the plainly fictitious Atyss king of Alba (Liv. i 3.8), cf. Virg. Aen. v 568.
31 Polyb. xxi 37-5 (see p. 90). For Bardexis, another priestly title in that passage, see Diod. xxxvi 6; Plut. Mar. 17.
32 See on this point Kroll Catullus 130; Hepding Attis 140; Wilamowitz Hell. Dicht. ii 292.
33 In this poem, which no doubt reflects a Hellenistic original guessed by Wilamowitz to be by Callimachus (see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 761), Attis lands in Phrygia from foreign parts, is seized with enthusiasm, and, unmanning himself, puts himself at the head of a band of devotees, who reach the house of Cybele and fall asleep ashamed. Attis wakes disillusioned, and making his way to the coast mourns for the life of a Greek youth which he has lost, until a lion, detached from her carriage for the purpose by Cybele, chivvies him back to his duties. In Dioscorides the lion does not appear until enthusiasm has cooled (ἀγναὶ δ’ αὐτῶι ἐφύγη χαλέπης πνεύματα θεοκρίσης). Whether this is more than a coincidence I will not guess. It is hard to see why Dioscorides introduces this point, and, if his meaning is that the lion is reminding Atyss of a task which he was about to shirk, it is far from clear.
34 Cf. Rohde Psyche 7 ii 14, 26.
35 Fr. 8 ap. Paus. vii 17.9.
THE GALLUS AND THE LION

μητρός, ὡς τοσοῦτο ἦκων παρ᾽ αὐτῇ τιμῆς ὡς Δία αὐτῇ νικήσαντα ἐν ἔπει τὰ ἔργα ἐπιπέμψας τῶν Λυδών, which killed a lot of Lydians and Attis with them,\textsuperscript{36} for which reason the inhabitants of Pessinus will not eat pork. The story is no more than outlined, but it is plain that Attis, whether godling or devotee, before setting out had been, like Atys in Dioscorides, in the service of Cybele at Pessinus, which was, as Cicero says, sedes domiciliumque Matris Deorum.\textsuperscript{37}

It is also plain, if I am right in connecting the two passages, why in the epigram Atys was going to Sardis. He was on an important missionary journey, and like the Galli in Polybius (see p. 89), who were also on official business, should have been wearing τύποι and προστηθίδιον. I hope that the latter was a naiskos-pectorl known to Atys as his θαλάμη.

There is no indication in what work Hermesianax wrote about Attes or what else he said, but he belonged seemingly to the first generation of Hellenistic poets and provides our earliest informative reference to Attes.\textsuperscript{38} The poet was a native of Colophon and therefore likely to have been well informed about Lydia,\textsuperscript{39} but beyond that all must be guesswork and I shall add two comments only. The Gallus-lion episode is, as we have seen, a familiar theme with Hellenistic epigrammatists, but the other epigrams show no point of contact with Hermesianax and I should guess that Dioscorides borrowed from him a setting for the story but not the story itself. Secondly, it would be an odd coincidence if the only place in Greek in which the Phrygian is called "Artos"\textsuperscript{40} should set him on his way to Lydia, where the name is known in other connexions. There is no evidence that Hermesianax called him by that name, though the fact that Pausanias, reporting Hermesianax, calls him "Arte" does not prove that Hermesianax did so, for Pausanias is retailing facts about Attes in connexion with a cult at Dyme in Achaea, where he was so named, and might not have concerned himself with a slight variation in the name. However that may be, I should guess that somebody connected, or wished to connect, the Phrygian with persons of the Lydian royal house called Atys. The best known of these, at any rate to us, is the son of Croesus, who, in Herodotus’s familiar story (i 34), was accidentally killed when hunting a boar which was ravaging Lydia. Hermesianax’s Phrygian was killed by a boar which was similarly engaged. The stories are not identical, but I think that Ed. Meyer\textsuperscript{41} and Hepding\textsuperscript{42} were right in calling attention to their resemblance.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

\textsuperscript{36} So also more briefly the scholium on Nic. Al. 8 without reference to Hermesianax or Lydia. Attes is there a shepherd with whom Rhea falls in love.

\textsuperscript{37} Har. resp. 28.

\textsuperscript{38} Theopomp. Com. fr. 27 and Dem. xviii 260 are obscure and tell us nothing.

\textsuperscript{39} The known connexions of Dioscorides are all with Egypt, where also the cult of the Μήτρη Θεῶν was established; see Visser Götter u. Kulte im Ptol. Alexandr. 43.

\textsuperscript{40} In late Latin Atys and gen. Ateos occur (see Thes. L. L. i 1147). Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Arīsŏôθa spells the Lydian name 'Atíō. Neither fact however seems to me important.

\textsuperscript{41} RE ii 2262.

\textsuperscript{42} Attis 101.
THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE OPKION TΩΝ ΟΙΚΙΣΤΗΡΩΝ
OF CYRENE

Θεός. Τύχα ἄγαθα.
Δάμης Βαθυκλέους ἥπερ· περὶ δὲν λέγοντι τοίς ὘θαῖοι[1]
Κλειδαίμας Ἐυθυκλέους, ὡς τὸς πόλις ὥρθωται καὶ οἱ δέ[1]
μὸς εὑτυχὴ ὁ Κυρανίων, ἀποδόμοι τοῖς Ὀθραῖοι το[1]
ἀμ πολιτήμαν κατὰ τα πάτρια, τὰ οἱ πρόγονοι ἑποίησαν
to, οἱ τε Κυρανίων καὶ τοῖς Ὀθραῖοι, καὶ οἱ ἐν Θήραι μέ[1]
nοντες, καθὼς Ἀπόλλων ἐδωκε Βάπτοι καὶ τοῖς Θηραίοι[1]
οι τοῖς κατοικίζοντας Κυρανίων εὐτυχεν ἐμένοις το[1]
ὁρκοις, τα οἱ πρόγονοι ἑποίησαντο αὐτοὶ ποτ᾽ αὐτῶς, ὅκα
10
tαν ἄποικιαν ἀπεστέλλον κατὰ τὰν ἐπίταξαν τῷ Ἀπόλλων
λόντος τῷ Ἀρχαγέτα· ἄγαθα τύχα· δεδόχαι τὰς δάμω[1]
καταμεῖναι Ὀθραῖος ἵσαμ πολιτήμαν καὶ ἐν Κυρανίω k[1a]
tα τὰ αὐτά· ποιεῖσθαι δὲ πάντας Θηραίοις τὸν ἐπιθυμε[1ov]
τὸς ἐν Κυρανίων τοῦ πολέμου ὅρκους, ὅπερ τοὶ ἀλλοι ποτ
15
e διώκομεν ἔνας καὶ καταστάμεν ἐς φιλάν καὶ πάτραν ἐς 
ἐννῦν ἔταιρας. Καταγράφεν δὲ τὸ δε τὸ γάφαμα ἐν 
λυγιῶν, βέμεν τὰς στάλλαν ἐς τὸ ἱαρὸν πατρίδοι τῷ
Ἀπόλλωνος τῷ Ποθίου, καταγράφεν καὶ τὸ ὅρκον ἐς τὰς στάλ[1av],
tὸ οἱ οἰκιστήρης ἐποίησαντο καταπλεῦσαντες Λιβύανδε [σύ]
20
μ Βάπτων Ὀθραῖοι Κυρανίων. Τὸ καὶ ἀνάλομο τὸ δέη 
ἀν ἦ ἐς τὰς καταγραφάν, οἱ ἐπιστάται ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀπολόγοος [κο]
μισάθοντας απὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος προσόδον.
"Ορκον τοὺς οἰκιστήρων.

25
[Ἐ]δοξα τὰ ἐκκλησία · ἐπεὶ Ἀπόλλων αὐτομάτευξεν B[ατ]
tου καὶ Ὀθραῖοι ἀποκοικίας[1] Κυρανίων, ὅριστον δοκεὶ Ὀθ[1a]
ois ἀποτέμεν ἐς τὰς [Λιβ]ίων Βάπτοι μὲν ἀρχαγέταν[1v]
tε καὶ βασιλιὰ ὡτιροῦν δὲ τοὺς Ὀθραῖους πλέν · ἐπὶ τὰς ἵσι[1]
καὶ τὰ ὁμοία πλέν κατὰ τὸν οἶκον, τῶν δὲ ἑνα, κατὰ[ε]
γεναθαι πετο ἐπὶ τῶν χώρων ἀπάντων] τῶς ἱστοντος, καὶ τῶν [ἀλ
20
λ]ων Ὀθραίων ἐλευθερίων, το καὶ λήδε], πλέν. Αἰ μὲν δὲ καὶ κατέχοο[αν]
tὶ τὰν οἰκίαν οἱ ἀποκοικία τῶν οἰκείων τὸν καταπλέουσα[τα]
ὑστερον εἰς Λιβύαν καὶ πολιτήμας καὶ τιμὰμ πεθέκε[εν]
καὶ γὰς τὰς ἀδεσποτὰς ἀπολαγχάνεν. Αἴ δὲ καὶ μὴ κατ[εχ]
αι τὰς οἰκίας μὴ ὁ Θηραῖοι μὴ διανεῖται ἐπικουρε
30
ν, ἀλλὰ ἀνάγκαι ἀνθυναι ἐπὶ πέντε, ἐκ τὰς γὰς ἁπαθε[εν]
ἀδιέστως Θηραίων ἐπὶ τα αὐτῶν χρήματα καὶ ἡμεὶς πολυῖτ
ας. 'Ο δὲ καὶ μὴ λήδε πλέν ἀποστέλλοσας τὰς πόλεις, ἀνα[αι]
μος τίνα τὰ καὶ χρήματα ἐστω αὐτῶν δαμόσα. 'Ο δὲ ἀπ
οδεκομένος ἢ ἀνθίζων ἢ πατήρ τινος ἡ ἀδελφοί ἄδελ
35
φέν παιυσετα ἀπερ ὁ μὴ λέων πλέν. Ἐπὶ τοῦτοις ὀρκία ἔπ
οιχαντο οἱ τε αὐτοὶ μένον τε καὶ οἱ πλέοντες οἰκίζοντε
καὶ ἀράς ἐποίησαν τὸν ταῦτα παρβεβούντας καὶ μὴ ἢ 
μένοντας ἢ τῶν ἐλλιμια οἰκείων ἢ τῶν αὐτῶν μὲν
ἀντων. Κηρύξοι πλασμαντες κολοσσοι κατεκαίων ἐπα
In the years immediately following the discovery of the 'Stele dei Fondatori' at Cyrene (SEG ix 3) considerable work was done on it, especially on the text, though the condition of this is still not entirely satisfactory. Some attempt was also made to establish whether the ὅρκιον τῶν οἰκιστήρων, which is included in the fourth-century Cyrenaean inscription, may be taken for what it claims to be, namely a seventh-century decree of Thera arranging for the foundation of the colony at Cyrene. The two main works devoted to this were articles by Ferri and Ferrabino. Neither of these can be said to give a final or satisfactory picture, and in fact scholarly opinion has for the most part simply followed Wilamowitz's conclusion, given in his short note appended to the first publication, that the ὅρκιον was invented for this occasion and is comparable with the later κτίσις Μαγγησίας. The most that they allow the ὅρκιον to represent is a fifth-century source for Theraean history, used both by Herodotos and the composer of this document. Meiggs is an exception in believing 'the main substance of the document . . . to be original'.

If the document were original it would be unique as a public decree of considerable length dating from the seventh century arranging a most important historical event. The Greek epigraphist, the Greek historian and anyone with special interests in Greek colonisation must all regard a decision on the authenticity of the ὅρκιον as highly desirable. Why, therefore, has there been a thorough discussion of the matter not appeared? It must be either because it is so obviously a forgery that an immediate decision is possible, or because there is not sufficient evidence or material on which to base a firm conclusion. We have almost no analogous material from so early a period, nor have we, to my knowledge, analogous epigraphical texts which quote much older documents. Thus the obvious and normal arguments from analogy are denied to scholars. So it is perhaps a dangerous or thankless task to investigate the authenticity of the ὅρκιον. But since it does not seem that the document can be lightly dismissed as a forgery, an attempt at a comprehensive discussion of the problem may at least pay due recognition to its importance to any student of early Greek history, even if no absolutely clear-cut conclusion emerges. At least the ground needs clearing of false notions and the relevant considerations need to be revealed.

In outline the plan of this paper is as follows. First, a discussion of the ὅρκιον and the literary tradition about Cyrene’s foundation, especially Herodotos’ account; with this goes closely Ferrabino’s thesis, which needs refutation but has apparently not yet received it;
secondly, the relevant general considerations about forgeries, documents from the early period and its history, together with arguments from analogy; thirdly, discussion of the detailed internal material of the text itself; and, finally, a concluding section which will also include further discussion of the relationship between our document and Herodotos.

The inscription SEG ix 3 is the record of a decree of the people of Cyrene providing that the Theraeans should have equal citizenship in Cyrene according to the agreement which (they said) was made at the time the colony was sent out. They also arrange for the publication of this agreement with the decree; so we have the so-called ὅρκιον τῶν οἰκεστίριον, which purports to be the decree of Thera providing for the establishment of the colony.

It can easily be shown that the character and contents of the ὅρκιον are, in general, in agreement with the literary tradition about Cyrene’s foundation. The article on ‘Kyrene’ in RE was published just before the discovery of our inscription; in fact it is there regretted (col. 159) that inscriptions from Cyrene are few, and the hope is expressed that some will come to light in the new excavations. The very swift fulfilment of this hope did not, however, invalidate anything written in this article (157 f.) on the foundation of the colony. The historical deductions from the partly mythical account in Herodotos, iv 145-59, that the colony was sent out under pressure of economic necessity, that Battos was its founder, that Delphi played an important part in the events—all these were confirmed by our inscription. The discussion of the relation of the decree to the literary tradition does not, therefore, involve attempts to reconcile large inconsistencies, and this agreement on fundamentals gives us at least this encouraging beginning: the principal circumstances of the enterprise may be accepted as truly represented by decree and literary tradition. But the decree could still have been invented in accordance with literary records, in which case it does not rank as an independent source and the literary tradition is only in a superficial way confirmed by it.

Ferri and Ferrabino concerned themselves with the origin of the ὅρκιον, whether it was Theraean or Cyrenaean. This is important because Herodotos’ account shows differences between the traditions from Cyrene and Thera, and, since the decree purports to be Theraean, it is naturally all the more suspect if it can be shown to represent the Cyrenaean tradition. Ferri supported the ὅρκιον’s claim to come from Thera, while Ferrabino attacked his work and tried to prove the origin to be Cyrenaean. The argument naturally rests on the difference in the two traditions given by Herodotos, so this difference must be examined first. Those who have interested themselves in Herodotos’ sources have discussed this matter. Jacoby, for instance, RE ii 436, distinguishes chapters 150-3 as Theraean and 154-6 as Cyrenaean. But I believe that greater precision can be attained, which is my excuse for treating the subject again.

The Theraean account of the oracles preceding the expedition is given in iv 150-3. This takes one from Delphi’s first command to found a city in Libya (150.3), given to King Grinnos, to the time when the expedition sailed. Once, however, Herodotos has related the departure, he says (154.1) ταῦτα δὲ Θηραίου λέγουσι, τὰ δ’ ἐπὶ λοίπα τοῦ λόγου συμφέρονται ἴτη Θηραίου Κυρηναίου, Κυρηναίοι γὰρ τὰ περὶ Βάττον οὖν διαμεῖος ὀμολογέουσι Θηραίουι. From this point to chapter 156.1 we are given the Cyrenaean account of the oracles and events leading up to the departure of the expedition. In this, it is true, the only real point of similarity between the two accounts is the unvarying advice of Delphi.10

But the point that should stand out from Herodotos’ words is that it is only on this part

---

10 The Cyrenaean account is dismissed by Chamoux, 95 ff., as a collection of fictional appendages, while Legrand (Herodote iv, Budé, 1945, 158 ff.) suggests with reason that Herodotos’ informants at Cyrene were (1) favourable to national sentiment, (2) unfavourable to the Battiads, whose rule had ended comparatively recently. This observation is relevant to the question of the name Battos, to be discussed below.
of the story that the two accounts diverged. It is notable that in the account of the later adventures of the colonists (157-8) Battos is scarcely mentioned. The Pythian speaks to the colonists, not to Battos alone (157.2), and this part of the story is clearly not to Herodotos τὰ πέρι Βάττων. My submission is therefore that Herodotos proceeded as follows. He found that the two accounts differed in the events preceding the departure. So he gave the Theraean version up to the departure, then interposed the Cyrenaean version, and after that related τὰ ἐπίλυσιν τῶν λόγων, on which the two accounts agreed. There is one very strong piece of support for this interpretation of Herodotos’ words. The end of the Theraean version is formed by the information that they despatched two penteconters to the island of Platea (153). In the passage 156.2, where we come to the actual departure, after the account of the Cyrenaean tradition, the information is the same: ἀπέστειλεν μετὰ ταῦτα τῶν Βάττων οἱ Θηραῖοι δίῳ πεντεκοντέραι. This single repetition shows exactly where the variation in the two accounts ended.¹¹

Both Ferri and Ferrabino failed to see the true scope of the difference in the two traditions, and much of their work is spoilt by this misunderstanding of Herodotos. With this firm basis attained comparisons between the decree and Herodotos’ account can be made with confidence, and we may proceed to take Ferrabino’s arguments in detail (I follow Ferrabino’s numbering of his arguments).

In argument 1 Ferrabino says (p. 250) that the phrase of the decree (24 ff.) Ἀπόλλων αὐτομαίτεν Β[��τ]ιοι καὶ Θηραῖοι ἄποι[κίσαι] Κυρίαν corresponds to a typical element in the Cyrenaean tradition, seen in the passages Hdt. iv 155.3 and Pind. Pyth. 4.60 ff., whereas the tradition of Thera said that the oracle was given to Grinnos (Hdt. iv 150.2). This argument is scarcely conclusive. It is true that we are dealing here with the events about which the two traditions differed, but even the Theraean account leaves it perfectly possible, or even probable, that the Theraeans could think of Delphi’s advice being given to Battos. Already in 150.3 Grinnos points out Battos to the god, and by the time he comes to sail there has been another visit to the oracle (151.1), and their choice of him as ἱγίςων and βασιλεύς (153) makes it probable that he had visited the god in person for advice like other oikists.

Argument 2 concerns the word Κυρίαν, where one would expect Libya. Ferrabino did not see them as such, for he does not include the event in the material on which the two traditions differed, the limits of which are, as has been shown, clear. (2) It would leave the Theraean account without an explanation of the move from Platea to Cyrene, whereas if we assume that the agreed account is resumed at 156.2 πλούσιας δὲ εἰς τὴν Λιβύην οἴκτω, both accounts tell a complete story, though the Theraean would have two occasions on which a man was left behind. A possible explanation of this might be that it was a regular procedure in stories of colonial foundations. It is better, I feel, to assume two events than to reject Herodotos’ exposition of the tradition. The differences are large enough, viz.: in 151.3 Korobios is left behind by a reconnaissance party, in 157.1 the man is left behind after two years’ occupation by the colonists; the man Korobios is not a Theraean in 151.3, the unnamed individual of 157.1 is one of the colonists; in the first passage the spies return eagerly to Thera, in the second the colonists appeal disparitely to Delphi. One cannot deny, however, that in accounts with many mythical trimmings repetitions and confusions could occur.

¹¹ Macan (Herodotos ii–iii vol. ii 265 ff.) attempted to show the scope of the discrepancy in the traditions, but, though he is partly right, I do not think he is completely so. He writes ‘the discrepant traditions concern only the actual foundation story of the Libyan colony, the person of the founder and the action of the first adventurers’; he then gives a perfectly adequate account of the differences and similarities in the two accounts of Battos and Delphi. But his statement (p. 266) ‘it is not perfectly clear at what point exactly the ‘‘Kyrène’’ story is conceived by Herodotos as ceasing to contradict the ‘‘Theraean’’’ is, I think, unfair to Herodotos, who, as I have tried to show, does make the matter clear. The reason for Macan’s statement is his belief that the variation must go down at least to the abandonment of Platea. For the procedure whereby they left one of their number behind, the rest applying to Delphi (157.1), seems to him to be a variant account of the action described in the Theraean story (151.3), where Korobios is left behind by the reconnaissance party. At first sight these no doubt look like varying accounts of the same event. But if we take them as such difficulties arise. (1) Herodotos
himself finds it surprising, but points out that it too corresponds to the tradition of Cyrene (Hdt. iv 156.2 and Pindar). This is a point of detailed wording which will be considered later. It need only be said here that it seems very doubtful if this could be said to be distinctively part of the Cyrenaean tradition. Pindar can be discounted; a poet writing when the city had long been established would easily fall into the anachronism, if it is one, whatever the origin of his material. As for the single occurrence of the name Cyrene in Herodotos' Cyrenaean version (156.2) and absence from the Theraean, this seems more likely to be chance than a true difference, especially as the Theraean tradition told of considerable previous information about the area to be colonised (151.2–153). The use of the word en to may be relevant to the whole question of the document's authenticity, but it seems too flimsy an argument when used to try to prove that the document represents the Cyrenaean, not the Theraean, tradition.

Ferrabino's argument 3 could be significant, however, if admissible. He asserts that the general similarity between the 'pseudo-Theraean' decree of our inscription and that in Herodotos is offset by three fundamental differences in detail. This argument involves discussion of the passage in the where the text is most difficult to establish.

Oliverio's text (27 ff.) runs as follows: έπι ταύ τοια[κ]α[ι] ταύ ὁμοιοι πλευς κατὰ τῶν οἶκων, νῦν δὲ ἐνα, κατά[ε]γεσθαι περ ἀπὸ τῶν χώρων ἀπαύγων τὸν ἤβαλτας, καὶ τῶν [ἀλλ]ῶν Ῥήγαων ἐλευθέρων, [ὁ καὶ λιτί], πλευς. The two important problems are the arrangement of the phrases (or punctuation) and the filling of the one gap of any length. The latest and best discussion of this problem is by Wilhelm, and though uncertainty must remain about the choice of words for the large gap, his ordering and explanation of the phrases seems convincing. He sees that the δὲ after νῦν must mark a division between that phrase and the preceding one (although it need not be adversative), so that Oliverio's κατά[ε]γεσθαι must govern νῦν δὲ ἐνα; a verb needs to be found to govern τὸν ἤβαλτας, and some qualification for νῦν δὲ ἐνα. These considerations led him to propose the following text: έπι ταύ τοια[κ]α[ι] ταύ ὁμοιοι πλευς, κατά τῶν οἶκων. νῦν δὲ ἐνα κατά[ε]γεσθαι περ Ῥῆγαων ἐλευθέρων, πλευς δὲ τὸν ἤβαλτας. This text may be used as a basis for discussion and is unlikely to be very far from the sense and wording of the original.

From this text the decree's decision was that one son should sail from each family, that they should be young men, and that of the remaining Theraeans anyone could join the expedition. We may now turn to Ferrabino's three fundamental differences of detail between the οἰκῶν and Herodotos' decree.

He asserts that Herodotos states that the lot was applied in each of the seven villages, whereas in the decree κατὰ τῶν οἰκῶν. This last phrase should probably not be taken with κατά[ε]γεσθαι, as we have seen, but even if we have there is no difference here, for Ferrabino has misread Herodotos. His words (ἄρεθρον τε ἀπ' ἄρεθρος περιπετεια) show clearly that we are dealing with families here no less than in the decree. It is after this (τε...καὶ) that we come to villages. It is true that Herodotos' words, if pressed, are not exactly Arist. Pol. 1265b, 12 ff., where the Corinthian lawyer Pheidon is said to have thought that the number of houses (families) should remain equal. The parallel seems admissible historically, but one wonders if κατὰ τῶν οἰκῶν can bear so much. Grammatically it must mean either 'by family' (LSJ s.v. κατά B) though the plural would be more usual (see examples ibid.) or 'for their home' (LSJ B 'direction towards an object') though this seems redundant, or something like 'according to house (family), etc.' (LSJ iv), which is the way Wilhelm takes it. This last seems best, but it must be noted that the expressions with κατὰ in this sense are slightly different.

12 iv 153. This assumes that the passage represents an actual decree of Thera, as I show to be probable below.
14 There still remains the difficulty of exactly interpreting κατὰ τῶν οἰκῶν. Neither Chamoux's translation (equal rights 'pour chaque famille'; p. 107) nor Oliverio's ('con equali diritti navigare da ciascuna casa'; p. 227) really represent the κατα. Wilhelm's paraphrase (p. 6) is as follows: 'Gemäss der Zugehörigkeit eines jeden zu seinen oǐkος, gewissermassen als Vertreter derselben.' And to support this historically he adduces the parallel
equivalent to the ὅρκους's viev δὲ ἐνα. It is generally thought that they mean one brother out of every two.\textsuperscript{15} Given Greek ideas about families,\textsuperscript{16} it is unlikely that the different wording would often produce a different result, and in fact it seems better to take the words as Herodotos' way of expressing the same provision rather than a fundamental difference. For the general similarity of the provisions is more striking than their difference.

Ferrabino's second difference rests partly on his reading τῷ ὅρκῳ ἐκάστῳ πάντας τοὺς ἡμῶν, which he interprets as meaning a choice by age in the families; while Herodotos says that the choice was by lot. In fact Ferrabino's reading makes very difficult sense immediately after 'one son per family', and ἡμῶν can scarcely mean 'the youngest' and represent the method of choice. This difference therefore seems inadmissible. The only difference is that Herodotos has mentioned lot while the ὅρκους does not. This point will merit consideration later, but it is not part of Ferrabino's argument.

Ferrabino says (p. 251) that the third difference is Herodotos' omission of the provision for volunteers. This has no argumentative force. Herodotos' silence could show that he thought such a provision unnecessary to mention; it was probably common to all such enterprises; but it is idle to look for reasons for an omission of this sort, or to argue from it. Thus Ferrabino fails to convince me of his three fundamental differences in detail between the ὅρκους and the Herodotean decree.

Ferrabino's argument 4 (p. 251) is rendered completely invalid by a proper understanding of the scope of the difference between the Theran and Cyrenaean traditions, such as I hope to have given above. He says that the provision for return in the ὅρκους (34-7), though it does not agree exactly with Herodotos' account of the attempted return (156.3), does give this account its 'logical presupposition', while the Theran account does not admit such a pact or its violation. Ferri's explanation of this (p. 23) is that the Theran account, whether publicly inscribed or simply traditional, avoided every unpleasantness. But the account of the attempted return, if the view expressed above is correct, is not part of the story on which the traditions diverged,\textsuperscript{17} and this comparison with Herodotos has therefore no bearing on the question of the origin of the decree.

Ferrabino's fifth argument (p. 251) concerns the dialect of the ὅρκους. He asserts that it is Cyrenaean not Theran.\textsuperscript{18} The questions of the changes which might be made in republishing a document of another state will be discussed below, and these include dialect. Here I need only anticipate by saying that there are enough examples to show that the dialect could be altered to that of the publishing state, and so does not in itself determine the origin of the document. In view of this discussion the conclusion must be that Ferrabino's thesis fails; it cannot be said that the ὅρκους represents exclusively the Cyrenaean tradition.

The second main division of this study, what I would call general considerations, may seem to some extent to float in the air, because it precedes the detailed discussion of the internal evidence, but for purposes of arrangement it is better for it to come first.

In any question of authenticity sound method demands that the burden of proof is with those who argue against it. Hence this paper will mostly consist of an evaluation of arguments against the ὅρκους's authenticity. Those who have doubted the ὅρκους's authenticity have assumed either that it was forged for the occasion or that it was taken from previous records, which is simply to date the forgery further back. Apart from the acceptance of the

\textsuperscript{15} See, e.g., Legrand, 171 n. 1, who would amend to ἀδελφον, thus (incidentally) making Herodotos and the ὅρκους in agreement.

\textsuperscript{16} E.g. Hesiod, Works and Days 376.

\textsuperscript{17} Chamoux, 98, also considers this to be part of the Cyrenaean account. This suggests that he has not noted exactly where the two accounts diverged, in spite of his statement on p. 93.

\textsuperscript{18} I have discussed this matter with Miss K. Forbes, who is working on the dialect of Cyrene, and I gather that there are many difficulties in the dialect of the ὅρκους. But this is not immediately relevant for my purposes here, as I hope to show.
orkeon's authenticity these two exhaust the possibilities of its origin: if false it is either an epigraphical forgery or the creation of a chronicle, a literary invention. These two possibilities may be examined in turn.

If it was forged for the occasion we must consider its relation to the occasion. The Cyrenaeans decide to give Theraeans full citizen rights in Cyrene according to the ancient agreement. This is apparently one-sided and led Ferrabino (p. 253) to conjecture that the renewal of an old privilege was made by Cyrene in order to make for good relations with the second Athenian League, to which Thera belonged. Zhebelioff, suggesting a later date, would connect it with Alexander's friendly agreement with Cyrene. The choice between these dates cannot be made on purely epigraphical grounds. But it is hard to see why Thera should come into the agreement between Alexander and Cyrene, and Ferrabino's connexion with the second Athenian League is ingenious but far-fetched. It is probably safer to leave conjectures and look at the internal evidence.

The document makes it plain that the giving is all on the Cyrenaean side because the old agreement was felt to be binding. The exact connexion of 4 f., ἀποδόμεν τοῖς Ἐθεραίοις τὰ μα πολιτήμαν κατὰ τὰ πάτρα is with the provision of the ὄρκον (30 ff.) ai μὲν δὲ κα κατεχόντων τέλος ἱκεσίων οἱ ἀποκοινων αὐτοῖς καὶ τούς καταπλέων ἔστερον ἐστὶν ἱερόν καὶ πολιτήματος καὶ τιμὰμ πεντάευς καὶ γὰρ τὰς ἀδεσπότους ἀπολαχάνεν, but the whole tenor of the document makes it unnecessary to look for further reasons for the Cyrenaean action. If the ὄρκον had such force for them it seems most unlikely that they regarded it as a forgery for the present occasion.

But they could have been deceived, it might be argued. The cui bono argument seems to lead to the Theraeans. The Theraeans could have prepared their forged agreement and had their ambassadors foist it on the Cyrenaeans. There is intrinsic improbability here too; it makes the Cyrenaeans too credulous and careless, and for a great, cosmopolitan Greek city much too ill-informed. Nor does the document look like a forgery for this end: to persuade the Cyrenaeans to give the Theraeans citizen rights. One clause only, that quoted above, can be referred to this object. In the rest there is no concealment of the forced nature of the expedition; the strictly limited right of return to Thera is not hidden (33–7). Even the relevant clause could have been made much more satisfactory for the suggested aim. As it stands, it could easily be contended that it only refers to the first years of the colony; for the document is arranging for the first settlement, and the return provision, next to which it stands, is specifically limited to the first years. An intended deception would surely have provided for a clearly permanent right for all Theraeans to settle in Cyrene. So much for general arguments on the assumption that it is an epigraphic forgery. There remains the approach from analogy.

Epigraphical forgery occurred from time to time throughout Greek history. The earliest we know of is probably that by the Delphian, whose name Herodotus knew but would not tell, who changed the dedication on one of Croesus' gifts to please the Spartans. Theopompus asserted that the Treaty of Callias was a forgery because it was inscribed in the Ionic letters not officially introduced at Athens until the archonship of Euclides. There is no need to list further examples to show that such forgeries are possible. But there is one inscription analogous to the ὄρκον, which appears so close that it demands special consideration. This is Inscr. v. Magnesia no. 20. Inscribed at Magnesia c. 200 B.C. (ibid., p. 15) it purports to be a decree of all the Cretans conferring benefits on the colonists and

19 See IG ii 1.179, fr. c, lines 9 and 11, which can be taken to show this.
20 C.R. Acad. USSR. 1929, 429 n. 2.
21 Diodoros xvii 49.3; Curt. Ruf. iv 7.9.
22 Mr John Cassels, who kindly examined the tone on my behalf, assures me of this.
24 FGH ii B. 115 F.154.
their leader at the time of the colonial expedition. Magnesia on the Meander was certainly founded in the time of the Ionian migrations, and the decree is a flagrant fabrication, as Wilamowitz showed with heavy irony.25

Although the difference in the dates26 perhaps weakens the argument from analogy, it is instructive to compare the ὄρκιον with the Magnesia inscription. The latter is made to bear a superficial resemblance to a foundation decree; there is provision for armed help (20 f.) and for money (15 ff., 27 ff.)—one of the more striking anachronisms. But the goodwill of the Cretans to the colonists is more fully illustrated by their granting them in perpetuity all the interstate privileges of the Hellenistic world (10 ff.): kinship and friendship for ever, meals in the pynateum, the right to import and export without tolls throughout Crete, the right to own property, and, finally, citizenship. Wilamowitz argued convincingly that the motive for this forgery was the desire to avoid the scourge of Cretan piracy,27 and the document is drawn up so as to convince readers that very friendly relations existed in the past, and to provide antiquity’s warrant for privileges in the present.

When the character of Inschr. v. Magnesia no. 20 is carefully observed it becomes clear that the differences between it and the ὄρκιον are much more striking than any superficial similarity. The Magnesian document confines itself to specifying privileges and illustrating the great cordiality of the metropolis (the role given to Crete) at the time of the foundation. We have seen that the ὄρκιον is quite different; it concerns itself almost entirely with the necessary arrangements for the establishment of the colony, and there is no attempt to show any cordiality on the part of the mother city. The Magnesia inscription shows how a forgery of this kind was made to gain present political advantage. The fact that the ὄρκιον is not like it suggests that it does not belong to the same family.

But even if it is difficult to take the ὄρκιον as a forgery for the occasion, there remains our second possibility: that it was taken from a chronicle of earlier date, and is an earlier literary invention. Inscriptions based on literary sources of a historical kind are found quite frequently. The Parian Marble, which refers to historians, was inscribed in the first half of the third century B.C., and is only the most famous of many. Other examples of ‘inscriptions of a literary character’ are collected by Larfeld,28 and Forsdyke discusses some of the most notable in a chapter of his Greece before Homer (1956) called ‘Public Instruction’. These tend to be chronicles or lists of priests and magistrates and are not obviously comparable to the ὄρκιον. They are also of a rather later date, the third century B.C. and after. At the beginning of the second century B.C. the inscriptions Inschr. v. Priene nos. 37 and 38 explicitly quote historians in connexion with an international dispute,29 but the character and date of our document, which claims to be an ancient decree, seem to make the analogy too distant. Inschr. v. Magnesia no. 17 is an account of the foundation of Magnesia on the Meander, and so is at least close in subject-matter. It is a typical κτίσις,30 decked out with forged Delphic oracles,31 and was considered to be a complete fabrication by Wilamowitz,32 though Schmid believes we have a ‘bestimmte überlieferte Tradition’.33 But being a chronicle with the stock components of the developed κτίσις of Hellenistic times it is by no means analogous to the ὄρκιον. A true analogy of a decree copied from an earlier literary invention escapes me, but we can still argue the matter on the assumption that this is the ὄρκιον’s origin.

The direct literary source is not Herodotus; and, as far as I know, no scholar has

25 Konon (FGH i 26) F.1, no. 29. The tradition is fully discussed by Wilamowitz, Hermes xxx (1895) 177 ff. See also Inschr. v. Magnesia p. 16.
26 The ὄρκιον was inscribed at Cyrene c. 250 years after its presumed date; Inschr. v. Magnesia no. 20 some 800 years afterwards.
27 Hermes xxx (1893) 191.
28 Griech. Epigraphik 510.
29 See FGH iii B, 491 and Commentary.
30 It is used as a good example of a ‘Ktisissage’ by P. B. Schmid in Studien zu griech. Ktisissagen (Diss. Freiburg i.d. Schweiz, 1947) 94 ff.
32 Pp. 190 ff.
33 See n. 30 above.
suggested that Herodotos is the direct source of our document. That he is not is clear from the details in the ἄρκινον which are not in Herodotos’ account, though the question of the relationship of Herodotos and the ἄρκινον will have to be mentioned later. The Herodotean account is a very full one, but the ἄρκινον has more detail on the actual official act of sending out the colony. If a literary invention, therefore, it must be an invention of an author more interested in Theran affairs than Herodotos. Thus it seems improbable that this would be an author of a general Greek history like Hellanikos, for all his industry. The possible sources would seem to be a local chronicle or a κτίσις, a foundation story. The latter seems attractive, but should probably be dismissed, for the early poetical κτίσεις are extremely shadowy; the literary form is only certain and common in Hellenistic times. The local chronicle remains and this brings us to the question of date. The question can be put in this form, was it before or after Herodotos? Those who think the ἄρκινον and Herodotos have a common source clearly choose the former, so we may look first at the possibility of a pre-Herodotean local chronicle.

Jacoby believes that local history comes after what he calls great history; Herodotos did not use local historians so much as produce them. It seems rather overbold for a modern, however well we know the fragments, to dismiss the famous statements of Dionysios of Halikarnassos (de Thuc. 5.819) about the predecessors of Herodotos and Thucydides. These certainly suggest some quantity of historiography, even if it is denied this title, and Dionysios had access to all the material. For all that, Jacoby’s thesis only appears wrong if pressed to the point of denying any local chronicles before Herodotos. In general he has made the point that local history follows ‘great history’. Thera was not a large or flourishing place by the fifth century, so that on a necessarily risky argument from probability it seems unlikely that the few early local historians would include one of Thera. There is thus some improbability in the belief that Herodotos and our document had a common source in a pre-Herodotean chronicle of Thera. It is worth noting that, even if this chronicle had existed, on the evidence of Dionysios’ statement we should be chary of taking the author for a creator of fictions. For he states that these early writers had one aim: to present for the knowledge of all as many memorials as they found preserved in cities and tribal states, in temples and in archives, not adding or taking away anything themselves.

If there are difficulties in the way of assuming a pre-Herodotean local chronicle of Thera, a post-Herodotean one is less satisfactory as a source for the ἄρκινον. The date of the invention comes close to the inscription’s publication, so that this suggestion becomes vulnerable to the same objections which were raised against the idea of a forgery for the occasion. The invention would also, one would expect, reveal the dominating influence of Herodotos, and I hope to show later that the ἄρκινον’s relationship to Herodotos does not seem to be that of copy and model.

These arguments all show that considerable difficulties beset the theory that the ἄρκινον is a copy of a literary invention of earlier date. We have seen that there are also difficulties in regarding it as a forgery for the occasion. The general questions I want to ask are therefore concluded by this one: are the difficulties in taking the ἄρκινον as genuine greater than the ones we have found in taking it as false? If it is genuine it should suit seventh-century Thera, and this must be investigated next.

Some of the matters relevant to this question belong to the examination of the details

---

34 Or possibly Cyrenaean, though it is slightly against probability and certainly against the principle of economy of explanation to imagine that the Cyrenaecs had a chronicle which the Theracans exploited.
35 See Jacoby, Athen. (Oxford, 1949) 364 n. 62. Ion’s and Hellanikos’ prose κτίσεις seem to be the earliest definite examples.
36 Whether or not one accepts Jacoby’s conclusions about early Greek historiography (see n. 38 below), he is clearly right to look at all other early writers in their relationship to Herodotos.
37 See n. 6 above.
38 E.g. Athen. 68, 28n n. 111.
39 As Wilamowitz and Chamoux, see n. 6 above.
of the text, but the general considerations are plain enough and sufficient for the immediate purpose. The document reveals a Thera politically organised, with a monarchy and an assembly, capable of arranging a colonial expedition, of conscripting citizens for it, of inflicting the death penalty and confiscating property for the state, and with a fully developed sense of citizenship.

As we have seen no precise or definite analogies of the right date exist. But there are one or two from an early enough period to be of some use. The famous inscription from Dreros is of the right date and shows, as Ehrenberg has emphasised, a developed polis organisation, some specialisation of magistrates and the concept of the polis. For the polis is defended against the individual. Thera is not far from Crete, which flourished particularly in this early period. In spite of the controversy about its date the Spartan Rheta may also be admitted as a parallel, and this shows not only a well-developed constitution and concept of the state, but also the co-existence of monarchy and assembly in a Dorian community. The constitutional stone from Chios should perhaps be dated rather lower than Wilamowitz's 'um 600'; but this even shows definite democratic arrangements, such as rhetai, an assembly and the council of the demos.

These are not more than general analogies on the constitutional development of Greek states, but when added to the probable situation of Thera in the seventh century they gain in value. In his little paper 'die archaische Kultur der Insel Thera' (Berlin, 1897), based largely on archaeological remains, Hiller von Gaertringen described the archaic period as its 'Glanzzeit' (p. 8), and noted in particular its very early type of alphabet (p. 14 f.). This suggests that writing was introduced to Thera early and its use is shown to have been widespread certainly by 600 by the earliest epitaphs and inscriptions from the gymnasium. Though no state document is included in the inscriptions from this early period, the familiarity with inscriptions shows that the seventh-century Theracens could well have made a written record of a state act. At a similar date the people of Dreros did and the Spartans had already made a record of the Great Rheta. The fact that inscriptions before 500 B.C. are comparatively rare tends to make moderns think that public documents also must have been rare before that date. Chamoux, for example, shows this tendency, when he writes that the decree claims to be from too ancient a period to be authentic (p. 110). But, as has been pointed out, though inscriptions are originals to us, they were in fact published copies of a few originals chosen from all those on more perishable material in the state archives. The greater number of inscriptions of post-archaic date reveals an increased tendency to make public and permanent records; it does not reveal the non-existence of state documents in the early period. In general, therefore, the analogies and the probable situation of seventh-century Thera do not suggest that either the ideas or the existence of our document need be dismissed as anachronistic.

We may now turn to more detailed examination. The title of the document49 "ὄρκιον

---

49 This in particular will require further discussion in detail, but for the moment we are testing the document as it stands against the probable conditions of seventh-century Thera.
40 Clearly shown by the provision about return, 33 ff.
41 See BCH lxi (1937) 334 ff., with the correction in BCH lxii (1938) 194 ff. Published in Buck, Greek Dialects (Chicago, 1955) no. 116.
42 Guarducci dated it to the beginning of the sixth or possibly end of the seventh century, Rit. di Fil. xvi (1939) 20.
43 CQ xxvii (1943) 14-18.
44 Plut. Lycurgus 6. Although his own date seems extremely high Hammond showed the weakness of the argument for a low date (sixth century) in JHS lxx (1950) 42 ff. (see p. 42 n. 3 for bibliography). Andrews, The Greek Tyrants (London, 1936) 73, argues sanely for a date in the seventh century. It certainly cannot be later than Tyrtaios.
46 IG xi 3.563 ff. and 762 ff.
47 Well stressed by Klaffenbach, Griech. Epigraphik (Göttingen, 1957) 50 f.
48 That it is a title and not the bare record of an oath (like the frequent Attic ὀρκόν) seems certain from the larger-sized letters and 18 f.
τῶν ὁμιστήρων’ as usually translated ‘oath of the founders’ \(^{50}\) might be misleading. There is no oath recorded as such, and it might be argued that the compilers knew there should be an oath, but had no record of one. As it stands our ὄρκον is clearly not an oath. This argument against the decree’s authenticity is removed, however, by a different translation, ‘the agreement of the founders’. This makes better sense, is perfectly in accord with usage (for ὄρκον means solemn agreement as early as Homer, see LSJ s.v.) and can be justified from the inscription itself. In lines 8 f., 18, 40, 47, 49 ὄρκον is used, and in all of these the translation ‘agreement’ is perfectly possible, if not preferable; in 14 f., where διάφορως makes it certain that an oath is in question, the word used is ὄρκον.

The first words after the title, ἐδοξε ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, raise several questions. Probably the two most important are whether this sanction formula would be possible in a seventh-century document and whether the constitutional idea behind it is anachronistic. But others need consideration: if it is derivative, a product of the fourth century, then what was its origin? Is there any significance in these particular words in contrast to the more regular ἐδοξε τῷ δήμῳ ὧν θεῖος βουλή καὶ τῷ δήμῳ? The more important questions will be more easily discussed after these last ones.

At Thera there was an ἐκκλησία [sic] in the fourth century (IG xii 3 Supplement 1289.5) though there is no instance of its appearance in an introductory formula. Nor indeed have we any evidence for the formula introducing Theraean decrees till the third century, when we have [ἐ][δ][θ][κ][θ][ε][ι][ν][τ][ῷ][δ][μ][ῶ][ν] (IG xii 3 Supplement 1290.10) and ἐδοξε ταῖς βουλαι[1] [καὶ ταῖς] δήμοι (1291.2 f.). What is the value of this slight evidence? There was an assembly called an ἐκκλησία at Thera before the triumph of the koine, and, in late examples, the formula ἐδοξε ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις does not occur. Little though this is we can say that the sanction formula of the ὄρκον was probably not copied from contemporary Thera.

But we must also attempt to discover if the formula could have come from any other fourth-century source. The first possibility must be Cyrene itself, but we possess only one piece of relevant evidence, the beginning of the contemporary decree preceding the ὄρκον. Here the formula is ἐδοξεθαυ τῶν δήμων (11). This is strong evidence, even though it stands alone, that the formula of the ὄρκον was not taken over from current practice at Cyrene.

The only examples of relevant date known to me of the words ἐδοξε ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις standing alone as a sanction formula \(^{51}\) are from Calymna, Epirus, Leros and Oropos. \(^{52}\) It is scarcely likely that the composers of the document went to any of these states for models, so that we may answer our first question by saying that the evidence does not show that the formula was copied from a contemporary source. It is, however, true that the only examples of the formula that we now have are of the fourth century or later.

The next question, whether these particular words are significant, is made necessary by our knowledge that one important decree regulating colonial affairs was passed by the ‘assembly for sacred matters’. \(^{53}\) But it must be admitted that the comparison of examples of this sanction formula with the more normal ones reveals no significant differences. It seems to have been simply an occasional alternative. \(^{54}\) We may thus conclude that the

---

\(^{50}\) E.g. Chamoux, 107; Oliverio, 226.

\(^{51}\) I exclude such phrases as ἄλλαις ἐδοξε τελεῖα: Argos, IG iv 557.2.

\(^{52}\) See ‘Tituli Calymnii’ by M. Segre, AS Atene, xxii–xxiii (1952) 1.1.1 f.; B, 11 ff.; 2.1 f.; Collitz-Bechtel, Sammlung der griech. Dialektinschriften 1335.6, 5520.4; IG vii 4250.2 f., 4251.2 f. All these are, more or less confidently, assigned to the fourth century.

\(^{53}\) Tod, 33.44 f.; but see the republication by W. Vollgraff, Verhand. d.k. Nederl. Akad. van Wetenschappen (Letterkunde), Nieuwe Reeks lii, 1948, no. 2. For the assembly see fr. vi 44 f. (p. 9).

\(^{54}\) In addition to those in n. 52 I list the following examples: IG xiv 256.7, 612.1, 952.10; these, from the Western Greeks, are not quite parallel as the formula does not stand alone; it is, with slight variations, ἐδοξε ταῖς ἄλλαις καθα καὶ ταῖς βουλαῖς. The same phrase is restored at line 6 of no. 13 of Asylurkunden aus Kos, Herzog and Klaffenbach, Abh. deutsch. Akad. (Berlin, 1952) no. 1, and the restoration is defended on p. 24 by reference to IG xiv 256.7. But the phrases are not exactly parallel, so there is room for doubt. Also, from Corcyra, we find ἐδοξε ταῖς ἄλλαις in IG ix. 1 685.1, 686.1, 687.1, 688.1. All these are honorary decrees of the third
sanction formula was not invented according to current practice at Cyrene or Thera, and it was not used because of its inherent suitability to such a document. But we note that it is only paralleled from documents of the fourth century or later.

Wilamowitz said that ἐκκλησία is 'unglaublich in dem alten Thera' and that for ἔδοξε ἄδε would have been written. The word ἐκκλησία and this use of ἔδοξε do not occur before the fifth century, so the argument from silence lies at hand. To argue definitely from the non-appearance of a word before a certain date is to ignore the chance nature of our record of Greek words, so we must look also at analogous material. In early or primitive decrees the sanction formula tends to be either brief or non-existent, as on the early Elian bronzes from Olympia. But the decree from Dreros begins with a definite sanction formula similar in nature to those of later documents: "Ἄθ' ἔφαγεν πόλιν. As the first editors stated, analogous Cretan documents suggest that πόλιν is equivalent to τοῖς ἀνθρώποις and shows that the assembly of citizens is responsible for the decision. An assembly capable of state decisions has already been shown to be conceivable in seventh-century Thera. The Drierian document suggests that such an assembly could head a document with a formula expressing its sanction. On the other hand the words ἔδοξε and ἐκκλησία seem unlikely to have been used. Thus the answer to the two most important questions about these two words is this: evidence and probability suggest that the actual words of the sanction formula are not original, though the existence of a formula with this meaning would not be a constitutional anachronism.

The word αὐτοματίζειν (25) raises the question of words in the text of purely lexicographical or dialect interest. As a matter of general principle I do not intend here to draw attention to such words unless they seem relevant to our main question. For example, ἀποκλειεῖν in line 268 would be, if of the seventh century, far the earliest appearance of ἀποκλειεῖν. But the word is regularly used by Herodotos and Thucydides meaning to colonise, and the fact that it does not occur before Aeschylus (fr. 304, OCM, Sidgwick) is most probably simply due to the chances of survival. The bulk of writing preserved from before 500 B.C. is comparatively slight, yet the language had been called upon to express much of human and political experience long before this. In the case of a simple active verb meaning to colonise the first record of the word could well post-date its first use by a long interval. But there remain a few which are significant for our purposes, although they raise for the most part only lexicographical questions, and these may be taken together here.

αὐτοματίζειν is a regular late word for to prophesy, the earliest recorded use apart from our inscription being Diodoros xvi 92.2 (see LSJ, Add. et Corr. 2055). Contemporary (i.e. fourth-century) uses of the word which have been recorded are quite different in meaning (LSJ s.v.). On the other hand it is clearly wrong to say that this is a late word (in this sense) and deny the possibility of its authenticity. But for the one occurrence in

...
our inscription it would be stated that the word is confined to the first century B.C. and later; the fourth-century occurrence shows that it is much older, though it does not show how much older. But it is true that it is an unusual word and χρήσις would be expected in its place.

πολιτήσια (33) meaning rights of citizenship or the like is not found before Herodotos, from whose writings onwards it is frequent (see LSJ s.v.). The original meaning is as here. Although it would be regarded as a ‘recent’ word on this evidence, it is a word which, one would imagine, would quickly follow the use of πολιτής (πολιτάς as in line 37 or πολιτής). This is found as the antonym of ἐξεις from Alkaios onwards (LSJ s.v.). The concept is clearly not out of place in the seventh century, so there is perhaps nothing particularly suspect in the appearance of the word here in spite of the lack of other pre-Herodotean instances.

ἀδεσπότω (34) meaning ‘unoccupied’ is not exactly paralleled until Strabo (xvii 797). In the fourth century the word normally used in such circumstances may have been ἀδιαπότος (undivided). Later settlers at Black Corcyra were to have a share of τάς ἀδιαπότουs (Syll. III 141.10). The first record of the word ἀδεσπότως is in the high-flown language of a Platonic myth (Rep. 617ε) where ἀρετή is called ἀδεσποτωτος. The adjective would quickly arise from the noun however, and although ἀδειπτής is not attested before Pindar and Aeschylus (LSJ s.v.), the compilers write (ibid.) ‘not in Homer (for metrical reasons) but he uses δειπτήω’. It is difficult to find an obvious archaic word to expect in this sense. In describing the Cyclops’ island Homer uses the adjectives ἀστάρχος, ἀνίπτυς (Od. ix 122), but the composers of a decree would need more legal, less poetic words. ἀκληρος means without owner in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite 123, ἀδαστος is Sophocles’ word (Ajax 54). In a Herodotean oracle (iv 159) ἀναδιομένας means ‘to be distributed’. This variety and the lack of an obvious alternative should make one chary of condemning ἀδεσπότως, which gives the exact sense required.

ἀδεέωs (36) only occurs here (LSJ Add. et Corr.) though the adjective ἀδεές is frequent from Homer onwards. It is only worth mentioning here because of the occurrence of ἀδέες = ἀδέης in one of the archaic rock-cut inscriptions at Thera (IG xii.3 552), a connexion noted by Wilamowitz. The connexion does not, however, prove anything about the origin of the decree, especially as it could be simply chance.

θανάσιμοσ (38) meaning ‘liable to the death penalty’ is a natural extension of the word’s basic meaning ‘belonging to death, pertaining to death’, and its use here is not classified separately in LSJ. But the only other use of the word precisely parallel to this legal meaning is in the Cyrenaean constitutional document, SEG ix 1.53. There the offence of changing Ptolemy’s arrangements in Cyrene is punishable by death, and the expression used is θανάσιμος ἐσται αὐτός. This document is dated at the earliest to 322–321 B.C., so is later than SEG ix 3. It is possible that its wording was influenced by that of the ὁρκον, with the more common ἐσται replacing the ὁρκον’s τένατι, a dialect form (see LSJ s.v. τέλομαι). On the other hand it could well be argued that the phrase was a regular Cyrenaean one of the fourth century, and its use in the ὁρκον shows the Cyrenaean origin of this phrase. The meaning is not sufficiently unusual for any definite conclusions about origin to be drawn from the use of θανάσιμος here, but the existence of the exact Cyrenaean parallel certainly suggests a Cyrenaean origin.

The remaining detailed points for discussion involve more than purely lexicographical matters. It has been suggested that the presence of the name Βάττος (25 f. and 27) shows that the document cannot be from seventh-century Thera, and if Herodotos’ statement (iv 155.2) about the name Battos is accepted it must be conceded that the name could not have appeared in the original document. Herodotos suggests that the name Battos

41 Cf. Ehrenberg in RE xvi 1100; Taeger, Hermes
42 See Hiller in RE s.v. ‘Thera’ 2292 f.
originated in the Libyan name for king, which it was, and Pindar knows another name for the founder of Cyrene, Aristoteles (Pyth. v 87). Then the story of Battos’ stuttering becomes an etiological tale to explain the foreign name. Herodotos’ explanation is accepted by Parke, for example, who considers that no oracle containing Battos’ name is authentic; for him Pindar’s retention of the other name is sufficient confirmation of Herodotos’ conjecture. But there are difficulties, which have been discussed recently by Legrand and Chamoux. Legrand objects that if the name was a title meaning king all the kings should have borne it. In fact it alternates with Arcesilas like any other Greek name. If Battos had a former name it is surprising that neither Herodotos’ Theraean nor his Cyrenaean informants apparently knew it; just as it is surprising that Herodotos did not know what Pindar did. Both French authors note that Battos is a perfectly acceptable Greek name connected with the word ‘to stutter’, like the French Lebègue, although most of its holders do not in fact stutter. Legrand suggests that the stammering legend, which would easily grow up etiologically from the name and is not flattering to the ancestry of the Battads, comes from the anti-Battiad Cyrenaean source, while the explanation by connexion with the Libyan word for king was put about by a pro-Battiad source which noted the similarity of the Libyan word. Possibly the family itself had made the connexion in order to improve their standing with the natives, and Delphi was glad to agree as it showed the oracle’s prescience and command of foreign tongues. Chamoux, without referring to Legrand, makes similar suggestions: either the name Battos gave rise to the stammering legend and the resemblance to the Libyan word for king was coincidental, or the title was taken to impress the natives and then became a proper name. Legrand’s explanations seem most plausible, but for our immediate purposes we need only note that Herodotos’ suggestion is open to doubt, and thus the presence of the name Battos in our document is not necessarily to be regarded as a later intrusion.

As noted above the occurrence of the name Kupánav in line 25 has also been regarded as a sign of falsity. The name is probably from the pre-Greek ‘Aegean’ language, as its suffix -ωρη shows, and the Greeks are supposed to have found Cyrene inhabited by a Libyan population, so that it is not impossible that the Theraeans knew of the place and its name before sending out the colony. Previous Greek knowledge of the area is certain. The other true foundation decrees we possess, though of course of much later date, name the actual city to be founded. On the other hand, Herodotos’ account shows that the first Greek attempt was made on the island of Platea (iv 153, 156.3), so that either Platea or the more general Libya would seem more likely to be authentic.

A further point to be noticed in the opening of the decree is the form of the first sentence. In it we are given the motivation of the act in a clause beginning with ενει before the Theraean decision itself, expressed in the words ὀφειδέν δοκεῖ Θη[ναίο][λ]εῖ. Such an arrangement of the opening is characteristic all over the Greek world in the fourth century, but is not found to my knowledge in early inscriptions, so that it would seem very unlikely to belong to an authentic seventh-century inscription.

63 Parke and Wormell, 74 ff.
64 P. 155 (n. 10 above).
65 Since the former name is so relevant to the argument Herodotos puts forward, the argument ex silentio seems admissible. Chamoux’s (p. 97) ‘cet autre nom qu’Hérodot ne daigne pas préciser’ seems to gloss over the difficulty.
66 Legrand, 155 n.; Chamoux, 95.
67 It is a common enough Greek name (cf. Pape, Grie. Eigennamen, 1911, s.v.). To his list add IG vii 1556; SEG i 352.1, ix 174, 175, 176, x 237.12. The earliest examples, however, are the kings of Cyrene, and it is possible that all the others were derived from them. The earliest non-Cyrenaean bearer is the Corinthian leader in Thuc. iv 43.6.
68 P. 156.
69 See on this whole question Bertholdy, Mélanges Boinasq i (Brussels, 1937) 47 ff.
70 Naupaktos, Tod, 24; Brea, Tod, 44.
71 See Larfeld, Grie. Epigraphik 343 f. His statement that the form of opening with the motivation expressed by an ένει or ένειοι clause is found in early documents was supported by his first example only, and this is now differently restored and dated to the fourth century (see Hiller, IG v 2 xix 65 ff.).
Of the phrase ὅμοιον δοκεῖ Ἡθαιός Wilamowitz wrote ‘ganz neu; ὀρθῶ im solchen Sinne ist sonst wesentlich poetisch’. On the whole the appearance of a rare word suggests authenticity rather than the opposite. It has been seen that a poetic source is not likely, but it could still be argued that the word was inserted to give the forged document a high-flown appearance. The matter seems too uncertain for any clear conclusion to be drawn.

The appearance of the word ἀρχαγέταν (27) was quickly seen to be particularly interesting,72 for one of the ancient inscriptions from Thera (IG xii 3.762) contains this word, and it can be argued that the Theran written it for king.73 Wilamowitz maintained that it was the ‘echt’ word, and the addition of βασιλεία could be taken as an explanation of it and considered an interpolation. He has been followed by others.74 Certainly the connexion with the language of seventh-century Thera is encouraging, but objections can be made to the suggestion that the two titles or offices are simply two words for the same thing, one old, one new. In the first place there is the fact that Herodotos also has two words in the passage iv 153, in which he records the Theran decision to send the colony: εἶναι δὲ ὁμοιὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ βασιλεά Βάττον. The implications of this will be discussed below, but, as Herodotos could not have copied our document, his use of two titles makes one disinclined to see βασιλεία as a Cyrenaean explanation of ἀρχαγέταν. Secondly, there was a cult of Battos Archagetas at Cyrene (SEG ix 72.22) as also of Apollo Archagetas (e.g. our own inscription, line 10). The Cyrenaecans therefore were accustomed to the word in its more familiar sense of leader, especially colonial leader (see LS7 s.v.). Thus the two titles express two aspects of Battos’ position, as could be expected; he both led the expedition and was king of the new city.

The phrase ἐνί ταύ ἵπται καὶ ταύ ὀμοία in 27 f. raises the questions whether this equality is in place in a colonial expedition of the seventh century and whether this formula would have been used to express it. From the middle of the fifth century the phrase is frequently found, a widely used formula (LS7 s.v. ιπτα). The earliest occurrences are at Gortyn (Inscr. Cret. iv 72.2), in the Athenian decree about Hestiaea (IG ii 40-41.4) and in Thucydides (i 29.1). The Gortyn inscription is of the same period as the great Law of Gortyn and to be dated c. 450 B.C.,75 and that from Hestiaea not long after 446 (loc. cit.). All three deal with land or colonial settlement. The appearance at Gortyn suggests that the phrase was an old-established formula for such uses rather than a recent Attic invention. It is noteworthy that neither of the two important words are the products of democracy. The Spartan peers were ὀμοίοι, and ἰόνομα was an aristocratic ideal in sixth-century Athens.76 Although there is to my knowledge no evidence from early colonies which shows that lots were equal,77 it certainly was the normal behaviour later, even in oligarchic communities,78 and the Greek obsession with γῆς ἀναδομή suggests a familiarity with the idea of equal shares in the land, which colonial practice may well have provided. For these reasons there seems to me no need to be suspicious of this provision.

The word ἑταίρως in 27 suggests authenticity. We know that there were ἑταιρεῖαι at both Cyrene (see our inscription, 16) and Thera (IG xii.3 450.18). Clearly the group came from Thera to Cyrene. Such groups grew out of the Homeric ἑταίριοι,79 the band of close companions of a lord, and it is presumably in this sense that the word is used here:

72 See Wilamowitz, 40.
73 See the discussion by Hiller, JdI xlvi (1932) 127 ff., where he defends the reading 'Ἀρχαγέτας Προκλῆς, i.e. King Prokes, in preference to taking 'Ἀρχαγέτας as a proper name. By connecting it with King Prokles of Epidaurus and arguing from letter forms he comes to the date first half of the seventh century.
74 Besides Hiller (p. 129) see Risch, Mus. Helv. xi (1954) 34 n. 59.
75 See Guarducci, Riv. di Fil. xvi (1938) 264 ff.
77 The story of Aithiops, the Syracusan colonist mentioned by Archilochos (see Athen. 167d), merely shows that the colonists all had lots, as we should expect; it does not say that they were equal.
78 E.g. the Corinthians, Thuc. loc. cit.
79 See Busolt, Griech. Staatskunde i 250 f., 327 f.
the colonists are the ἔταιροι, of Battos. There is perhaps also the possibility that the meaning is ‘those Theraeans who are members of the ἡταιρείαi shall sail’, but the wording seems to favour the other alternative. In either case the unusual expression, when combined with the existence of the ἡταιρείαi, has an authentic look.

One of the most striking aspects of the document is the change from regular infinitives after ὅρκες to narrative aorists at line 40. While Ferri (p. 22) decided from this that the document is genuine to this point, but that the narrative section is based on a historical source, Wilamowitz, using most doubtful etymological arguments, thought that the narrative section was ancient because it is free from ‘recent’ words, and the decree forged. Chamoux too (p. 109) thinks that this section proves the decree to be forged. But these authors have not expressed all the implications in this intrusion of narrative.

The most important one concerns the question of forgery. If the whole document was forged for the occasion, then it seems certain that it would all have been in the normal decree style and the infinitives would have persisted throughout. There would have been no difficulty in expressing what we are told in narrative in terms of decreed instructions. Thus the distinction between the narrative section and the decree proper seems to show that the whole document is not a forgery for the occasion; to append narrative to a forged decree is not a way to convince people that it is an archaic Theraean enactment. If there was no attempt to deceive, the narrative, by its very distinction from the rest, also shows that the composers knew exactly the scope of the decree; they thus had a source in which the decree existed as a decree.

This investigation of the text itself has revealed several words or phrases which are probably of the fourth century (ὁδος, ἐκκλησία, θανάσιος), and though arguments can be found in each case against concluding this certainly, to employ these arguments in such a number of instances (and others may have escaped me) would suggest special pleading. On the other hand the general arguments against the hypothesis of forgery are reinforced by the appearance of ἔταιροι for example, and by the implications of the added piece of narrative. If some of the wording probably belongs to the fourth century but the document in general seems genuine, then the evidence points to the conclusion that we have a genuine document edited in the fourth century.

Although there is no precise parallel it is worth looking at the changes which Greeks admitted in publishing texts. The first question is that of changes of dialect. If we do not include treaties among them, the only decrees regularly published outside the issuing state were honorary decrees; hence this is the only category of decree considered by Buck in his treatment of this question.80 These, he finds, were normally published in the dialect of the state responsible for the decree.81 Our document is, however, not an honorary decree, so that it is probably wrong to apply this rule and conclude that it should be in Theraean. The Athenian Coinage Decree (ATL D.14) is probably a better analogy. The examples of this which have been found show that this Attic decree was published in some places with Ionic spelling and forms, for example in the fragments from Cos and Aphytis, and even with some simple changes of wording. If our document is placed in Buck's category of treaties, as it perhaps should be, it would be normal for it to be in the dialect of the publishing state. Thus it would not be at all abnormal or surprising if the Cyrenaean publishers changed a Theraean document into their own dialect.

But the changes seem likely to have gone beyond dialect. It must be remembered that the Greeks did not demand complete verbal accuracy as we do in legal documents. A revealing example is found in the Quadruple Alliance of 420, of which we have two texts, one on stone (Tod, 72) one in Thucydides (v 47). Thucydides purports to give the exact terms, yet there are changes, which Tod lists (p. 177). These are orthographic, certain changes of form not affecting the sense, a few omissions, and in one case an addition.

80 AJP viii (1913) 133 ff.
81 A notable example is IG xii.2 15.
Although attempts have been made to account for these, even by changing Thucydides’ text to force agreement, a remedy rightly rejected by Buck (p. 156 n.), the truth is probably that Thucydides, even when copying, allowed his own usage to replace the wording of the text, omitted a few words thought inessential, and even added on one occasion words he thought necessary.

Purely epigraphical evidence shows the same thing. Wilhelm showed that the two copies of the Attic decree about first fruits at Eleusis (Tod, 74) were very probably cut by the same stone-cutter, yet variations between the texts occur, and this when the two communities concerned were as closely connected as Athens and Eleusis. Similarly quite considerable differences are found between Athenian and Delphic editions of the same Amphictyonic Decrees.

If such differences were allowed between contemporaneous copies, we should not be surprised if changes were made in publishing a very ancient Theraean text at Cyrene. Such a text would appear very different from the decrees they were used to. Its opening especially would seem bare, and it is around the opening that the wording seems particularly suspect, as we have seen. One remembers Polybios’ difficulties in interpreting the ancient treaties between Rome and Carthage (iii 22.3). The Great Rhetra is again an illuminating parallel; as Hammond has pointed out, the actual wording cannot be original, as it is not in the Laconian or Delphic dialect. Analogies have shown how far the Greeks were ready to change the wording of documents. A seventh-century Theraean decree would be hard to understand and unfamiliar in form for a fourth-century Cyrenaean. Some editing seems only too probable, and the fourth-century appearance of some of the wording, and especially of the opening, could well be attributed to this.

In conclusion there is one further matter relevant to this discussion which demands consideration; it is the passage Hdt. iv 153, the sentence beginning Θηραίων δὲ εἶδεῖ. It raises the question whether Herodotos or his source knew of a Theraean decree about the colony, and, if so, whether it was our document in its ancient form. The lines of inquiry available are Herodotos’ practice about recording such documents and the comparison of the contents of this sentence and our decree.

So far as I know the state documents buried in Herodotos have not received the treatment given to those in Thucydides. The inscriptions in Herodotos have been well discussed by Volkmann, but these do not include possible treaties and decrees. Thucydides, though he occasionally quotes treaties, never gives us the exact words of a decree. When he gives what was clearly a decree of the people his practice is to give his own paraphrase, just as Herodotos does, as can be seen by comparing, for example, Thuc. vi 8.2 and Hdt. v 97.3. Even when he gives many clauses of what was almost certainly a recorded decision, as in viii 67.3 (cf. 69.1), the establishment of the Four Hundred in 411, he uses his own words and is, we may be sure, much briefer than the legal phrases of the original.

There are many treaties and public decrees in Herodotos’ work. The treaties are listed by von Scala, Die Staatsverträge des Altertums (1898), though he omits i 150.2. I add here what appear to me to be the probable Greek decrees in his work: i 151.3, 152.2, iii 46.2, iv 146.2, 153, v 96.2, 97.3, vi 22.1, 66.1, 106.3, vii 144.3, ix 106.3. Although he never reveals his source it is difficult to believe that none of these was taken from a written record. He never quotes, but simply introduces the main decision in his own words with εἶδε or ἐδόθη. The passage iv 153 is one of the fullest records of a public decree; detailed enough to make one reasonably sure he is using a written record, yet so brief as to suggest he has only given what he wanted. There is no possibility of proof or of showing his source, but it can be said that the comparison with other state decisions recorded in his work shows that he is probably giving here a definite Theraean decree.

82 JHS lx (1950) 44.
83 These are listed by Colin, BCH xxiv (1900) 89.
84 See n. 23 above.
If we compare Herodotos’ decree with the ὄρκιον we note that Herodotos only gives the decision to send out the colony, the choice of leader and the choice of personnel. These topics are all relevant to his immediate description of the despatch of the colony; the other matters dealt with by the ὄρκιον would be less relevant. Close comparison is only possible between the arrangements for personnel and the choice of leader. We have already noticed that both Herodotos and the ὄρκιον give Battos two titles or offices; Herodotos uses ὑγρεμόνα and the ὄρκιον ἀρχαγεῖταν for the first; both use βασιλεύς for the second. The concept of both, that Battos is to lead the expedition and be king of the new state, is clearly the same. This agreement is striking.

In view of the textual uncertainty it is difficult to draw any certain conclusions from comparing Herodotos’ arrangements for personnel with those of the ὄρκιον. We have already seen that his ἀδελφεῖς τε ἂπ’ ἀδελφεῖα, though different from the ὄρκιον’s κλών δὲ ἔνα, is probably only another way of expressing the same provision. His addition of πάλιο λαγόντα, and his statement that the men came from all seven villages could be looked on as explanations about Thera and procedure necessary for a general history. The latter phrase is certainly different from the decree’s provision for volunteers, though it could be an extension in thought to the effect of that provision. The fact that Herodotos’ decree is much shorter and yet contains certainly one statement not found in our document (the choice by lot) makes it most improbable that our text was made up from Herodotos by filling out his bare bones. For such a process everything in his brief sentence would certainly be utilised before recourse to invention. Comparison between the ὄρκιον and Herodotos’ decree thus reveals on the one hand that it is wrong to regard the ὄρκιον as a forgery based on Herodotos. On the other hand the exact agreement on the two titles of Battos and on the provision of personnel in the most important point (i.e. conscription by families) shows that it is not impossible that Herodotos or his source had access to the ancient Theraean decree. Certainly the passage is favourable to the hypothesis of a recorded decree at Thera and more favourable than not to the possibility that this is the decree produced with changes of wording at Cyrene.

This attempt at a full consideration of the arguments bearing on the question of the authenticity of the ὄρκιον τῶν οἰκιστήρων has not led to a proved conclusion. The difficulties in general in assuming the document to be a forgery, either of the fourth century or earlier, have been shown, yet some of the words and expressions have been seen to be probably not original. The matter seems to come to a question of wording; can a document which is not in the exact words of the original be called authentic? We should not think so. But we ought not to let our preoccupation with exactly authentic wording lead us to condemn the document as a whole as false. For this rigid attitude conflicts with other evidence and strong arguments. Unless these can be clearly disposed of it seems better to regard the content of the ὄρκιον τῶν οἰκιστήρων as original.

A. J. Graham.

University of Manchester.
THE TOPOGRAPHY OF THE FROGS

To attempt to relate the fantasies of Old Comedy to reality is no doubt a hazardous business. But the burlesque must have been based on facts, and familiar facts at that, if it was to be effective; and it may enlarge our understanding of the Frogs, and heighten our appreciation of its humour, to inquire what relation the journey of Dionysos may have had to places which were known to Aristophanes' audience. The places alluded to in the course of the journey have been identified in various more or less conflicting ways since at least the time when the Arguments to the play were written. There has been little hesitation over accepting at any rate some of these identifications, for it would certainly have been funny to see Dionysos call on Herakles in, say, Thebes or Tiryns; proceed from there to the Acheron or the Styx; and finally meet the souls of the Initiates in the underworld, moving in an everlasting procession to a ghostly Eleusis. But the fun would surely have been much more pointed had it been more consistent and relevant to the everyday life of the Athenians themselves; and it is the purpose of this article to suggest that it did in fact possess this consistency and relevance—that Dionysos was actually represented as following a route perfectly familiar to the audience, visiting places well known to them and indeed even in view to them as they sat in the theatre. At the beginning of the play Dionysos is on his way to call on Herakles and ask him what route he followed when he went down to the underworld to fetch Kerberos. Dionysos quickly reaches the house of Herakles, and if we take the indications of the play literally at this point we may conclude that this house was not far from Athens. It soon becomes clear that this conclusion is right. Herakles shows by his intimate knowledge of affairs at Athens that he lives in or near the city, and it is easy to see where he lives. He is not the Herakles at Melite, from whom he is sharply distinguished (501); but since Xanthias, when impersonating him, claims to be thinking of the Herakleia in Diomeia (650 f.), he must be the Herakles honoured in that festival. The Herakleia in Diomeia were the principal festival of Herakles at Athens, and were held at Kynosarges, a place outside the walls and not far from the Diomeian gate.1 There was a Herakleion there, between the city wall and the Ilissos; and that is evidently the house of Herakles in the Frogs.

When questioned about the route to the underworld Herakles tells Dionysos that immediately on leaving the Herakleion he will come to a great λίμνη (137). Can we take this literally, too? If we can, the λίμνη must also have been in the relatively narrow piece of ground between the city wall and the Ilissos. Not an impossible position, on the face of it; but consideration of this point involves the larger question of the whereabouts of the sanctuary of Dionysos ἐν Λίμναιοι. For Dionysos certainly arrives at this λίμνη immediately on leaving the Herakleion, as Herakles said he would, and it is indeed a λίμνη and not a river, for Xanthias is able to run round it. But when he is rowing across it the songs of the Frogs make it clear (215–9) that he is in their marshy haunts—in their temenos, to which the crowds come in drunken revelry τῶν ἱεροῖν Χύτρων. There is a well-known difficulty here. The temenos of the Frogs is evidently the sanctuary ἐν Λίμναιοι, but that sanctuary was closed on Anthesterion 13th, Chytroi: it was open on only one day in the year—Anthesterion 12th, Choes.2 How then can the Frogs describe the crowds as coming 'at the Chytroi'? It has been suggested that if they came towards the end of the day on the Choes, the revelry would probably go on until after sunset, which marked the beginning of the next day, Chytroi, and in that case the phrase used by the Frogs would be justified.3

1 Cf. Harp., Suid., s.v. 'Ἡράκλεια'; L. Deubner, Topographie von Athen2 169 f., 422 f. 2 Dem. lix 76. Attische Feste 226. On Kynosarges see W. Judeich, 3 Cf. Deubner, 100.
But this is unconvincing. It seems more likely that τοῖς ἱεροῖς Χθύπους is not a locative of time, ‘at the Chytroi’, but a dativus commodi, ‘for the Chytroi’, qualifying κραυμαλάκωνος. For κραυμάλη is not so much ‘drunkenness’ as ‘the sequel to drunkenness’, ‘hangover’; and one does not have a hangover while revelling, but only after the revelry. The crowd described as κραυμαλακώνος are therefore not merely revelling in a drunken fashion, but revelling in such a way as to bring on a hangover; and they are doing this, not at the Chytroi, but in preparation for the Chytroi. At the Anthestheria the Choes was the day of festivity, the Chytroi the day of gloom and mourning. The drunkenness was entirely appropriate to the former, the hangover to the latter.

The temenos of the Frogs, then, was the sanctuary ἐν Ἀλίμωας, to which crowds of revellers came at the Choes; and on the evidence of the play, taken literally, this sanctuary was between the city wall and the Ilissos, close to the Herakleion at Kynosarges. The position of the sanctuary has, however, long been the subject of controversy, and the site generally accepted for it is not near Kynosarges. Before we can decide whether to take the Frogs literally on this point, therefore, we must consider the question of this sanctuary in more detail.

A certain amount of information about the sanctuary ἐν Ἀλίμωας has been preserved. It was recognised as one of the most ancient sanctuaries in Athens by Thucydides.4 In the In Neearam it is spoken of as the most sacred of the Dionysiac sanctuaries.5 It was originally set literally among marshes—Aristophanes’ song of the Frogs makes this clear—although by Strabo’s time the area may have ceased to be marshy.6 It seems to have covered a large area, for there was room in it for the crowds of revellers who came there. It was a fully enclosed space, as we have seen, open on only one day in the year. It contained an altar, beside which a stele was set up (some time before the end of the fifth century, to judge by the description of the lettering) to record a decree laying down the qualifications required in the Basilinna,7 who played a leading part in the ritual of the Anthestheria. There were apparently also fourteen lesser altars used by her fourteen attendants, the Geraiai.8 There was a temple in the sanctuary, and a building, oikos, the purpose of which is not known.9 Within the temple, or somewhere else in the sanctuary (perhaps in the oikos), was a secret place which no one but the Basilinna ever entered.10

The site of this sanctuary has been identified by Dörpfeld and others with the triangular sanctuary, dating back to the sixth or possibly the seventh century and apparently Dionysiac, which he excavated west of the Acropolis in the hollow between the Areiopagos and the Pnyx. The position of this is alleged to be favourable to the formation of a marsh; and other features of the site—the single entrance, the presence of a temple and another building, and the remains of a stone offering-table with steleai beside it—are claimed to correspond precisely to known features of the sanctuary ἐν Ἀλίμωας. This identification has been generally accepted, but it is none the less open to serious objections. No inscriptions were found to support it. There was no sign of the thousands of choes which were deposited in the sanctuary ἐν Ἀλίμωας over the years. The relatively late foundation date of Dörpfeld’s sanctuary is inexplicable in view of the antiquity of the cult which is supposed to have been carried on there. Of the features which are relied on to support the identification of the

4 ii 15-3-5.
5 Dem. loc. cit.
6 Cf. Strabo viii 5.1 (description of Sparta). The argument that Strabo, or his source, here refers to the sanctuary of Dionysos ἐν Ἀλίμωας at Athens (F. Bötte, AM xxxiv (1909) 988-92) is commonly accepted, but it is not conclusive. Bötte’s interpretation of the passage depends largely on the punctuation which he adopts; and while it is improbable, as he suggests, that such a sanctuary, otherwise unknown, existed at Sparta, it is hardly less improbable that Strabo appended to his account of Sparta a reference to Athens without noticing, or warning his readers, what he was doing.
7 Dem. loc. cit.
8 Ibid., 78; the number of the Geraiai (and, by implication, of the altars) is given in AB 1.231-32, EM 227-35.
9 Sch. Ar. Ran. 216.
10 Dem. lix 73.
sanctuary, the single entrance proves nothing, since there is no necessary connexion between the number of entrances and the frequency with which they were opened; the temple and building are open to the same objection on the score of their date as the sanctuary as a whole; and the stone offering-table, being a τράπεζα, cannot be identified with the altar mentioned in the In Neeram, for that was a βωμός, which is something quite different.

As to the possibility that marshes existed in the area, no geological authority for this has been produced; the two geologists' opinions usually invoked are not only contradictory but in fact refer to the area between the Acropolis and the Ilissos. The map shows that the site of Dörpfeld's sanctuary is actually on a low saddle between the Acropolis and Areopagos on the one side and the Pnyx on the other, with lower ground to the north-west and south-east; what the position favours is the formation of springs (Dörpfeld, indeed, found over seventy), not of a marsh. And in fact the area excavated by Dörpfeld could not have been marshy in the classical period, for on his own showing the whole of it was occupied by roads and buildings. Most important of all, the site of Dörpfeld's sanctuary is due west of the Acropolis, a position which has never been, and indeed cannot be, satisfactorily reconciled with what Thucydides tells us about it. Thucydides lists four sanctuaries, the sanctuary of Zeus Olympios, the Python, and the sanctuaries of Ge and Dionysos εν Αίγαια, and states that they were founded near to the pre-Thesean city. This primitive city he defines as the Acropolis and the area below it which had a more or less southern aspect, i.e. which lay more or less to the south. The first three of the sanctuaries which he mentions are known to have lain to the south-east or south of the Acropolis, along the course of the Ilissos; and the fourth must have lain in the same direction, too. There, and there alone, in the vicinity of the Acropolis, were two fundamental necessities for the formation of a marsh to be found: the lowest-lying ground in the area, and an adequate supply of water.

There is, however, one further requirement: the low-lying area must be such that the water stays in it because it cannot readily drain away. Was this requirement ever fulfilled? For a possible answer we must look a little farther downstream. South-southwest of the Acropolis, at a distance of about 1,500 metres, the low hill of Sikelia blocks the course of the Ilissos, forcing it to turn north-westwards and seek a way through the gap between the Sikelia and the Mouseion hills. That gap has presented no obstacle to the course of the river in modern times, but it may have been widened and deepened by erosion since the classical period. Some erosion there must have been. The destructive effects of erosion in Attica are described in the Kritis by Plato, who recognised its principal cause—deforestation. Once begun, the process would inevitably continue indefinitely, and what affected Attica generally would sooner or later affect the course of the Ilissos also. That there was at least a tradition of heavy erosion in Athens itself is suggested by the account which Plato puts into the mouth of Kritis. According to this, the Acropolis was originally a continuous stretch of high ground, rich in soil, extending from the Pnyx to Lykabettos; but one disastrous night of earthquakes and torrential rain was sufficient to crumble it away, strip off its soil, and leave it as the isolated rock familiar since historical times. After Plato's day something similar, though not necessarily so sudden, may have created or at any rate enlarged the gap between the Mouseion and Sikelia hills. Certainly the deterioration of the Ilissos is not in doubt; it is evident from the contrast between the shady stream with grassy banks, depicted in the opening scene of the Phaidros, and the unsightly dry, stony watercourse that can be seen in old photographs taken before the Ilissos finally disappeared in the modern expansion of Athens. Between the Mouseion and Sikelia hills, then, the ground level may well have been higher in antiquity than it is now.

11 Judeich, Rhein. Mus. xlvii (1892) 59, n. i.
12 Judeich, Topographie von Athen 362–6; cf. Gomme, ii 56 f.
13 Kritis 111 a–d.
14 Ibid., 112a.
higher is a question on which we can perhaps only speculate; but to the extent that it was higher there would have been a corresponding accumulation of standing water to the east, in the form of a pool or series of pools, or a marshy area. And since the Ilissos was, on the evidence of the Phaidros, a perennial stream in the classical period, this accumulation of water would have persisted all the year round.

In any event it is clear from the Phaidros that, whether for the reason suggested here or for some other, the valley of the Ilissos south of the Acropolis was more than ordinarily well watered. Both Phaidros and Sokrates refer with significant emphasis to the grass on which they could rest. Green grass in the heat of summer-time was (and is) something to marvel at in Greece; and a place which was so grassy when most of the countryside was scorched in the summer sun may well have been actually marshy at the beginning of spring.

Thus the sanctuary ἐν Αἰγόνεῳ would be in a physically appropriate place if it were somewhere near the Ilissos; and there is in fact some evidence, apart from any indications in the Frogs, of a sanctuary of Dionysos near the Ilissos and roughly south of the Acropolis. It is to be found in an inscription of 418–417 B.C., recording a decree laying down the terms on which the Archon Basileus was to let out the temenos of Neleus and Basile.\(^16\) This provided that the lessee was to enclose the sanctuary of Kodros, Neleus, and Basile and plant in it a minimum of two hundred olive trees, and to control ‘the ditch and all the rainwater that flows between the gates and the gates where the mystai drive out to the sea, and all that flows between the public house [τῷ οἴκῳ τοῖς δημοσίοις] and the gates that lead to the baths of Isthmonikos’. The preceding clause in the decree provided that it should be engraved on a stone stele and set up in the Neleion παρὰ τῷ ἱερῷ.

It is clear from the terms of this inscription that Kodros, Neleus, and Basile shared a common sanctuary, although the temenos as a whole belonged primarily to Neleus. Now Kodros, according to tradition, sacrificed his life just outside the city, not far from one of the gates;\(^17\) the spot where he met his death was shown by the Athenians to visitors, and Pausanias saw it on his way along the right bank of the Ilissos, south-westwards from the Python.\(^18\) It is virtually certain that the sanctuary of Kodros was at or near this spot—and with it the temenos of Neleus and Basile, of which it formed a part. This is confirmed by the fact that the stele itself, which was originally set up in the Neleion, was found at what were, in 1884, the southern outskirts of Athens ‘on the left of the railway [a steam tramway] running to Phaleron’, and apparently at a distance of one block of houses from the right bank of the Ilissos;\(^19\) it is a substantial slab of Pentelic marble, 1·49 × 0·64 × 0·20 m., and although it has been used as building material, it is unlikely to have been shifted far from its original position. The temenos of Neleus and Basile, then, lay outside the city between the Themistoklean wall and the Ilissos and to the east of the road to Phaleron; the usual assumption, that it lay within the city and nearer to the Acropolis, is made in defiance of this evidence. Moreover, the ditch over which the lessee was to have control can hardly have been anything but the boundary ditch round the temenos; how else could he control it? The two gates mentioned in the inscription therefore represent two points on this boundary; and the intervening stretch of wall must accordingly have formed one side of the temenos. In other words, the temenos lay immediately outside the wall, extending eastwards from the Dioclean gate, on the Phaleron road, to ‘the gates which lead to the bath of Isthmonikos’.

Where, then, was the Dionysion? It was believed by Frazer, Judeich, and others to be the sanctuary immediately south of the theatre; hence the apparent necessity of placing the temenos of Neleus and Basile within the city. But this forced Judeich, for example, to assume that the temenos of Neleus and Basile was an inordinately long and narrow strip of land cutting right across the southern half of the city, from the theatre area to the walls;\(^20\) a manifest improbability, which becomes an impossibility once the temenos is placed, in

---
\(^{16}\) IG i 94.29–38; cf. J. R. Wheeler, AJA iii (1887) 38–49.
\(^{17}\) Lycurg. 86–7.
\(^{18}\) i 19.6.
\(^{19}\) S. A. Koumanoudes, AE 1884, 161–4.
\(^{20}\) Topographie von Athen 161, n. 1.
accordance with the evidence, outside the walls. Since, however, the walls formed the northern limit of the temenos, with the Diomeian gate at its north-western corner, the ditch between this gate and the Dionysion must have run in a more or less southerly direction. Therefore this Dionysion lay to the south and adjoined the temenos of Neleus and Basile, at least at its south-western corner. We do not know the dimensions of either sanctuary; but the distance between the city walls and the Ilissos, east of the Phaleron road, was so small that the more southerly sanctuary, the Dionysion, must have been very close to the river.

So we find, first, that the only probable site near the Acropolis for the sanctuary év Alývvas was along this stretch of the Ilissos; and, secondly, that there was in fact a Dionysion here. Can it be doubted that the Dionysion of the inscription was the sanctuary of Dionysos év Alývvas?

Two objections remain to be met. One is that Isaios speaks of a house alongside the sanctuary as being év ἀστεῖ. But in fact he is speaking of two houses év ἀστεῖ, one of them situated alongside the sanctuary, and contrasting them with a country estate at Phyla; and in the context it is possible that the phrase év ἀστεῖ is used somewhat loosely to contrast with Φλυγία, and can actually be applied literally only to the other house. The other objection is that Pausanias might have been expected to mention the sanctuary év Alývvas, if he had passed so close to it. But in his day the marshes may have disappeared, and it seems probable that the cult had been largely forgotten and the sanctuary allowed to fall into disuse. Wherever the sanctuary was, Pausanias had clearly heard nothing of it. For him the oldest sanctuary of Dionysos was the one alongside the theatre.

We may now return to the Frogs. We have argued that the journey of Dionysos took him first to the Herakleion at Kynosarges, and from there to the Límn not far away, in the temenos of the Frogs; and that this temenos was the sanctuary of Dionysos év Alývvas, situated in the area between the city wall and the Ilissos. It may be supposed that once Dionysos had crossed the Límn he would, from the point of view of the audience, have passed beyond human ken. But having thus entered the underworld, he then meets the chorus of Initiates, singing their joyful hymns; and this meeting, far from being an irrelevance, or a merely general illustration of the life of the blessed after death, confirms that his entry was made somewhere near the Ilissos. For these Initiates are not mystai singing of their procession to Eleusis—that supposition, common though it is, is ruled out by their constant references to the flowery meadow towards which they are moving: there would be no flowers on the parched and dusty Thriasian plain in autumn, the season of the Eleusinian Mysteries. Nor are they singing of the flowery fields of Elysium, for the meadow to which they are advancing is not only flowery, but also marshy (ἐλευον, 352). The only other possible explanation is that the Mysteries alluded to are the Lesser Mysteries, the Mysteries at Agrai; and this suits the text admirably. These Mysteries took place in Anthesterion, just when the flowers were coming into bloom, in the very month in which the sanctuary of Dionysos év Alývvas was opened; they were performed at Agrai, just across the river from the site here suggested for the sanctuary év Alývvas; and they were concerned with τά περὶ τῶν Δόλυννον. The initiates in the Frogs have completed their initiation—they are μεμημένοι (158, 318). They have performed their sacrifice and have feasted on the victim (ἵριστηται δ’ ἐκαρκοῦντος, 377); hence the delicious whiff of pork which so delights Xanthias (338). Now they are about to set forth to a flowery, marshy meadow (373 f., 445, 449 f.; cf. 326, 352 f.) for the dancing and revelry to come. It is reasonable to suppose that this meadow was not far from Agrai; and in that case there can be only one likely site for it: it was close to the Ilissos, at least in the same area as the sanctuary év Alývvas, if indeed it is not actually to be identified with the sanctuary. Here only the topographical relationship is in question;
but this coincidence, that the celebration of the Mysteries at Agrai, which were at least partly Dionysiac, occurred at the same time of year and in the same area as the Dionysiac ceremonies in the sanctuary ἐν Αἰγυπτίῳ, goes far in itself to explain the prominent part played by the Initiates in the Frogs.

Our conclusion, then, is that in depicting the journey of Dionysos Aristophanes keeps close to the facts of Athenian topography, and thereby makes the fun all the more telling to an Athenian audience. This involves the interesting implication that there was at Athens a reputed way down to the underworld in the sanctuary of Dionysos ἐν Αἰγυπτίῳ, and that Herakles had once used this route when he went down to steal Kerberos.

*University of Birmingham.*

G. T. W. Hooker.
AIGINA AND THE DELIAN LEAGUE

It is usually taken for granted\(^1\) that throughout the first part of the fifth century B.C. until her defeat by Athens in or about 457 Aigina was a member of the Peloponnesian League and was consistently hostile to Athens and to the formation and growth of the Confederacy of Delos. I believe that the evidence for this view is weak, and that Aigina was never a member of the Peloponnesian League but probably was a voluntary member of the Delian League from its formation.

About 494 King Kleomenes of Sparta invaded the Argolid and defeated the Argives at Sepeia. For this invasion he used some ships belonging to Aigina, which he had taken by force.\(^2\) This implies that some kind of fight must have taken place recently between Aigina and the Spartans, or their allies. How could the Spartans, who were a land and not a sea power, capture ships from the Aiginetans, who had one of the largest fleets in Greece at that time?\(^2\) Only with the help of an ally whose naval power was stronger than Sparta’s. Obviously this ally must have been Corinth. Corinth was always a naval power, and at this period she was hostile to Aigina,\(^4\) and she was undoubtedly a member of the Peloponnesian League. So the forces of the Peloponnesian League fought and defeated Aigina shortly before they defeated Argos in the middle 490s. There were, of course, traditional connexions between Argos and Aigina. Argos had assisted Aigina in a war against Epidauros and Athens long before;\(^5\) while after her defeat at Sepeia Argos demanded a fine of 500 talents from Aigina as an atonement for her treachery,\(^6\) and she could not have made this demand if she had not had, or claimed to have, some kind of alliance with her. It is therefore not surprising that the Peloponnesians should attack both Argos and Aigina at the same period.

During the period 493–488 there was a war between Athens and Aigina.\(^7\) In this war Corinth helped Athens. In the middle of it the Persians attacked Athens, and Sparta, though late, sent help to Athens. Aigina on the other hand Medised (no doubt because her recent defeats had left her temporarily too weak to resist a Persian attack), and the kings of Sparta, at the request of Athens, took hostages from Aigina to ensure her neutrality during the Persian invasion.\(^8\) It is clear, therefore, that during these years Aigina was on bad terms with the Peloponnesian League as well as with Athens.

---

1. E.g. ‘Aegina . . . was a leading member of the Peloponnesian League’ (E. M. Walker in CAH iv 260); ‘[In 491] Athens was, like Aegina, a member of the Peloponnesian League’ (J. B. Bury, History of Greece (3rd ed., 1951) 259); ‘Aegina . . . no doubt withdrew from naval operations along with the Peloponnesians at the end of 478’ (ATL iii 197).
3. In Hdt. vi 89 the Athenians do not have enough ships to fight the Aiginetans until they have borrowed twenty from Corinth, making a total of seventy.
4. Hdt. vi 89; cf. Thuc. i 41.2.
5. Hdt. vi 86.4.
6. Hdt. vi 92.2.
7. Hdt. vi 87–93. See A. Andrewes, ‘Athens and Aegina, 510–490 B.C.’ in BSA xxxvii (1936–1937) 1–7, on the dates of the events in this war. His arrangement of them may be correct; but in any case the precise dating of these events does not affect my argument.
8. This event is the main piece of evidence adduced by D. M. Leahy in his article ‘Aegina and the Peloponnesian League’, in CP xlxi (1954) 232–43, in favour of his view that Aigina joined the Peloponnesian League before 491. He argues that Sparta would have had no legal right to seize the hostages if Aigina had not been a member of the League. But it seems clear to me that the case is one of might, not right. When the Aiginetans found that the hostages were demanded not just by one Spartan king (who might lack the support of the nation as a whole) but by both, they realised that resistance was useless, and decided (Hdt. vi 73.2 ἐξανάλημμεν need mean no more than this; cf. iv 154.2) to give in. To argue that this proves Sparta and Aigina to be allies seems to me paradoxical. Seizure of hostages is the act of an enemy, not of a friend.
In 483/2 Themistokles proposed that the Athenian navy should be built up to enable the war against Aigina to be renewed.\(^9\) Two hundred ships were built, but they were not used against Aigina. On the contrary, they fought side by side with Aiginetan ships at Salamis, where the Aiginetan contingent was judged the most courageous of all.\(^10\) And during this campaign Athens had enough confidence in Aigina’s loyalty to entrust her with some of her own families.\(^11\) It is clear that in 480 the quarrel between Athens and Aigina had been made up, and Aigina was as zealous as Athens in opposing the Persians. On the other hand the long-standing friendship between Athens and Aigina’s traditional enemy, Corinth, was probably beginning to decline. Herodotus’ account of the discussions of the Greek leaders before Salamis indicates disagreement between the representatives of Athens and Corinth, and though it may be exaggerated by later hostility between the two cities it must have some foundation in fact.

In 478 came the split between the Peloponnesian League and Athens which resulted in the foundation of the Confederacy of Delos—the split between those who thought that the war against Persia was finished and those who wanted it to continue. Which side did Aigina take? Her earlier alliances tell us nothing. Between 495 and 488 she fought against both Athens and the Peloponnesian League. In 480 and 479 she fought with both against the Persians. I hope to have shown in the preceding paragraphs that before 478 there is no reason to connect Aigina more closely with the Peloponnesian League than with Athens.

What other evidence or arguments are there to show that Aigina sided with Sparta and Corinth from 478 onwards?

1. The Aiginetans were Dorian. But this proves nothing. The Argives were also Dorian, but they were not noteworthy for friendship with the Peloponnesian League.

2. Aigina is said to appear in the ‘Spartan group’ on the Serpent Column.\(^12\) But the arrangement of this list of names is really too haphazard for any conclusion to be drawn from it. Those who claim that the list falls into three groups representing the allies of Sparta, Athens, and Corinth, and that Aigina falls in the Spartan group, are forced to admit, for example, that Melos falls in the Athenian group. No one would claim that Melos after 479 was an ally of Athens; this list does not prove, then, that Aigina after 479 was an ally of Sparta.

3. Polyarchos made a special journey from Aigina to Sparta to accuse the Athenians of continuing to rebuild their walls while Themistokles was negotiating at Sparta.\(^13\) But there is no evidence even that Polyarchos was an Aiginetan, let alone an official representative of Aigina.\(^14\)

4. Aigina helped Sparta at the time of the Helots’ revolt.\(^15\) But so did Athens.

There is, then, no evidence that Aigina joined Sparta and Corinth in withdrawing from the war in 478. Indeed it would be surprising if she had. The Aiginetans were traders, and so depended for their prosperity on the freedom of the seas from Persian domination. Whereas Corinth’s trade interests lay mainly in the west, where the Persians had not penetrated, Aigina had always looked eastwards.\(^16\) It was in her interest that the naval war against Persia should be continued.

So there is no reason to reject the statement of Diodoros that some years later the

---

\(^9\) Hdt. vii 144.1.  \(^10\) Hdt. viii 122.

\(^11\) Hdt. viii 41.1.  \(^12\) This point is made in ATL iii 96.

\(^13\) Plu. Them. 19.2.  \(^14\) Of course the passive of ἀποστέλλω often means not ‘be sent’ but merely ‘go’ or ‘set out’, so that Plutarch does not say that Polyarchos was sent by the Aiginetans or by anyone.

\(^15\) Thuc. ii 27.2.  \(^16\) Aigina had a shrine of her own at Naukratis (Hdt. ii 178.3), and was perhaps the only city in or near mainland Greece to take part in that colony. Even in 480 the ships that Xerxes saw sailing through the Hellespont were on their way to ‘Aigina and the Peloponnese’ (Hdt. vii 147.2).
Aeginetans broke away from the Athenians, with its clear implication that until then Aigina had been a member of the Delian League. This is his account of the war:

xi 70.1-4 (464/3): ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦτον ἀποστάντες Θάσιοι ἀπὸ Ἀθηναίων . . . ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Αἰγινήτας ἀποστάντας Ἀθηναῖοι χειρωσοῦμεν τὴν Ἀιγιναν πολυτροκεῖν ἑπεξεργάζατο· αὕτη γὰρ ἡ πόλις τοὺς κατὰ θάλασσαν ἀγῶνι πολλακίς εὐθυμοῦσα φρονείματος τε πληρής ἤν καὶ χρημάτων καὶ τριήμερων ἐπιτροπώς, καὶ τὸ σύνολον ἀλλοτριῶς ἄλλως διέκειτο πρὸς Ἀθηναίους. διόπερ στρατεύσατο ἐπὶ αὐτὴν τὴν χώραν ἐξῆγονα, καὶ τὴν Ἀιγιναν πολυκόουτες ἐπετεύχθον ἐλεύς κατὰ κράτος. καθόδερον γὰρ ἐπὶ πολὺ τῇ δυνάμει προκόπτοντες οὐκέτι τοὺς συμμάχοις ὁποῖο πρότερον ἐπικεφαλῶς ἔχοντω, ἀλλὰ βιαῖως καὶ υπερφάνως ἠμῆρα. διὸ καὶ πολλοί τῶν συμμάχων τὴν βαρβάτα φέρειν ἀδυνατοῦντες ἀλλήλοις διελέγοντο περὶ ἀποστάσεως, καὶ τινὲς τοῦ κοινὸς συνεδρίου καταφρονησαντες κατ' ἑδίκιν ἐτάττοντο.

xi 78.3-4 (459/8): τουτῶν δὲ εὐθυμησάτων αὐτοῖς γενομένων, τοὺς Αἰγινήτας ὁρώντες περιφρονησαμενοὺς μὲν ταῖς προγεγενήμενας πράξεσιν, ἀλλοτριῶς δὲ ἔχοντας πρὸς αὐτοῖς, ἔχουσαν καταπληρείαν. διὸ καὶ στόλον ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ἀξίολογον ἀποστελάντων τῶν Ἀθηναίων, καὶ τὴν Ἀιγιναν κατακομμάντην, μεγάλην ἐμπερίαν ἔχοντες καὶ δόξαν τῶν κατὰ θάλασσαν ἄγων, οὗ κατεπλάγησαν τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἔχουσαν δὲ τριήμερες ἱκανας καὶ προσκατακεκυκλάσασας ἑτέρας, ἐναμικχαράς, καὶ λευθέντες ἀπέβαλον τριήμερος ἑβδομηλίκοντα· συντριβόμεναι δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις μειώτως διὰ τὸ μεγάλος τῆς συμφορᾶς, ἑναρκαισθησαν εἰς τὴν Ἀθηναίων συντλείας καταλαμβάνω. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν Λεωκράτης ὁ στρατηγὸς κατεπράξατο τοῖς Ἀθηναῖοι, τοὺς πάντας διαπολεμήσας μὴν ἐνεία πρὸς τοὺς Αἰγινήτας.

It may be thought that in the first of these two passages the statement that Aigina to σύνολον ἀλλοτριῶς ἢ διέκειτο πρὸς Ἀθηναίουs contradicts the statement that the war was a revolt from the Delian League just like the revolt of Thasos. If it does, the one which we should reject is the single vague statement about general hostility, not the other more precise part of the account with its deliberate comparison between Thasos, Aigina, and the other allies.

Diodoros’ dates may be wrong, yet his facts may be right. He tells us that Aigina revolted from Athens, and the Athenians ravaged the land of Aigina and besieged the city (but apparently did not take it). A little later (how much later we cannot tell, for no doubt Diodoros’ dates here as often are unreliable) the Athenians resolved to subdue the Aiginetans completely. They equipped a large expedition, and the Aiginetans were defeated in a sea battle in which they lost seventy ships, and so were forced to join the Athenians’ συντέλεια. A συντέλεια is a group of cities contributing money to a common treasury. This sentence therefore means that the Aiginetans now had to contribute money to the treasury of the League; before now of course they will have contributed ships to the common fleet.

Diodoros therefore describes a revolt by Aigina from the Delian League, suppressed by the Athenians in two stages. How does this compare with the brief account of the same events given by Thucydides?

i 105.2-4: πολέμου δὲ καταστάντος πρὸς Αἰγινήτας 'Αθηναίοις μετὰ ταῦτα ναυμαχία γίγνεται ἐπ᾽ Ἀιγινή μεγάλη 'Αθηναίοι καὶ Αἰγινητῶν, καὶ οἱ ξυμμαχοὶ ἐκατέρως παρῆσαν, καὶ ἑνίκως 'Αθηναίοι καὶ ναῦς ἐξουσιοδοτούτων λαβόντες αὐτῶν ἐς τὴν γῆν ἀπέβησαν καὶ ἐπολέορκοι, Λεοκράτους τοῦ Στροίζου στρατηγοῦντος. ἐπείτη Πελοποννήσιοι ἀμέσως βουλώμενοι Αἰγινήταις ἐς μὲν τὴν Ἀιγιναν τριήμεροι ὁπλίται πρότερον Κορινθίων καὶ Ἐπιδαύροιν ἐπικοίνων διεβασάν, τὰ δὲ ἀκρά τῆς Γερανείας κατέλαβαν καὶ ἐς τὴν Μεγαρίδα κατέβησαν Κορινθίων μετὰ τῶν ξυμμαχῶν . . . οἱ δὲ 'Αθηναίοι τὸ μὲν πρὸς Ἀιγινή στρατεύματα οὐκ ἐκάνθησαν . . .

i 108.4: ὁμολογησάντως δὲ καὶ οἱ Αἰγινήται μετὰ ταῦτα τοῖς 'Αθηναίοις, τείχῃ τε περιελώτες καὶ ναῦς παραδόντες φόρον τε ταξάμενοι ἐς τὸν ἐπείτα χρόνων.
Thucydides gives a different order of events; for him the war begins with a sea battle in which the Athenians capture seventy ships, and then follows the siege, which ends in Aigina’s capitulation. This certainly seems a more natural sequence, and so is probably the right one. But is there anything in this account to cast suspicion on Diodoros’ statement that the war was the result of an attempt by Aigina to break away from the Delian League? It is true that Thucydides does not say that the war started as a revolt. But neither does he say that it did not; and this, after all, is not the only omission in his account of the Pentekontaetia.

Three other features of his account should be noticed:

1. In the sea battle with which the war began both the Athenians and the Aiginetans were supported by their allies. After this battle, the Peloponnesians wished to help the Aiginetans and so sent troops to Aigina and invaded the Megarid. This seems to me to imply that the Peloponnesians did not help Aigina in the sea battle; that is, that the Peloponnesians were not among the allies of Aigina.

2. The decision of the Peloponnesians to help the revolt by invading the Megarid recalls their decision to help the revolt of Thasos a few years earlier by invading Attica. It is the normal Peloponnesian reaction to the revolt of a member of the Delian League.

3. The terms eventually imposed by Athens on Aigina were almost exactly the same as those imposed on Thasos, which are described by Thucydides in very similar phrases:

\[ Θάσιοι δε τρίτον έτει πολυρκούμενοι όμολόγησαν 'Αθηναίοις τείχος τε καθελόντες και ναός παραδόντες, χρήματα τε δώσαν ἀποδώναι αὐτικά ταξάμενοι καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν φήρειν, τὴν τε ἡπτερον καὶ τὸ μέταλλον ἄφεντες. \]

In short, Thucydides’ account of the war between Athens and Aigina may well be the account of the suppression by Athens of a revolting ally, and I see no good reason to reject the clear implication of Diodoros that Aigina was one of the original members of the Delian League.

University of Manchester.

Douglas MacDowell.

\[ ^{17} \text{Thuc. i 101.1–2.} \]
THE BOOK TRADE IN FOURTH-CENTURY ANTIOCH

Although the papyrologist and the palaeographer have by now made the study of books in the ancient world a preserve almost peculiarly their own, it may yet be helpful to indicate literary evidence for the reading and writing habits of the educated classes in periods and places in which such modern studies have as yet been able to provide little or no material. A case in point is Antioch in the fourth century A.D., where there is considerable information embodied in the little appreciated works of Libanius, by which light is shed on the question of the writing and publication of books of various kinds. Except for some recent remarks upon copyists and book distribution in Antioch made by Paul Petit, this body of evidence has remained virtually untouched, despite its value. There are limitations, of course; Libanius has no use for any other culture than that of the Hellenic and the rhetor. Syriac is mentioned only once in all his writings, and then in a contemptuous aside (Or. xiii 31); Latin, which he realized was increasingly in competition with his own educational system, he met with determined opposition (e.g. Or. i 214, 234; x 14), while he looked upon Christian literature with all the rancour of a confirmed pagan (e.g. Or. xxxv 21; xviii 178).

To him, as a schoolmaster, and to his students in rhetoric, books were essential, but it is clear that some restrictions were imposed both on master and pupil by the availability of texts. The ordinary school text seems to have been obtainable, subject to the rules of supply and demand, but other works were correspondingly harder to obtain. One must not look to him for indications of purchase price. It may have been necessary for the parents of his pupils to purchase books—it certainly appears as a normal item in their budget—but he never descends to the mundane question of cost. He himself usually got his books by presentation rather than by purchase, and in any case he maintained his own copyist. His fellow rhetors, Acacius and Demetrius, did the same, and the lending of a text for the purpose of taking a copy was normal practice (e.g. Or. liv 68). There was, however, in addition to the demand which these private copyists satisfied in the establishments of professional sophists or the wealthy families, some market for books for which the professional copyist catered. That there was also some traffic in second-hand books is indicated by Libanius' account of the repeated attempts to burgle his library and of the theft and subsequent misadventures of his prized text of Thucydides. This turned up in the possession of a freshman who had purchased it on the open market (Or. i 1148). The ordinary student found the purchase of books a necessity, and Libanius reproves those parents who keep their sons so short of money that they are unable to buy the texts they need (e.g. Ep. 428.3).

Although the production of literary texts in Antioch was, broadly speaking, shared between the private assistant, a slave as often as not, and the commercial copyist, it cannot be said that either group was very numerous. In the years 357–358, indeed, it appears that there was a shortage of copyists in the city. Thus it is regarded as both honorific and extravagant that the prefect, Strategius, should put ten copyists on the printing of Libanius' panegyric for its distribution throughout the cities (Or. i 113), especially in view of the delays in copying which private individuals had to endure at this time before texts of any new oration could be sent elsewhere. In A.D. 361 Libanius reveals a real eagerness to relieve 1

1 Petit, "Recherches sur la publication et la diffusion des discours de Libanius", Historia v 479–509. Despite his very subjective application of Rother's rhetorical statistics, the general lines of his argument are sound, and his information good.

2 Cf. Or. xxxv 12: ἀνθίκοσαν τὰ εἰσοδία, βιβλία τε ὄνομαν. Cf. Sentent. 3.5.

his copyist, Theophillus, of unnecessary labour, even at the risk of inconveniencing a close friend, 'for it is not fair to burden the copyists to no purpose' (Ep. 263). He has the same eye to economy, as far as his own copyists are concerned, when he sends to a friend in Tarsus copies of two orations with instructions to take a copy for himself before passing them on to the one for whom they are ultimately intended (Ep. 615, 619). That this was regular practice, whether the author gave his permission or no, is indicated elsewhere (e.g. Ep. 481.2). At any rate, Libanius, as a good sophist, regards it as his duty to offer all possible support to the professional copyist also; hence his recommendation of a friend of the copyist Maenoc. He commends an Antiochene copyist who goes to Athens for employment and asks, significantly enough, that he be protected from the insolence of the students. Copyists employed in the civil service are rarely mentioned by him, though they must have been common enough; only one certain named example is to be found.4

The situation in other cities must have been less favourable for the professional copyist than that in Antioch. Libanius expresses surprise that copies of the works of Aristeides are not available in Laodicea (Ep. 1262), but the fact remains that Antioch was the clearing house for all Syria. From Antioch copies of Libanius' works, even in his own lifetime, go out to all the Greek world, so much so that the copyists were unable to fulfil the demands made upon them (Or. i 155).5 There Strategius can collect the copyists for his great publicity campaign, and there two, or often three, official courts are in session and intense business activity constantly prevails. Thus there was room for some specialisation inside the profession which could hardly have occurred in other Syrian cities. There existed a branch which dealt exclusively with the copying of legal documents—a type of employment which must have been peculiar to Antioch.6 There is no mention of the fees to be charged in any of these cases, and it should be emphasised that his interest does not extend to any language but Greek.

While the numbers of professional copyists were relatively few and sometimes unequal to the demands made upon them, those privately maintained could not have been very many either, or Libanius would not have noted the delays mentioned above. They seem to form part of the households of the very wealthy or the dilettanti alone. They were regularly maintained, either as slaves or as free men, in the sophistic establishments, as is only to be expected; Libanius, both as a student in Athens and at the beginning of his career in Constantinople, had a Cretan as his personal μητρογράφος (Or. i 43). Later in his life, he records the deaths of slaves who acted as copyists for him (Or. i 184–5), and of his secretary, whose handwriting, he notes, was much better than his own (Or. i 232).7 Short-hand was not encouraged in such establishments as his. It seems strange, at first sight, that these rhetors and sophists, who always had an eye for publicity, should not use this long-established practice, but all the evidence indicates that the pagan teachers eschewed it. This was in keeping with their tradition of memorisation, public exhibition and limited distribution, with which the methods of the stenographer were incompatible.8 Only in the most exceptional circumstances, which were in fact those of a public trial, would a sophist like Prohaeresius demand that the official court stenographers should take down a copy of his declaration (Eunapius VS p. 489). Here the Christians seem to have followed civil service practice in their methods of propaganda, and to have appealed to a wider audience than that for which the traditional oral method of the sophist catered. Origen, for instance,

7 Or. i 232: τὰ γράμματα μοι πρὸς ἐπιθετίζεις συνέπαρται βελτίω τε ὅτα τῶν εἰμόν. Identical with Maximus (φιλάς τῶν δικαίων ἡμῖν), Or. xliii 3.
8 Memorisation, cf. Or. iii 17; Ep. 376. Limited distribution, Petit, op. cit.
had shorthand writers taking down his words and working in shifts; he also had numerous copyists and girls trained in writing (Euseb. HE vi 23). Malchion, a Christian rhetor of Antioch, also employed shorthand writers in his campaign against Paul of Samosata (ibid., vii 29). Chrysostom’s sermons according to Socrates (HE vi 4), were either published by him or taken down by shorthand writers for publication later. The same practice is adopted by Julian for the official correspondence which needed the use of stenographers (Or. xviii 174–5).

Concerning the technique of the copyist, Libanius allows us a few incidental remarks which have some importance. He records that, just after A.D. 350, he and his friend Aristaenetus had come to the conclusion that the standard of writing, with regard to presentation and appearance, had declined, as compared with that of an earlier time, and he laments the absence from it of κάλλος γράμματων (Ep. 580.2).9 In A.D. 371, he regards his text of Thucydidex, which was stolen from his library, as irreparable. He describes it as easy to carry and the lettering as small and neat. This fashion of writing seems to belong, in fact, to a time early in the preceding century.10 On the other hand, big lettering is mentioned in A.D. 362 (Ep. 798). As for the differences in handwriting, Libanius has mentioned his own as compared with that of his secretary (Or. i 232), but even more interesting is the claim which he makes to be able to identify the handwriting of one of his friends at a glance, even when the signature is hidden (Ep. 44.7–8). This is one of the few comments upon an individual’s style of handwriting to be found in Greek. No fixed limit can be assigned to the life of his texts. His Thucydidex was clearly quite an old copy, perhaps 150 years old. The library of Aristaenetus’ grandfather, which caused the reflections upon the styles of handwriting in Ep. 580, was also fairly old. The items had been collected for fifty years already and may have belonged to an earlier time still. However, a text of Aristeides which he received in A.D. 361 had a life of no more than 200 years at most, for it was so affected by age that syllables showed only occasionally and no coherent reading could be deciphered (Ep. 631). A text of Hadrian of Tyre is something of a rarity (ibid.), as is the ‘Odaenathus’ of Longinus (Ep. 1078).

No less informative are his references to the writing materials then in use. Tablets were common enough, but the evidence of Libanius suggests that their use was restricted to two main purposes—for local or complimentary messages, and for schoolboy exercises.11 Papyrus as such is not mentioned as often as might be expected, presumably not through any lack of such texts but because they are more often referred to in general terms, of which βιβλία or γράμματα are most commonly used. For the most part βιβλία and χαλκία may be regarded as interchangeable.12 If any distinction is to be made, it is that βιβλία is almost always used to denote literary texts of common use in the schools or in Christian and pagan religious teaching.13 Parchment also is mentioned, sometimes in connexion with texts used in the schools, notably in the schools of law. Its disadvantage was that it produced a big fat tome, ideal as a weapon in student warfare or as a disguise for the innate stupidity of the law student, but not very well suited to the user’s convenience.14 Mostly, however, it was a term applied to literary texts not normally part of the school curriculum or which


10 γράμματα μὲν εν μικρότητι χαριέτα, τὸ δὲ σύμφων ὅσω βάθων φέρεται ὡσε αὐτὸς ἔφερον, e.g. Roberts, Greek Literary Hands, 17 ff.

11 δέλτοι—as local messages, Or. i 122; complimentary, Ep. 1021; Or. liv 35, 161; as petitions, Or. li 11 (γραμματειόν δήθην). For school exercises, Ep. 886; Or. xxxv 22: ὥσι τῶν δέλτων ἐν παντὶ πολλῷ ἔκαστῳ μηδὲ τὸν ἐπιτελεῖν ἐμπεθέλικτος; cf. Chrysostom, Vainglory, 73.

12 Cf. Or. xviii 72: καὶ ταῦτα ἐπιταττεῖ ἐκ μέσων ἀνοσταύμαν καὶ τότε τῶν βιβλίων ... ἢ γὰρ εἶχεν ἐν κεφαλί ἢ βιβλίον ἢ ὀπλά.

13 βιβλίος—as school texts; e.g. Or. i 8, 148 (his text of Thucydidex); xxv 46; xliii (study books at Athens); Ep. 1048; 842; βιβλίος—as Christian texts, Or. xxx 21; of Porphry, Or. xvi 178.

14 Or. iv 18, Eutropius, a law student, διηθέρας παχέον τε καὶ πλατέα τὰ γόατα βαρνονειας ἐφερεν; Or. liv iii 5, διηθέρα, used in student fights.
were destined to be sent elsewhere.\textsuperscript{15} The roll was still the regular form of the book, as can be seen from the few references of Libanius and Chrysostom.\textsuperscript{16} In all cases the limiting factor, apart from the time and labour of production, was that of weight, bulk and storage. Hence the need for the slave to carry the boy's books (Or. lviii 19) and the difficulty of reading a book while in a carriage (Ep. 1018.3) or walking through the forum (Or. i 8). The size and awkwardness of books were enough to make the normal posture for instruction a seated one, and the professorial chair was not merely an honour but a necessity. A large and widely spread traffic in books was also made difficult for the same reason. A cartload of books—an amazing quantity, evidently, since it was accompanied by a marriage proposal and both the proposal and the gift were presented by his friend in person—could be transported from Heraclea to Nicomedia (Or. i 54), but to transport numerous volumes from Antioch to Heraclea was a more hazardous affair. Hence Libanius feels more reluctance to burden his copyist. Julian's emphatic order to his official, that he should receive the library of George of Cappadocia in full, also reveals the difficulties of transport. The collection of a library by any man of learning involves considerable effort. It is a godsend to be allowed the free run of a library (Ep. 25.5–6), and the loss of a book is, for our scholar, a misfortune to be deplored and to be avoided at whatever cost (e.g. Or. liv 68; Ep. 347).

For both orations and correspondence, Libanius maintained his filing system, with a secretary engaged upon it. This is certainly the case, with regard to orations already delivered, in A.D. 362 (Ep. 744.5), and a generation later it is equally the case with orations composed and awaiting delivery (Ep. 877.3; cf. Ep. 949). The storage was in a κιβότων, which was the normal article of furniture for the purpose.\textsuperscript{17} For his letters Libanius displays no less care; he is able to turn to his file and produce duplicates of letters which had never reached their destination, and he can refuse to send copies of the complete correspondence between himself and Julian, offering only a selection instead (Ep. 1307; 1264). This filing system, devised with an eye to publication (Ep. 773.5), could also be used for discreet suppression of incriminating documents at a time when allegations of conspiracy were common and the spy system widely spread. He records an examination of his correspondence after the conspiracy of A.D. 371 (Or. i 175–7), and it is no accident that there is a complete gap for the period 365–388 beginning with the revolt of Procopius and ending with that of Maximus, both of whom he was accused of supporting (Or. i 163; xxxii 27). From the fact that none of his letters were discovered, it may be presumed that he had anticipated the inquisition, but at the cost of any publication of his correspondence during these years. Such prudent discretion was essential for one in his vulnerable position, not only in such times of insecurity, but even when his popularity was at its height. This is shown by the caution which he displayed concerning the publication of his oration upon his dead uncle (cf. Ep. 283), where two-thirds of the speech was delivered in public, the remainder behind closed doors and to a select audience under seal of silence, because of derogatory remarks about Gallus which might have aroused the imperial displeasure of Julian. Publication, in fact, could be a double-edged weapon. The receipt and recitation of letters from the great increased his prestige; the contents of his own letters, if spread abroad by the recipients, might cause him embarrassment in Antioch (e.g. Ep. 476–7). It was difficult to harmonise prudent reticence with the maximum publicity.

The general impression to be gained from the works of Libanius, and for that matter from those of Chrysostom, is that the demand for books in Antioch was relatively small, and
was steadiest in those circles which were interested in some form of teaching. This did not include any but a small minority of that upper class, which both teachers made the target for their eloquence. Both rail against the absence of good literature from such homes or the lack of desire to use it even when it is present. 18 While the Christians made some attempt at mass production of texts, the pagan practice was actually to restrict the output of new works, in accordance with the orator’s loyalty to the oral tradition and his upper class clientele. Opportunities for employment as copyists were comparatively few, and any extra demand inevitably led to delays in the distribution of other texts. The number of copyists was small, and the number of customers for whom they catered was also small, as was their output. A cultured intelligentsia, capable of appreciating the Greek style of the pagan master and the Christian pupil, there may have been, but, despite the influence it exercised, its very lack of numbers did not allow of any great development of the book trade in Syria at this time. To judge Antioch’s position as a centre of Hellenic culture by the laudatory remarks of Libanius is to ignore the tacit indications which he gives to the contrary.

A. F. Norman.

University of Hull.

THE ARCHAIC ACROPOLIS: SOME PROBLEMS

The literature on the Acropolis seems to me as untidy as the site itself. Every discovery that could, on the present evidence, be made about its history, every truth that could be pertinently stated has already appeared, I should imagine, in one or other of the books or articles devoted to it since the Greek excavations of the eighties. I am merely attempting the humble but, I think, necessary task of sifting out what seem to me the more interesting discoveries, the more significant conclusions. Before we form any more theories, we must try to discover what under present circumstances we can reasonably know.

In this paper I shall have space only to consider the history of the main buildings, one or perhaps two large temples and perhaps a large propylon, up to the Persian destruction of the archaic Acropolis in 480 and 479. The minor buildings of poros, with triglyphs barely 1 foot or 15 inches wide, and walls or columns consequently less than 15 feet high, will interest me only incidentally. I have found no clear evidence for the sites of any of these, not even Wiegand’s ‘Building B’, considered by J. A. Bundgaard (pp. 55 ff.) to be the precursor of the north-west wing in the Periclean Propylaea. Moreover I can isolate the problem of the large buildings more conveniently and with a clearer conscience, because it has already been isolated by C. J. Herington in his stimulating book, Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias (Manchester, 1955). His thesis is an interesting one, that from far back in the archaic period two important temples stood on the Acropolis. The more southerly, dedicated to Athena the Warrior Maiden (Parthenos), occupied a site somewhere within the limits of the present Parthenon. The more northerly and the more important in state ritual was dedicated to Athena as the City Goddess, and occupied the site between the present Parthenon and Erechtheum, generally known as the ‘Doerpfeld Foundation’. Every visitor to Athens will know this series of old broken walls just south of the Caryatid Porch. Wiegand’s is still, I think, the most workmanlike plan of it (Wiegand, figs. 72 and 117—my FIG. 1). Herington’s thesis, then, enables me to arrange my questions as follows. How many successive temples occupied the Doerpfeld Foundation, what did they look like and how were they related to one another? And again, was there any important temple on the site of the present Parthenon before the decade 490–480, generally considered the date when a marble Parthenon was first attempted? Because of its possible scale, I shall also have to consider the date and form of the archaic Propylon. If it were a large building, it could be the source of various large fragments hitherto assigned to temples; and Heberdey, the latest American books, and now Bundgaard all make it rather large, between 15 and 20 metres square. (For the actual dimensions they give, see below, pp. 146 ff.)

Before I consider these questions, I must enter one or two caveats about the Athenian use of building stones. Many scholars seem to me too ready to believe in datable fashions, and to date buildings rather precisely from the actual stone used in them. For instance, Dinsmoor and others would put the stump of Old Propylon, still preserved south of Mnesikles’ main hall, and published by C. H. Weller in A.J.A viii (1904) well after the first decade of the fifth century. For, says Dinsmoor in A.J.A xxxviii (1934) 447, it marks, with the first marble Parthenon, the beginning of an epoch, ‘that of construction in Pentelic marble’. Now presumably its marble portions are of Pentelic, although no one but Dinsmoor has said so. But is it really ‘technically similar’ (Dinsmoor, loc. cit.) to the temple? Its marble antae and facing-slabs are mere trimmings, and such composite structures of limestone and marble—Pentelic marble at that—go back as far as Wiegand’s earliest architectural remains, the H-fragments which he assigned to the oldest temple on
the Doerpfeld Foundation. These fragments are of the early sixth century. Pentelic, or marble like Pentelic, was used for life-size statues as early as Payne's favourite kore (no. 643, Payne, *A.M.S.* pl. 70, 71) and for small structures as early as c. 520 B.C. For the famous altar in the Python, commemorating the archonship of the younger Peisistratos, was of Pentelic. He would be a bold man, then, who said that the Old Propylon, because it is trimmed with Pentelic, must be dated well after 500.

Nor can we draw any safer conclusions from the use of poros or hard limestone ('calcaire'). Poros, of course, is the soft, honey-coloured stone, easily worked but badly needing a thick protective coat, so familiar to students of archaic Greece. 'Calcaire' is the hard, white limestone generally found in quarries not so far from poros—for instance, around the eastern shores of the Corinthian Gulf. There the higher hills are of 'calcaire', the lower hummocks round Sikyon of poros. The stones shade into one another. See, e.g., P. de la Coste-Messelière, *Au Musée de Delphes* 97 ff. Poros, naturally, was in greater demand for the elaborate detailing of temples. The sixth-century temple of Delphi, we know, was built of it; for the remains usefully corroborate Herodotos' words (v 62.3) *συγκεκριμένοι όφα πορίνου λίθου ποιέων των νηών.* In Attica, poros was quarried largely on Piraeus, and called Aktites Lithos (*IG* ii*2* 1668, etc.) while a favourite hard limestone of the archaic period, used for the parts of the Peisistratean Olympiaen and the lowest step of the first marble Parthenon, was the Kara stone from Mt Hymettos. Now it would have been logical for a mason with archaic tools to make Doric superstructures entirely of poros, or only their less elaborate blocks of 'calcaire' or marble. But, so far as I know, few Athenian buildings were as logical as the temples of Paestum, in which poros and 'calcaire' are most carefully disposed. One, at least, of Wiegand's smaller entablatures from the Acropolis, *D,* is entirely of poros (Wiegand, 166 and pl. 13, no. 5). But his oldest fragments, the 'H-fragments', are mostly of hard limestone, not of poros at all—the rest, as we saw, being largely of marble. On the other hand Dinsmoor (*AJA* li

I use the following abbreviations in addition to those in general use:


The following works are cited by their authors' names alone:

R. Bohn, *Die Propylaen der Akropolis zu Athen* (1882).
T. Wiegand, *Die archaische Porosarchitektur der Akropolis zu Athen* (1904).

1 Wiegand, 1–72. The metopes on one side at least were of Pentelic marble (pp. 10 ff.), and the sima (pp. 46 ff.) was of marble, again Pentelic according to Lepsius (*Griechische Marmorstudien* 122). For the name, 'H-fragments', see Dinsmoor *AJA* li (1947) 114.
2 Payne (p. 38) dates this kore before 510 B.C. It is of Pentelic (Lepsius, 73).
3 Welter, who restored the altar in *AA* 1939, 27–30, dated it to 512–511, and observed that we should not be misled by its rather Ionian inscription into dating it later. Klaffenbach, in Kirchner, *Imagines* 11, is tempted to put it even earlier. Meritt's date, 497–496, has been generally rejected, and I myself follow the majority of scholars (cf. *SEG* x 318).

There are possibly older statues and structures of Pentelic (is the gorgoneion, Payne, pl. 1, generally assigned to the H-fragments, Pentelic?), but in my rather cursory searches I have not found them. Nor could I judge for myself whether the white marble of Weller's Propylon is really Pentelic. I am no mineralogist, and can recognise Pentelic only when it has rusted. But I am sure Wiegand's words are true (Wiegand, 12): 'Je weiter aber unsere Kenntnis der attischen Marmorarten sich ausdehnt, desto mehr erkennt man, wieviel Vorsicht beim Bezeichnen geboten ist'—a conclusion reinforced by the paper of Norman Herz and W. Kendrick Pritchett on 'Marble in Attic Epigraphy', *AJA* lvi (1953) 71–83, to which my attention has been drawn by Mr R. M. Cook. There seems at present, according to this paper, no short cut to recognising the quarry from the appearance of the marble. Herz and Pritchett agree with Lepsius that both 'Hymettian' and 'Pentelic' are found on either mountain, but do not share his optimism in assigning various grades of 'Pentelic' to the one or the other.


5 '... dass sie in überwiegender Anzahl nicht aus leichtem, gelblichen Poros, sondern aus schwerem, rötlichgelbem, hartem Kalkstein bestehen' (Wiegand, p. 5).
THE ARCHAIC ACROPOLIS: SOME PROBLEMS

(1947) 126 n. 86) would put Wiegand D long after the Persian Wars; correctly, I think, in view of its simple, classical proportions. And I am inclined to do the same to Wiegand E (= Wiegand, pl. 12, no. 5) for the same reason. So poros buildings continued to rise on the Acropolis long after 480.

We must be careful, indeed, not to suppose that the Acropolis was all tidied up immediately after 479, and that then nothing was built on it except and until the marble buildings of the years 450–400. It was apparently a scene of confusion and ill-patched ruin, to judge from Herodotos v 77.3 (τειχέων περιπεδευμένων πυρί), or from the marble metope of the old H-temple evidently not buried with the debris of 479, for it has Ἀθηνᾶς καλὸς scribbled on it in lettering of c. 450. So one finds it even harder than one might have thought to know what survived the Persian Wars, and in what form. Nor can one automatically date poros buildings before 480.

We can now take the three sites possibly occupied by sixth-century forerunners of the three most important fifth-century buildings, the Erechtheum, the Parthenon and the Propylaea; and we begin with the Doerpfeld Foundation, the probable Temple of Athena Polias and supposed forerunner of the Erechtheum (FIG. 1). The foundations, described

in detail by Wiegand, 49 ff., comprise two rectangles, an inner and an outer, mutually independent, the outer for a peristyle, the inner for a cella. The inner is 34.7 by 13.45 metres, too large, I think, to be a real Hekatompedon, even if one uses Dinsmoor's long Doric foot of 32.7 centimetres. One cannot make the superstructure shorter, for the foundation-wall is less than 5 feet thick. The area which it encloses is subdivided by

---

6 Wiegand, fig. 115; IG ii 925. I do not know why Dinsmoor calls the youth Ἀτηνᾶς (AJA li (1947) 148).
7 Dinsmoor's Doric Foot is 32.7 centimetres long (A.A.G. 72 n. 1) or 32.6 centimetres (A.A.G. 195 n. 1). If, however, the Athenian foot is best measured in the stadium, it is nearly as the English 30.5 cms. and Wiegand's inner foundation must have been reckoned 114 feet long. (Buschor's 'Hekatompedon' at Samos was 33.5 metres long, according to AM 1930, Beil. 27). All the same, anything about 100 feet long could surely be called Hekatompedon by the crowd. Compare the use of γιορτένταρες and Pentekontaetia. The cella of the Periclean Parthenon could be called Hekatompedon merely because it was almost 100 feet long, not because its forerunner was an exact Hekatompedon.
walls closely resembling it in material and technique. For they are all of small blocks of blue Acropolis limestone, put together piecemeal and without fastenings. But the subdivision of the area is strange and complicated. There was, it seems, a very shallow porch at each end. Behind the eastern was a short cela with aisles, behind the western a shorter cela without them. Between the two cellas were two small adyta, side by side, occupying the full width of the building. The two-porched cela-building must have been amphiprostyle, as Dinsmoor sees, for each porch is too shallow for a normal pronaos in antis. The wall at the rear of each, which presumably contained a large door, was apparently thicker than the others, to judge from Wiegand, fig. 72. The western cela and its pronaos together formed almost a square in plan. In all these three features, the Doerpfeld Foundation anticipates the Periclean Parthenon. In the first and last, it anticipates the eastern part of the Erechtheum. But it seems altogether different from temples outside Athens, even from the Old Temple at Corinth, which, with its two cellas back to back, is sometimes considered a forerunner of the Parthenon.

The outer foundation also lacks clamps and dowels. 'Der Stylobat der Ringhalle, die einzige Stufe des Tempels, besteht aus grossen Quadern, welche weder unter sich, noch mit der Euthynteryia durch Klammern oder Dübel verbunden sind' (Wiegand, 121). G. Welter (AM (1922) 69) says this building had H-clamps. But it is quite clear from Wiegand (p. 121) that these are found only on the architrave-blocks, which may or may not go with this foundation.

The uppermost surviving course is faced, at any rate, with larger blocks, well trimmed to a right angle. It is put together (Wiegand, 51) with greater care than the inner foundation, and its walls are far thicker, averaging 2.5 metres (Wiegand, fig. 72). Nor are they of Acropolis limestone, but of Kara stone. There was never more than one step, the stylobate proper, below the columns and above the notably irregular euthynteryia (the levelling-course at ground-level).

What is more, the blocks of this stylobate do not approach a square on plan, as they do in nearly all Greek temples. They were very thin, with a very short outer face, if the single 'stylobate' block shown on Wiegand's plans affords any evidence. The whole foundation is on plan a double square.

One can choose between three opinions on this group of foundations. (1) The inner foundation could be very early, c. 600, and the outer much later—say, Pisistrataean. (2) Both could be very early. (3) Both could be Pisistrataean.

Most scholars, including Doerpfeld and Wiegand, have decided for the first. Wiegand points out (p. 51) that nowhere in Greek architecture, when a temple was laid out all together, were different materials and techniques used for the foundations of cela and peristyle. So the inner foundation here must be earlier, and designed for a complete temple, to which Wiegand assigns those large fragments of upright oblong metopes and

8 See his restored plan, AJA xxxvi (1932) 316. Mrs Hill (Ancient City of Athens 136 f.) ignores this, surely the only tolerable restoration.

9 It had at each end a much deeper pronaos, with antae, and it did not have the thicker cross-walls of the Athenian temples. Indeed, it seemed probable to Doerpfeld that at Corinth the cross-cutting between the two cellas, being 'much shallower and less sharply defined than any of the others, served for some slight superstructure... probably a screen'. See B. Powell, AJA ix (1905); and compare pl. 3. This would entail two continuous Doric colonnades along the whole interior—much the most likely design, it seems to me.

10 Wiegand, 119 f.; Lepsius, op. cit. 115 f. See above, n. 4.

11 See Wiegand, 50, and also fig. 72, which shows the surviving stretch of euthynteryia along the north side. An outline restoration, with euthynteryia and stylobate only, appears in fig. 112. Dinsmoor agrees (AJA li (1947) 117, n. 32) that 'the outer pink foundation... served as the euthynteryia course and supported the stylobate of the external columns'. The façade was 21.34 metres wide on a stylobate just over 1.5 metres deep. These are proportions very like those of the Heraion at Olympia—19 metres wide on a stylobate 1.4 metres deep.

12 c. 600, because this is the probable date for the first peristyles even partly of stone. See now Searls and Dinsmoor, AJA xlix (1945) 73.
mutules of varying width (Wiegand, figs. 24 and 64) which he includes among his H-fragments (p. 128, above).

But in very early temples the cella-building might surely have foundations quite different from those of the ptera. At Thermon, too, for instance, although this is not absolutely clear from the published photographs, the earliest stretch of the peristyle foundations seems to have larger stones than the ground course of the cella. Indeed, so primitive does the latter appear, that one can believe mud bricks rested directly on its small stones, without either toichobate or orthostates. After the High Archaic period, such weaknesses and divergences seem most unlikely. The difference in materials, then, could agree with an early date for both foundations.

Again, the outer foundation was a mere euthynteria and stylobate. In this it resembled most obviously the Heraion at Olympia (Olympia ii pls. 3, 20). But its construction was more primitive than that of the Heraion. Its krepis was largely of irregular blocks, like those of Thermon and Artemis Knakeatis at Tegea, both, similarly, very low temples with very low krepides.

The double square of the plan could also be an early feature. Artemis Knakeatis was a double square. So, very nearly, were the great temple of Artemis at Corcyra and the Basilica at Paestum, which, whatever its date, has very primitive features. Archaic temples were either very short or very long, and the normal classical temple, rather longer than a double square, is a mean between earlier plans. A double square, of course, is still used as late as c. 500, in Aphaia at Aegina and the second temple of Athena Pronaia at Delphi. But it agrees equally with a very early date; and the other features of our outer Doerpfeld Foundation can only, I think, be very early—say, c. 600, or soon after.

Moreover its general dimensions suit fairly well not only the scale of the H-fragments but also the total number of them as put together by Schuchhardt and arranged by him as a frame for the pedimental sculptures. He includes in his more important pediment the large poros group of a lion and lioness (? together attacking one single fallen bull (Wiegand, figs. 230a, b), and flanks this with Bluebeard on the right and Herakles and Triton on the left (all illustrated in Wiegand, pl. 4, and discussed by him on pp. 73–93). This gives a pedimental field 18 metres wide, a façade 20–25 metres wide on the frieze and 21.7 metres wide on the euthynteria. Wiegand (fig. 72) gives 21.85 metres as the width on the euthynteria of the Doerpfeld Foundation—a satisfactory agreement.

But, urges Dinsmoor (AJA li (1947) 116), the whole Doerpfeld Foundation must be as late as Peisistratos' time (c. 550 onwards). For both inner and outer foundations are dressed

13 See, in particular, AE 1909, plate facing cols. 183–4.
14 As suggested by Rhomaios in AE 1909, cols. 174 ff.
15 The west stylobate of Thermon is that of the High Archaic Temple (Rhomaios, loc. cit. col. 173). For Tegea, see AE 1952 1–31 (Rhomaios).
16 For the Basilica, see now F. Krauss in Festschrift für Carl Weickert 99 ff. (fig. 1 gives 66 by 55 metres as the overall dimensions). Artemis at Corcyra was perhaps 23.45 by 48.9 metres on the euthynteria (Korkyra i, pl. 22).
17 AM lx–lxi (1935–1936) 72, fig. 8. He restores them as two lions.
18 The group of Herakles and Triton, as published in the standard books, now needs some minor corrections. See Hesperia viii (1939) 92 ff. (Bronner).
19 Dinsmoor (AJA li (1947) 115 ff.) denies that Schuchhardt's reconstruction would fit the foundation. According to him, Schuchhardt obtained a temple 20–64 metres wide on the frieze, but should have obtained one 48 centimetres narrower, with ten metopes measured by Wiegand as each 1.115 metres wide, and eleven triglyphs each, according to Wiegand, 0.81 metres wide (Wiegand, fig. 24). Dinsmoor actually measures 58 centimetres narrower. For 11 × 0.81 = 8.91, and 10 × 1.115 = 11.15, and 11.15 + 8.91 = 20.06, just 58 centimetres less than the width—20.64—which Dinsmoor supposes Schuchhardt to obtain. Actually, the difference is between 20.06 and 20.25, the width given in Schuchhardt, fig. 8. Since the metopes have nearly all gone, and since the temple was highly archaic, I do not find 19 centimetres an impossible difference. And at euthynteria level Wiegand and Schuchhardt differ even less. (For Dinsmoor's objection to Schuchhardt's pedimental slope, see below, p. 145.)
with the claw—an instrument that has left no traces on the much earlier H-fragments, whether of marble or poros. The H-fragments must come from a structure older than any part of the Doerpfeld Foundation. They were finished with the point and the flat chisel, the marks of which appear ‘on hard surfaces, respectively, as pock marks and in the crêpe-like texture known as drove work. On the other hand the toothed chisel, which came into use fairly late in the Peisistratid period and in any case never appeared in “H” architecture (whether poros or marble) nor in the pedimental or other sculpture (whether poros or marble) that goes with it—apparently being at that date quite unknown—is nevertheless as characteristic of the blue inner foundation rectangle (Pl. XXVII, 3) as of the outer pink foundation rectangle (Pl. XXVII, 4).’ Dinsmoor’s observations are correct.²⁰ Moreover, evidence of early marble buildings at Delphi seems to confirm that up to c. 540–530 the claw was not used. On the oldest Ionic marble treasury there, generally considered the Cnidian, the flat chisel was used everywhere, the claw nowhere. In August 1956 M. Salvat was identifying its fragments by their drove work. For, as Dinsmoor once observed (BCH xxxvii (1913) 8) ‘the toothed chisel is completely unknown in the Cnidian Treasury, but was used in the three Ionic structures which followed its lead’. How, then, can we save the very early date, which we have assigned to the Doerpfeld Foundation? It seems evident that we must try. For it seems unthinkable that a krepis so low and rough, on the Acropolis of all places, should date from as late as c. 530 B.C.

First, we can deny that the claw ‘first came into use fairly late in the Peisistratid period’. The earliest Attic marble sculpture was so carefully polished, so intensively rubbed, that one can seldom detect a sign of the instruments which dressed it.²¹ Casson and Miss Richter apparently agreed (in AJA xli (1937) 107) that the claw first certainly appeared on the hair of Kore 593, dated by Payne ‘well before the middle of the sixth century’ (A.M.S. 9—cf. pl. 12). Moreover, for some years around 540 drove and claw were used, the drove over the claw, on the same surfaces, as shown, for instance, by a famous grave-stele in New York.²²

Now Casson suggested that, ‘like many sculptors’ tools, the claw-chisel was taken over from the architect and mason’. I think myself that it was first used for horizontal surfaces, or ‘beds’. Dinsmoor noticed that in the second-oldest marble treasury at Delphi, his ‘Clazomenian’, the toothed chisel (viz. the claw) for the first time began to play a part on the horizontal bed surfaces (see BCH xxxvii (1913) 8). And, of course, the most important bed of all was the euhynetera. Perhaps the claw was used there first of all. The masons responsible for the H-fragments evidently treated stone in many respects like wood. The marble parts (metopes and roof-sima) are plank-like. The triglyphs were sometimes of several horizontal blocks, grooved on to one another like cabinet-work (Wiegand, fig. 10). The raking cornice was pegged at the corners to the horizontal with small cylindrical dowels (Wiegand, 18 and fig. 20), of a type reasonable and common in woodwork, but very rare in proper Greek masonry. Even the marble sima, although at its highest (over the pediments) only 27 centimetres high, was built up in places of two horizontal strips, similarly pegged with round dowels (Schuchhardt, AM lx–lxi (1935–1936) 5, fig. 1).²³ According to Casson, early archaic carving in soft stone might well follow the technique of woodcarving (Technique, p. 84). But what is remarkable about the H-fragments is the treatment

²⁰ For typical drove-work, unbroken striations of the flat chisel, on the H architecture, see, e.g., Wiegand, fig. 46 (from the soffit of a raking cornice—cf. Wiegand, pl. 21), Schuchhardt, op. cit., pl. 16, where the work of the drove alternates with that of the small pick, or ‘punch’.

²¹ A fact stressed and perhaps exaggerated by S. Casson in his Technique of Early Greek Sculpture (Oxford, 1933).

²² G. M. A. Richter, Archaic Attic Grave-stones, fig. 73 ff. For the marks on this and another stele, see AJA xlvii (1943) 190, figs. 5–7 (Richter). Perhaps these stelai are not before 530, however.

²³ One remarkable instance of such a long, thin strip was evidently that pegged to the stone Kat. 1, shown in Schuchhardt, fig. 13.
of marble, too, as if it were wood, and the fastening of the entablature as if it were joinery. But the hard rock of the Acropolis, used on the inner foundations, would need special methods of dressing—a stout punch, and most obviously, the claw, if that were already known. For the claw combs off large areas rapidly to a uniform depth. Just conceivably, then, the clawed foundation may not post-date the H-fragments.

There is one other possibility, that the High Archaic peripteral temple erected, according to Schuchhardt, on the Doerpfeld Foundation, was taken down about 525, and as far as the euthynteria, which was then redressed and made to take a new temple (Wiegand, 115-47), in scale very nearly a duplicate of the old (see Figs 2, 3). It seems very reasonable to believe that this ‘Pisistratean’ Temple, designed, as almost everyone believes, for the Doerpfeld Foundation, and famous for its marble pedimental sculptures of Athena and the Giants, is merely a replacement of the H-Temple. The H-fragments include a frieze 1.37 metres high, with triglyphs between 0.76 metres and 0.81 metres broad (Wiegand, figs. 60 and 24) and metopes either 1.11 or 1.055 in width (Fig. 3: cf. Wiegand, figs. 24 and 64). The ‘Pisistratean’ Temple seems to have had on its façades a frieze 1.34 metres high, with triglyphs 0.82 metres and metopes 1.20 metres broad (Wiegand, fig. 118). Metopes then are rather squarer and less archaic, and the entablature, although slightly more stunted, protrudes further over the corner-columns (its total length now at frieze level will be 10 x 1.2 plus 11 x 0.82, or 21.02 metres, 75 centimetres greater than in the H-temple, where it was only 20.25 metres wide—see above, p. 131). This difference is only to be expected; for

34 Payne puts Athena, from the pediment of the new temple, rather before 520. Wiegand, who first assembled the fragments of this ‘Pisistratean Temple’, dated it somewhere in the second half of the sixth century (Wiegand, 114), Dinsmoor, who accepted it as Wiegand left it, a little later than the Temple of Corinth, and therefore, I suppose, about

530 (A.A.G. 90). Apart from the pedimental sculptures, the best known fragments are the stretches of entablature built into the north wall of the Acropolis, of which Penrose (Principles pl. 46) gives measured details.

the depth of the architrave grows greater with the years. Surely the identity of the general dimensions shows that one temple replaced the other. The 'Pisistratean' architrave, 1.275 metres high (Wiegand, fig. H.8) is less close to Wiegand's 'H architrave', which reaches a height of 1.5 metres or more (Wiegand, fig. 24). Certainly, the 'Pisistratean' goes nicely with the frieze, and conceivably the H-Temple had a relatively heavier architrave, as perhaps, did the Temple of Artemis at Corcyra where the architrave was 1.32 metres high, the frieze only 1.05, according to KorKyra i pl. 23. The construction of the H-architrave worries me, and I was tempted at first to assign it not to a peripteral temple but to a propylon. Why I still think it is from this temple I shall try to explain below.26

I believe, then, that two peripteral temples, one of the very early sixth century, one of c. 525 B.C., followed one another upon the Doerpfeld Foundation.

We now turn to the possible temple of Athena Parthenos, somewhere on or near the site of the present Parthenon. The accounts given by Penrose (JHS xii (1891)) and Doerpfeld (AM 1892 and 1902) of the earlier temples traceable inside and beneath the present

26 It is rather difficult to assign the architrave block, Wiegand, fig. 3, to a peripteral building. Dinsmoor saw this (AJA li (1947) 140, 143), although he does not make his reasons clear. I shall have to return to this. See below, pp. 142 f.
were superseded by the description given by Hill in *AJA* xvi (1912) 535–8. Hill’s account has stood the test of time, and later scholars have added very little. For my brief discussion of Hill and of this quarter of the Acropolis, I refer the reader to my key-plan, *Fig. 4*.

Hill showed that inside the krepis of the present Parthenon and at the same level there exist the substantial remains of a krepis of three steps. The lowest step (still largely in situ) was of Karian stone, the two uppermost of marble, like the column-drum. The cella-building had a marble toichobate similar to the present, and on the same level. But above this came a moulded Ionic ‘footing’ to the wall—omitted from the present Parthenon, although it was copied in the present Theseum. 27 Nothing survives above the column-shafts, and these are unfinished. The lowest drums were centred, not over the joints in the stylobate, as in the present Parthenon, but the centres of the blocks (Hill, 544, fig. 11). The lower diameter was a little less—5 or 6 centimetres—than in the present Parthenon, the intercolumniation slightly greater, the increase amounting to nearly one lower diameter (1.9 metres) in a colonnade of sixteen columns, 66 metres long (Hill, pl. 9). These discrepancies, though small, would be troublesome for anyone proposing the blocks of one temple in the other, and tend to show that the Parthenon was redesigned only after an interval and a change of taste. Hill’s temple had, surprisingly, six columns by sixteen. Its euthynteria stretched on the east 1 metre outside the present. On the south it was 1 metre inside, on the west nearly 4 metres, and on the north nearly 7. On all sides Hill sets it on a platform, the northern edge of which he discovered in a Byzantine grave under the present Parthenon (Hill, 547, fig. 14), and the southern edge of which, twenty-two courses high, was seen so impressively in the Greek excavations of the eighties. 28 This platform, on east and west, stretches just over 3 metres beyond the euthynteria, on north and south, 2½ metres. 29 It could have been designed for Hill’s marble temple, and there is no need to posit an earlier, larger temple of poros. No material remains of such a building are known to survive anywhere on the platform; and indeed we can but be pretty certain that every part of the platform which anyone has ever examined dates from 490 or later.

The two papers of Kolbe and Dinsmoor (*Jdl* li (1936) 1–64 and *AJA* xxxviii (1934) 408–48) have left, I think, only two alternatives open. The first marble Parthenon and the whole of its platform were built either between 490 and 480 (Dinsmoor) or very soon after 480 (Kolbe). Between the solid stone platform of the Parthenon and the great south retaining wall of the Acropolis, generally called the Cimonian, there lies, deep down in the earth, a continuous stretch of the old prehistoric ‘Pelasgic’ wall (1 or S1 on scholars’ sections). Wholly inside (north of) this wall is a polygonal wall of hard limestone, BC on Doerpfeld’s plans *AM* xxvii (1902) 396, 398, figs. 4 and 5. It is straight, almost parallel to the south side of the Parthenon and between 1½ and 2 metres thick (Kolbe, 8). Doerpfeld considered this wall, S2, a retaining wall for a terrace contemporary with the oldest phase of the Parthenon.

Outside (south of) the wall S2 are two stretches of a much thinner wall, only 1.2 metres thick (Kolbe, 9), of squared poros ashlar. The more westerly forms, as it were, a two-sided bastion protruding southward from the Pelasgian Wall just outside the Parthenon’s southwest corner—the inside face of this wall, of course, is still visible today, lining a kind of pit on the Acropolis. At its west end—Doerpfeld, fig. 5—it is apparently rooted in the Pelasgic, and may have continued westwards along it (but contrast Cavvadias pl. Z). It is labelled GH on Doerpfeld’s plans, and 4 or S4 on scholars’ sections. The more easterly stretch connects the Pelasgian Wall and S2. It figures as EF on Doerpfeld’s plans and 3 or S3 on scholars’ sections (for this numeration, see Kolbe, 7–9). Kolbe seems to me to have proved

27 For all these details, see Hill, op. cit., pl. 8. For the moulded footing in the Theseum, see, e.g., Koch, *Studien zum Theseustempel* pl. 44, 57 i.

28 For pictures, see, e.g., Cavvadias and Kawerau, pl. 1. Photographs of the ’eighties have been constantly reprinted, e.g. in *AJA* xxxviii (1934) fig. 3; *Jdl* li (1936) figs. 6 and 7.

29 3:146 at the ends, 2:146 at the sides (Hill, 547).
FIG. 4. Plan and two sections of the Parthenon and area to the south (from Kavvadias, Doerpfeld and Kolbe). Dotted lines indicate conjectures. DH = Dinsmoor’s Hekatompedon; BH = Hill’s Parthenon; T = Level of terrace presumably retained by Wall 2; P = Pelasgic Wall ('S 1'); 2 = 'S 2'; 3 = 'S 3'; 4 = 'S 4'. The other letters indicate points taken by Doerpfeld in AM xxvii (1902), figs. 4, 5.
that no stretch of ashlar ever ran along the top or face of the Pelasgian Wall to connect S3 and S4 (see Kolbe, 10–11). And, with him, I find it impossible to believe that these stretches of poros ashlar can ever have formed part of the retaining wall of a terrace at any stage in the history of the Parthenon. I note, too, that according to Cavvadias (pl. E—followed in my fig. 4), though not according to Doerpfeld (fig. 5), the eastern end of the eastern ashlar wall actually crosses S2 in such a way that, had it been a permanent wall, it would have caused a rather miserable re-entrant in the line of the older terrace retained by S2.

We are left, then, with a possible retaining wall S2. Now Dinsmoor believes this really was a retaining wall between c. 490 and 470. After investigating all we know of the walls and the earth fills to the north of each, he divides the whole gigantic earth-mound piled against the south side of the Acropolis-rock into three main parts: (1) Soil, now very deep down, already deposited there between prehistoric times and c. 490 B.C. (2) Earth piled as a fill into the space between S2 and the existing stone platform of the Parthenon. The latest sherds found in it show that it was piled there c. 490 B.C. And the dressing of the platform’s south face shows that two courses and a half below the euthynteria were meant to be seen, and that the bottom of these must mark the original top of S2 (cf. Dinsmoor, 415). To judge, then, from Doerpfeld, 393, fig. 2, S2 should have had a visible height of c. 7½ metres towards the east, much less towards the west—in fact less than 5 metres from the measurements I take on Cavvadias pl. H—not, surely impossible with a thickness of 1½ to 2 metres, and a fill some 10 metres thick. As is his habit, Dinsmoor seems nowhere explicitly to describe the retaining wall S2 as it must have been in its original state. This enables Kolbe to launch his polemic against it. But Dinsmoor has really nothing to fear. Structurally, such a retaining wall seems quite possible. (3) All the rest of the vast fill inside the ‘Cimonian’ Wall dates from c. 470.

But Kolbe denies that S2 was ever designed as the ornamental retaining wall for a permanent terrace. For him all walls, except the Pelasgian, between the ‘Cimonian’ and the platform were put up as temporary affairs between c. 475 and 445, to give workmen on the Parthenon some platforms at various levels for hauling and storing materials. The fills everywhere, even inside S2, date from after 480. The first marble Parthenon itself was designed in the seventies, and the marks of Xerxes’ flames upon it are illusory.

Note the main result of these two studies, that together they have made it impossible to envisage a Parthenon of the sixth century anywhere near its present level or position. The great earth fill, which must have been designed to conceal the unsightliness of the Parthenon’s platform everywhere below the third course from the top, cannot have existed before c. 490, as is very plain from the sherds in which it was so rich. Kolbe would put everything after 480, Dinsmoor everything except the small portion inside S2. This alone should go in the nineties.

Here I side with Dinsmoor against Kolbe:

(1) It still seems more reasonable to believe in a Parthenon begun after Marathon, which progressed as far as the column-drums and then was burnt by the Persians in the winter of 480–479. Despite Kolbe, 61, Mr Hill is still assured that the marks on the stone blocks of his first marble Parthenon are those of fire and not of algae. Kolbe’s view also entails that the north wall of the Acropolis into which so many of its fragments are built was not rather swiftly erected in the early seventies, but must have been built at leisure rather later. I find this, though not perhaps impossible, rather difficult. Again, it would

---

30 Dinsmoor, 437–8. The sherd, Graef-Langlotz, ii 731, of c. 490, is much the latest. The other late sherds are of c. 510–500.

31 On p. 36 Kolbe argues that the technique of the lower part of the north wall and the ‘Cimonian’ wall is the same. But he seems to wish to prove by this not that the north wall is of the sixties, but that the lower part of the ‘Cimonian’ wall is of the seventies. I still think myself that the north wall dates from the seventies, and is a good deal older than most of the
have been strange of the Athenians in, say, the early sixties to interrupt work on a temple that had progressed so far and to discard so many complete or half-completed column-drums of precious Pentelic marble (see, e.g., the pictures, Hill, figs. 2 and 5; Picard, L’Acropole pl. 15). It is not merely a case of their finding so many flaws in the marble drums, caused, thinks Kolbe (p. 63), by flecks of mica—although they are hardly likely to have quarried and dressed so many duds. It is a case of their abandoning the design and their work on a great building at the most adventurous period of their history.

(2) Kolbe has very little tangible evidence. The fact that two drums from the first marble Parthenon were found in the wall S₄ (Kolbe, 60) which must, as we have seen, post-date 480, will tell against Doerpfeld, who thought S₄ was older than 480 (Doerpfeld, 398, 410), but not, that I can see, against Dinsmoor. Again, despite Kolbe, it seems of very little significance whether sherds of c. 480 B.C., such as the loutrophoros, Graef-Langlotz ii 638, found deep down just inside the ‘Cimonian’ Wall, are in fact from its fill or from the original humus-layer beneath. Points like this will not affect the date of S₂.

But, Kolbe adds, S₂ never in fact stood as high as I have argued it could. It was never higher than at present (c. 4 metres: cf. Doerpfeld, fig 2; Kolbe, figs. 40, 41). The strata show that the earth tumbled over the top of it at this height. I find this argument very weak. Anyone could have thrown the top down and tumbled the strata into their present angle—from the Persians to the builders of the Cimonian Wall.

But, argues Kolbe, the staircase in S₂ near its western end (at point 77 in Cavvadias, pl. A’—cf. Doerpfeld, fig 4, point B) was not meant for visitors to the terrace, as Doerpfeld had thought, but for workmen on the Parthenon to hand things from one level to another. For outside the wall S₂ it starts at the level of the highest preserved course of the Pelasgic Wall. But inside S₂ it only reaches a height some 1½ metres below the level of the supposed terrace, and then stops (pp. 38–9). But why, if it is for workmen, is this stair-gap so inconveniently narrow? In any case, the stairs are preserved for the whole thickness of the wall. Had they continued inside the wall, they could quite easily have rested on earth, and so disappeared later at any time. In 490, for all we know, they continued on to the top of the terrace.

Kolbe’s real case, I think, rests on the single sherd Graef-Langlotz ii 731, the fragment of a r.f. kalyx-krater showing a boy with a hoop. It dates, according to scholars, from about 490 B.C. Dinsmoor thought that it belonged to the fill inside S₂—in which it would, indeed, be the latest sherd. Of the others, the vast bulk belong to the later part of the sixth century and a dozen to the years around 500 (Dinsmoor, 437–8). According to Kolbe, however, this small sherd, only some 5 centimetres square, comes not from the fill but from the humus-layer below it. So the humus must still have been virgin ground some time after 490, for the krater is unlikely to have got broken and buried very soon after its

‘Cimonian’. It may, indeed, owe its jagged, ‘Cranaan’ plan not to its date but the nearness and steepness of the rock-face. Nor is it distinguished from the ‘Cimonian’ wall by the fact that it contains debris. One has only to think of Wiegand’s epi-
styles embedded in the ‘Cimonian’. But remember that it displays the entablature of Wiegand’s and most other scholar’s ‘Pisistratean’ Temple (Wiegand, 118; see above, n. 23.) Surely this is an intentional memorial of the Persian barbarity, in which, to quote Picard (L’Acropole, 12), ‘le rationalisme esthetique des Athéniens avait mis de l’ordre dans les exercices de mortification patriotique imposés à la cité’. If so, ‘Pisistratean’ Temple and Parthenon will have been thrown down by the Persians.

Moreover, the north wall was more often seen and less of a task to build than any wall on the south. And finally Plutarch specifically connects the south wall alone with Cimon’s victory over the Eurydem and therefore, presumably, the middle sixties: πραθέντων δὲ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων λαβῶν τοῖς τὰ τὰ ἄλλα χρήματα ὀ θήμας ἐτέρων και τῇ ἄκρου τὸ νότον τείχος κατασκεύασεν ἀτ᾽ εκείνης εὐπορίας τῆς στρατείας (Plutarch, Cimon 13.7). For the date, see Gomme, Commentary on Thucydides i 408. I feel, then, morally certain that the north wall was built before the south.

33 See the excellent picture in E. Curtius, Stadtfgeschichte von Athen 48, fig. 11.
manufacture. And there is no doubt that the excavators found it buried low down in the humus, for it was found, according to Langlotz, ‘in der untersten Erdschicht über dem gewachsenen Fels’. But (i) it could, after all, have been broken and dropped before work began on the platform and terrace c. 488. (ii) It could even have worked down, in some way, from the fill above. It is a very tiny fragment. (iii) Despite Langlotz, it could still belong to the fill. For, as one would expect, the builders of the platform first made an excavation for it in the topsoil, or humus, with sloping sides. This left a half-V, extending down to the rock, later occupied by the lowest part of the fill (Layer IIb in Doerpfeld, fig. 2; IIa in Dinsmoor, fig. 1). Even Kolbe shows this on his fig. 43. There is every reason to believe that ii 731 was found here, particularly since it apparently turned up on the first day of the more careful excavations, June 4, 1888, and at this moment the Greeks were clearing the lowest level of earth immediately adjacent to the platform (for the detailed argument, see Dinsmoor, 423-5).

So we are left, I think, no real reason to doubt that all the parts of the platform which modern scholars have ever seen, together with S2, its fill and the first marble Parthenon, were built between 490 and 480.

The little book, Ο ΣΤΕΡΕΟΒΑΘΗΣ ΤΟΥ ΙΑΡΘΕΝΟΝΟΣ, by Constantine Syriopoulos (Athens, 1951) adds nothing to our knowledge. According to him, S2 was built as a temporary retaining wall on the south side of the Acropolis, before any stone platform for a Parthenon existed. About 450 debris had accumulated up to the very top of S2, and only then was an enormous trench sunk in the fill and the existing platform erected from its lowest course upwards. The beginning of this work is recorded in the first of the Parthenon building accounts (IC i2 339-53), which run not from 447-446 to 433-432, as everyone had thought, but from 450 [sic]-432 (Syriopoulos, 49). For work was interrupted by Thukydides, son of Melesias, and by external wars for about three years (447-444). Some time during the building of the Parthenon most of the ‘Cimonian’ Wall was also built.

But these unlikely conclusions seem to me to be irresponsibly argued:

(1) There is no evidence in any of the primary authorities for a deep trench cut through the strata behind S2. The diagrams and photographs of Doerpfeld, Kolbe, Cavvadias, etc., all agree in showing no disturbance here. Syriopoulos’ only evidence is not for a trench but for a pit ‘towards’ the south-east corner of the platform, allegedly seen by Penrose in 1887, when the Greek excavations were just beginning, and sketched by him (from memory?) in JHS xii (1891) 281. Further west, Penrose rightly notes, the strata had not been disturbed. (Penrose wished to believe the platform had been extended eastwards for the present Parthenon—a belief diametrically opposed to the evidence discovered by B. H. Hill; cf. AJA xvi (1912) 537, 538, pl. 9). The pit noticed by Penrose seems to me to have been that dug by Ziller in 1864, which went down twenty-two courses of poros (Dinsmoor AJA xxxviii (1934) 421). Hill pointed this out to Syriopoulos (Syriopoulos, 97), but Syriopoulos would not admit it.

(2) No one, that I can see, has ever found a sherd later than c. 470 in any of these fills between the ‘Cimonian’ Wall and the Parthenon. On Syriopoulos’ view, when people were working in this area up to the mid-forties, absence of sherds datable c. 470-450 should surely surprise us. It will not do to say with Syriopoulos (p. 98) that ‘dates of sherds are valid only for the earth-fills, not for the stone platform (stereobate)’. Such a statement misses the point.

(3) It is hard to know how much of Hill’s First Marble Parthenon Syriopoulos accepts as a separate stage in the history of the building. But surely he could not reject Hill’s dimensions for the krepis, the completely different construction of the stylobate in his Parthenon, or the small but intractable differences between the diameter of his columns and those in the existing Parthenon. He therefore has to believe that, for no material reason
which he can see, a radically new design was approved in the mid-forties, and that this
involved scrapping the marble krepis and columns erected only four or five years before.
This would be worse than François Mansart’s behaviour at the Val de Grace.

(4) The first ten years of the Parthenon building accounts were each headed ἐπί τέσ
[numbered] ἀρχές ἦ τὸ δεῦρο ἐγγραμματεύε <demotic>. We have just enough to show
this in, e.g., IG ii2 340. This closely resembles the heading of each tribute quota list, ἐπί τέσ
ἀρχές <numbered> ἦ τὸ δεῦρο ἐγγραμματεύε <demotic>. It is generally believed these
days that for one year between the fifth and the ninth no tribute quota was ever recorded,
but that from at least the ninth onwards this absent year counts in the numbering, as if
tribute had been paid. See especially Wade-Gery in ATL iii 278 ff. and Hesperia xiv
(1945) 212 ff. If this is right, the Athenians have dated their records most scrupulously
according to the exact time-interval from the first year of the board’s existence, and even
counted in the sequence years in which it was quiescent. Surely one would have to do
this, or, especially under ancient Greek conditions, one would muddle one’s dating hope-
lessly. But according to Syriopoulos (p. 49) there was a jump of three or four years between
the third and fourth building-account of the Parthenon, and the numbering of the accounts
nowhere takes notice of it.

His ignorance of the Tribute-lists and the way in which, as generally interpreted, they
here make against him is only the most striking example of his parochialism. Nowhere
does he seem conscious of all that detailed research in Britain and America which has
set the Periclean building debates and the beginning of the Parthenon very plausibly in the
years after 450–449, consistently with Plutarch, the Anonymus Argentinensis and the
Parthenon Accounts themselves.

(5) He divides the building-work into three periods, the first (Years I–III) on the
Platform, the second (Years IV–X) on the structure of the Parthenon, the third (Years
XI–XV) on all the carved ornament. His only positive evidence is that in the first we
are told that stones were dragged, but not where they were dragged; in the second they
were dragged προς τα εργαστερα; in the third εσ τα εργαστερα. Actually Years I–III have
nearly all gone. In the second period, our first possible προς τα εργαστερα comes in
Year IX (IG i2 347, v 38), and Year X is already more likely to have ἱππολυκυα εσ τα
εργαστερα (IG i2 348, v 75). For the restoration here see Dinsmoor, AJA xvii (1913) pl. 3.
These accounts, then, offer inadequate evidence for the occurrence of Syriopoulos’ preposi-
tions, on the different meanings of which he lays so heavy a strain.

The omissions and special pleas in this book seem, then, to me to render its conclusions
valueless: and I still agree with Dinsmoor that the First Marble Parthenon, its platform
and the retaining wall S2 all date from the years just after 490.

So much, then, for the First Marble Parthenon, the immediate precursor of the Periclean.
But it now proves very difficult to give it, in turn, any forerunner at all approaching it in
size. I should have liked myself to argue that its extraordinarily archaic proportions, more
archaic even than those of the old double temple at Corinth,33 its peristyle of six columns
by sixteen and its krepis of 69.6 by 26.2 metres showed that it was rebuilt on the exact
lines of a temple of c. 600 B.C. Such rebuildings are not, of course, un-Greek.34 But here
the stone platform was a new, extravagant construction of the early fifth century. Before
the 490, the Pelasgian wall was still probably in use as a free-standing fortification, and the

33 First Marble Parthenon, 281: 1. Corinth,
25: 1. Bassai, although of the later fifth century,
is 25: 1. (I calculate the proportions of the First
Marble Parthenon from Hill, 547, of the others from
Dinsmoor, A.A.G. Appendix.)

34 One thinks of Delphi and Ephesus. Above, I
have argued for another, on the Doerpfeld Founda-

tion. A similar history might help to explain Bassai.
But the facts are still obscure. On p. 43 of A.A.G.
Dinsmoor speaks of such an archaic temple as pos-
Tible, on p. 155, n. 1 as certain. Kourouniotis
(ÆE 1910) 285) concludes that one existed and is
represented not by the small 'adyton', but by the
arrangement of the temple as a whole.
south slope, which it protected, only accidentally covered by the detritus of centuries. As Cavvadias shows, the natural rock of the Acropolis reaches its highest point, 156.6 metres, just north of the Parthenon’s north-east corner. The level rock-platform, into which it has been cut, underlies roughly the northern half of the present temple. But going south from the third intercolumniation of the east façade, the fifth column of the west, the rock slopes steadily downwards at an angle of 20 degrees. This configuration completely rules out any archaic precursor of Hill’s temple on the same plan and the same site, but at a lower level. If we believe in a large sixth-century temple, we must surely put it under the northern half of the present Parthenon. But it cannot easily have extended north of this. For then it should have left some trace of a continuous edge; and no one has ever found this in all the painstaking surveys of the site, from Penrose to G. P. Stevens. If it existed then and had a width comparable with Hill’s temple, it must have fallen within the present krepis and extended southwards nearly to the penultimate columns of our Parthenon’s short façades. I suppose this is just possible. But, remembering that even Hill’s Parthenon did not extend so far south as the Periclean, I find it a little surprising that c. 490 builders should go to such pains merely to redraw a large archaic foundation some 6 metres further south at most. They would have won a small strip of land north of the Parthenon, which was later sacrificed to the Periclean temple. I should prefer to believe the temple and platform of c. 490 an entirely new venture, and to believe that temple’s archaic narrowness in part accidental—due to the double cella and the narrowness of its largely artificial site.

Dinsmoor makes no attempt to derive Hill’s temple from any High Archaic precursor of similar plan. Instead, he argues that our Parthenon was often called Hekatompedia by the ancients not because any part of it, or even of Hill’s temple, was 100 feet wide or long, but because it occupied the site of a High Archaic temple exactly 100 feet long. This, and not the temple on the Doerpfeld Foundation is, he thinks, the source of the H-fragments; and he adjusts them, especially the architrave-block Wiegand, fig. 3, to give the façade a width of 16.34 metres or 50 ‘Doric feet’, on the stylobate. It was incredibly primitive, a mere cella-building with façades tristyle in antis, and was placed partly outside Hill’s Parthenon but mostly on the site of its north-east corner (op. cit., fig. 3). Although so archaic, it dated, according to Dinsmoor, from only 570 B.C. Indeed, he considers it was built as the ‘temple of an independent cult’, and connects this with the alleged establishment of the Great Panathenaia in 566 B.C.37

35 Compare the cross-section, Ausgrabungen pl. Θ and the two plans, pls. Α’ and Ζ.
36 Compare Penrose, Principles, pl. 2, Cavvadias, pl. Ζ’ and G. P. Stevens in Hesperia Supplement iii (1940) fig. 32. Stevens in this paper, ‘The Setting of the Periclean Parthenon’, shows the rock-cuttings in great detail. I find his discussion on pp. 46 ff. of the earth-fills and buried walls rather less thorough—one reason why I felt I had to go into the rights and wrongs of the controversy between Dinsmoor and Kolbe.
37 Not only would it have been a far greater labour to build out the platform even a few feet further, but also, no doubt, the Athenians up to 480 felt bound to leave proper circulation between the platform and the outer parapet of the Pelasgian Wall. Just sufficient was left at the platform’s south-west corner.
38 Note, e.g., Plutarch’s portmanteau phrase, ‘τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἐκατομπεδὸν Παρθένων’ (Pericles 13.4). For a collection of ancient references, see Dinsmoor AJA li (1947) 123 n. 74.
40 Dinsmoor, op. cit. 7: ‘16.24 metres on the frieze’ (p. 141).
41 Dinsmoor, op. cit. 140. According to a very corrupt passage of Marcellinus’ Life of Thucydides, Hippokleides son of Teisandros was archon when ‘Παναθηναία εὐθύνη’, and this, according to Jerome, was perhaps the Panathenaic Year 566–565; for Jerome runs ‘Ol. 53-3, Agon gymnicus, quem Panathenaen vocant, actus’ (see T. J. Cadoux in JHS lxviii (1948) 104). For myself, holding, as I do, to the dogmatic scepticism of Beloch, I deny that we know the true dates of any archons until nearly the end of the sixth century. So that on general grounds I consider 566 B.C. a worthless date. J. A. Davison, in ‘Notes on the Panathenaia’ in JHS lxviii (1958) 27, seems to consider the style of the earliest Panathenaic vases to be about the best evidence for a date around 560. But at present we can date no vases of this time absolutely. Because of such vases a date of c. 560 has been proposed for the pedimental
If we presuppose Dinsmoor's temple and the site he gives it, we can explain on the whole why anyone enlarging it would need to build out a massive stone platform on the south. But this, I think, is almost the only merit of his reconstruction. There is only one other that I can see, the use he makes of the architrave-block, Wiegand, fig. 3 (\(\text{my FIG. 5}\)).

\[\text{FIG. 5. Architrave-block built into the Cimonian Wall. Wiegand, fig. 3.}\]

\[\text{FIG. 6. Wiegand's architrave-block, according to Dinsmoor, AJA li (1947) 142, fig. 8.}\]

This block, with one or two others, is built into the 'Cimonian' Wall high above the Theatre, as Wiegand shows in fig. 2. It is the only one completely exposed. But the others seem to have been of equal length, 3.85 metres. They are now only 1.36 metres high, but have evidently lost their crowning taenia, which was a thin strip projecting

sculptures, Bluebeard and the rest, and accepted by most scholars. I have no experience in this field, but it seems to me that the heads and especially the beards of Bluebeard closely resemble those of the Panathenaic amphora in Halle (Beazley, ABV 120, Development pl. 17.1); while Broneer's new head of Herakles reminds me even of Exekias (cf. FR pl. 131 and Hesperia vi (1937) 477). But even if vase-paintings and pediments were of 560 and so, perhaps, a generation later than Doerpfeld's Foundation, we need not be surprised. Hitches occur in building and tympana would be filled last of all.
upwards 10 centimetres or more from the rest of the stones' upper face (Wiegand, fig. 4).\(^{42}\)

If we restore it, we find that the three 'steps', into which our stone is carved on its right-hand edge, were all originally of equal height, just 49 centimetres. These 'steps', though possibly unique, are considered by all scholars to be ancient. If so, they must represent the point where the architrave, about 150 centimetres (three large cubits?) high, met three wall-courses, each just under 50 centimetres (one cubit?) high. Therefore, they formed the joint over a wall-end, or anta. This Wiegand saw, when, in figs. 24 and 112 (cf. fig. 59), he put this architrave on the pronaos, distyle in antis, of the High Archaic temple that he assigned to the inner Doerpfeld Foundation. This Schuchhardt did not see when, in his fig. 8, he showed it on the corner of a peripteral temple, where, one may hold, its form would be without purpose or parallel. But, as Dinsmoor saw (AJA xxxvi (1932) 316—see above, n. 8), the building on the inner Doerpfeld Foundation was not distyle in antis, but amphiprostyle. So we cannot put Wiegand's architrave block on the façade of that building either. Dinsmoor puts it on the corner of his own Hekatompedon, where, structurally, it would fit.\(^{43}\)

Can such a temple have existed? I begin with one minor defect. Dinsmoor doctors Wiegand's architrave wrongly, to get it on the corner of his building. Wiegand (fig. 5) gave the regula next to the stepped joint only two guttae. Dinsmoor (fig. 8 = my fig. 6) gives it three. This, of course, will alter the width of the metope, the right-hand metope of Dinsmoor's façade. In fig. 8 (= my fig. 6), he accepts Wiegand's width, 1·12 metres for the left-hand metope above this block.\(^{44}\) For the right-hand, his extra gutta leaves him, as he thinks, a width of 106 centimetres. Actually, however, it leaves him one of 96 centimetres only; if one marks his extra gutta fairly on Wiegand, fig. 3, I do not see how, on p. 142, he can calculate a metope between 1·03 and 1·12 metres wide. So his end metope will be violently reduced. In any case, I prefer Wiegand's two guttae to his three. The architrave-block on its lower edge exactly equals in length its right-hand neighbour in the 'Cimonian Wall' (Wiegand, fig. 2). So the architect, I think, made both blocks with soffits of equal length, to span his standard distance from axis to axis. If so, the

\(^{42}\) This seems quite extraordinary construction, but I believe Wiegand, and feel bound to agree with him. How would water escape from the channels between this taenia and the metopes? The bottom of no metope seems to be preserved. But I suppose each could have had a projecting taenia, like the Sicyonian (for which see La Coste-Messelière, Au Musée de Delphes 43, fig. 1, and pls. 1–3). If this came out to the level of the triglyph-face, as in the Sicyonian monopteros (cf. cit., fig. 1), it could then shoot the rain-water down over the upper surface of the taenia of the architrave. In other stretches of the same architrave, however, the top was nearly flat, the construction nearly normal (Wiegand, fig. 6). The variations in the top surface are listed on Wiegand, 39 ff.

\(^{43}\) I take this to be his reasoning, although I nowhere find it really explicit in his articles. On AJA li (1947) 115, however, he says that Schuchhardt's complete, encircling peristyle 'is not only contrary to the evidence of the jogged joint on an existing corner architrave from one façade (fig. 8), but it forced Schuchhardt to eliminate all the flank architrave fragments, which are of forms that could not have been supported on columns and must have rested upon solid flank walls'. Dinsmoor, fig. 8 is a doctored version of Wiegand, fig. 3 (see FIG. 6).

\(^{44}\) Although rather ungraciously, for he believes that the normal metope-width was 117 centimetres, and that this penultimate metope, made deliberately narrower, happens to be 112 centimetres wide only 'by a coincidence' (op. cit., 142 n. 160).
centre of the regula ought to have come directly above the block's lower right-hand corner, as it did according to Wiegand, but not according to Dinsmoor. Besides, the adjacent small courses need, to my eye, more bearing-surface than Dinsmoor can give them in his fig. 9.

These are details. But what is unprecedented is a temple of this large size, extremely primitive plan and relatively late date. Would the Athenians, inaugurating a new cult about 570 B.C., have given it a temple like this?

1) Dinsmoor gives it a pronaos and opisthodomos, both with fronts between antae. Are such plans common, without an encircling peristyle? The normal small temple with pronaos in antis has no opisthodomos.

2) A temple to crown the highest point of the Acropolis, a relatively large building and yet without a peristyle, seems to me without parallel not only in the early sixth but even the late seventh century. I can think of no large Greek temples without peristyles, except in chthonic cults and Mystery religions. The peristylar plan appears in its full development soon after 600 in the Heraion at Olympia, but was virtually developed well before then, at Thermon. After that, I think, important Doric temples always had it—the Temple of the Athenians at Delos being the exception that proves the rule.

(3) Thermon, I think, is the last known Doric temple of the Greek mainland to have had an odd number of columns on each short façade.45

Athenian art, we know, was not backward at the date Dinsmoor gives, 570. A design so primitive even for that date would, I think, be unexampled.

Nor am I sure, competent and detailed as is his discussion of the subject, that Dinsmoor's building will really take all the large pedimental sculptures of poros hitherto discovered, not only the pair of lions (or lion and lioness) devouring a bull and the two groups of Bluebeard and Herakles with Triton, which Schuchhardt has already put in one pediment, 46 but also the pair of lionesses, each with her prey, and large simple serpents in the angles which have normally been assigned to at least two separate pediments. 47 According to Dinsmoor (p. 147), the Lions, Bluebeard and Triton went in one pediment, the Snakes and Lionesses in the other. Nor, he thinks, need the floor of either tympanum be longer than 13½ metres. Whereas in Schuchhardt, fig. 8, the Lions, Bluebeard and Triton, without undue stretching, appear to need a tympanum at least 15 metres wide.

On p. 145, Dinsmoor reconciles his tympanum with his Hekatompedon, 16.24 metres wide at frieze level. The cornice projected just over 70 centimetres, giving the pediment a total width of 17.68 metres. Now the raking cornice was just over 30 centimetres high (on which all authorities seem agreed), 48 while under the sculptures was a pedimental step some 22 centimetres high which, though seemingly less certain, is equally well agreed. 49 A vertical section through both members at an outer corner of the tympanum-sculpture would total rather more than half a metre. But we should expect a pedimental slope of vertical : horizontal :: 1 : 4 or 1 : 3½, 1 in 4 being nearly 14 degrees, 1 in 3½ nearly 15. Therefore, we have to subtract 2 metres at either end to obtain our tympanum-width; and this will be 17.68 minus 4, or just over 13½ metres (13.62 metres at most, according to Dinsmoor, with the steepest slope). In the centre, the tympanum will be about 1.7 metres high.

45 I am thinking of important Doric temples, not of such equivocal and perhaps secular buildings as the tristyle apsidal hall Wiegand, fig. 154, and what was possibly its successor, the north-west wing of Mnesikles' Propylaea. On the possible connexion of the two, see Bundgaard, 55 ff.

46 Schuchhardt, fig. 8 and p. 87. The groups are Heberdey, nos. VIII and V (Triton and Bluebeard numbered as one).

47 See, for instance, E. Lapalus, Le Fronton Sculpté en Grèce figs. 12 and 14. These groups are Heberdey, nos. VII and IX. All the poros groups, as Dinsmoor says (p. 146), were found close together.

48 Dinsmoor, 145; Wiegand, fig. 24 (equal to the horizontal cornice); Heberdey, 142, makes it possibly less ('at least 27 centimetres').

49 The step seems pretty ill-preserved. Ragged patches of it survive, attached to Herakles and Triton (Heberdey, V, E and F).
Schuchhardt, fig. 8, Dinsmoor argues, makes several mistakes. It gives the raking cornice a height of 40 centimetres, and the pediment a slope of only 12 degrees, or 1:4\(\frac{1}{2}\), far too low for archaic times, as Dinsmoor (p. 145) points out. Compare my fig. 7.

Therefore, Schuchhardt puts the corner of the tympanum 3 metres, instead of 2, inside the corner of the pediment (see my fig. 7). So his tympanum of 15 metres, in which the sculpture makes a tolerable composition, should be stretched out to 17, in which it would not.

But if Schuchhardt's real tympanum, 17 metres, is too wide, Dinsmoor's, 13.5 \times 1.7 metres, seems to me too small altogether. The snakes in the corners of one pediment seem too shattered for restoration and measurement. Of the other figures, the single lionesses were each apparently over 3 metres long, and the pair of lions, I think, totalled 6 metres (see Heberdey, 77, with which Dinsmoor (p. 147) agrees). Dickins gives the preserved length as 5.35 metres. But he seems to be measuring only the fragments shown in Wiegand's photograph (Wiegand, fig. 230a), which he reproduces, and not to be including the rear leg of the right-hand lion, which must have existed as shown in Wiegand, fig. 230b. This brings the length up to nearly 6 metres, as shown by Schuchhardt (whose fig. 8 gives 5.8 metres). Then the preserved length of Herakles and Triton is over 3.4 metres, and Triton has lost his head, to the right. Bluebeard is only 3.4 metres long, but evidently had once, to the left, some tree or companion.\(^{50}\) Both groups together surely accounted for 8 metres. If we allow no gaps we get 14 metres at least for the length of the tympanum; but more reasonably, with Schuchhardt's small gaps, at least 15.\(^{51}\) As for the height, Heberdey (fig. 83) makes this 1.95 metres for the centre, between the pair of lions. It would be hard to reduce this. The lioness, as made up, is only 1.6 metres (Heberdey, 77: Dickins, Catalogue i 76), but is not dependable (I do not understand Dinsmoor's argument from it on p. 147). It would give the tympanum a maximum height of 1.8. Heberdey makes the slope 1 in 4. For this he has the evidence of Triton who rises 75 centimetres in 3 metres (p. 48). So, if nearly 2 metres high, the tympanum should have been nearly 16 metres wide along the foot of the sculptures.

These dimensions, if irreducible, as I think they are, make Dinsmoor's tympanum of 1.7 \times 13.5 just impossible. They are also a good deal shorter, perhaps, than the 17 metres which Schuchhardt's drawing, as amended, now requires.

Yet it is easier to enlarge a pediment than to reduce it. One has only to add a little—

\(^{50}\) Dickins' measurements (Catalogue i 78, 82). The figure to the left of Bluebeard, apparently peaceful, was envisaged by Dickins (p. 81) as standing, by Schuchhardt, more plausibly, as kneeling (Schuchhardt, 89, fig. 17).

\(^{51}\) Schuchhardt gets 15\(\frac{1}{4}\); but one could run his monsters' snaky tails a little more into the corners. Some of these sculptures reached the tympanum frame. The heads of the snakes in the other pediments were sliced by the raking cornice; Heberdey, 104-5.
say, 25 centimetres—to the pedimental step, to have a pediment wide enough for the outer Doerpfeld Foundation. At Corcyra, the upper pedimental step is about 27 centimetres high, but had a plain course as high between itself and the sharply sloping top of the front horizontal cornice (*Korkyra* i pl. 24). So the corner of the carved tympanum was 3.3 metres inside that of the pediment, although the entablature was rather smaller than in the H-fragments.

The other pediment which we can usefully compare with Schuchhardt’s is the marble pediment of Athena and the giants (Payne, *A.M.S.* 52 ff.), because everyone seems to agree that this stood after c. 520 on the outer Doerpfeld Foundation, and therefore was some 22 metres wide. But the central figure, Athena, as made up in the Museum, is 2 metres high (Payne, 69), and should perhaps be several inches less (Payne, 53). Actually, I measured her on the cast in Cambridge, an exact replica of the Museum restoration (Payne, pl. 36), as only 1.93 metres high. Her crest has gone. Yet one need not imagine her, even with this, as much more than 2 metres high. So the dimensions of the tympanum agree well enough with Schuchhardt’s, as he made it up to fit this very ‘Doerpfeld Foundation’.

Of Dinsmoor’s other sculptures, the metope with the crouching ‘panther’ (Dinsmoor, 150–1) seems hardly possible. For, while extending the whole width of the metope, the animal would leave a fascia 22 centimetres wide across both the top and the bottom in addition to the crowning taenia. There are a good many of these ‘panthers’, and Schuchhardt (fig. 18) would make them into a frieze across the pronaos of his temple. Compare, he says, the animal friezes at Prinias (*AJA* xxxviii (1934) pls. 18, 19). Since our ‘panthers’ are only about 60 centimetres high, although twice the length, they would fill a metope some 110 centimetres square very badly. From the beginning Greek artists filled their metopes better than this. Payne, too (*A.M.S.* 11), considered the ‘panthers’ to come from a continuous frieze. It is also against reason and analogy, though necessary on Dinsmoor’s measurements, to give a temple metopes of poros on the main front, of marble on the sides (Dinsmoor, 149).

So I am loath to believe that Dinsmoor’s Hekatompedon existed.

Before asking whether the H-fragments must all come from one building, the Doerpfeld Foundation, I must look for a moment at the early Propylaea. Was there, perhaps a large Propylon of the early sixth century, which could accommodate them, or some of them?

The surviving stump of pre-Periclean Propylon, published by Weller, contains no obviously datable feature—no portions of entablature, or even column-drums. The large, plain steps and un moulded wall-base would seem to suit a severe Doric building of the Early Classical Period, the epoch assigned to it by Dinsmoor and Doerpfeld. Yet do we really know? There remain, in an opening turned at 60 degrees to the Pelasgian Wall, (1) the south-west corner of a marble krepis of three steps, (2) upon this krepis a wall of poros designed to face and hold back the Pelasgian Wall on the south side of the gap, (3) a short wall of poros (2 metres long) running along the top step of the krepis and at right angles to the facing-wall no. 2. This short wall, at present five courses high (Weller, pl. 3), ends in a marble anta, at present of two blocks set on end. The main face of the anta turned at right angles to the steps is 1.175 metres wide (Weller, pl. 2), its side, facing the steps, is of only 58.5 centimetres. Note that there is no pier or anta at the corner where the short wall meets the Mycenaean, so that this building offers no precedent for the two thin antae set close to one another on both the Erechtheum and the south-west wing of the Periclean Propylaea. According to Weller the existing stump of anta, which

---

52 For a clear picture see C. Picard, *L’Acropole* pl. 75.
53 On the Erechtheum, at the south-west corner of the North Porch: Hege und Rodenwaldt, *Die Akropolis* pl. 82. On the Propylaea, at the west end of the façade of the south-west wing: Bundgaard, fig. 7.
equals in height six courses of the short wall, represents the original height up to the soffit of the anta-capital. The stump is 3·515 metres high. So the whole building was only about 4 metres high to the soffit of the architrave (Weller, fig. 4—my FIG. 8). A firm marble anta could hardly be much higher, in construction like this. So I accept Weller's low walls and small Doric order, and agree with him that to judge from the plan the Propylon of Gaggea, Selinus (Koldewey and Puchstein, fig. 59) offers the best parallel—even now, I think, the closest known. There the anta is planned in much the same way, so that the building has no anta on the corner. The dimensions, too, seem much the same, 75 and 42 centimetres for the two faces of the anta, and 4 metres to the soffit of the architrave. South of our Propylon, the Pelasgian Wall is lined with three marble slabs, generally considered to be three marble metopes, belonging to the H-fragments. Their re-use here, structurally unconnected with the Propylon, will not necessarily date it. Indeed, it

54 I should wonder if they did, had not Dinsmoor seen on one of them the tongue pattern which comes on these metopes immediately below their crowning taenia (Wiegand, fig. 14a and b) and which is very plain on one of these metopes re-used for the Hekatompedon inscription (Wiegand, fig. 114; Kirchner, Imagines 20). Dinsmoor writes (AJA li (1947) 143) that 'two others may be restored by means of the painted pattern as 1·008 metres (Hekatompedon inscription, A) and 1·019 metres (one before the Propylon), these averaging 1·010 metres'. 'He adds (p. 148) that the three still in place outside the old Propylon “are complete apart from the retrimming occasioned by their new setting”.'

On pp. 142-3, Dinsmoor shows us that he needs metopes of Wiegand's height (1·37 metres—which, plus the top taenia, chiselled off, would be 1·5 metres)—and of varying widths, most of them 1·17 and 1·01, but a few of 1·12 and 1·06. The three metopes by the Propylon I measured as 1·30 high, and 1·00, 1·14 and 1·22 wide (3 feet 3½ inches, 3 feet 9 inches and 4 feet). These are awkward dimensions, and show either arbitrary trimming or a frieze not arranged like Dinsmoor's.

I sympathise, then, with Weller's note (p. 44): 'I am informed that the opinion has been advanced *via vero* that these slabs were originally metopes of the "old Athena temple"; how the irregular widths (cf. p. 47) are explained, I do not know. Besides, according to Penrose (Principles of Athenian Architecture pl. 49), the metopes of the old temple inserted in the northern wall of the Acropolis are 4·4 feet (= 1·3 metres) in height.' Weller's measurements are 1·31 metres high, and from 1·23 to 1·01 metres long—just a very little greater than mine, and quite incompatible, I think, with Dinsmoor's frieze.

In AJA li (1947) 118 n. 40, Dinsmoor says Weller expressed doubts on whether the Hekatompedon inscription used two metopes of the Old Temple. But Weller doubted only the three slabs in situ beside the old Propylon.
may have been remodelled once, without being wholly rebuilt, as we see from the internal junction of the facing-wall and the short front wall (Weller, 40 and 67).

This building, with its small order, columns only 4 metres high and triglyphs in any case not wider than 58 centimetres (the side of the anta), is a quite impossible source of the H-fragments. Whatever its date—and it could, I think, be older than is generally thought—its architect and frieze should have been half the scale of Wiegang's.

Weller (pl. 1) gave it a ground plan of 14½ by 11 metres, in keeping with the moderate scale of its order. But since his time the American School has tried to give it a width of 17.5 metres, a depth of 14, Bundgaard a width (20 metres) equal to that of the Periclean Propylaea's main hall, a depth (17.5) equal to the depth of that hall from anta to anta. The Americans go by cuttings, allegedly for the north wall, discovered by Dinsmoor near the north-east corner of Mnesikles' main west hall (Stevens, op. cit., 80). I do not know whether Dinsmoor ever found the corner shown on Stevens' plan. Neither Stevens nor Bundgaard, who also claims to accept Dinsmoor's find, actually assures us of the corner. Yet more strangely, Dinsmoor's north wall, as drawn by Bundgaard (fig. 22), runs well outside the line drawn for it by Stevens. We can only await a plan of Dinsmoor's excavation.

Bundgaard grounds his own dimensions on an interesting theory. To put this briefly, and I hope not too cruelly, he denies (despite the known excellence of Greek draughtsmanship and mathematics, and the habit of drawing plans to scale in Ancient Egypt) that Greek architects normally drew working plans or elevations of buildings before construction started. Temples were very simple buildings, and the architect could stand on the site and determine the height, detailing, etc., of each member, course by course, as the building went up. I should have thought myself that the elevations, even of Doric peripteral temples, were sufficiently subtle in the fifth century to need preliminary drawing to scale.

55 See p. 128, above. I could see no traces on it of the claw, only of the drove (see above pp. 131 f). Unfortunately, my camera could not take this detailed work when I tried it in August 1956.

56 G. P. Stevens in Hesperia XV (1946) 78, fig. 4. These dimensions are repeated in J. T. Hill, Ancient City of Athens 143, and we are evidently not meant to believe her plan opposite, which makes them 13 by 13 metres.

57 Bundgaard, 30 n. 21. He says that Stevens misunderstood Dinsmoor. But in AJA li (1947) 126 n. 83, Dinsmoor writes about the Old Propylon that 'we know neither the spacing of the columns, nor the distance between column and anta, nor the total width of the building (my discovery of foundation cuttings in 1910 having been incorrectly interpreted to the contrary)'. Bundgaard, however, says in his own note that in 1946 he himself carried out 'a renewed exposure of the site'. He describes and illustrates the results on his pp. 41-44; p. 43 and fig. 22 make it clear that he only discovered a floating area of rough rock, on which it is unlikely that any walls stood. He thinks that the area is far enough north to exclude Stevens' north wall. But even this seems uncertain (p. 44). Perhaps this rock was outside the Propylon altogether. I cannot but recall Stevens' dictum (op. cit., 88), 'The propylon... affords an illustration of the way the study of archaeology advances'.

58 For all this, see Somers Clarke and R. Engelbach, Ancient Egyptian Masonry esp. pp. 53 ff.

59 For instance, if one raised the stylobate in the centre by a series of unequal steps (Vitruvius 'scamillae impares', as they are plausibly interpreted in Dinsmoor, A.A.G. fig. 59), it would greatly help in choosing the curve and determining the length of one's vertical module, if one drew an elevation beforehand. A plan or 'paradigm' would have obviated confusion on the rather subtle east façade of the Theseum, where the axes of the columns are spaced, according to Koch (Theseustempel 76 and fig. 70), in a careful way. Take the mid-point (J) of the stylobate and that of the lower diameter in each of the three columns to one side of it (H, K, and L). Then JL : JK (1:625; 1) : JK : KL (1:599:1). The slight discrepancy even shows that the architect was using Fibonacci's figures (1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, etc.) for 1:625; 1 : 13 : 8, and 1:599; 1 : 8:5. In actual modern measurements JL, JK and KL are respectively 6.29, 3.87 and 2.42 metres (Koch, pl. 41) and I do not know in what ancient units of measurement they could have been worked out for the first time on the ground with movable pegs. Surely they determine the very length of the stylobate, before it is ever built! (For this, and other similar proportions, see my review of Koch in Gnomon xxix (1957) 96-7.)

Any cornice block, especially one with the novel mouldings of the Propylaea (Bohn, Propylaeum pl. 13),
But if Bundgaard can show that the Periclean Propylaea, which at first sight seem the most elaborate building of the age, in fact required no initial design to scale, he will have gone some way towards proving his case.

For him, these Propylaea seem a congeries of simple rectangular buildings, so poorly related aesthetically that the architect Mnesikles had evidently no notion of grouping, or even of the need for it. He omits some striking instances of Mnesikles' unifying powers, and is as tortuous as anybody in explaining the notorious asymmetry in the placing of door and windows behind the façade of the north-west wing ('Pinakotheke'). The more I look at the plan, the more I think they were placed to exclude direct sunlight from the picture gallery. But in this paper I need merely to examine his argument that Mnesikles rebuilt the main structures already existing, and to much the same scale, only pegging out on the ground slightly tidier alignments for them—an argument worked out in detail on his pp. 29 ff., and carefully illustrated in figs. 22, 40 and 41. Just under the central door in the gate-wall of the Mnesiklean Propylaea, at points marked C, D, and E on fig. 22, he thinks he has discovered the foundations of the gate-wall in the older building. Here there is 'a regular stratum enclosed on both sides by straight lines, parallel with each other and with the west stylobate [sc. of Weller's propylon]. It can be definitely concluded that it was intended to carry a wall whose foot had the width of the expance, c. 1·76 metres. It is striking to find so massive a cross-wall marked out in a building whose side-walls were only c. 0·80 metres thick. A similar circumstance is, however, to be found in its successor. The side-walls of Mnesikles' building are 0·88 metres and the threshold under the gate-wall 1·76 metres. There is, moreover, a singular correspondence between the measurements from E to the façade belonging to it and from the gate-wall to the point where Mnesikles' side-walls end, the fronts of the great west antae, etc.' In other words, Mnesikles, in designing his central gate-wall and halls, was hidebound by the dimensions of the Old Propyla, and merely threw a hexastyle colonnade out from either front.

One cannot treat these hexastyle colonnades as unimportant additions. The Athenian are surely the only amphiprostyle Propylaea of that age—which is itself sufficiently remarkable evidence that Mnesikles had a mind of his own. Moreover, there is another fundamental difference between Bundgaard's Old Propylon and Mnesikles'. Bundgaard must believe that, in his own Propylon, a stout gate-wall ran unbroken from side to side; for there are the cuttings for it, made deliberately in the very centre of the building by some practical architect working on the spot, and shown in figs. 22, 24 ff. But in Mnesikles' Propylaea the gate-wall, of course, is completely broken by the Panathenaic Way. There is not even a low threshold of one slab in the central door, although to each side there is a wall and four steps. On his fig. 40, Bundgaard actually shows his Propylon sliced, like Mnesikles', from end to end by the Panathenaic Way. But this is exactly the plan that, in the light of pp. 29 ff., he should consider impossible.61

were better drawn beforehand than merely described or specified as the work went up. I find even a simple Greek cornice block almost impossible to describe. Therefore, I think, unlike Bundgaard, that the ἀναγραφέος of IG II 1666 A.48 must be some sort of a drawing: λίθος...καὶ τὰ γεωμ...ἐκπέλεξαν ἀπερρίφθειν ἐν χαῖτας ὁρθός πανταχῆς πρὸς τὸν ἀναγραφέος οὖν αὐτὸν ὁ ἀριστεῖτος κ.τ.λ.

There were to be others, of the anta-capitals (A. 90) and the tiles (B.34).

60 Especially his brilliant use of dark stone under the wings to give the whole west façade a single continuous base, while at the same time the eye reads the four steps of the centre and the three steps of the wings each as single krepidies, each of the correct height (one lower diameter) for the building above it. Elsewhere, too, he uses the dark stone to unify and yet articulate the building, thus showing he has those peculiarly architectural powers not, perhaps, exhibited in Scandinavia since the Renaissance Royal Palace at Stockholm. For the dark stone, see Shoes' admirable paper in *Hesperia* Suppl. viii 341 ff.

61 At one point, I think, he explicitly decides for an unbroken gate-wall, but does not see how it wrecks his main theory. 'It is hardly likely that the stair in the older propylon was treated as an independent feature, with special course heights which did not come within the gate-wall system till the threshold was reached' (Bundgaard, Chapter I, 35).
Other features of the Old Propylon, whatever its size, must have given it a completely different character from the Mnesiklean. Its front columns, for instance, cannot have had a lower diameter greater than 1·2 metres; for the face of Weller's anta turned towards them is only 1·17 metres wide (Weller, pl. 2). But Mnesikles' main façade has columns of at least 1·6 (Bohn, pl. 2). Again, the column-spacing was radically different. For whereas the short wall at the corner of Weller's façade was 2·38 metres long (1·795 + 0·585 metres—Weller, pl. 2), Mnesikles' anta-face, of course, extended only about 1·5 metres. So the colonnades in the two buildings get off to a start of nearly a metre's difference.

One can ask oneself whether Bundgaard's building is even conceivable. His columns, I suppose, should have had a height of at most 6 metres (five lower diameters); and the architrave should (as in Mnesikles' building) have been level with the lintel of the central door. But on fig. 40 Bundgaard restores a central doorway equal to Mnesikles', and therefore 4 metres wide. I suppose these ungraceful proportions are just possible, if one can believe in the door-opening generally restored for the Siphnian Treasury.62 If Bundgaard accepted Weller's order, as I think he ought, he would get a column rather more slender than the anta-face—1 metre, say, in lower diameter—a column and anta only 4 metres high, and therefore a central door-opening 4 metres square! Much will depend on the period to which one assigns one's Propylon. Then again, I presume Bundgaard's Propylon had doors in all the openings, and it was the Greek habit to pivot these at the rear of each opening. In Mnesikles' Propylaea the doors in one period, pivoted behind the jambs of the central doorway, swung to a point at least 2 metres east of the gate-wall (Bohn, pl. 3). But this is just the clear width inside the colonnade which Bundgaard allows his Propylon's East Hall. The doors would not, perhaps, hit the columns. But what starved and parsimonious architecture! It is perhaps not fair to ask how all the wide spans, which so exercised Mnesikles, were overcome in the old building, with its identical dimensions. Doubtless much can be achieved with wood and terracotta.

But it seems to me that for his very distinctive design Mnesikles was guided by nothing that had existed on the site. We can safely use nothing in the present Propylaea as a guide to a single feature of its precursor. So we are left with Weller's building, with its small order, its probably modest plan, and its possible resemblance to the Propylon of Gaggera.

The only large arcaic building for which good evidence exists seems, then, to be the very old peripteral temple represented by the outer and inner Doerpfeld Foundation. Let us end by considering its relation to the H-fragments.

First, we may ask whether the date at which they were dismantled can be reconciled with that which I have tentatively assigned, on p. 134 above, to the rebuilding of the Temple on the Foundation, 525 B.C.

The two marble metopes re-used for the Hekatopmedon Inscription (IG ii 3–4) had been taken down before 485–484, when the inscription was engraved. They could have lain about for years before that, since the other metope, originally on the same building but with the mid-fifth century graffito scribbled on the corner, must still have been lying about a generation after Xerxes' campaign.63 Nevertheless, Dinsmoor, who assigns them in AJA li (1947) 148 to his Hekatopmedon on the site of the Parthenon, holds that they were taken down only after Marathon. Then at least thirteen were deprived of their 'crowning fascias' (viz. the taenia), chamfered along the edge and re-used in the forecourt pattern found on other marble metopes among the H-fragments. But its taenia is nearly 22 centimetres high, and projects nearly 4 centimetres, which exactly agrees with their dimensions (Wiegand, fig. 14a); and its dressed face and top, like theirs, shows no trace of the claw.

---

62 For which see, e.g., Dinsmoor in BCH xxxvii (1913) 57 (opening of 9·4 by 3·2 metres).
63 See p. 129 above. The graffito is ΑΥΣΙΑΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ. The metope is of dark marble, which may or may not be Hymettan (cf. Wiegand, 12). It does not seem to have had below the taenia the tongue-
of the Old Propylon; some were deprived of their 'crowning fascias' and used for inscriptions; others were left lying about. So, even according to Dinsmoor, some metopes were re-used years after the alleged date of dismantling. He admits as much, too, of the other H-fragments. They were found in bulk in the 'great earth terrace south of the Parthenon'; but he does not say in which part of it. Wiegand's architrave blocks, as we saw above, p. 142, were built into the 'Cimonian' wall—well after 480. Finally, Dinsmoor has to suppose (op. cit., 117 n. 35) that 'the choice squared blocks of the Hekatompedon [as he thinks], so far as they were not used in the Older Parthenon foundation, remained piled up as a reserve and were used by Kimon twenty years later'. In that case, any 'reserve' might be created or used at any time; and we are as far as ever from knowing when the H-fragments were available for re-use. Perhaps in 487. Perhaps—as I rather think—in 525.

The H-fragments, thinks Dinsmoor, all came from one building. At first sight we may wish to agree if, as I hope, we believe in only one known temple of very early date—the temple on Doerpfeld's outer and inner foundations.

I find it rather hard, however, to fit all these fragments into one building, and then place it on the foundations. These foundations show evidence of a hexastyle peripteral temple, with a tetrastyle amphiprostyle cela-building—a feature surely unique, except for the First Marble Parthenon, and one which surely proclaims our temple in some sort the ancestor of the Parthenon. What would have happened to the Doric frieze of the

---
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64 *AJA* li (1947) 117: '... all the "H" architecture and sculpture, which clearly belongs together without subdivision'.

65 For the First Marble Parthenon, see Hill, *AJA* xvi (1912) pl. 9. Hill restores it (i) on the analogy of the later Parthenon, (ii) because, in his view, the anta base which he describes on his pp. 552-3 can come only from an amphiprostyle temple. It projected from an end wall only about 0.50, and its projecting face, 1.822 metres long, corresponds to a column of the right width just under 2 metres. At the same time, one must notice that such an anta is unique. On one short side the moulding was cut off at a mitred joint, where the block met the cross-wall. But on the other short side, which is 120 centimetres long, and which marked the beginning of the cela-building's outer wall-face, the moulding continues unbroken. It should surely have been broken back a relatively short distance from the corner (here, perhaps, 40 or 50 centimetres) as is the similar moulding in the analogous position under the short return of the west anta of the Theseum (Koch, pl. 41). Presumably it was not, because the pronao was prostyle—although, we notice, the anta-returns are relatively short on the prostyle façades of the Propylaia (Bundgaard, fig. 8) and the Temple of the Athenians at Delos (Délai xii pl. 16). So perhaps the outer side of the anta equalled the face in width, as at Selinus G (Hulot et Fougères, Selinonte 251). But then, why does the moulded base-block not extend the whole width of the outer side? Would such asymmetric jointing on it be tolerable? Hill's plan (cf. my fig. 9) gives the antae no break at all, and seems to make
pronaios, when it turned the corner? With the normal Doric pronaios in antis merely the end triglyph was returned round the corner and the frieze then stopped dead. But on an amphiprostyle cela-building it ought, surely, to have continued right down the long sides. Normally, Doric architrave-blocks from walls must come not from cela-buildings, but from small Doric non-peripteral temples. But these blocks, among the H-fragments, could come from the cela. The columns of the order had evidently a lower diameter of about 1⅔ metres.

Coming to the fragments themselves, one has first the puzzles of the marble sima. Its technique, its construction in long rectangular strips of unrelated widths and lengths, and its sharp compositions of bright, primitive forms all put it among the H-fragments. But its proportions seem extraordinary. The corona of the raking cornice, according to all authorities, was 50 centimetres high (see p. 145 above). But the raking sima with the herringbone pattern (Fig. 10) was only 25 centimetres high, the chequerboard raking sima (Fig. 11) only 21 and the normal horizontal sima 17. In extremely archaic temples the sima was normally much higher than the corona. At Kalydon, for instance, it is restored as one and a half times the height of the corona by E. Dyggve (Das Laphron, fig. 221), just as it is for the second phase of Artemis at Corycra—a phase when, as in our H-temple, the moulding continue quite unbroken along the whole cela building. This, surely, would be tolerable only in the Ionic of the time. I am quite baffled by this detail of Hill's Parthenon.

66 Well shown, for instance, at Bassai: Cockerell, Aegina and Bassae (London, 1860), Bassae, pl. 5; J. Durm, Baukunst der Griechen 3rd edition (Leipzig 1910), fig. 240a.

67 See, for instance, the evidence for an extraordinary strip at one end of the raking sima (Schuchhardt, fig. 13 and pl. 1).

68 Schuchhardt, fig. 13 (herringbone), fig. 7 (chequerboard); and Wiegand, pl. 9 (horizontal).

69 Korkyra i pl. 24 (I do not know what is sima, what corona in the first phase—pl. 23).
it was of marble. Buildings at Selinus and Foce del Sele show the same proportions, and surely deserve a mention, though some scholars might rule them out of court as too provincial.

The akroteria normally assigned to our H-fragments seem similarly stunted. The Gorgon (Payne *A.M.S.* pl. 1, Schrader, 319 ff.), dated by Payne (p. 12) to c. 570 B.C.—which makes it rather late for our very primitive foundation—is restored as the akroterion on one apex. But one cannot make it even 1 metre high (Schuchhardt, fig. 12): for the head, which should be more than a quarter of the whole, is 25 centimetres high.\(^\text{70}\) In Classical times, of course, the heights of the akroterion and the tympanum were about equal, as they were already on the Siphnian Treasury\(^\text{71}\) and probably the Temple of Aphaia.\(^\text{72}\) It is

**FIG. 11.** Apex of second H raking sima, according to Schuchhardt, *op. cit.* 34, fig. 7.

true that the pediment of Kalydon, officially dated before the H-fragments\(^\text{73}\) is given rather small akroteria by Dyggve (*op. cit.* fig. 221). Even assuming that he is right to make it so wide—about 11 metres—the proportions are not so extreme. For his Gorgon at the apex is nearly three-quarters the height of the tympanum, ours only half. And each of our corner akroteria is a mere helix, 40 centimetres high, or less. Sima and akroteria, then, seem exceptionally small among our other H-fragments. Must we, in fact, assign them to the two very wide pediments required by the outer Doerpfeld Foundation?

When Schuchhardt first published in detail all the fragments of marble sima, forty-six fragments were known altogether from what seemed to be two different pediments. He argued reasonably that, if he could put together one slope of one pediment, he could calculate pretty accurately the width of the façade on the cornice; and he discovered that the right-hand half of the slightly taller raking sima, which I call the ‘herringbone’ sima,

\(^{70}\) 26·0 centimetres, according to Schrader; 25, according to Payne.

\(^{71}\) As set up in the Museum at Delphi (cf. Robertson, *Greek and Roman Architecture* pl. 2a).

\(^{72}\) Much depends on the restoration of the scrolls. Cockerell (*Aegina and Bassae*, pl. 4) makes the akroterion much lower; Fiechter (in Furtwaengler, *Aegina*, pls. 33, 49–51) rather higher.

\(^{73}\) Dinsmoor puts it shortly after Thermon, which he dates to 620 (*A.A.G.* 51–2).
offered him the best hope;74 for he could identify fragments from it even where the ‘herringbone’ band along the top had not been preserved.

He is guided by several facts: (i) The size of the coupled circles along the lower part of the sima keeps nearly constant within a pediment but varies appreciably from pediment to pediment (fig. 10). (ii) On the ‘herringbone’ sima the ‘herringbones’ change direction at the apex of the pediment, so one can assign their preserved specimens to the appropriate sides. The two bands of herringbones appear to have crossed one another at the apex; see Schuchhardt, fig. 4. (iii) The coupled circles are joined like a closed guilloche or figure-of-eight by a diagonal. This diagonal changes direction on the ‘herringbone’ sima, on a block labelled Kat. 47 and illustrated on Schuchhardt, pl. 11 and figs. 4, 12. It just makes a join with two other fragments, showing that it was once part of a single apex-block. So, on the left-hand side of the pediment, the diagonals ran downwards from left to right, on all its right-hand side, except the two top pairs of circles, from right to left. On the chequerboard sima they changed direction, according to Schuchhardt (fig. 7—my fig. 11) immediately to the left of the apex. In this case, however (his pl. 11.4), those on the right-hand side ran down from left to right—the exact opposite of the direction on the other pediment. Almost all the preserved fragments of this sima seem to come from the left-hand side.

(iv) The original stretches of raking sima were of various lengths, even more varied than those of the horizontal sima, and even though the joints on the raking sima apparently marked the upper and lower edges of the pantiles, which were thus of different heights.75 But actually most examples have very little pantile now attached to them. The end of one sima-block, if well preserved, will therefore show us exactly at what point on the pattern the next began. On the other hand, if both sides of a joint have perished, it is quite impossible to ascertain where it came.

Guided by all this, Schuchhardt obtained a length of at least 7.77 metres, the total of the stretches preserved, for the right-hand side of the herringbone sima; and this is already too long for one side of any pediment that would fit the inner Dorpfeld Foundation. Wiegand’s pediment for this side had a length of just 7 metres (Wiegand, fig. 112). So Schuchhardt concluded that the sima must be intended for the outer foundation.

Why Schuchhardt arranged the fragments on a side in all 11.65 metres long is not quite clear (Schuchhardt, fig. 13). Why, for instance, could not Kat. 13 have joined Kat. 47? One could reduce the length by a metre or two. But I suppose Schuchhardt started from that required in a building on Doerpfeld’s outer Foundation.

Since he wrote many more fragments have been found—sixty-nine, according to Dinsmoor, up to the time when Dinsmoor wrote his article for AJA (1947).76 Schuchhardt is now about to republish the sima, and stands a fair chance, I think, of determining the width of the roof far more exactly. I cannot, of course, predict the results of his detailed study, but I hope he may now find that he can put together much of the chequerboard sima.

A new fragment, no. 68 in the catalogue (my fig. 12), will help him considerably, if it comes this, with joints down the roof-slope than with those across it). See Schuchhardt, p. 104, which I am not sure that I have perfectly understood.

74 P. 115. Schuchhardt catalogued the 107 fragments of marble sima known to Wiegand, and added 109 new fragments to the list, a number which Züchner in the same year increased by 62 pieces, while Broner found a few others in a well on the north slope of the Acropolis in 1937, so that we are now dealing with a grand total of about 285 pieces. But Dinsmoor, while possessing these 285 to Schuchhardt’s 216, does not himself re-examine them as evidence for the width of the roof.
from this. It is the right-hand end of a piece from a right-hand side, and contains portions of two figures-of-eight. In the left-hand one, the diagonal runs down from left to right, in the right-hand one, from right to left. But on the right-hand side of the herringbone pediment, all diagonals ran down from right to left. So no. 68 should come from the right-hand side of the chequerboard sima. Prima facie, we can now, perhaps, understand why in all fragments of that sima except that immediately to the right of the apex (Schuchhardt, fig. 7) the diagonals ran down from right to left. They must have run that way on all the left-hand side, changed direction at the apex and run down from left to right for a short stretch, and then changed direction again somewhere along the right-hand side at the point marked by the new fragment no. 68.

I hope that, as a result of his latest efforts, Schuchhardt will be able to make up two coherent pediments, each big enough for the outer Doerpfeld Foundation.

In fact, though this sima seems small for the other H-fragments, all other marble simas of this period are actually smaller. And they all seem to be freely dressed with the claw—e.g. the two examples, Wiegand, pls. 9.3, 10.2a—whereas Schuchhardt's shows no trace of the claw.

I am myself often tempted to judge reconstructions of buildings by the likelihood of the proportions that they embody. I am still impenitently hostile to Bundgaard's Propylon and Dinsmoor's Hekatompedon. But I must admit that Schuchhardt's sima and the associated akroteria, although at first sight too stunted, really do seem to have crowned a very wide pediment. And there is still a good chance that this is to be associated with the outer Doerpfeld Foundation, and so was originally 22 metres wide.

The frieze presents a minor problem. On the one hand there are the single metopes of marble and the single triglyphs, of which some at least were built up of horizontal courses of hard 'calcaire' (see above, p. 132). On the other, there are some remains of single blocks of 'calcaire', of which each comprised a triglyph and metope together, and must therefore have been about 1.85 by 1.35 metres. Such construction was normal in Classical Greek buildings of moderate size, because on such buildings, where the lower column-diameter was about 3 feet, it was convenient to make all possible blocks about 3 feet long—a size fairly easy to handle. Only one course, that of the architraves and door-lintels, needed to be made of anything much bigger. But I am a little surprised to find it on so large a temple so early.

The problem of the architrave is much more serious. First, all known architrave-blocks, whether complete 'epistyles' or small blocks from, perhaps, the top third of the visible architrave, appear to argue for a heavy architrave about 1.5 metres high, and a frieze above with metopes over 1 metre wide. But does not the Doerpfeld Foundation imply that the cella-building had much lighter columns and entablatures on the façades? And, if so, where are these represented in the H-fragments? Schuchhardt, in fig. 18, gives the pronaos the heavy architrave of 1.5 metres, which alone survives in any tangible blocks. But he associates it with a column 85 centimetres in upper diameter and a frieze only 80 centimetres high. This, surely, cannot be right.

---

77 Wiegand (p. 12) calls them 'Kalkstein' (= calcaire), Dinsmoor calls them 'poros' (AJA li (1947) 148). Alas! when in Athens I did not find these fragments which all seem to be small.

78 For instance, Dinsmoor's plan (AJA xxxvi (1932) 316) makes them only two-thirds the diameter of the outer. But then it seems to wish to make them Ionic—unnecessarily?
Actually, there is enough room on the end walls of the inner Doerpfeld Foundation (Wiegand, fig. 117) for Doric columns nearly as wide as those on the outer stylobate; and, if later known examples are any guide, the entablature over such internal columns, even where they are appreciably smaller, can equal that of the peristyle.\textsuperscript{79} Wiegand, believing the two foundations supported temples of different date, was actually able to make the entablature of the inner larger and heavier than that of the outer, as is clear from a study of his fig. 112 (though he does try to make up on the cornice). So we need have no qualms in making them equal.

Moreover, we saw (above, p. 149) that in an amphiprostyle cella-building the Doric frieze would conceivably have been carried down the long sides, over the side walls. So the

\textsuperscript{79} The Temple of Zeus at Olympia affords a very good example, where the pronaos columns are about five-sixths of the peristylar, and the entablatures are nearly equal (Olympia, Tafelband I, T. IX and X).
reduced architrave-blocks, generally thought to have come over walls, could have occupied this position on the cella-building above the inner Doerpfeld Foundation.

A much more serious problem is that of the architrave-block, Wiegand, fig. 3, which I described above, on p. 142. If the right-hand edge was originally stepped in the present remarkable way, it would most naturally have rested on the right-hand anta of the sort of Doric façade shown in Wiegand, fig. 112. But it is cut to the same scale as the other 'H' architraves, and seems to go with them. Yet it cannot go on the outer peristyle. Can it go even on the amphiprostyle cella-building, at the beginning of a long side? Its right-hand edge could rest on the anta, but there is room on the side of the porch for only one architrave-block, and this one seems the wrong length for the position. It neither extends to the corner nor stops to the right of the last regula, as it would in a Classical temple—for in Classical times the architrave had a depth of one lower diameter, and was normally

![Diagram of architrave corner]

**FIG. 14.** Perspective of corner of H-pronaos; restoration with wide pronaos. (This drawing unfortunately omits the vertical joint in the architrave below the centre of the last triglyph on the long side; cf. FIG. 13.)

two blocks deep, so that the depth of one block equalled half a lower diameter and therefore the width of one triglyph, or one strip of regula.  

**It is hard to assign the block to another building, for it shares the dimensions of the other fragments. Moreover, I have tried to show my disbelief in Dinsmoor's Hekatompedon**

This is well shown on the Theseum (Koch, pl. 6) and, in an analogous position to ours, on the north-east corner of the Propylaea (Bohn, pl. 6).
and Bundgaard's large Propylon, the other potential candidates for it. One might say boldly that, despite all appearances, it could come from our peristyle. For many other H-fragments exhibit tortuous and misleading construction—Schuchhardt's sima, for instance, or the frieze, where in places single triglyphs might be composed of several blocks, while in others one triglyph and metope together might form a single block. Indeed, Wiegand (fig. 58) figures what seems to be part of another corner-block from the architrave; and it shows traces of another joint, quite unlike that on the stepped edge of his fig. 3, yet equally unexpected. For it runs along most of the regula, just above its lower edge!

Or one might urge, with equal boldness, that in this early temple the whole architrave was only one triglyph—or regula—width in thickness, and composed of pairs of blocks (fig. 13). Would they be stable? They would be nearly 1 ½ metres high and only 40 centimetres thick—rather like the orthostates in a Classical temple. In spite of everything, I think this architrave is possible. A regula and architrave-depth of 80 centimetres (Wiegand, fig. 24) and a lower diameter of rather less, perhaps, than 1 ½ metres (Wiegand, fig. 72). These (see fig. 13) could give columns of the proportion of Athena Pronaia, Delphi (Robertson, fig. 25) and an architrave about as lofty as that in the Basilica of Paestum, and even narrower (Koldewey, fig. 10). The wide regula and narrow architrave would completely solve the triglyph problem; and at least in our temple the triglyph, though equaling in width the full depth of the architrave, would not equal one lower diameter, as it did in the almost contemporary building, the small Sicyonian 'monopteroi' at Delphi. 81 I append a little sketch, fig. 14, to help readers decide whether a colonnade of such proportions might
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**FIG. 15.** Corner of H-pronaos, Plan (A) with wide pronaos; (B) with narrow pronaos. See n. 82.

please the archaic eye. Let them remember that this is only an internal order, a corner of the pronaos, where by normal Classical practice the column should be relatively more slender—as at Aphaia, Aegina, Zeus, Olympia, and the Parthenon itself.

81 Here the regula was much wider than the upper diameter and nearly as wide as the lower, and the joint between the architrave-blocks on the corner came nearly half way along the regula. See La Coste-Messelière, *Au Musée de Delphes* figs. 1, 4, which the reader should study before condemning my sketch, fig. 14, out of hand.

The small Sicyonian architrave, like the large architraves of Paestum, needs no 'backer' and is only one block deep. Among the fragments of H architrave-blocks measured by Wiegand (pp. 3-4), none seems to be thicker than 31 centimetres.
All the same, this block of architrave causes me some uneasiness. Without it, I should have no qualms in assigning all these H-fragments to the cella and peristyle of a single early temple on the Doerpfeld Foundation. I should date it as early in the sixth century as I could (although it apparently took many years to build), and should argue from its plan that it foreshadowed the Parthenon far more obviously than the Erechtheum. It was rebuilt on the same foundations about 525, and at that time, probably, these were dressed with the claw. The first Parthenon of any size for which we have evidence was planned in the eighties of the fifth century. Until the time of Mnesikles the Propylaea were probably small.

To these rather negative conclusions, drawn from published evidence and the remains visible four years ago—in August 1936—I find that at present I can add nothing.

**Hugh Plommer.**

---

82 In a normal prostyle porch, the axis of the last triglyph is the length of one good architrave-block from the centre of gravity of the anta (see, e.g., *Delos* xii pl. 16). But could it be here, especially if the last triglyph and the corner-column had the same axis? Wiegand's block is 3.84 metres long, which should mean that the front of the anta was just over 3 1/4 metres from the axis of the column. But the Doerpfeld Foundation, as shown in Wiegand, fig. 72, suggests that anta-front and column-axis were only 2 3/4 metres apart. The foundation, very fragmentary at the corners of the cella-building, could perhaps be deceptive. Or perhaps in my sketch I have made the anta too narrow on the outside. Give it an outer face as wide as its front to the column, do not bother to centre the third triglyph over it, as in my sketch, and on the inside give the anta the slightest possible projection from the cross-wall, and perhaps one could then fit my architecture more easily on to the Doerpfeld Foundation. See my plans, fig. 15, where (A) gives the restoration that I like, and that I have shown in fig. 13, (B) the restoration, with narrow pronaois, which better suits the foundations of the corner as given by Wiegand.
EUBOEAN LEKANAI

(PLATES IX–XV)

In the Archaeological Institute of the University of Tübingen there is a lekane that was acquired by the late Professor Watzinger too late for inclusion in his Griechische Vasen in Tübingen.\(^1\) It has recently been published in an article ‘Zu einigen böotischen Vasen des sechsten Jahrhunderts’ in the Jahrbuch des römisch-germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz iv\(^2\) by Dr Konrad Schauenburg, who regards it as Boeotian. This lekane (PLATE IX 1–5; Schauenburg, pl. 8)\(^3\) and one in Munich which goes with it (PLATE X 1–3, XI 1, 2; CV iii pl. 146.3, 5–7)\(^4\) are similar in many respects to Boeotian lekanai, but I hope to show that they are in fact of the same fabric as the three great grave amphorae from Eretria.\(^5\) The most recent discussion of these amphorae and full bibliographies are to be found in Mr John Boardman’s article ‘Pottery from Eretria’, BSA xlvi (1952) 30 ff., to which I shall frequently refer.

In shape the two vases are near to Boeotian lekanai of the orientalising class\(^6\) except that the flat ribbon handles are ‘continuous’, that is, they are formed from a continuous strip of clay which is applied to the rim externally in such a way as to leave a rather pinched loop in the centre and a centimetre or so of the ribbon projecting at each end. The ribbony strip keeps its identity all along and nowhere does it merge into the rim; see PLATE X 2, 3, XI 1. By contrast, in orientalising lekanai (the largest single Boeotian class) there is no connexion between the projections and the handle, from which they are separated by about a centimetre of normal rim. For a typical example see CV Heidelberg i pl. 27.5. Both the Tübingen and the Munich lekanai have on the rim a row of reversed zeds similar to those which decorate the lip of the Wedding amphora and the Herakles amphora.\(^7\) Immediately above the foot there is a broad black band edged at the top with a red line painted over the black. The base within the foot-ring is decorated with a large black spot inside a small circle. The interior has a tondo framed by a red ring superimposed on the edge of the surrounding black, and two red circles are painted over the black a short distance below the rim. The surface of the Munich lekane has been coloured a deep red, well preserved under the foot. The black glaze on both vases is thinly applied and streaky.

---

\(^1\) My attention was first drawn to this vase by Professor Watzinger. I am very much indebted to Professor Schweitzer for giving me facilities for studying it in Tübingen and for permission to publish it. I wish to thank Dr H. Luschey for making me new photographs and Dr K. Schauenburg for allowing me to use one of his. Professor Haspels has given me permission to publish the lekane in Amsterdam and Professor Diepolder to figure a new detail of the Munich lekane as well as to reproduce an existing photograph; Mr Boardman has put me much in his debt by generously sharing his notes and photographs, and Professor Trendall by very kindly examining the lekane in Warsaw for me. To these my thanks are due. I am especially grateful to Mrs Karouzou for allowing me to spend a considerable time studying pottery from Euboea in the National Museum and for permission to publish details of the grave amphorae and other vases from Eretria now in Athens. Finally I wish to record my gratitude to the Trustees of the Leverhulme Research Awards for a grant that enabled me to work in Greece in the spring of 1957.

\(^2\) Pp. 65 ff., pl. 8. This article was already completed when Dr Schauenburg’s discussion of the vase appeared. A certain amount of overlapping is therefore inevitable.

\(^3\) Inv. 5443-28. Ht. 8-0 to 8-9 cm., diameter without handles 33-8 to 34 cm. The diameter given by Schauenburg, op. cit. 65 n. 15 includes the handles.

\(^4\) Inv. 6197. Ht. 10 cm., diam. 32-8 cm.

\(^5\) The Wedding amphora, Athens 1004, CC667; the Herakles amphora, Athens 12075, Nicole 889; the Peleus amphora, Athens 12076, Nicole 890.

\(^6\) Metropolitan Museum Studies iv 18 ff.

\(^7\) BSA xlvi pls. 9, 10.
The Tübingen vase has on the outside a lotus band, on the inside a man’s head. The lotus band consists of black buds with white sepals alternating with red buds painted directly on the clay, all connected by arching stalks skipping one (see plate IX 2 where the faded colours have been restored on the photograph). The stalks are rather thick and thrust themselves some way into the buds, being in several cases visible through the red pigment. This kind of lotus band does not occur in Attic or Boeotian black-figure, but it is exactly paralleled in every respect on the lid of the Wedding amphora from Eretria, Plate IX 6. It is highly probable that the lid of the Eretrian Herakles amphora also had a band of the same kind, but a great deal of it is missing and only the top of the arching stalks now remains. A similar band, differing only in the absence of connecting stalks, is to be seen on the foot of the Herakles amphora, Plate X 6. Others are found on amphorae in Athens (2635, from Tanagra) and Mykonos (KA 1028), which have been connected with Eretria by Professor Amyx and Mr Boardman, and on a plate in the Louvre.

The bearded head in the tondo bears a superficial resemblance to those on the necks of a number of neck amphorae and on the handle-plates of column kraters by companions of Lydos, but it does not closely correspond with any of them. Still less does it resemble the heads inside Boeotian orientalising lekanai. Over his black hair the Tübingen man wears a red fillet with two rows of white spots representing a wreath of flowers; see Plate IX 4 and (the same coloured) 5. The white spots are unusually large and no incision is used. This garland is not characteristic of either Attic or Boeotian, but it is seen on the bridegroom of the main panel of the Wedding amphora (the colour too faded to show on a photograph) and on the nearest of the group of three women beyond the horses in the same scene (see BSA xlvii pl. 11a), though in her case there is only one row of spots. The bold, well-defined red stripe across the cheek of the Tübingen head is very unusual. It seems too large and too near the eye for a moustache, yet it can hardly be intended for anything else. We may compare the much neater incised moustache of the Hermes watching the struggle with the hydra on the Herakles amphora (Plate X 4), whose face, less carefully drawn and on a smaller scale, bears some resemblance to that in the Tübingen tondo. Still nearer, mutatis mutandis, is the head of the goddess in front of the Hermes, Plate IX 7. The neck of the Tübingen man also has a red patch, but, unlike the stripe on the cheek, it is very worn and has no firm outline and may therefore be a remnant of a coat of red that originally covered the whole neck. If so, it is rather remarkable to find a red neck, red beard and largely red check in such close juxtaposition.

The Munich lekane agrees with that in Tübingen in every respect (shape, handles, large black spot and small circle on base, position of red bands and so forth), a trifling difference being that the zeds on the rim are more widely spaced. The subjects on the other hand could hardly be more unlike, but here the Munich lekane also finds points of contact with the Eretrian amphorae. Outside we have an animal frieze—pair of rams, hare between eagles and a single goose in a field of lotuses; inside, a row of three geese overlapping (CV iii pl. 146.3). In their grouping the rams recall the pair in the panel on the back of the shoulder of the Herakles amphora (Plate X 7) who also are grazing at a lotus, while in

---

8 Miss Haspels (ABL 29, 107) refers to a number of Attic lotuses with white sepals, but these do not alternate with red buds. Those on lekythoi of the Dolphin class (op. cit. 14 f., 193 f.) are of a different shape, almost globular at the base of the bud, with an elongated tip, cf. CV Reading i pl. 11.7. The Eretrian bud narrows gradually.

9 AJA xlv (1941) 69 n. 36.

10 BSA xlvii 45 f., pl. 14.

11 CA 579, BSA iii (1957) pl. 6a.
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12 Cf. the neck-amphorae of the Painter of Vatican 309, e.g. Rumpf Sakonides pls. 4b, 5c, d, e, f, 27c, d, and the column kraters of the Painter of Louvre F6, CV Oxford ii pl. 12.7, 8, 10.

13 Boston 552, Fairbanks Cat. pl. 62; Neugebauer Antiken in deutschem Privathesitz 148 pl. 61, and, related to the orientalising class, Mainz University, formerly Preys, Metropolitan Museum Studies iv 34 fig. 28; CV Mainz i pl. 33.4.
drawing they are nearer to the ram (unfortunately decapitated in the photograph) just below Hermes in the animal frieze of the same amphora (Plate X 4). All the animals on the lekane, like those of the Wedding amphora, were gay with lavish markings in red and white. The numerous white patches on the rams, too faded to be seen on a photograph and only just discernible to the eye, are similar to those on the boars on the foot of the Wedding amphora (see Plate XI 5 and, the same coloured, 6) and on the great bull in the main zone on the back of the Herakles amphora. Such white patches are of course common on animals in Attic black-figure and can be found here and there on Boeotian lekanai, e.g. New York 66.1021.16, Metropolitan Museum Studies iv 22, 23, figs. 6, 7, but nowhere is there such a close correspondence with the Munich lekane as on the Eretrian amphorae. The red stripes on ribs and hindquarters are generally larger and more shapely on Eretrian animals than on normal Attic.

Where, as often, there is little or no incision the coloured stripes tend to assume a special importance and become more consciously decorative. They are broad and rounded at the top and taper towards the bottom, taking the shape of an elongated pear or a leaf; see for instance the ram on the foot of the Herakles amphora, Plate X 6. When accompanied by incisions they are smaller and less conspicuous but still normally retain the tapering shape; see the bull beneath the hydra of the main zone of the Herakles amphora, Plate X 5. This is true also of the Munich rams and the hare, Plate XI 1, in all of which the stripes on the hindquarters are of this Eretrian shape; see Plate X 3 where the red stripes on the ram have been painted over on the photograph. This illustration still does not give any idea of the colourfulness of the original as the six white patches have not been repainted.

The large number of flowers (no less than seven) springing from the ground on the Munich lekane is surprising. There is nothing to compare with this in Attic or Boeotian animal friezes, nor, it must be admitted, are they often found on extant Eretrian ware. But in this connexion we may remember not only the solitary lotus between the grazing rams of the Herakles amphora (Plate X 7), but also the large ivy leaves springing from the ground on the back and foot of the Wedding amphora and on the foot of the Herakles amphora (BSA xlvii pl. 9a, b and pl. 10a; here Plate X 6). These ivy leaves fulfil the same purpose and could very easily be turned into lotuses similar to that under the neck of the ram on the left on the Munich lekane (Plate X 1) merely by adding a red centre and two black sepals. The lotus to the right of the hare (Plate XI 1), less opulent than the others, corresponds with that hanging behind the head of Hermes on the Herakles vase (Plate X 4). The filling ornament in the shape of a four-stroke rosette between the legs of the same ram is known in Eretrian from an early period, see Boardman, op. cit. 18 fig. 19.

To the two lekanai just discussed must be added two joining fragments of another found at Olynthus: Robinson, Olynthus v pl. 45. 19A. It is rather coarser and much is missing, but the handle, zeds and the pair of red lines inside are all true to type. There remain only parts of two lotus flowers and a bud. The flowers, as far as they are preserved, are of a shape common in Attic. A degenerate version of the same flower occurs on an amphora in Mykonos tentatively attributed to Eretria by Amyx (AJA xlv (1941) 69 n. 36) and figured by Boardman (BSA xlvii pl. 14). The bud on the Olynthus fragment with its

14 In Attic the red stripes vary considerably. Those of Kleitias are thin and delicate, closely following the incised line, see Furtwängler-Reichhold, Gr. Vasenmalerei pl. 3. Lydos makes his sometimes in the same way as Kleitias, as on the amphora Naples 2770, JHS li (1931) pl. 13, but elsewhere he has broad blocks of colour completely filling the space between the incised lines as on the Athens dinos Rumpf, Sakonides pl. 19, or, clearer, Hoppin

Handbook of Greek B.F. Vases 161. Those on the commoner kind of Attic vase tend to look like sausages.

15 These well-shaped tapering markings are found also on some unpublished vases in Chalcis Museum. They are not exclusively Boeotian, but are found on a few Boeotian vases, see BICS vi (1959) 2 pl. 1.2d. Similar stripes, though generally less pointed, can be seen on Pontic vases and on some Rhodian.
curious incisions seems to be unique. It has a red spot on each of the petals incised round the edge, not visible in the illustration.16

That Euboian vases should find their way to Olynthus is by no means improbable, and the excavator of the site has himself suggested (op. cit., 67) that the fragment 19B illustrated on the same plate, found in the same trench as the lekane fragment 19A, might be early Euboian. This fragment shows the head, neck and part of the breast of a cock, and in front of it part of a wing. The unusual red spots seen on the wing feathers recall the red spots just referred to on the lotus bud of the lekane. Between the wing and the cock is a dotted cross like that above the back of the hare on the Munich lekane (Plate XI 1). The toothed lines across body and neck of the cock may be compared with similar lines on birds on the lid of a pyxis from Eretria, Athens i9886 (Plate XV, 1, 2), which from the yellow colour of the clay and other indications is almost certainly of Euboian make. A near replica of this pyxis was in Leipzig until destroyed in the war. Its provenience is not known.17 Another example of the toothed line is seen on fragment 42 A, Olynthus v pl. 53, where it is used for the wing-feathers of a bird or siren, painted in white. The tail-feathers are also painted white, as are those of the large siren on the back of the Wedding amphora (BSA xlvii, pl. 9 b) and those of a bird or siren on a fragment from Eretria, ibid., 35 and pl. 10d. It seems very probable that this Olynthian fragment too is Eretrian, and that the lekane fragment 19A is not an isolated example of Euboian ware exported to the north.

In the second Athenian fascicule of the Corpus Vasorum (pls. 16.1–3, 17.1) Mrs Karouzou has published a lekane of unknown provenience18 with the same general characteristics as those in Tubingen and Munich—continuous handles, large spot in small circle on the base, lower part of body black with a red edge (mainly lost, but visible for a short distance). The zeds on the rim are rather taller than those on the preceding lekanai and are separated by dots. The inside is in a very bad state, the tondo being completely destroyed. The outside has a procession of geese grazing, the leader snapping menacingly at a small man wrapped in a himation. The birds are well drawn with fine incised work on their heads, and it has been thought that the vase is too good to be Euboian. But equally neat rendering of details can be seen in the main zone of the Eretrian Herakles amphora where the hydra heads, though less elaborate, are comparable. The sinuous necks of the geese, the curve of their backs and their shape generally resemble those of the geese in the bottom row of the foot of the Peleus amphora more than any other geese that I know, and the little man would be at home with the company on the neck of the same amphora (Boardman, op. cit. pl. 9 c).19 The rows of four or five spots in the field, some round, some egg-shaped, are like those above and below the much clumsier goose on the Munich lekane and those on the Herakles amphora accompanying the lion immediately below Herakles (ibid., pl. 10 a, 11 b). There is no added colour discernible except faint traces of white dots between the pair of incised lines that run across the wings. The surface of the vase, like that of the Munich lekane, has been darkened to a rich red and the glaze is streaky.

A lekane in Amsterdam,20 Plates XI 3, XII 1–3, may be placed near the Athens lekane. It conforms with the usual basic rules—continuous handles, zeds on the rim (tallish like the right on the neck of the Peleus amphora, the incised curve across the eyeball which gives life to his eye has a counterpart on the figure on the extreme left. On this latter figure also, as on the little man of the lekane, the middle incised fold of the himation cuts right across the vertical fold that hangs down in front.

16 For the Euboian habit of embellishing petals or leaves with a spot of added colour, see BSA ii pl. 7 a and f (the latter, Athens 16327, wrongly marked g on the plate).
17 I am much indebted to Mrs Koch for information about this pyxis. There is no photograph extant, and I owe my knowledge of it to sketches made by the late R. P. Austin.
18 Nat. Mus. 16343. Diam. 33 cm.
19 Though the posture is different, the folds of his himation agree with those of the third figure from
20 Allard Pierson Museum inv. 273. Algemeene Gids 1322; Scheurleer Catalogus eener Verzameling Egyptische, Griekse, Romeinsche en andere Oudheden no. 388, pl. 36.2.
those of the Athens vase, and for once the right way round), the lower part of the body black with a red band at the edge, a red band encircling the tondo, a pair of red lines about 3 cm. below the rim and a large spot in a small circle in black on the base. On the outside there is a centauromachy: three Lapiths, one with a short cloak over his arm, the other two armed with clubs, and six centaurs armed with stones. In the tondo there is a youth running. The vase is in poor condition, much mended and with one of the handles modern. The black glaze has flaked a good deal and much of it is fired to a purplish red. The equine bodies of the centaurs have large white patches similar to those on the animals of the Munich leukane, but like them too faded to reproduce, and the stones in their hands were probably white. The hair of the youth in the tondo is red, but that of the Lapiths on the outside does not seem to have been coloured. The incisions are carefully made. Especially noteworthy are the incised lines at the throat like the neck line of a garment though the youths are naked, the taut line from brow to ear which gives the impression that they are wearing close-fitting leather caps, the rows of small curved incisions on the inner side of the thigh as well as the outer, and the long shallow S curve running down the thigh to the knee. The leukane is said to have come from Karditsa, on the eastern side of Copais.

A minor piece from the same hand is a lekythos now in the possession of Mr Walter C. Baker in New York, Collection Lehmann pl. 6 no. 101, showing a horseman between two youths, one of whom carries a short cloak similar to that on the leukane, plate XII 3, but painted red and foldless. The red cap-like hair, the incised neck-line of a non-existent chiton, low and widely spaced nipples, shallow S curve on the thigh and the treatment of the knee are the same as on the leukane. On the shoulder we have the familiar Eretrian black lotuses with white sepals, but the buds between them are black, not red as on the Wedding and the Herakles amphorae and the Tübingen leukane, and there are black spots between the flowers. Rather near to these two vases, but of poorer quality and with a number of minor differences, is the lekythos 567 in Chalcis Museum which has a youth pursuing a woman with one onlooker, and on the shoulder black buds alternating with black spots.

In the Humboldt University, Berlin, there was formerly a leukane, D 149, of a different class but nevertheless, I believe, Euboean if not Eretrian (Plate XIII 1-3. No. 2 shows a portion overlapping the left side of the vase as seen in Plate XIII 1 with the colours retouched). The handles, still continuous, are less pinched, making a broader, shallower arch. On the base, instead of the usual spot and ring, there are two concentric rings, the outer broad. The rim has upright stemless ivy leaves. The lotus design on the outside is unparalleled. It consists of a row of upright full-blown flowers interlocked with a row of inverted buds, each bud and each flower linked to its neighbours by long white stalks. The full-blown flowers are large and fleshy with fat white centres and at top and sides four little red petals edged with white arcs. The inverted buds have a white sepal at each side painted directly on the clay with a third painted over the middle of the black bud itself. Between each side-sepal and the bud there is a red petal hanging loose, also painted lekythos and the Amsterdam leukane with Rhitsona 51.229, Sixth 42 class C, pl. 13, with which goes 51.228, BSA xiv, pl. 9 f., both of which I now suspect to be Euboean.

22 Diameter more than 30 cm. I have never handled this vase and have seen only the inside, through glass, in 1930. My knowledge of the outside is drawn from photographs sent me soon after by Professor Noack, here reproduced in Plate XIII 1-3, and from notes made by P. N. Ure in 1914. A few details remain uncertain and have therefore been left out of the discussion.
directly on the clay, while short transverse bands of red bind the white stalks together both beneath each flower or bud and again lower down (or, in the case of the buds, higher up), where the stalks diverge from one another. There is no incision whatever on the outside of the vase.

In the inside of the bowl we see a bull walking out of the tondo to right. The front hooves trespass beyond the reserved field into the black area and are outlined with incision. His entire head projects also and is outlined with both incision and white paint. White is used for a line that runs down the underside of the neck and is continued under the belly, for the large curving horn and for the end of the tail. A thick white line marks off the shoulder; thin white lines indicate folds of wrinkled skin on the neck and the play of light on the ribs and hindquarters. Red is not much in evidence, being used only for the part of the neck between the white shoulder line and the white wrinkles, and for two small marks on the back. Incision is not employed except where it is necessary for outlining the hooves and the projecting head, being reinforced in the latter case by a white line. The space between the bull’s legs is filled by a stemless lotus with white sepals like those on the outside of the vase. This recalls the three lotuses, similar but inverted and with black sepals, on the Vienna amphora attributed to Eretria by AMyx AjA xlv (1941) 65 fig. 4, 67 n. 26. Above the back there is a four-stroke rosette like that beneath the Munich ram, but here each of the eight points is marked with a white spot. We may compare Boardman’s Eretrian amphora C3, BSA xlvii 25 fig. 21c, pl. 5, his fragment from Eretria in Athens ibid. 35 n. 230, pl. 10d, and also perhaps, to go further afield, the fragment in Bonn from the Euboean colony of Cumae, AA 1936 365 fig. 22, all of which have the four-stroke rosette with spots of added white.

The shape of the animal is peculiar. Its general aspect is hardly bovine, and at first sight it could be taken for an ass,25 but the long white horn and the folds on the neck are convincing. It has one feature in common with the much more realistic bulls of the Wedding amphora (plate XIII 5, from the same negative as 4 with the colours overpainted), and that is the white line which runs down the underside of the neck. A white line in this position can be found also on Attic vases from the Françoise vase onward,26 but most of them are later than the Wedding amphora and the animal concerned is most frequently the deer. This odd lekane has no claim to be regarded as Attic, and the fact that in this point it agrees with mid-sixth century Eretrian practice, together with the white-sepalled lotus and the four-stroke rosette, helps to place it within the Eretrian sphere.

We find links with both the unique Berlin lekane and the Tübingen group in a lekane in the National Museum in Warsaw, formerly in the Binental collection, CV Poland iii pl. 108.1, here plates XI 4, XIV 1–6.27 I am very much indebted to Professor Kazimierz Michalowski for information about this vase together with new photographs and permission to publish them. Like the Tübingen group the Warsaw lekane has a large spot within a circle on the base, pinched continuous handles and reversed zeds on the rim, but these have become sharper in the angles. There are two red rings instead of one framing the tondo. For the shape compare plate XI 4 with IX XI 2 (Tübingen) and XI 2 (Munich). On one side we see the head and shoulders of a girl in a red ‘penguin’ cloak holding up a flower. The position of the arm as it rises out of the cloak recalls the primitive women of Boardman’s Eretrian group C, e.g. BSA xlvii, pl. 5.C3, pl. 6.C6, C4, pl. 7.C12, and, nearer in date, the woman on the extreme left of the main scene of the Wedding amphora, ibid. pl. 11a. It is actually closer to the seventh-century prototype than to the Wedding amphora. The girl’s garland is like that of the Tübingen man, but the large white spots (now very

25 So Schauenburg, op. cit. 64 n. 10, though with a query.
26 E.g. on the Eye-siren vase, London B 215, CV iv pl. 52.1 (goats on shoulder), on vases by Nikoxenos Painter such as London B 238 CV iv pl. 58.2, and occasionally on Little Master cups.
27 Inv. 138370. Ht. 11 cm., diam. 33.5 cm.
faded) are more closely spaced and the red fillet runs between incisions. Behind her head a large lotus bud helps to fill the field like those on the Berlin lekane and the Vienna amphora mentioned above. The woman of the pair on the other side of the vase wears a red fillet with incisions but no white garland, and, except for traces of a white contour line, both women have lost the white of their flesh, so that the undercoat of black is revealed showing its extreme streakiness. I can cite no close parallel in Etruscan, nor in Attic or Boeotian, for the male head with its red flesh, full red lips outlined with incision, drooping mustache and shaggy beard.

It is chiefly the treatment of the lotuses that recalls the Berlin lekane. Those immediately below the handles have their counterparts on the outside of that vase—opening buds with loose petals painted directly on the clay between the sepals and the bud. On the Berlin vase these petals are red, on the Warsaw lekane white. The Warsaw buds, including the single one behind the head of the girl, are also peculiar in having a red centre or core, larger than the white streak down the middle of the Berlin buds, but probably not unconnected with it. Also, in the star-shaped pattern of eight buds in the interior of the vase the four larger are almost completely covered with white paint, only a narrow border being left in black round the edge. The converse of this (leaves or buds in black with a border of applied colour) is found on undoubted Eretrian, e.g. the black leaves with red border beneath the siren on the back of the Wedding amphora, BSA xlvii pl. 9b. The four smaller buds in the Warsaw tondo are entirely black, though the thin washy paint has shrunk away from the edge giving a false impression of a solid core within a less substantial outline. The full-blown flowers on the Warsaw and Berlin lekanai (see plates XIV 5, 6, XIII 1, 2) do not resemble one another except in so far as they reveal unusually bold experiments with naturalistic flower forms. On the Warsaw vase white, much of it laid directly on the clay, is used for the tightly packed petals, red for most of the rest of the flower. An unusual detail is seen in the white spots painted over the tips of the curling tendrils that support the flowers.

Close to the Warsaw lekane in several respects, though not in the decoration of the exterior, is a lekane in a private collection in Germany, plate XV 3–5. The bowl is not warped like that of the Warsaw vase but is nearer to that in Munich (plate XI 2). The reversed zeds on the rim have, like those in Warsaw, become sharper and there are two red rings round the tondo. The spot within the ring on the base is smaller than normal. The tondo contains a rosette formed of four lotuses of the same kind as those under the handles of the Warsaw lekane and on the outside of the one in Berlin, except that the petals between the sepals and the bud are black instead of white or red, are larger and more important, and appear to be attached, while those in Warsaw and Berlin stand free. The rosette is completed by simple unattached buds, inverted, between the opening flowers. Traces of applied colour, now lost, covering a good deal of the buds but not reaching to the edge where a border is left in black, provide another feature in common with the Warsaw lekane, and so do the excessively long tapering tips. The decoration on the outside is something quite new. In a vineyard or orchard there is on one side a hedgehog and on the other a hare, each with a hound after it. The accessory colours have almost completely disappeared. In spite of the contrast between the freer style of this scene and the archaic appearance of the Warsaw heads the two vases are undoubtedly to be classed together.

None of these vases is reported to have been found in Euboea. Two, those in Munich and Amsterdam, are said to have come from Boeotia, and that may well be the case, for

---

28 Found in Attic also; cf. the buds edged with red on the vase by Theoizotus, Louvre F 69, Hoppin Handbook of Greek B.F. Vases 353, and the Geryon amphora in Los Angeles, Hesperia xxiv (1955) pl. 1b.

29 This shrinking of the paint away from the edge of an object is a common phenomenon in Eretrian, cf. the black buds on the foot of the Herakles amphora BICS vi (1959) pl. 34.

30 Ht. 9 cm., diam. without handles 32·5 cm.
there is no reason to suppose that there was no trade in pottery across the Euripus in the second half of the sixth century. On the contrary, the Eretrian amphora Athens 2635 (BSA xlvii pl. 14) was found at Tanagra. The finding-place of the others, except the Olynthus fragment, is unknown. Internal evidence has shown that the lekanai in Tübingen and Munich are remarkably close to the Eretrian grave amphorae. The links that connect the other vases grouped here with them are more tenuous, but sufficient to entitle us to claim them all for Euboean workshops. Whether some should be attributed to Chalcis or elsewhere rather than to Eretria is a question that cannot be answered until more work has been done on Euboean sites.

A. D. Ure.

University of Reading.
GREEK ASTRONOMICAL CALENDARS AND THEIR RELATION TO THE ATHENIAN CIVIL CALENDAR

Several investigations have been devoted to the Athenian calendar and to the cycles of Meton and Kallippos. However, most authors have not clearly distinguished between true and mean lunar months, nor between astronomical calendars and the Athenian calendar. In investigating the Athenian calendar, many authors have made use of the regular successions of full and hollow months described by Geminus in his Isagoge, without first making sure that these months were in actual use at Athens. Discussion as to whether ‘the month’ began with the astronomical New Moon or with the visibility of the crescent might have been avoided if the authors had realised that the word ‘month’ has several meanings and that in every particular case the meaning has to be inferred from the context. Peasants or soldiers, far away from civilisation, would start their month with the visible crescent, astronomers would make it begin at the day of true or mean New Moon, and cities would adapt their festival calendar to the needs of the moment, intercalating or omitting days in such a way that the festivals can be held at the days prescribed by law or tradition. Of course, it may happen any time that a civil month coincides with the astronomical or with the observed lunar month, but in absence of definite evidence we never have the right to identify a civil month with an astronomical month.

In section 1, exact definitions of four different meanings of the word month will be given, which all occur in Greek literature. In sections 2–7, the astronomical calendars of Meton, Euktemon and Kallippos will be reconstructed, following the lines indicated by Scaliger and Fotheringham. It will be shown that these calendars were used by later astronomers like Aristarchos, Timocharis, and notably Hipparchos, for dating astronomical observations. The rules for counting days and the intercalation cycle will be reconstructed, as far as possible, from the astronomical texts.

In section 8, the relation of these calendars to the Athenian calendar will be discussed. It will be shown that the astronomical calendars differed from the Athenian festival calendar in many respects, and that there is no reason to assume that they ever were used at Athens.

1. Four Kinds of Months

Geminus gives, at the beginning of Chapter VIII of his Isagoge, the following definition:
Month is the time from one conjunction to the next, or from one full moon to the next. He next defines the conjunction as the moment in which the sun and the moon are in the same degree of the zodiac.

Of course, Geminus knew very well that this astronomical definition is not fit for practical purposes, because the conjunction is not observable (except if there happens to be a solar eclipse). Therefore, he proceeds to describe how ‘the ancients’ named the days in accordance with the visible phases of the moon. ‘The day, on which the moon appears anew, was called vouμενια’, etc. He also says that solar eclipses take place on the last day of a month.

Strictly speaking, his two definitions are contradictory. According to the first definition, the month would begin at conjunction, and solar eclipses would take place on the first day of a month. According to the second definition, the month would begin with the first

1 Geminus Elementa astronomiae (ed. Manitius; Lipsiae, 1898) 121.
visibility of the crescent, and solar eclipses would take place on one of the last days of a month. The former definition is astronomical, the latter practical.

In Babylonia, the month began on the evening on which the crescent was visible for the first time after New Moon. More precisely: If on the evening of the 29th day of any month the crescent is visible, the month has 29 days; if not, the month has 30 days. The same rule still holds in Muslim countries.

I shall call these months observed lunar months. The words of Geminus indicate that the Greek months originally were just observed lunar months.

The months beginning with the conjunction will be called exact lunar months or conjunction months. These months are a theoretical construction; they could not be used in practice in classical times, because before Kallippos (330 B.C.) astronomers were not able to predict the true conjunction. Still, Thukydides seems to use this kind of month in ii 28: “During the same summer, on the first day of a month according to the moon (νομημα κατά σελήνην) the sun was eclipsed.” He adds that only on such a day a solar eclipse is possible.

The difference between the first days of an exact month and an observed lunar month is one or two days, or in exceptional cases three days.

If artificial months, alternating between 29 and 30 days, are counted off by fixed rules such as Geminus gives, these months will be called mean lunar months.

The difference between mean and exact lunar months is very small, for the largest difference between true and mean conjunction is, roughly speaking, half a day. In the time of Meton and Euktemon, astronomers were not yet able to calculate this difference. Even Eudoxos, sixty years later, explained the motion of the moon by means of three uniformly rotating spheres, which means that he assumed the motion of the moon in its orbit to be uniform. It was Kallippos who added two more spheres for the moon (and also for the sun). Still, Geminus, two centuries after Kallippos, makes no distinction between exact and mean lunar months; for, after having defined the exact lunar month he adds: ‘The duration of a month is $29\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{2}$ days.’

Therefore, in discussing the system of Meton and Euktemon and the passage from Thukydidus, we shall not distinguish between mean and exact conjunction, nor between mean and exact lunar month.

Lastly, we have the months in actual use in the Greek cities. We shall call these months civil months or months of the festival calendar. Originally, these months must have been observed lunar months, but if a festival could not take place on the right day, the city officials had the right to intercalate days. This is proved by an Euboian law which allows an intercalation up to three days, if the stage technicians for a certain festival are late.²

Athenian inscriptions offer many examples of intercalated and second intercalated days. One inscription³ even mentions a fourth intercalated Elaphebolion 9; so the Euboian maximum of three days does not hold for Athens.

The obvious conclusion from these and other facts is that the Athenian civil months did not coincide with the observed lunar months nor with the exact or mean lunar months of the astronomers.

The order of magnitude of the deviations may be judged from double dates ‘according to the archon’ and ‘according to the god’ in the second century B.C. Pritchett and Neugebauer found that the dates κατὰ θεῶν are always higher than the dates κατ’ ἀρχοντα, which shows that the archons often intercalated days. The differences range from 1 to 20 days (see n. 2).

The following table shows the order of magnitude of the differences between the starting-points of the four kinds of months:

---
2. Fotheringham's Reconstruction of the Calendars of Euktemon and Kallippos

In an important paper, Fotheringham has reconstructed the methods of the schools of Meton and Euktemon, and of Kallippos, for counting years, months and days. Meton and Euktemon started their cycle with the observed summer solstice under the Athenian archon Apseudes:

432 B.C., June 27 = Phamenoth 21 = Apseudes Skirophorion 13.

This date is given by three independent witnesses and accepted by all chronologers. Kallippos started his cycle with the date:

330 B.C., June 28 = First year of Kallippos, Hekatombaion 1.

This date was obtained by Fotheringham by counting backward from the four dates of Timocharis according to the rules of Geminus. It was the day of the summer solstice according to Kallippos and according to modern calculation.

The rules for constructing the months of 30 and 29 days were described by Geminus as follows:

"The astronomers around Euktemon, Philippos and Kallippos . . . had found that 19 years contain 6,940 days, or 235 months. . . . They first assumed the 235 months to be of 30 days; this would give a total of 7,050 days. . . . The 7,050 days exceed the 6,940 days by 110. They now assume 110 months to be hollow, so that the 235 months of the 19-year cycle contain just 6,940 days. In order to obtain a uniform distribution of the omitted days they divided the number 6,940 by 110; this gives 63 days. Thus, every 63 days one day has to be designed as omitted in this cycle. It is not always the 30th day of the month which is omitted, but every time the one that falls after 63 days is omitted. In this cycle the months seem to have been correctly defined and the intercalary months distributed in accordance with the phenomena, but the length of the year has not been defined in accordance with the phenomena. For the length of the year, as a result of many observations, is agreed to be 365 3/4 days, while the year resulting from the 19-year period is of 365 6/9 days. These exceed the 365 3/4 days by the 76th part of a day. Therefore, the astronomers around Kallippos corrected the difference and constructed the 76-year period consisting of four 19-year periods. It contains 940 months, of which 28 are intercalary, and of 27,759 days. They adopted the same arrangement of intercalary months. . . ."

Geminus says that every time after 63 days one day is to be omitted, but he does not say what is the first omitted day. Fotheringham assumed, quite naturally, that in both cycles the first 63 days were counted from the beginning of the cycle. Hence, in the cycle of Meton and Euktemon, the 110 days with numbers 64, 128, . . . up to 7,040 are omitted, and thus the 7,050 days were reduced to 6,940, as it ought to be. In the cycle of Kallippos, the 440 days with numbers 64, 128, . . . up to 28,120 would be omitted, and, moreover, the last day of the cycle has to be omitted in order to obtain the desired

28,200 - 441 = 27,759

days. This arrangement would give a nearly uniform distribution of omitted days in both cycles.

We may call the omitted days ‘omitted tithis’, using the terminology of India. Tithis are lunar days: 30 of them form a mean lunar month, and to 64 tithis correspond 63 civil days, so that roughly every 64th tithi has to be omitted.

Fotheringham tested his hypothesis by applying it to the dates of the four observations of Timocharis as given by Ptolemy:

2. Year 36 Elaphbolion 15 = Tybi 5 = 294 B.C., March 9.
3. Year 47 Anthesterion 8 = Atyr 29 = 283 B.C., January 29.

Backward count from these four dates by the rules of Geminus led to one and the same epoch date in all four cases. This is a strong point in favour of Fotheringham’s hypothesis that the first omitted day was the 64th day.

Fotheringham left no doubt that he considered the calendars of Meton and Kallippos as astronomical calendars only. He writes: ‘It might be objected to my restoration of the Metonic cycle that the omission of every 64th day, irrespective of its place in the month, might lead to the omission of the proper days for important festivals, to which I reply that in all probability Meton never expected his calendar to be used for other than astronomical and meteorological purposes, though he probably knew that it would provide a standard by which the errors of the civil calendar could be measured.’

However, Pritchett and Neugebauer doubted the existence of ‘Greek astronomical months’. They supposed that Timocharis either dated his observations in the Greek festival calendar and that this calendar happened to be in accordance with the moon on these four days, or that ‘astronomical records purposely disregarded arbitrary changes and kept their dates always kata theos’.

Our first aim will be to show that Fotheringham was right in assuming that Timocharis used mean lunar months.

3. WHAT KIND OF MONTHS DID TIMOCHARIS USE?

Timocharis may have used (a) observed lunar months, or (b) conjunction months, or (c) actual Athenian months, or (d) mean lunar months. We shall now investigate these four possibilities.

(a) Observed lunar months. The third observation was on Kall. I 47 Anthesterion 8 = 283 B.C., January 29.

If the month were an observed lunar month, the crescent would have been visible on the evening of Anthesterion 0 = 283 B.C., January 21.

But the New Moon was on January 22 at 11 a.m. So the crescent could not have been visible, either in Athens or in Alexandria, on January 21.

(b) Conjunction months. The fourth observation was on Kall. I 48 Pyanepsion 25 = 283 B.C., November 8.

If the month were a conjunction month, the New Moon would have been on Pyanepsion 1 = 283 B.C., October 15.

However, the New Moon was on October 14 at 1 p.m. Hence, Timocharis did not use conjunction months.

The fullest and clearest exposition of this subject has been given by Olaf Schmidt, ‘On the Compotation of the Ahargana’, Centaurus ii (1952) 140.

(c) Athenian civil months. In this case, we have to consider two possibilities.

(i) Many authors have assumed that the months in actual use at Athens were observed lunar months with occasional deviations due to careless observation or arbitrary intercalations. Now, careless observation of the crescent always causes lower date numbers, and so do intercalations of days. In fact, we have seen already that in the second century B.C. the dates κατ’ ἄρχοντα were always lower than those κατὰ θεόν. However, the first three dates of Timocharis were all higher than the dates in an observed lunar calendar would be. Hence, if the Athenian calendar was an observed lunar calendar with or without arbitrary intercalations, the dates of Timocharis were not Athenian dates.

(ii) Dinsmoor and others have assumed that the Athenians actually used the mean lunar calendars of Meton and Kallippos, with occasional deviations due to carelessness or arbitrary intercalation of days. If this is assumed, and if Timocharis used this calendar, he actually used, in the four cases known to us, mean lunar months without any deviation. This leads us to the fourth possibility:

(d) Mean lunar months. No matter what point of view we may accept concerning the Athenian calendar, there is no escape from the conclusion that Timocharis used mean lunar months.

This was to be expected beforehand. If Timocharis wanted to use observed lunar months or the festival calendar, he would have had to ask a friend in Athens on what day the crescent had been seen, or how many days had been intercalated in this particular year. Moreover, as Fotheringham rightly remarks, civil dates would have been perfectly useless for later astronomers. On the other hand, if he used mean lunar months, calculated according to a simple rule, all Greek astronomers would have been able to convert his dates into any other calendar or to check his Egyptian dates.

What kind of mean months he used is clearly indicated by Ptolemy's own words: 'In the 36th year of the first Kallippian cycle.' The Kallippian cycle, as we know it from Geminus, was not only a definite method of counting years and months, but also of counting days.

Therefore, the most reasonable conclusion is that Timocharis used the system of Kallippos, as explained by Geminus and interpreted by Fotheringham.

4. Conversion of Dates

To make quite clear what I mean by 'the calendar of Euktemon' and the 'calendar of Kallippos', I shall now give easy rules for the conversion of dates from the Julian or Egyptian calendar into the calendars of Euktemon and Kallippos. Note that the Julian year -431 is 432 B.C.

A. Calendar of Euktemon

(1) If a Julian or Egyptian date is given, we first determine the distance from the epoch of Meton and Euktemon -431 June 27 = Phamenoth 21.

If we start with a Julian date, by far the safest and easiest way to find this distance is to find the Julian day numbers of the given dates by Schram's tables⁷ and to subtract them. The difference is the Euktemon day number E, the number of elapsed days since the beginning of the cycle.

Examples. Consider the eclipse of -430 August 3 mentioned by Thukydides, and the eclipse of -424 October 9, which took place according to a Scholion to Aristophanes,

⁷ R. Schram, Kalendariographische und chronologische Tafeln (Leipzig, 1908). These tables may be used for the Egyptian calendar too, but this is not so easy.
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Clouds 584, under Stratokles in the month Boedromion. To find the Euktemon day numbers E.

| Julian day number | 1564,215 | 1566,474 |
| Epoch            | -1563,813 | -1563,813 |
| Euktemon day number | E = 402 | E = 2,661 |

(2) Divide E by 6,940. The quotient gives the number of elapsed cycles of 19 years. The remainder R gives the number of elapsed days of the current cycle.

(3) Divide R by 63. The quotient Q is the number of omitted tithis, and the sum R + Q is the number of elapsed tithis of the current 19-year cycle. Add 12. The sum T = R + Q + 12 is the number of elapsed tithis, reckoned from Skirophorion 1.

(4) Divide T by 30. The quotient M = q is the number of the current month, Hekatombaion of the first year of the cycle being counted as month no. 1. The remainder r is the number of elapsed days in the month, so D = r + 1 is the day number.

In our two examples, the calculation would be:

- **Eclipse of Thukydidès**
  - E = 402
  - R = 402
  - Q = 6
  - T = 420
  - M = q = 14
  - D = r + 1 = 1
  - (14th month, day 1)

- **Eclipse of Clouds**
  - E = 2,661
  - R = 2,661
  - Q = 42
  - T = 2,715
  - M = q = 90
  - D = r + 1 = 16
  - (90th month, day 16)

B. Calendar of Kallippos

(1) If a Julian date is given, we first determine the distance from the epoch -329 June 28, by subtracting the Julian day numbers obtained from Schramm's tables. The difference is the Kallippian day number K, the number of elapsed days since the beginning of the cycle.

If an Egyptian date is given, we add to the number of the day the number of elapsed months of the current Egyptian year, multiplied by 30, and the number of elapsed Egyptian years since Thoth 0 of the year 330 B.C., multiplied by 365. Add 138, the distance between Thoth 0 and Hekatombaion 1 of the first year of Kallippos. The result of the addition is the Kallippian day number K.

For the dates of the four observations of Timocharis, the calculation in the Julian calendar would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-294 December 20</th>
<th>-293 March 9</th>
<th>-282 January 29</th>
<th>-282 November 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J = 1614,028</td>
<td>1614,107</td>
<td>1618,086</td>
<td>1618,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1601,069</td>
<td>-1601,069</td>
<td>-1601,069</td>
<td>-1601,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K = 12,959</td>
<td>13,038</td>
<td>17,017</td>
<td>17,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Egyptian calendar, the calculation would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36 II 16</th>
<th>36 V 5</th>
<th>47 III 29</th>
<th>48 I 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,775</td>
<td>12,775</td>
<td>16,790</td>
<td>17,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K = 12,959</strong></td>
<td>13,038</td>
<td>17,017</td>
<td>17,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Divide K by 27,759. The quotient gives the number of elapsed cycles of 76 years. The remainder R gives the number of elapsed days of the current cycle.

(3) Divide R by 63. Add the quotient Q to R. The sum T = R + Q is the number of elapsed tithis or lunar days of the current cycle.

(4) Divide T by 30. The quotient q plus 1 gives the number of the month. The remainder r plus 1 gives the number of the day in the month: M = q + 1, D = r + 1.

For the four observation dates of Timocharis, the calculation is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K = 12,959</th>
<th>13,038</th>
<th>17,017</th>
<th>17,300</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R = 12,959</td>
<td>13,038</td>
<td>17,017</td>
<td>17,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q = 205</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T = 13,164</strong></td>
<td>13,244</td>
<td>17,287</td>
<td>17,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q = 438</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = 24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 439</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D = 25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The month numbers may be compared with the month names given by Ptolemy in order to obtain information concerning the intercalation system of Kallippos. The day numbers agree exactly with those given by Ptolemy. I suppose that Timocharis made a calculation of the same kind in order to reduce his Egyptian dates to the calendar of Kallippos, which seems to have been in general use among astronomers of his time.

5. **Two Methods of Counting Years**

For years after Kallippos Ptolemy always uses expressions like: 'At the end of the 50th year of the first Kallippian period' (Almagest iii 1, p. 207, Heiberg); 'In the 54th year of the second Kallippian period' (iv 11, p. 344); 'In the 17th year of the third Kallippian period' (iii 1, p. 195).

Ptolemy's direct source for these observations is Hipparchos. The months and days are given in the Egyptian calendar only. In addition to these dates, we have the four observations of Timocharis, with double dates in the Kallippian and Egyptian calendar.

For years before Kallippos, a different system is used. Ptolemy quotes from Hipparchos the details of three eclipse observations made at Babylon. The dates are given as follows (Almagest iv 11, pp. 340–3, Heiberg):

(1) Under the Athenian archon Phanostratos in the month Poseideon, in the night from Egyptian Thoth 26 to 27.

(2) Under the Athenian archon Phanostratos in the month Skirophorion in the night from Egyptian Phamenoth 24 to 25.
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(3) Under the Athenian archon Euandros in Poseideon I in the night from Egyptian Thoth 16 to 17.

Several authors have supposed that the eclipses were observed in Athens and reduced to Babylon by Hipparchos or his source, but I have shown that this is astronomically impossible.8 The observations were made in Babylon, and Hipparchos used the Athenian year and month names to make clear what months he meant. The original Babylonian reports gave, of course, years of Persian kings and Babylonian month names, but these would mean nothing to Hipparchos' Greek readers. Therefore, he was obliged to give the equivalents in at least one other calendar. Actually, he used the Athenian names of years and months, and the Egyptian date of the day.

Did Hipparchos use the Meton–Euktemon intercalation cycle, or the irregular Athenian intercalations of months? If he wanted to make it easy for himself and his readers, he had to use a regular cycle. According to Geminos, Kallippos considered the cycle of intercalary months introduced by 'those around Euiktemon' as satisfactory, and adopted it himself. Therefore, we shall assume that Hipparchos used the same cycle. This hypothesis will be confirmed in two cases. In two more cases it does not lead to any inconsistency in the intercalation system, as Fotheringham has proved.

I suppose that Kallippos published a list of Athenian archons and of intercalary months up to his own time, and gave a rule how to continue the intercalation cycle after his own time. Hipparchos could use the list of archons for all years before Kallippos, and the Kallippon cycles for years after Kallippos. This would give him a consistent dating system for all dates from the time of Meton and Euktemon up to his own time.

Fotheringham’s hypothesis may now be stated thus: Timocharis and Hipparchos both used this dating system, and Geminos also describes the same system. This hypothesis is confirmed by all the four Timocharis dates, and by the two Hipparchos dates for which we can check the intercalations, while the other Hipparchos dates do not contradict it. In my opinion, we may regard this hypothesis as firmly established.

6. INTERCALARY MONTHS

The distance between the last two observations of Timocharis is 283 days. Computed from the Athenian month names and day numbers, the distance would be 8 months and 17 days, i.e. 1 month less. The usual intercalary months in the Athenian calendar is a second Poseideon (VI₂), so an Athenian intercalation cannot explain the difference of one month.

Scaliger, Mommsen and Fotheringham concluded from this that the year 6 in the cycle of Meton had a second Skirophorion (XII₂). This is an additional argument in favour of the conclusion that Meton's cycle was an astronomical, and not an Athenian calendar. I shall not follow Ideler,9 who corrected Pyanepon in Ptolemy’s text into Maimakterion. All manuscripts have Pyanepon, and the manuscript tradition of Ptolemy’s Almagest is very good.

The epoch of Kallippos was the first day of a Kallippon year, and since Kallippos adopted Meton's and Euktemon's intercalary months, the same epoch must also have been at the end of a Metonic year. The time between the two epochs was 5 cycles of 19 years plus 86 months, hence:

(1) The first 7 years of a Metonic cycle had 2 intercalations.

---

In the same way, the four observations of Timocharis can be used to count the number of months in a certain number of years of the cycle. The results are:

(2) The first 4 years had 1 intercalation.
(3) The first 5 years had 1 intercalation (hence the year 5 was normal).
(4) The first 15 years had 5 intercalations.
(5) The year 16 had a second Skirophorion.

From two solstice observations by Aristarchos at the end of the 50th year of the first Kallippian cycle, and by Hipparchos at the end of the 43rd year of the third Kallippian cycle (Almagest iii 1, p. 207, Heiberg), we derive:

(6) The first 12 years had 4 intercalations.
(7) The 19 years of the cycle had 7 intercalations.

The three Babylonian eclipses of Hipparchos confirm the results (6) and (7) and yield the following additional information:

(8) The year 13 had a second Poseideon (VI).
(9) The first 11 years had 4 intercalations.

This information is consistent with the relation (6) obtained previously, for if the year 13 had a second Poseideon, the year 12 cannot have been intercalary, hence, if the first 12 years had 4 intercalations, the first 11 years already had 4 intercalations.

From (4), (6) and (8) we may conclude that the years 14 and 15 were normal.

7. Dates of the Summer Solstice

Meton and Euktemon observed the summer solstice in the morning of Skirophorion 13; the Euktemon day number is 0. In order to obtain the summer solstice of the next year, Euktemon had to add 365$\frac{1}{4}$ days, and so on.

In order to obtain definite integer day numbers, we have to adopt a convention concerning the beginning of the day. I shall adopt the definition given by Geminus: Day is the time from sunrise to sunrise. I shall also assume, as Ptolemy did, that the observed solstice was after sunrise. Now it is clear that we have to add 365 days for the first, second and third year, and 366 days for the fourth year. Thus, we obtain the Julian dates and the Euktemon days numbers $E$ given in the second and third column of the table on the opposite page. The fourth column gives the quotient $Q$ of the division by 63, the next one the number of elapsed tithis

$$T = E + Q + 12$$

and the last column the date in the calendar of Euktemon.

In the years 0, 4, 7, 9 and 11–16, where the intercalation is known, we see that the effect of the intercalation was to bring the solstium date between XII 6 and XII 29. Assuming that the purpose of the intercalation was to avoid wide variations of this date, we may safely conclude that dates like XI 23 or XI 20 were not desired, and hence that the years 1 and 17 were normal. Just so, we may assume that dates like XII 15, XII 7, XII 18 and XII 11 for the years 3, 5, 6 and 8 were preferred to dates like I 15, I 7, I 18 and I 11 in the first month of the next year, and we may conclude that the intercalary years in the cycle of Meton were

2 or 3, 5, 8, 10 or 11, 13, 16, 18 or 19.

10 Gemini Elementa astronomiae (ed. Manitius) Chapter 6, p. 68.
There remain three cases of doubt. If the three former years 2, 10 and 18 were intercalary, all solstitial dates would be in the last month of the year (XII or XII, as the case may be). This was the hypothesis of Scaliger,11 Em. Muller12 and Fotheringham. If, on the other hand, one or two or three of the years 3, 11 and 19 were intercalary, one or two or three solstitial dates would be at the beginning of the next year (I 1, I 2 and I 4).

This is what Ideler, Böckh, Redlich and Gresswell have proposed.13 A list of solstitial dates like our last column would be indispensable for any Greek who wanted to use Euktemon’s calendar in combination with Euktemon’s parapégma. This parapégma14 started with the summer solstitial and gave star phases and weather forecasts for specified numbers of days after the summer solstitial. A list of 19 dates of summer solstitial for the 19 years of a cycle would be necessary for anyone wishing to know the weather forecast for a particular day. Therefore, I am sure that Euktemon actually published such a list, annexed to his parapégma.

8. The Calendar of Euktemon and the Athenian Calendar

The differences between the calendar of Euktemon and the calendar of Athens are:

1. Euktemon had a regular intercalation cycle of 19 years, whereas the intercalation in Athens was irregular.

2. In Euktemon’s calendar, after every 63 days one day was omitted, regardless of its position within the month. Thus it could happen that a month had no 15th day. In a festival calendar, this was, of course, impossible.

---

11 Scaliger, Em. Temp. 72 (quoted from Ginzel ii 400).
12 Real-Enzykl. i (1862) col. 1049, s.v. ‘Annus’.
13 F. K. Ginzel, Handbuch der Chronol. ii 400.
(3) In the festival calendar, days could be intercalated, sometimes 1 or 2, sometimes even 4 days in succession. In Euktemon's calendar, there were no intercalated days.

(4) In Euktemon's calendar, the first day of a month would be the day of the mean conjunction, as Fotheringham has shown. On the other hand, the Greek months were originally meant to be observed lunar months, beginning with the visible crescent. This is clearly stated by Geminus (p. 105) and by Aratos (quoted by Geminus). The traditional names of the first and last days of the month clearly show that the first day was supposed to be the day of the crescent, and the last day the day of the conjunction.

Dinsmoor and other authors do not share this point of view. While admitting that the Athenians did not follow Euktemon's intercalation rules, Dinsmoor still maintains that they began the month on the day of the (mean or true) conjunction, and that they used regular sequences of full and hollow months according to one of the rules explained by Geminus.

The only evidence for this hypothesis, as far as I can see, is the statement of Thukydides quoted in section 1. Thukydides says: 'On the first day of a month, according to the moon, the sun was eclipsed.' I accept Dinsmoor's translation of νυκτήρια by 'on the first day of a month'. However, Thukydides adds the words κατὰ σελήνην, thus underlining that the months ought to be taken 'according to the moon', and not according to the archon.

In other passages, too, Thukydides avoids the use of the Athenian festival calendar for dating purposes. The reason was, as he himself explains (v 20), that this calendar was too irregular. He prefers expressions like 'at the end of the winter' or 'when the summer had just begun', and he claims that this system has the advantage, over dating by archons and other magistrates, that it enables him to give the length of the war exactly, within a limit of a few days.

Thukydides' attitude towards the beginning of the months seems to be much the same as towards the beginning of the seasons. He used neither the irregular months of the festival calendar nor the observed lunar months beginning with the visible crescent. He preferred to use lunar months beginning at the conjunction. I suppose he did not distinguish between the mean and the true conjunction. This would explain his assertion that solar eclipses always take place on the first day of a month according to the moon.

If this explanation is accepted, Thukydides' lunar months have nothing to do with the Athenian or any other city calendar. Therefore, Dinsmoor's only argument for his assertion that the Athenians used mean lunar months beginning with the (mean) new moon, loses its force.

On the other hand, the difficulties to which Dinsmoor's hypothesis gives rise are numerous:

(1) If the cycles of Meton–Euktemon and Kallippos were meant as cycles for the Athenian calendar, the intercalary month ought to be a second Poseideon in all cases. As we have seen in section 6, this cannot be brought into accord with the text of Ptolemy. This difficulty was 'solved', as we have seen, by correcting Pyanepion into Maimakterion.

(2) If the Athenians followed the rules of Euktemon or Kallippos, there ought to be no intercalary days. To explain the existence of these days, it was supposed that the calendar sometimes got out of step with the moon and that days were intercalated to correct the error. Now how would this work?

A mean lunar calendar may get out of step with the moon if we forget to omit a day where the rule prescribes it. The obvious remedy would be to omit a day in a later month, not to intercalate days.

Another possibility would be to simplify the rules by assuming every second month to be hollow. This would give us too many hollow months, and the remedy would be to

---

intercalate days. If this is the explanation, we should expect 3 intercalary days in 8 years, i.e. 1 pro mille of the days would be intercalary.

However, Pritchett\(^\text{16}\) found that 16 out of 275 decrees, ranging in time from 346 to 100 B.C., were passed on intercalated days. This is more than 5 per cent. Hence, only a minute part of the intercalations actually found can be explained as corrections of errors.

A third possibility of committing errors would be to begin a new month on the day of the visible crescent instead of beginning it at the astronomical new moon. The remedy would be to omit 1 or 2 days at the end of the next month and to start the new month on the day of conjunction. Hence, the correction of errors cannot explain the numerous intercalations of days.

(3) Pritchett and Neugebauer found differences between κατὰ θέον and κατ’ ἄρχοντα dates in the second century B.C. ranging from 1 to 20 days. Assuming that the dates ‘according to the god’ were mean or true lunar dates, it follows that the calendar ‘according to the archon’ was highly irregular and did not follow astronomical rules. Hence, Dinsmoor’s hypothesis cannot be maintained for the second century B.C.

(4) Pritchett’s investigation shows that intercalary days were just as frequent in the third as in the second century. Hence, Dinsmoor’s hypothesis has to be abandoned also for the third century.

(5) Dinsmoor’s hypothesis that the Athenian calendar was regular would lead to the conclusion that the duration of the ptyanies was variable. However, Aristotle states that (in a normal year of 354 days) the first four ptyanies have 36 days and the remaining six 35 days each.\(^\text{17}\) So we have to give up Dinsmoor’s theory for the fourth century as well, unless we pretend that Aristotle was misinformed on the ptyanies calendar of the city he was living in.

(6) Aristophanes complains that the Athenians ‘confused the days up and down’ and that the Gods ‘go to bed without supper, not obtaining festival banquets duly on festival days’. This shows that the festival calendar was irregular in the late fifth century too.

(7) This conclusion is confirmed by five examples of differences between the calendars of different cities, ranging from 2 to 8 days.\(^\text{18}\) There is no reason to suppose that the Athenian calendar was correct and the others in disorder.

**Conclusion.** Dinsmoor’s hypothesis is not supported by any fact, and is contradicted by all the facts.

9. **The Summer Solstice on the Miletus Parypeta**

One of the two parypegea fragments found in Miletus gives the date of a summer solstice under ... _YKAEITOC_ as Skirophorion 14 = Payni 11. Now the true summer solstice was exactly at noon on 106 B.C. June 26 = Payni 11, and for every year earlier or later the shift in the Egyptian date is exactly ¼ day. Hence, if the error of the observation does not exceed 2 days, the years 114 to 98 B.C. are possible.

I shall accept the opinion of Diels\(^\text{19}\) that ... _YKAEITOC_ must be Athenian archon Polykleitos. From historical sources we know that Polykleitos held office in some year at the end of the second century, so the astronomical and the historical evidence agree well.

Diels restricted the investigation to the years from 113 to 109 B.C. and found that the year of the observation was 109 B.C. If we accept this year and convert the Egyptian date Payni 11 into the calendar of Kallippos, we obtain

\[108 \text{ June 26 = Kall. cycle III, year 69, Skiroph. 12.}\]


\(^{17}\) Arist. _Pol._ 2.2.

\(^{18}\) W. K. Pritchett, ‘Julian Dates and Greek Calendars’, *Classical Philology* xlii (1947) 235. The differences are 8, 7, 2, 2 and 5 days.

This is not in accordance with the text date XII 14. The Euktemon date would be XII 8, still worse. The new moon was on June 14 about 8:40 a.m., so the exact lunar date would be XII 13, and the observed lunar date XII 11. The date number according to the archon would be 11 or 12 if the archon had not intercalated days, and less if he had. The differences between κατὰ θέου and κατ’ ἀρχοντα dates are positive or zero in all instances known from the second century B.C. So we find no explanation for the figure 14 engraved on the parapegma.

A solution of these difficulties may be found as follows. Among the years 114–98 B.C. there is just one year in which the Egyptian Payni 11 coincided with Skirophorion 14 according to the calendar of Kallippos, viz. the year 106 B.C. As we have seen, the summer solstice of this year fell just on Payni 11, or June 26. Hence the year 106 B.C. would fit extremely well in every respect.

If this year is correct, the writer of the Milesian parapegma would have used, just as all other astronomers did, the Kallippian calendar alongside the Egyptian calendar.

10. THE LUNAR ECLIPSE OF OCTOBER 425 B.C.

As we have seen, the eclipse of 425 B.C., October 9, took place, according to Euktemon’s calendar, in the middle of the month IV (Pyaneption). However, a scholion to Clouds 584 tells us that this eclipse took place under Stratokles in Boedromion. Hence, either the scholiast used Euktemon’s calendar and made a mistake in his calculation, or he knew from a contemporary source that the civil month, in which the eclipse took place, was Boedromion. This is what Dinsmoor and others have assumed, and I shall accept this assumption as being the most probable one.

Now, if we assume that this civil Boedromion coincided with the third lunar month of the year, and hence, that Hekatombaion 1 was approximately July 27, we get into serious difficulties (see Dinsmoor, Archon of Athens 333). The first difficulty is that Aristotle refers to a comet as having been visible in Gamelion under the archon Eukles at about the time of the winter solstice (427 B.C., December 29). The preceding new moon was on December 15, so if the month Gamelion began on December 15 or a few days later, Aristotle’s statement would be in perfect order. This would give us June 10 for the new moon at the beginning of the next year (426/5). Hence, the year 426/5 would have 14 months (June 10 to July 27), a manifest impossibility.

The second difficulty is that the four years 425/4, 424/3, 423/2, 422/1 would be normal years, which would mean an extremely irregular intercalation. Of course, this is not quite impossible, but all this looks highly improbable.

The easiest and most probable solution of all the difficulties seems to be, to drop the assumption that the civil Boedromion coincided with the third lunar month of the year 425/4. If we suppose that 14 or more days had been intercalated in the first three months of the year, the eclipse would take place at the end of Boedromion, and all difficulties disappear.

A difference of 14 or 15 days between the festival and the lunar calendar would be of the same order of magnitude as the differences between the festival and the Prytany calendar in the third century, or between dates κατ’ ἀρχοντα and κατὰ θέου in the second century. So there is nothing improbable in the assumption of a difference of 14 or more days.

Of course, I do not pretend that this explanation is certain. The only safe conclusion is that we really do not know when the year 425/4 began, and whether the four following years were normal or not. Dinsmoor’s ‘fixed point’, the eclipse of 425 B.C., October 9, is not at all a fixed point of the Athenian calendar.

University of Zürich.

B. L. Van der Waerden.
SOLON’S ‘PRICE-EQUALISATION’

In his article entitled ‘Solon and the Megarian Question’ (JHS lxxvii) Mr A. French has given a valuable exposition of Solon’s economic reforms in their relation to the strategic necessities of Athenian overseas trade.¹ This, however, leads him to an assessment of the statesman’s policy which it is rather difficult to accept, conflicting as it does both with tradition and the general probabilities of the situation. Further, it is partly based on an interpretation of a passage in Plutarch which is, I think, mistaken and indeed impossible, although it has been adopted by most authorities. Mr French’s argument may be summarised as follows:

(1) In the pre-Solonian era the sea route to South Attica and Phaleron, still more to Mounychia, was dominated by a hostile Megara owing to her control of Salamis; hence only the ports of East Attica were available for overseas trade in bulk cargoes. Early imports of grain and timber would have been from Thessaly, for which these ports were particularly convenient.

(2) However, increasing population and the decline in soil fertility made it desirable to import wheat in large quantities from the Black Sea; this would necessitate delivery at a port nearer the city and therefore control of Salamis to prevent Megarian interference on top of the other considerable hazards of the Black Sea voyage. It would also necessitate a high price which, though in accordance with the internal agricultural conditions, would diminish the advantages of the additional external supplies to the impoverished population of Attica. The Athenian government must either embark on a naval programme, and fight Megara for Salamis, or use less grain, which meant limiting the population.

(3) The large landowners would benefit by the shortage and a high local price for their surplus; increased imports would improve the position of the ‘men of the coast’, and of the ‘hill-men’ too if they could buy enough to keep themselves from starvation.

So the Alkmæonids and Solon in his early days (as Peisistratos later) are to be found favouring naval power and the development of Black Sea trade, with the necessity of a friendly Salamis. Operations in the Hellespont area indicate attempts to improve security at the other end of the Aegean crossing. This party, therefore, found themselves in hostility towards Megara, while the reactionary Kython, who represented the landowners, opposed this policy and so gained support from Megara.

(4) Solon’s conquest of Salamis proved only temporary, and he was forced to undertake measures aimed at escaping from the dilemma in (2) above. They were a compromise—as were his political reforms—and a failure; the problem was finally faced and solved by Peisistratos who recovered Salamis and pursued a whole-hearted expansionist policy.

(5) In support of the theory that Solon’s economic reforms were merely a compromise and not a new and realistic direction of policy, it is argued that they were restrictive in nature. The freeing of the serfs amounted to the removal of unwanted labour from an overcrowded agricultural economy; exports other than oil were banned; neither of these can be regarded as encouraging primary production or trade. Restrictive also was the ban on the export of slaves, at least of those of Athenian birth.

¹ Some portions of this article have benefited from the comments of my colleague Mr K. M. Dallas, Senior Lecturer in Economics, and from discussions with Professor J. R. Elliott, to whom my thanks are accordingly due. I am also most grateful to my friend Mr A. French, whose comments on my draft I have at times incorporated; in particular he has let me see an unpublished article on the Pattern of Attic Agriculture which affects the argument at some points.
(6) Again, not even the local consumers would benefit from Solon’s monetary revision; the increased quantity of coins in circulation would tend to cause a rise in prices. This trend, however, might be offset by the effect of the ban on exports, which would cause disposal on the home market of any surplus commodities other than oil. Hence Solon fixed standard and equalised prices for basic agricultural products. Secondary industry, however, would benefit from the greater flexibility of the monetary position and the higher money prices. (Evidently Solon’s importation of craftsmen was intended to take advantage of this.) Small pastoralists must suffer from the low price fixed for sheep.

(7) As for the large land-owners, they both lost and gained from Solon’s price-fixing legislation. Oil was naturally one of the principal products of large, rather than small, estates; but if it were equated in price not only with wine—for which the capital outlay would have been less—but even with wheat, the oil-producer would be hard put to it as far as the local market was concerned. Those who produced cereal surpluses, however, benefited.

Such then, according to this theory, was the compromise arrangement, under which no single group gained very much, and the unfortunate members of the community who were consumers rather than producers gained less than nothing. It would have been legitimate to infer that this was the reason why the ἐπισκυρὸς δρῦλοι so enthusiastically supported Peisistratos when he upset the constitution of Solon and (it would be inferred), his price-structure also, since one is said to depend on the other.

A parallel is assumed in Solon’s political arrangements, for which we have the reformer’s own authority as expressed in his poems² for regarding them as what they clearly were, a compromise between the vested interests and the new pressure groups of wealthy merchants and of under-privileged poor citizens. That this compromise failed, at least partially and in the long run, is historical fact. Yet failure is perhaps too severe a term; it was one stage, and an important one, in the political development of Athens, and was discarded when it had served its turn.

But did the economic arrangements fail, for whatever reason, and in the same way? And was their failure the reason for the emergence of the tyranny?

In the first place, if we are to accept the contention that only agricultural production was taken into account³ for political classification, the political change would have been not a compromise but a reassertion of the rights of the landed gentry. It would not have been much of a reform to remove privileges of birth and hand them back to the same people on a different basis. It seems impossible that many farmers other than Eupatrids in fact held such large areas of good land as to qualify for the highest income bracket by their volume of production. Many writers have held that money-income was regarded as the equivalent of ‘wet or dry’ produce, and the belief (justified by the facts in my view) that Solon wished to broaden the basis of political power makes it a necessary interpretation. The retention of the names, perhaps already familiar, of an agriculture-based classification can be easily explained. A sound reason for making the assessment in terms of primary production was that it would be universally understood; especially if, as Mr French argues, there had been serious price fluctuations in Attica just before Solon’s work, so that it would be far more difficult to say just what a monetary classification amounted to. Further, the small farmers, even though they may have become pretty familiar with coinage before the end of the seventh century, no doubt still operated to a considerable extent on a barter basis; the quantity of their production, however, would be readily measurable, though its

² Quoted both by Plutarch, Solon 18, and in Ath. Pol. 12.

³ For the opposing view, adopted in this article, see K. Freeman, Work and Life of Solon 59; J. Johnston, ‘Solon’s Reforms of Weights and Measures’, JHS liv (1934) 180; F. Heichelheim An Ancient Economic History ii 285, et al.
monetary equivalent might not. It could be argued that Solon, by insisting on a produce-qualification, was trying to encourage people to take up land; against which contention it is sufficient to instance the shortage of desirable farm-land, made evident by the horoi and the popular demand for γῆς ἀναδασμός.

Mr C. Hignett\(^4\) maintains that possession of land was an essential qualification for citizenship, and that membership of the first three classes depended wholly on income from primary production. But this would mean that all whose wealth came from commerce were debarred from office; a little earlier he has said, without fear of contradiction, that Solon's new provisions substituted wealth for birth, and if such a change was to be made, what object was there in restricting the privileges of political power to a few large landowners? What of the position of a man who owned enough land to qualify as a zeugites, but had also business interests extensive enough to put him in the highest class? I find myself compelled to accept the view of Boeckh and Stahl, that Solon introduced reckoning by income, not by area of landed property.\(^5\) The great distrust shown by Hignett and others for parts of the Athenaios Politia may well extend to the statement that the Solonian income qualification had to come 'ἐκ τῆς ωίκελας.'\(^6\)

Were all members of the 'Shore' party thetes?\(^7\) It is true that the group was not entirely satisfied with what Solon had done for it; on the other hand, its enthusiastic support of Peisistratos was somewhat shortlived. Had it been left entirely to Peisistratos to assist the commercial class, his relationship with Megakles would surely have been happier.\(^8\)

It is interesting also to examine the implications for the size of the citizen body of a purely landownership and primary production qualification. Of course we have no population figures, total or sectional, for Solonian Athens; for the Persian War period, however, some reliable facts are available, which suggest a hoplite force of at least ten thousand, and twice (at least) that number of thetes available for naval service. If we take half this number for a century earlier, we are hardly being over-generous. Now Hignett accepts de Sanctis' calculation of a minimum holding of 43 acres for a zeugites, and 110 for a pentakosioimedimos.\(^8\) Let us average the figures at 50 acres for zeugitai and 100 for members of the two higher classes. The 5,000 zeugitai alone would require 250,000 acres of cultivable land. If the two higher classes together numbered 1,500, a further 150,000 acres are required. It is most probable that there were smallholders amongst the thetes, for whom a further acreage must be added. We can only guess at the number and size of holdings; say 10,000 to 20,000 acres, though it might well be far more, giving a total of over 400,000 acres. Yet the total area of Attica is about 1,000 square miles, of which we are repeatedly told\(^9\) that only a quarter, or 160,000 acres, is cultivable.

If it be contended that the population figures for Solonian Athens are still too large, I would point out that the growth in total population during the sixth and early fifth centuries would have taken place largely in the city; certainly the number of farms will not have established belief regarding the Solonian constitution. Conversely, Grote (History of Greece ii 488) maintained 'it is not conceivable that a proprietor whose land yielded to him a clear annual return of 100, 120, 140 or 180 drachmae could ever have been designated by that name (Thetes)'. On this whole question see Schwan, in RE s.v. 'Theten', col. 195.\(^6\)

\(^4\) A History of the Athenian Constitution\(^a\) 98 ff.
\(^5\) Everyone agrees that 'later' the money equivalent was admitted, but there appears to be no evidence as to the date of this change, if it was a change. Glotz, Histoire Grecque i 41 (following Francotte) thinks landless persons were admitted to citizenship without admission to the γέφυρις.
\(^6\) Ath. Pol. 7.4,—this phrase is not necessarily a part of the original 'document' and may be merely a reflection of a later belief that in the dim past of the Solonian era all society was still on an agricultural basis.
\(^7\) The demiourgoi are said to have had two seats on the board of archons. P. N. Ure, Origin of Tyranny 16 says these were thetes. This involves rejecting a well-
\(^8\) On the supporters of Peisistratos see now A. French, Greece and Rome vi (1959) 46.
\(^9\) Interesting calculations of this type have been made by Mr French (cf. n. 1) which I hope he will publish in due course.
\(^a\) E.g. Cary, Geographic Background of Greek and Roman History 76.
increased greatly, though some marginal land will no doubt have come into production. The inference from these figures would have to be that the hoplite and cavalry forces of Solonian Athens were only one-fifth of those available a hundred years later, and that almost the total growth of population in Attica took place in the sixth and early fifth centuries. Elsewhere, however, it had led to colonisation a century earlier. It is an interesting exercise to draw these trends in population graphically, using the figures given by Gomme for the fifth and fourth centuries, and one which confirms my reluctance to accept the theory that primary production was the sole qualification for the Solonian classes.

Again, it cannot be denied that there was a mercantile class in Athens by this time, since it was at least partly, if not solely, in their interest that the attempt to win Salamis had been made. If they were influential enough to bring this about, they were certainly also influential enough to receive consideration in Solon’s reassessment of political classes, and not to have the door slammed shut in their faces. And if there was export of foodstuffs by the landowners, important and extensive enough to be placed under heavy penalties in the First Axon, this would have been balanced by luxury imports, trades in which middlemen certainly operated.

Several scholars have maintained that olive oil production on a commercial scale began early in Attica, and without necessarily taking at its face value the local belief about the invention of this useful tree by Athena or an early world-monopoly of olives in Attica—(though was not the city itself, poetically speaking, ‘well-oiled’?)—we may occur with the statements of Seltman that oil-export was a flourishing trade long before the fifth century, and of Besnier that in the time of Solon the commodity was already plentiful enough to allow it to leave the country without inconveniencing the inhabitants.\(^\text{10}\)

Further, the interests of the non-landowning group or those who, if they owned land, were not principally interested in agriculture, seem to have been taken into account in two other directions:

(i) Solon was clearly working towards the strengthening of the city economy by building up the non-agricultural labour force. Both the legislation against the export of Attic slaves and the encouragement of foreign craftsman-migrants operated in this direction; and the removal of surplus agricultural labour, remarked on above, must have involved its absorption in manufacturing and allied employments.

To support this labour force, a reasonable and, even more important, a steady food-price was necessary, thus permitting a level of wages low enough to encourage manufacture for export. This objective will have motivated Solon’s price-fixing legislation (but see comments on this below) and equally the banning of exports other than oil.\(^\text{11}\) The effect of throwing any surplus upon the home market would render life easier for the wage-earners even if the price of grain remained comparatively high. The ban would prevent speculative dealings in commodities and so help to maintain the stability of internal prices; and also channel those interested in the export-import trade towards the manufacture of secondary goods. So in mediaeval times towns banned the export of food and raw materials until they had been offered on the home market; if they met with no buyers and were thus shown to be genuine surpluses, they could then be exported; and the mediaeval towns were certainly not aiming at the restriction of external trade.

(ii) Debasement of the currency has been a fairly common expedient to encourage export trade. The question whether it is a two-edged weapon need not be discussed here. It was ‘a common expedient when mercantilist policies were first adopted, as in Tudor

\(^{10}\) Seltman, *Athens, its History and Coinage* 9; Besnier, in Darenberg/Saglio iv 1, 170, s.v. ‘Olea’.

\(^{11}\) As K. M. Chrimes suggested in *CR* 1932, 2, Solon’s classification would facilitate the assessment of the total (as well as individual) agricultural production of Attica and so afford a basis for a price-structure. See also below (high local wheat price?).
England’. The pegging of weights and measures may also frequently be found in a similar historical context. Another normal effect of the greater availability of money is a lowering in interest rates, which would be likely to encourage manufacturers and exporters. Again, surplus capital of landowners, directed away from loans to peasant-farmers as in the past, would be available for industrial investment. In view of these facts I am inclined to prefer the view that Solon’s changes were directed towards trade expansion.

The argument that Solon could not have been legislating for expansion in overseas trade depends on the theory that Megara had recovered Salamis before the time of Solon’s reforms, and that consequently she could deny Athenian ships the use of Phaleron. This theory is highly plausible but not completely convincing. The chronological data are too vague to be entirely conclusive, while the interpretation attached to Epimenides’ mot on Mounychia to the effect that the Athenians would tear it down with their teeth if they knew the trouble it would cause, seems far-fetched in the extreme. The second supposition, that without controlling Salamis Athens could not use Phaleron, also seems to push the case too far. Admittedly, Megarian privateers would threaten the route, but the risks might have been great enough to induce importers to demand a high price for Pontic grain, without being great enough to deter them altogether. And would not Aegina have provided at least as serious a threat to this trade? Later, Athens took steps to remove the eyesore of the Piraeus and also throttled Megarian trade entirely. There seems no reason why Megara should have been singled out for attack in Solon’s day for commercial reasons; the joint land frontier and the proximity of Salamis to both cities might well have engendered disputes, as similar circumstances did between many other Greek cities and their neighbours. A war fought for commercial reasons was likely to have been started by Megara to prevent Athenian occupation of an island practically in the fairway of her own trade. Salamis was far more vital to Megara; yet Megara’s trade was not cut off by Athenian occupation of Salamis and far more drastic measures were finally adopted by Athens to achieve this. Were normal relations between states in 600 B.C. those of piracy or of simple competition?

So far we have not had much reason to reject the ‘traditional’ view of Solon’s attitude to trade. A more complicated problem arises from his price-fixing, for which the authority is Plutarch, Solon 23. This is a miscellaneous section, beginning with certain enactments, which surprised Plutarch, concerning women, e.g. penalties for rape, and the selling of daughters. The monetary penalties in these cases appeared low to Plutarch; he explains this by the shortage of currency in Solon’s time, and goes on, apparently as an explanation of the situation resulting therefrom, to state that ‘for the valuation of sacrificial offerings he [Solon] reckons a sheep and a drachma for a measure of grain [s&. barley]’:

12 B. Baratowsky has discussed the evidence relating to the conquest of Salamis in an article in Studies presented to David M. Robinson ii 789. He shows that both the chronology and the agent of the Athenian conquest are equally hard to define with certainty.

13 French, op. cit. 241. Why should Epimenides suppose that Mounychia would cause harm to the Athenians if it were used to protect overseas trade? He must have been primed by the landowners to utter such a perversion of the truth—unless he were a very far-sighted prophet and foresaw not only the wealth and power but also the disasters and shame that Athens’ maritime empire would eventually produce. Nothing in the story refers to or implies the likelihood of Mounychia passing into the control of enemies. The story could well be the invention of a much later day.

14 Piraeus is barely thirty sea-miles from Sounion, and with a favourable wind this distance would be covered in at most eight hours. Hence, the last run home could have been made in the hours of darkness, along a coast with which the pilots would have been very familiar, and which provides more than one shelter on the way. How reluctant Greek merchant skippers were to sail at night along a well-known coast I cannot pretend to judge. One cannot reasonably suppose a ‘blockade’ maintained by penteconters nor that Megarian warships operated freely beyond Sounion, as a general practice. It has, however, been pointed out to me by Mr French that there was little reason for merchants to take such risks, if they could find another market, e.g. at Corinth.
Modern translators apparently make no bones about rendering these words as ‘a sheep and a bushel [sic] were both reckoned as the equivalent of a drachma’ (Dryden-Clough) which is the same thing as substituting \( a = b = c \) for \( a + b = c \). The only reasonable alternative to supposing that \( \kappaαι \) means ‘and’ is to take it as epexegetical, the translation then being ‘a sheep, that is, one drachma, was reckoned as the equivalent of a “measure of grain”’.

But no Greek writer would have chosen so tortuous a method of making a perfectly plain statement. He ought to have said ‘both a sheep and a measure were reckoned at a drachma’. The common misinterpretation has apparently found acceptance because it appears to be consistent with a further remark of Plutarch in the same section; he there states, on the authority of Demetrios of Phaleron, that a drachma was the general market value of a sheep, as was 5 drachmas of an ox. The context here is the bounties payable for wolf-carcasses, 5 drachmas for a wolf and 1 drachma for a cub. It looks as if Demetrios inferred from the bounties that they represented the market-value of what he supposed to be the appropriate victims of the pests concerned. But a wolf is unlikely to tackle an ox, unaided by his fellows; and a government is unlikely to pay so high a relative price as the price of an ox for the destruction of a pest. As will be shown below, the price was in fact much higher than the amount of this bounty. Incidentally, Plutarch, though not, it seems, modern scholars, takes the bounties as evidence for Solon’s encouragement of stock-raising for which he remarks Attica was better suited than for cultivation.\(^{15}\)

Amyot long ago was honest enough (and his editor in the Nelson edition follows suit) to take the phrase under discussion as meaning that a measure of grain was priced at 2 drachmas payable partly in kind and partly in cash—clearly a highly inconvenient method of payment. But this is what it should mean, unless amended; and no obvious change occurs to me, except the exclusion of the words \( \kappaαι \, \deltaραχμη \) on the pretext that they are a marginal gloss. This omission would (for the time being) enable those who wish to do so to equalise the price of a sheep and a measure of grain.\(^{16}\) When Solon’s equation of wet and dry measures, at least for political purposes, is taken into account, we then have a rather simplified and certainly impossibly rigid economic system in which the units of all basic primary products are pegged to the basic monetary unit; sheep = measure of barley = measure of oil = measure of wine = drachma (= \( \frac{1}{3} \) ox).\(^{17}\) No wonder Solon had to juggle the size of the measures!

But unfortunately for this ‘ideal’ solution, Plutarch’s testimony is unsatisfactory in other respects. It puzzles us to find a measure of barley in a sacrificial context. When animal victims were not used, cakes—hardly likely to incorporate any substantial fraction of a medimnos of grain—were offered; grains of barley were scattered in certain rites, while a sheaf may have been offered to Demeter. We could well have expected a reference to liquid offerings also, if there is any reason at all for price-fixing in such cases. The only possibility would be in the case of ‘first-fruits’;\(^{18}\) but there seems little reason to give these a cash value, since religious conservatism and propriety would not have permitted agriculturalists to compound in cash for such an offering. The sale by temple authorities of offerings surplus to their own maintenance seems the only explanation, which is not rendered very clear by Plutarch’s phrasing as it stands.

---

\(^{15}\) This statement is used by Heichelheim, \emph{op. cit.}, to show how Solon favoured the large landowners, as if \( \ζυγιται \) and even Hill-men would not be likely to suffer just as heavily in proportion from the depredations of wolves.

\(^{16}\) J. Johnston (\emph{op. cit.}) renders ‘a sheep and a drachma were reckoned as equivalent to a medimnos’ which neatly preserves the ambiguity as to whether a medimnos was worth one or two drachmas. Naturally he assumes the lower value.

\(^{17}\) Heichelheim (\emph{RE Suppl. vi, s.v. ‘\στος’}) accepts the equation, but in the next breath says that Solon was trying to provide the \emph{thetes} with cheaper grain. Clearly a drachma per medimnos is a high price relative to the other items.

\(^{18}\) The best evidence regarding \emph{αργυρωτα} appears to be \emph{IG} ii \( \text{76} \), the Athenian decree of 423–422 regarding the ‘tithes’ to be offered at Eleusis. Though the quantities are prescribed (at one-sixth of 1 per cent) there is no suggestion of a cash alternative.
Worse still, immediately after quoting Demetrios on prices, referred to above, Plutarch comments that, as one would expect, the prices of selected sacrificial animals laid down by Solon in the Sixteenth Axon were 'many times higher'. This further shakes one's faith in the customary interpretation of the earlier statement, which also ought to refer to sacrificial victims, and to the writer it seems dangerous to base any arguments about the price-structure upon it. Consider the case of an ox, said to cost 5 drachmas. The class of zeugitai, one of the main items of whose capital outlay was for a 'yoke of oxen', would thus have to expend 10 drachmas, against an assessed annual income of 200 drachmas (or 400?). The ox, Hesiod advised, should be the peasant's first acquisition, ranking before a wife. If cattle were so cheap, there would be no need to be so anxious. One wonders what was the price of a wife, if bought, according to the poet's advice? The price of slaves in 413 varied between 70 and 300 drachmas. Were they one-twentieth of that price in Solon's day? It is not likely that an ordinary working slave fetched many times more than a working ox.

The sheep is only less important than the ox. The scale of pastoral industry was certainly small and animals comparatively few; hence the price must have been relatively higher, and with regard to sheep it must not be forgotten that wool in those days did not have to compete with natural products such as cotton, still less with artificial fibres, but was the only available material for clothing. 'Sheep were so valuable for their wool that they were seldom sacrificed' (and hence rarely eaten) says one scholar. To equate the sheep with a measure of grain would have been ridiculous and certainly involved ruin for small pastoralists.

We have some evidence as to the relations between prices of the several commodities at later periods. At the end of the fifth century the price of olives—not olive oil—was roughly equal to that of wheat, and so oil will have been worth at least three times as much. At the beginning of the Peloponnesian War wheat was dearer than barley, in the proportion 5:2, doubtless a lower proportion than in Solon's day when barley was more readily available than wheat; now the price of barley was 1 1/2 drachmas a medimnos, so that if the figure of 1 drachma for a medimnos of barley in 594 is accepted, the increase in price over the century and a half would have been only 50 per cent; this is made highly improbable by the figures for cereals for the period between Solon and Demetrios—a rise of 500 per cent—by the greater availability of silver to the Athenian government after the Laureion discoveries, and by the rise in wages over the same period.

Wages also afford an interesting comparison. In Solon's time the daily wage of a labourer appears to have been 1 obol, and Cavaignac has calculated that a family could well live on 60 drachmas per annum, a figure that compares reasonably with the more comfortable circumstances of the Two-Hundred-Measure group. By Kimon's time wages in

---

19 It may be suggested that τὰ τιμήματα τῶν θησαυρῶν in the earlier passage does not mean the same thing as τὰς τιμὰς τῶν ἱερῶν in the later. The difference in meaning is not obvious nor to be deduced from the relevant entries in LSJ.

20 At the auction of the confiscated goods of those convicted of impiety, Prices at state auctions today tend to be considerably lower than open market prices; during the Peloponnesian War slaves were generally plentiful, and this was before the Spartan occupation of Dekeleia and a possible scarcity of slaves in Athens.

21 H. Michell, Economics of Ancient Greece 70. The current price ratio in Tasmania is between 3-1 and 4-1 for sheep and wheat, after allowance for government support of wheat prices. It seems unlikely that sheep are dearer in relation to other products in Australia than they were in ancient Athens.

22 Cavaignac, L'Economie Grecque 21. Adcock, in CAH iv 48 states that in the fifth century a metretes of olive oil was worth up to four times as much as a medimnos of barley. Evidence for the price of oil in later Greek times ranges from the reasonable figure of 10 drachmae in Egypt in 150 B.C., through 12 drachmae at Athens in the fourth century (sacrificial oil), and 15 to 17 drachmae at Delos later, to the astounding figure of 36 drachmae given by Aristotle, Oecon. ii 27.

23 Cavaignac, op. cit. 68. It would be fantastic to place nine-tenths of the rise in the last century or so of the total period. According to the same authority livestock had gone up 100 per cent; it looks as if the disparity is once again due to the false premiss of the sheep-wheat equation.
were 2 obols, and, in 431, 3 obols a day; late in the fifth century skilled artisans were receiving a drachma for work on the Erechtheum. If there had been a 300 per cent rise in wages, it is natural to suppose a rise of more than 50 per cent in the local staple food product, though of course some allowance should be made for Pontic wheat depressing the price of Attic barley, which was not so highly rated by the consuming public, as statements regarding rations make clear; the Spartan army laid down two choinikes of barley or one of wheat per man per day.

If then the price of barley was little higher one hundred and fifty years after Solon than that supposed by the price-equalisation theory, it is very probable that the first figure of 1 drachma per medimnos is either highly inflated, or wrongly reported. In the first case, since wheat would fetch a higher price still, there would be every inducement for traders to import wheat from overseas. In the second, no argument can be based on it, and in neither case do we find evidence of restriction of trade.24

The argument does not deny the equalisation of ‘wet’ and ‘dry’ measures. But once again the primary authorities do not make it certain that they were equalised in price; this may be inferred from their equal acceptance for political assessment, though it is not definitely established. The change in the size of the measures might well have been needed to render such an equalisation possible—but here again we are still in the dark about what Solon’s changes actually amounted to, as is made plain by the extensive literature on the subject.25 The Ath. Pol. vaguely says they were ‘increased’ like the coinage, and naturally there has been much uncertainty as to what this means; one apparently definite statement that they were now ‘larger than the Pheidonian’ has been reversed by some scholars, so that μειω is read instead of μείζων. This lack of precision is unfortunate; it is, however, possible without going over all the ground covered by others, to point out some disadvantages connected with an increase of capacity in the measures. As pointed out by Johnston26 an increase of capacity would mean a larger volume of production required for qualification for Solon’s property-classes and hence a reduction in the number of persons qualifying; if, as there is some reason to think, the classes (or at least the ‘traditional’ names thereof) were in existence before Solon, this would have been a retrograde step. If one is convinced Solon was putting the clock back, this becomes acceptable; hardly otherwise. It is not, I think, seriously maintained that Solon’s legislation was politically restrictive or reactionary, whatever view may be taken of his economic policy. Again, an increase in the quantities of commodity-units would strain the price-structure, since the devaluation would tend to cause a rise in prices, and yet the producers would not get a higher price if they were forced to sell more for the same return. Could any ancient state have enforced such a fixed price against such pressures? Johnston, therefore, after considering the evidence as to the Pheidonian, the Aeginetan, and the Attic measures, comes to the very reasonable conclusion that ‘the ἀλήθεια of the Ath. Pol. was of the same nature in all three cases (i.e. money, weights and measures), an increase in the number of units contained in a given quantity’ and that the ordinary interpretation of Aristotle’s statement is due to an error of either the author or a copyist—neither of whom are entirely above suspicion in such matters.

The dangers are now sufficiently apparent of building too imposing an edifice of price-structure and economic planning on the scanty and dubious information provided by Plutarch and ‘Aristotle’. Let us consider the sequel to Solon’s economic changes. There is no doubt that Athens had a considerable overseas trade a generation after Solon. It

24 ‘The most lunatic part of the whole business’ of price-equalisation, to quote a remark of Mr French, is in fact the equation of a measure of oil with the same quantity of wine. It would have to be remarkably good wine, perhaps of that vintage offered with such effect by Odysseus to the Cyclops, which could stand dilution with twenty parts of water to one.
25 See, for example, the bibliography in Heichelheim’s notes, op. cit. 523-5.
might take a generation for the import-export trade based on Attic oil to get into full swing. Peisistratos is known to have been the friend and associate of Solon in his youth; Solon is said to have been his adviser after he gained power—for it was the method of obtaining power and not the governmental policy of Peisistratos against which the aged statesman made his picturesque protest. Behind this smoke, there surely exists enough fire to justify the conclusion drawn from other evidence that Solon and Peisistratos in fact pursued similar economic policies. Is it not likely that Peisistratos saw that Solon had been successful in his stimulation of trade, notably the encouragement of production of a staple commodity for export, and determined to follow in his footsteps? The difference, however, was that Peisistratos did not have to respect the large landowners at all, nor make special concessions to them; his policy could be more thoroughgoing and he was not to be baulked by their selfishness. Hence his alliance with the Alkmaeonids—until disagreement, whether about political or marital practices, put an end to the honeymoon—and his pursuance of a policy linking Athens more securely with the Black Sea, Euboea, possibly the Thracian coast, and Miltiades in the Chersonese. Glotz indeed maintained that it was not to Peisistratos’ interest to encourage trade; he would find a peasant population easier to manage than merchants or a city proletariat, and one fact that we do know of his economic policy is the establishment of a kind of ‘Agricultural Bank’. The temporary nature of the support received by Peisistratos from the Shore seems to support this contention. Actually he must have encouraged both agriculture and commerce; if the peasants had moved from subsistence to commodity farming, as Solon had hoped their crops had to be marketed, probably by middlemen; trade received indirect rather than direct support in this way, while other activities of the tyrant also stimulated it.

To me it appears that Solon and Peisistratos followed the same general line of economic policy; Solon as a ‘sensible mercantilist’ allotting chief importance to oversea trade, and securing, only temporarily it may be, Salamis as an added protection against rivals and enemies near home, Peisistratos with a less conciliatory manner towards other interests at home getting a foothold at both ends of the Aegean crossing.

If Solon’s economic policy, no less than his political reforms, were so complete a failure, it would be difficult to account for his subsequent renown. For the only effect of the political changes, according to the ungenerous view, was to stall off revolution for a couple of decades, and the only effect of the economic policy was to stimulate Peisistratos into reversing it as rapidly as possible. Let us credit Solon with enough common sense and foresight to see which way the economic wind was blowing, and to envisage at least some of the possibilities of expansion, rather than suppose him to have set himself to prevent the trade development which made Athens great.

It may be argued that the Seisachthia in itself was sufficient memorial to ensure Solon’s undying fame; one section of the Athenian population was justly grateful, and all sections rightly joined in honouring its author as one of the great promoters of the humane outlook of Athenian society. But it is yet easier to reverence a humanitarian who has benefited

27 Cf. Grundy, *Thucydides and the History of his Age* 69, who also puts forward the view that Solon and Peisistratos were working in the same direction economically speaking. N. G. L. Hammond, *JHS* lx (1946) 80, points out that it would take a generation for the olive plantations to come into full production; hence he regards the prohibition of food exports as a purely temporary measure, to be repealed once the export trade had grown sufficiently to balance the necessary imports of cereals.

28 Grundy, 75 n. 1, speaks of the activities of Miltiades as a ‘corollary to the policy of Solon’.

29 Glotz, *op. cit.* 119.

30 Mr French rightly emphasises the decline in soil fertility as a major factor in the difficult position of Attic agriculture at the time of Solon. All the more reason, if Solon were aware of this (and why should he not be?) to stimulate the development of the olive which did not require such good land. Cereals required the best land available in Attica; later, perhaps, market-gardening would develop close to the city; the olive plantations would tend to occupy less desirable land on the hillsides.
your pocket as well; the very high estimation in which the memory of Peisistratos was held, tyrant though he was, is an indication of credit to economic benefactors. Around a figure such as Solon we are well aware that legend will accumulate; but let us not deny that Solon’s fame was justified by his works in more directions than one. Solon the mercantilist was the predecessor and possibly the adviser of his friend Peisistratos in building up the economic power of Athens through realistic treatment of her agricultural economy and encouragement of ‘secondary industry’ and the export-import trade.

K. H. Waters.

University of Tasmania.
NOTES

A Note on Thucydides iii 68.5

In his Historical Commentary (ii 358) Professor Gomme rejected long-suggested emendments to the text, which, as it stands, dates the Plateaean alliance with Athens to 519 B.C. Difficulties in accepting this date were long ago pointed out by Grote (iv 2 94 n.), adding the text of Herodotos v 78. It must be admitted that, if the dating is correct, the episode is quite out of keeping with all else that we know of Peisistratan foreign policy, for during the thirty-six years of the régime Athens is not credited with any other clash with a mainland power.¹ On the fall of the tyranny Athens is involved in war with Boeotia, Euboea, Aegina, and repeatedly with Sparta. A possible reason for the caution of the tyrants and the belligerence of the régime which followed their expulsion may perhaps be found in the nature of the defence force of which both governments disposed. Before the tyranny the Attic army had evidently consisted of the landed gentry leading the retainers from their estates; the squires (knights and hoplites) formed, with the Pentakosiomedimnoi, the only properly armed force in the state, and Peisistratos was very careful to disarm it at the beginning of his régime;² there is no suggestion that the confiscated arms were ever distributed to other sections of the citizen population, nor of any organisation employed by the tyrants to mobilise any citizen militia; indeed the organisation of the latter was one of the most urgent duties later undertaken by Kleisthenes. Instead of a citizen militia the tyrants employed a professional force of foreign soldiers (the ‘bodyguard’ so called). In his successful bid for restoration Peisistratos used troops from Argos, Naxos, Thebes, and Eretria. Herodotos is quite explicit about the tyrants’ dependence on mercenaries;³ when the Spartans invaded Attica to expel Hippias they were met not by Attic, but by Thessalian soldiers.⁴ The tyrants preferred mercenaries to militia because any force officered by the Attic squires might well turn its weapons on the ruler, whereas the hired troops stood outside the civic conflict. The tyrants’ bodyguards were not recruited from the citizens but were designed for use against them.⁵

³ Hdt. i 64.
⁴ Hdt. v 63.
⁵ Arist. Pol. 1285a.

The size, like the functions, of a professional force would be quite different to that of a militia. The former must be kept at a minimum size consistent with internal safety, not only for economic, but also for political reasons, so that it could also be personally overseen by the ruler without risking the delegation of authority: to compensate for its smallness, it must be well-armed, efficient, and above all mobile, so that it could be switched to trouble spots within the state or on the frontiers.

If this argument is accepted, the cautious policies of the tyrants are understandable. To send the security troops on foreign adventures was out of the question: in their absence the régime would be endangered; in the event of their defeat it was lost. The revival of the citizen militia by Kleisthenes was a necessary prelude to any policy involving foreign alliances and adventures. For this reason I would venture to disagree with Gomme’s statement that ‘there is no good evidence against 519 B.C. and nothing particularly in favour of... 509’. Apart from the arguments adduced by Grote, any serious consideration of the Athenian tyrants’ military organisation must throw additional doubts upon the date given by Thucydides.

A. FRENCH.

University of Adelaide.

The Syllabic Inscription, Hoffmann no. 106

(PLATE VIII. 2)

The British Museum has long been in possession of a limestone stele from the Cypriot village of Salaminou, some 12 miles north-east of Koukla (Old Paphos). It has been published—save in one particular—very adequately (B.M. Catalogue of Sculpture no. 430). It is excellently illustrated by the photograph here reproduced (for which I am indebted to the kindness of Professor Ashmole); and I can usefully comment only upon the inscription which fills somewhat chaotically the pediment above the naked archer. The Catalogue is content to reproduce for this inscription a text of Deecke (SGDI 41) over which we need waste no time whatsoever: as Deecke himself very soon saw (Bezz. Beitr. xi 317 L.), he had read it backwards, not in the characteristic direction of the fifth and fourth century Paphian signary, but from right to left.

Deecke’s second interpretation was a challenge to the ingenuity of R. Meister and O. Hoffmann, the former in 1889 (Die gr. Dialekte ii no. 144) venturing the following:

\[ \text{Ἀριστεύγωρα | τὸ Ὀπαναῖον ἐπὶ δάρα ὁ(μ) βα(ύ)το | χάρι ὁι καζηνητος ἐπαντὸ τὸ μᾶλιον(ο) τόδε.} \]
To this two years later (Die gr. Dialekte i no. 106) came his rival’s reply:

'Aρισταγόρας | τὸ 'Ονασίοκον ἐπέστατε ὁ παῖς | καὶ οἱ κατέγιγνον ο(1) αὐτό τὸ ... τόδε.

But with that the matter has lain dormant for some 70 years.

This neglect, however, is not so odd as it might appear. It was only our very recent excavation of the Kouklaia siege-mound (Ant. J. xxxi (1951) 54 ff.)—which has given me 192 syllabic texts, many of them admittedly the merest scraps—together with my revision and enlargement of the Kantidi corpus (S.B. Ak. Berlin xxviii (1911) 630 ff.; Emerita xxviii (1958) 111 ff.) that has established the signary of Late Archaic Paphos. Furthermore, to the three syllabic inscriptions, long known to us, of Nikokles, the last of the Paphian kings (SGDI 39; Hoffmann 103, 104) there are now two additions, one published by myself in Anatolian Studies presented to W. H. Buckler (1938) 197 ff. and the second to appear shortly in Opuscula Atheniensia iii. These five, with the manifestly contemporaneous texts of the ‘grotto’ of Apollo Hylates at New Paphos (SGDI 42, 43), give us the Paphian signary in its terminal phase at the very outset of the Hellenistic age. The inscription of this kingdom which fall in time between these two extremes can now not merely be read with more confidence but can also be given an approximate date.

For Hoffmann no. 106 accordingly I now offer the transcription which appears in FIG. 1.

\[1\]

\[5\]

\[10\]

\[15\]

\[20\]

\[25\]

\[30\]

\[35\]

\[40\]

a. ri. si. ta. ko. ra. i
to. na. si. vo. i. ko. c. pe. sa. ta. se o. pa. sa.
tc. se o. i. ra. si. o. jo. to. i. o. a. u. to. ma. na. i. jo. to. te

'Aρισταγόρας | τὸ 'Ονασίοκον ἐπέστατε

'Οφά | τὲς ὁ 'Ἰρασίος ὁ τὸ ἄυτὸ τὸ μητρὶ(ν) τόδε.

FIG. 1.

The inscription is thus cut down to its proper size, and its meaning becomes banal on any reckoning: a grandson set up this stèle in memory of his grandfather. Nevertheless it is not without importance, for there are certain things here which call for comment. μηδουμα has recently occurred in the Cypriot dialect and for the first time (RDAC for 1937–1939, Nicosia, 1950, of Karpassia). Here clearly in μηδουμα we have se intruding. Thereafter se robs ri of its sign, and subsequently (on the scanty evidence available to us) is so rendered without fluctuation until the time of Nikokles. Then, however, the Archaic form, surprisingly, was reintroduced, to compete with but not to supersede its rival. Ri, thus forced to differentiate itself, assumed the variations I show, none of them, it would seem, of much stability. All this might
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoffmann no. 106</th>
<th>Archaic</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Late Paphian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>L L (e)</td>
<td>L L L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td>△ △ △ (e)</td>
<td>△ △ △</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE</td>
<td>△ △ △ (e)</td>
<td>△ △ △ △ △</td>
<td>△ △ △ △ △</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>△ △ △</td>
<td>△ △ △ △</td>
<td>△ △ △ △</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO</td>
<td></td>
<td>△ △ △ (e)</td>
<td>△ △ △ (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>△ △ △ △</td>
<td>△ △ △ △ △ △</td>
<td>△ △ △ △ △ △</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>△ △ △ △ △ △</td>
<td>△ △ △ △ △ △</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>△ △ △ △</td>
<td>△ △ △ △ △ △</td>
<td>△ △ △ △ △ △</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Image of Table](image)

FIG. 2. Table of signs. (e) = Curium.

suggest an early fifth-century date for our inscription, but there are other considerations which militate against this.

Signs 3, 11, 28: the Archaic form of si and its subsequent developments are shown above. Here we have some highly erratic shapes, essentially I with two strokes variously disposed beneath it. But the resultant forms are perilously like Paphian le.

Signs 7, 13, 26, 32, 40 are variants of Paphian and indeed non-Paphian i which are (I believe) without parallel.

Signs 9, 20, 25, 29, 33: non-Archaic and seemingly late forms of Paphian φ. We may note the astonishing diversity permitted in one and the same inscription.

Sign 15 is characteristically Paphian for all periods; but various capricious variations occur even in the early texts.

Signs 17, 22: we observe that sa in the early Paphian is invariably rendered by V.

Signs 30, 41: the syllable jɔ, added to the Cypriot syllabary by Meister in 1910 from the Bulwer Tablet of (it is said) the Western Karpas (S.B. Ak. Berlin 1910, i 149) has not hitherto been identified in the Paphian. Meister's sign is in essentials a W supported by a short vertical; and Meister, I may say, has now been amply vindicated by fresh evidence from Kafizin and elsewhere. Now alike in the Kouklia siege-mound, at Rantidi and at Agia Moni in the most formal of all Nikokles' inscriptions (D. G. Hogarth, Devia Cypria 32 no. 10) I find a sign—an X between upper and lower horizontals—to which I give this same value. Signs 30 and 41 therefore attest an importation into Paphian territory of a foreign form, with possibly Curium as the intermediary. For that city, which in Archaic times wrote in a manner not to be distinguished from the Paphian, diverged from it at the outset of the fifth-century in the direction of the normal non-Paphian scripts of the rest of Cyprus, until by the fourth it was merged into these. We now find in late fifth-century Curium the jɔ of Meister with however a tilted stroke beneath it (unpublished). Of this 30 and 41 would appear to be a development, hitherto unexampled.

Sign 35: Archaic u, we may note, is invariably an inverted V.

Sign 38: the second form of ma shown for the Archaic Paphian occurs then but once, but thereafter in general holds the field. The X which now is found twice with certainty and twice questionably at Rantidi and in the Kouklia siege-mound (and yet once more in Archaic Curium) has hitherto defeated me. It is shown thrice by Deecke (for Salamis, Old Paphos and Curium)—but in each case hesitantly—with the value mu. X now appears for the first time unambiguously as ma.

The retention by ri of its old form may indeed suggest to us the earlier fifth century; but collectively these palaeographic considerations are definitely in favour of a later date, and would seem

VOL. LXXX
indeed to point to the fourth century, before, however, the age of Nikokles. But I must emphasise that we are concerned with the history of a very complicated syllabary over a period of some three, if not four, hundred years, and further that few documents can be assigned with confidence to the fifth century. At the same time, we must guard against dismissing any seeming abnormalities in inscriptions from the Paphian hinterland as rustic. Salamis stood on a route which ran north from Old Paphos along the ridge to the west of the Dhiarizos river via the Classical site of Amargetti (JHS ix (1888) 268 ff.) up to the Paphos Forest and the ancient copper workings at Pefkos tis Peravasaas. It is today the centre of a high and healthy country, rich in vines and almonds. In antiquity doubtless it had further assets of a more industrial nature, which bound it closely to the capital city of which it was, not indeed a dene (for Cyprus is notable in having possessed no dene-system) but a prosperous outlier.

T. B. Mitford.

St. Andrews.

Theopompos and Athenian lies

At the end of book X of the Philippika Theopompos gave a digression on the Athenian demagogues. In book XXV he gave a digression on Athenian lies. This, which may have been a shorter digression, specified two lies and questioned the accepted account of the battle of Marathon; perhaps Theopompos discussed these problems alone in full and contented himself with a general reference to other lies. One lie was the oath allegedly taken by the Greeks before the battle of Plataea; today many people believe, with Theopompos, that this oath was not authentic. The other lie was the peace of Callias. Today some people believe, against Theopompos, that the peace was authentic. It is not always easy to discover their reasons. Some of them claim to produce nebulous allusions to the peace from the text of Thucydides. This search in Thucydides for references to the peace is not likely to carry conviction; it simply draws attention to the silence of Thucydides about the peace in his account of the Pentecontaetia. In fact the positive evidence for the peace is flimsy, but there is one good reason for believing in the peace; that is the fact that no major fighting is recorded between Persia and the Delian League after 450. Whether this outweighs the reasons against authenticity is a question for judgement.

Recently Mr D. Stockton has offered a full dis-

1 F. Gr. Hist. II B 115 F 153-5.
2 Thus A. W. Gomme (JHS I (1930) 105-6; Commentary on Thucydides i 332) on Thuc. viii 56.4 (but what hindered the king from sailing round Asia Minor might be Greek ships, not a treaty), and A. Andrews (in a forthcoming article) on Thuc. viii 58.2.
3 Historia viii (1959) 51-79.
4 Theop. F 154; Krateros in Plut. Cim. 13.5.
5 M. N. Tod, Greek Historical Inscriptions 204.
7 Leocr. 80-1.
8 Diod. xi 29.2-3.
beyond which the king should not send naval and land-forces respectively. But the Plataea-oath is more or less contemporary with the 'second version' of the peace of Callias, that is, with the version which gave Cyaneae, the Chelidonian rocks and 'the Sardis-line' as the limits. The oath, like the 'second version' of the peace, was accepted by Ephoros and Lykourgos; Theopompos attacked both Athenian theses together. So the conjecture is permissible that the Plataea-oath was invented by the same man who put forward the 'second version' of the peace of Callias. And the Athenians gave Kleidemos a material reward for his account of their city.  

9 For the distinction see Historia iii (1955) 325–33. The explanation offered there of the peculiarities of the later two tribute-lists of the second assessment-period is, as far as I know, the only hypothesis which explains all the peculiarities, including the similarity of arrangement in the lowest list on the obverse of the first stele and in the first half of the list on the right lateral face. The objection raised by A. G. Woodhead (SEG xiv (1957) 5) does not take sufficient account of the position occupied by the 'southeastern group' in List 5. Accordingly, the space at the top of the reverse of the first stele is an adequate reason for regarding 447/6 as the year for which no tribute was recorded. This in turn tells against the peace of Callias.

10 Tertull. de an. 52.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


(The reviewer is not responsible for delay in the appearance of this review.—Ed.)

Reading this third volume of Professor Kaege's magnificent biography of the great Swiss historian, this reviewer, more strongly than ever (cf. on vols. i and ii JHS lxix 132 and lxxiii 146), felt his incapacity to fulfil, within a narrow space, his duties as a reporter and a critic, in such a manner as the reader is entitled to expect of him. He must, once again, restrict himself to some general remarks. There exist some biographies of great men which are about equal in size, but very few which are equal in understanding, in scholarly acumen and psychological interpretation, in historical insight, in loving admiration of his subject and yet always keeping the necessary distance. This volume makes it particularly clear how worthy the biographer is of his task. There emerges, nel mezzo del cammino (from the twenty-eighth to the forty-fourth year) of his life, the author of the three great books published during his lifetime: first, the masterly historian of Die Zeit Constantins des Grossen, who, against the prevailing views, stressed that without Diocletian there would have been no Constantine, and who saw in the latter the great statesman who created a new era called after him; secondly, the learned and often provocative art historian of Cicerone, whose leading idea was the importance of the after-life of antiquity in the Middle Ages; it is significant that many years later Aby Warburg dedicated his dissertation to Burckhardt; finally, with the Cultur der Renaissance in Italien, the creator of a new epochal concept of history and the first great Kulturhistoriker; this famous book was the first highly successful attempt at seeing a historical epoch as a whole, not chronologically, but as it were morphologically. The three books are described by Professor Kaege not so much as established works, but as the outcome of many struggles, both material and spiritual, and in particular of that tension in Burckhardt's mind between the youthful love for the great centuries of the Middle Ages and his growing realisation of the meaning of the classical ideal of Greece and Renaissance. Professor Kaege rightly feels the urgent need of a biography of Burckhardt because, in contrast, e.g., to Ranke, his published work consists of a few erratic blocks which only the biographer can put into their true context. He has been helped by the wonderful material hidden in Burckhardt's note-books, lecture notes, letters, drafts, poems (both in high German and in dialect), and last but not least the beautiful pencil sketches of Italian architecture and scenery. He has not only unearthed a large amount of invaluable material, but also made the most judicious and subtle use of it. The result is the portrait of a personality equally complex and human.

In the first four chapters, before the biographer reaches the Constantine, there is described, among innumerable details, the full impact of Italy on Burckhardt as well as the work he did in re-editing and largely re-writing the Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte of his teacher and friend Kugler; this may be called the last work of an apprentice and the first of a master. Furthermore, we learn of the early concepts of a History of Civilisation, originally intended as a series of small readable books by several authors, leading from the Periclean age through the late Roman empire and various periods of the mediaeval world to the age of Raphael. This plan never materialised, nor did in fact Burckhardt's wish to write a book on civilisation and art of the Renaissance. Through all these years we can feel how the attraction of the Classical ideal—Classical in its widest sense—gained ground, though never complete and exclusive supremacy, over the Romantic, the Gothic, the Christian world. Lectures were given (among countless others), pointing to the later lectures of the Cicerone had Greek sculpture almost in its centre, although Burckhardt practically knew Roman copies only; he nevertheless brilliantly conceived the world of the Greek gods in their ideal human images as a mirror of Greek life. The ultimate result of that era, however, is the idea, much disputed since and yet essentially true, that—after Burckhardt's words in a letter to king Max of Bavaria—the Renaissance was 'the mother and homeland of modern man'.

We are looking forward to the fourth and last volume of this work of patient and imaginative scholarship. It will be probably less interesting than the present one in biographical detail; but the quiet years of the recluse of Basle include the exciting intermezzo of his friendship with Nietzsche and also the delivery of those lectures which after his death became the Griechische Kulturgeschichte and the Weltgeschichtliche Betrachtungen, the Reflections on History.

VICTOR EHRENBERG.

WEBSTER (T. B. L.) From Mycenae to Homer. Methuen, 1938. Pp. xvi + 312, with 38 plates and a folding map. 30s.

No book could give a better impression of an expanding universe. Royalties will be given to the Michael Ventris Memorial Fund, and Professor Webster's first concern is with the revolution caused
NOTICES OF BOOKS

by the decipherment of Linear B, but there is much in the other Bronze Age records and archaeological material which is also newly found or recently published. The description of Mycenaean society, religion, art and literature draws mainly on material unknown when H. L. Lorimer's Homer and the Monuments and M. P. Nilsson's Minoan-Mycenaean Religion were published in 1950, and shows the replacement of prehistoric by historical methods. It also shows, unfortunately, the defects of the evidence for literature; analogy, survival, deduction, take the place of sources, and a whole class of Warrior Poets has to be created out of the chance survival of a helmet and lyre in the same (multiple) tomb (p. 130). It does not, perhaps, show how much conflict of opinion remains. To make an intelligible picture, W. gives only the interpretation which he accepts. The student who looks up the references will find for example that Professor Palmer does not think the Ta series has anything to do with a gift, and that Dr Finley does not think the Homeric gift system purely Mycenaean, and he may wonder if 'guest-cloths' alone are enough (pp. 12, 22).

1 In the treatment of the period of illiteracy (at least for us c. 1200-750), there might be more discrimination between (1) archaeological evidence, (2) early authorities on (a) recent and (b) early history, and (3) late authorities. Late writers knew suspiciously much about the Ionian Migration compared with what Thucydides knew about the colonisation of Sicily. Yet the interlocking evidence vividly recreates the proud society in which Greek poetry began and the disruption through which it had to survive.

'Our texts of the Iliad and Odyssey can be accepted as substantially faithful reproductions of the poems as they were composed' (p. 4). This includes K, λ, φ, ω. The Iliad was written not long if at all before 750, and the Odyssey not long if at all after 720, possibly by the same poet. Here the method is necessarily more familiar; analysis of the poems and comparisons with art. Some of the conclusions, however, are far from familiar, and so important that they need fuller discussion. The argument is: In Greek, Hittite, Egyptian and other mythologies, there are common elements, which are fully and convincingly described. The Greeks borrowed them in the Bronze Age, and they reached Ionia through Attica. Therefore stories common to Homer, the Cypria and Hesiod descended independently from the pre-migration corpus, Hesiod preserving the Attic version. The idea of representing scenes of everyday life is a modern idea' (p. 60).

Therefore Attic Geometric vases, though they anedate knowledge of Homer, illustrate the Attic version of the same stories; the mark is the absurd Dipylon shield, which is a misrepresentation of the 8-shield taken from Mycenaean artefacts which survived to the eighth century. Hence come the resemblances between Homer and Geometric vases, which again are fully and convincingly described. The conclusion depends, not on the two sets of resemblances, but on the intervening propositions. (1) Early borrowing. Three stages are possible: beliefs carried in early migrations, shown by the diffusion of, e.g., bull-men before active trade began; Myc. III, for which the evidence is perhaps weakest; transmission through Al Mina and the Phoenicians in the eighth century. W. has some excellent comments (p. 31) distinguishing borrowing of art motifs from borrowing of stories; but it is unlikely that no Eastern and Egyptian stories were carried with the alphabet, papyrus, scarabs, ivory, and monsters. (2) Impossibility of contemporary scenes at the date. This is disproved by their frequency in the art of Asia and Egypt, by the shield of Achilles itself. (3) 'Ionian' and 'Attic' versions. In Greek literature generally, there seem to be as many versions as poets. (4) Absurdity of the Dipylon shield. The model is very like the earlier Hittite shield, which was certainly 'real'. Its construction is clear and reasonable, not two complete circles, as on the Delos ivories. It is more likely that three shapes were in use simultaneously than that artists 'archaised' from a votive or chance find; unbroken continuity of an eighth-century type in seventh and sixth centuries is much easier. There is one particular difficulty, W. accepts games at some eighth-century funerals, though he might have argued that Hesiod's participation was a false projection of heroic practice. Of the Ay. 'Triada sarcophagus, he says that the dead man on it must be the dead man in it' (p. 35). But Dipylon shields are carried at funerals on vases. Therefore they are heroic, and funerals in Homer (except for cremation) and on vases came through the pre-migration corpus from Mycenae. The ground is laid by a suggestion that duels on Pylian frescoes may be sport, with a footnote, 'Mylonas argues that funeral games were already a Mycenaean institution, AJA 52 (1948) 77' (p. 55). Later 'the probability that funeral procession and funeral games were Mycenaean' (p. 164) becomes 'We have noted that grand funerals and funeral games were Mycenaean' (p. 172).

But Professor Mylonas based his case on the stelai, on which he saw chariot races, and W. has already accepted the opposite view that they are war-chariots (p. 32, cf. 234; rightly, since the 'marker' has since been found on a stel without a chariot). It is simpler, though duller, to suppose that painters and poets drew on what they saw around them, and that
they are alike (except that the vases and the Odyssey have more archers, and the vases, being on inhumation graves, have no pyres) because life in Athens and Ionia was alike.

This is a general study, bringing together views already expressed in articles, but the documentation is copious and immensely valuable. W., who is attracted by Myres' analogy of form in Homer and in Geometric art, also has his bold imagination and synoptic view. There are many valuable suggestions; I can mention only the treatment of the Teos inscription (p. 151) and of the part played by Poseidon and Apollo (p. 269), and the comparison of vocabulary in Iliad and Odyssey (p. 276 ff.). If I have written mostly about conclusions which I cannot accept, it is because one of the merits of such a book is to provoke discussion.

D. H. F. Gray.

PAGE (D. L.) History and the Homeric Iliad.

This book is brilliantly written, and the prevailing impression is that it was a pleasure to read. It consists of six lectures on different aspects of second millennium history, which have in different ways affected the Iliad, and of an appendix on the multiple authorship of the Iliad, which does not differ in style because it was originally planned as two lectures. The notes are admirably full and well documented; they are conveniently placed after each chapter so that the reader can easily turn to them for the details of the argument.

The first lecture reviews the references to Achaeans in Hittite documents. Ahhiyawa is identified with Rhodes and Milawanda as Miletus, but the names of individuals are rejected. There is nothing to quarrel with here, only a doubt whether the King of Rhodes was big enough to be treated 'nearly—perhaps quite—an equal' by the Hittite king. It is also strange in view of the trouble in the land of Luqqah that there is no mention of Bellerophon.

The second lecture is a clear and most interesting reconstruction of the history of Troy from its archaeology. Full weight is given to the appearance both of Gray Minyan ware and of the horse in Troy VI. This carries with it the implication that the founders of Troy VI were people of similar cultural background to the Greek-speaking invaders and occupiers of Hellas. Quantities of Mycenaean objects were found in Troy VI, and Professor Page makes the interesting suggestion that the Trojans paid in textiles and horses. Troy VI collapsed in an earthquake but Troy VIIA was sacked.

In the third lecture Professor Page uses the documents of Arnuwandas IV and Tuthalijas IV to reconstruct the background of the Trojan war. Tuthalijas IV faced a major rebellion in Western Asia Minor in a territory called Assuwa, which may be identified with the Greek Asia, and the Achaeans seem to have been on the side of the Hittites against the rebels, who may have included the Trojans. 'It appears at present likely that the Achaeans attacked Troy soon after the defeat of Assuwa by Tuthalijas.' But here the Achaeans are not only the Mycenaeans of Rhodes and Miletus but the complete host under the leadership of Agamemnon.

Their order of battle, and that of their Trojan enemies as far as it was known to them, Professor Page finds in the Catalogues of the second book of the Iliad. He argues (largely because of the prominence given to the Boeotians) that they were preserved independently of the poetical tradition which culminated in the Iliad and were incorporated in the Iliad at a very late stage; that the persons and places were not much altered but that the numbers of ships may be wholly Ionian additions. This is, except for certain details, a reasonable view. The Catalogue has undergone certain minor and obvious adaptations to make it into the muster list of the tenth year of the war, but this does not preclude its having been in the Iliad tradition long before as the Order of Battle of the beginning of the war. The Iliad tradition was concerned with the whole of the war and not merely the selection of events made by a poet primarily interested in Achilles and Agamemnon, and on that scale Boeotia may have been more important. For Professor Page 'Homer' lived 'in the ninth century or the first quarter of the eighth; and then there was no question of writing poetry or even of recording in writing a poem orally composed'. 'If he made any appreciable use of writing, he must have lived in the latter part of that (the eighth) century, and it is inconceivable that the Greeks should have lost all memory of its author': this argument seems to me worthless; we know nothing of Hesiod or Archilochos except what they tell us themselves, and Homer was precluded by the manner of epic from telling us anything. The limits on which Allbright and Dunbabin agree for the introduction of the alphabet are 850 to 750 and the known spread of eighth-century inscriptions on pottery (Attica, Ischia, Ithaca, Corinth, Perachora) suggests an earlier rather than a later time within these limits. Nor can it 'be stated without the least fear of contradiction that Linear B went out of use among all peoples soon after the Dorian occupation'. What we know is (i) that Linear B was used for writing on materials other than clay tablets (otherwise it would not have preserved its awkward forms from the fifteenth to the thirteenth centuries B.C.) and these other materials have not survived, (ii) that a syllabic script did survive in Cyprus, (iii) that no evidence except analogy has yet been produced for the Greek oral tradition, (iv) that the analogy of Oriental poetry suggests that the formulaic technique originated in the court style and was helpful for recording poems in difficult syllabic script. It is highly probable that the Greek tradition was oral between the Ionian migration and the adoption of the alphabet, but a versified order of
battle could have been preserved for some time on papyrus or skin. However, the main contentions of this chapter are extremely acceptable to those who believe that there is a considerable Mycenaean element in Homer.

In the fifth chapter the Linear B documents from Pylos and Knossos are related to Homer. Professor Page is extremely cautious here, and it is gratifying to see how much firm ground he finds (he is less kind to Professor Palmer’s ‘Dukes’ and ‘Barons’ than they deserve); the ‘Duke’, complete with temenos, can be recognised in Bellerophon, Meleager, Hektor, etc., and to make the ‘baron’ into a religious dignitary does not stop him being a ‘baron’); but he allows the sevanx and the basilēus, words for furniture and weapons (it is a pity that he includes Chadwick’s most improbable ‘arm-guards’), and some significant place-names and proper names; ‘the names survived only because the stories survived’. He has two arguments to account for the differences, and, of course, both are true. One argument is that much was forgotten during the long transition period; the other is that the Mycenaean poets and the clerks looked at quite different aspects of life. This second argument could have been very much strengthened by a glance at second millennium poetry from other sites; in Ugarit, for instance, the poetry shows no awareness of the bureaucracy revealed by the non-poetic tablets. Professor Page has given us so much of the historical documents of the Near East that one could wish that he had also written about their bureaucratic and poetic documents since contiguous civilisations are likely to have influenced one another.

Armed with the tablets and the Catalogue Professor Page moves to a discussion of Mycenaean relics in the Iliad, which he bases on linguistic survivals, memories of objects which had vanished, and memories of events long ago: ‘facts about the Trojans which could not have been known to anybody after the fall of Troy VIIA and facts about the Achaeans which are intelligible only against the background of the Trojan War’. He naturally studies very carefully the traditional formulae of the epic and is particularly indebted to Miss D. H. F. Gray’s article on formulae for the sea and weapons; it is in fact possible to distinguish old formulae, modernised formulae, and modern formulae. Thus many phrases can be recognised as Mycenaean, Ajax and his shield, the two Ajaxes, the spear of Achilles (he misses a point here: all pedigree objects should be tested for Mycenaean origin), Priam of the ashen spear, swift-footed Achilles (but surely in fighting not in running?), bronze-shirted Achaeans, Hector with glittering helmet, horse-taming Trojans. If these are all Mycenaean, they are nearly contemporary with the Trojan war; ‘the subject of the Iliad, the siege of Troy by the Achaeans, is not fictitious but historical and the names of some of the principal persons must be the true names of persons engaged in the Trojan war’. To this he appends a note which says, in effect, not Ajax because his tower

shield places him in the fifteenth century B.C. But he does not draw the consequences from this early dating of Ajax established by Miss Lorimer: Hector kills Periphetes who trips over his great shield and Hector himself has a great shield as he runs back to Troy. Hector therefore as well as Ajax was in poetry in the fifteenth century. I see no escape from the conclusion that the poets who sang the siege of Troy VIIA included precious elements of older battle poetry and the names of those who had fought long ago (this earlier poetry is the most obvious source of the ‘Homer’ names found on the Linear B tablets). Thus, while Professor Page’s conclusion is true in general, even a contemporary poem about the Trojan war admitted much earlier matter and was probably open to Eastern influences as well. It included a great deal besides history.

The appendix is designed ‘to illustrate two later stages in the making of the Iliad, with one example from the golden age of the Ionian epic and one from the period of Athenian predominance’. The first is the Embassy to Achilles, and in discussing it Professor Page identifies four different poets—the poet of the reconciliation (in book xix), the Phoenix-poet, the original embassy-poet, and the poet or poets of the Iliad into which all these matters were introduced. But why into the Iliad and not into the tradition behind the Iliad? I mean by the Iliad the poem which starts with Achilles’ wrath against Agamemnon and ends with Achilles’ abandoning his wrath against Hector. The Phoenix poet (whom I call Homer) stamped this poem with his new moral view most clearly in the prologue, in the Phoenix speech, and in Apollo’s description of Achilles before the final reconciliation; the reconciliation with Agamemnon is the necessary (but for Achilles now worthless) end of the wrath against Agamemnon. The second illustration is the Achaean wall in the seventh book, which according to Professor Page was not in the Iliad known to Thucydides. He does not notice the curious architectural similarity between Nestor’s wall and the walls of Troy VI. I have discussed this problem elsewhere and would only say here that it seems to me far simpler to suppose that Thucydides is not referring to the Iliad but to the first year of the war and his epic sources for that.

Disagreement on details necessarily bulks large in a review. It must not obscure a very large measure of agreement and a very real gratitude both for the presentation of the argument in the text and for the clear marshalling of the evidence in the notes.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.


The greatness of Myres lay in his power of relating the study of Ancient History to European and Near Eastern Archaeology, to Ethnology, and to Ancient Geography. He was not a regular excavator, and in
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Ancient History he had little (some would say too little) time for deep problems of textual and literary criticism—he once told Miss Gray that he regretted that he had never had time to become a philologist. The merits and weaknesses of his scholarship are obvious in his Sather lectures 'Who were the Greeks?' where his imagination led to illuminating historical reconstructions, but also to an excess of speculation. It is a book that a more cautious, or a less gifted, man could never have written.

In Homer and his Critics, a collection of essays edited with piety and restraint, Myres is not seen at his best. The range is there, it is true: Aristarchus and Aristophanes, Wood and Wilamowitz, Virgil and Villoslo, even Diderot and Darwin are all made to play their part upon his wide stage. There is a long chapter on Gladstone's view of Homer, and another on Wolf. It is pleasant to read his fresh and vivid prose, but where does it all lead? Why spend so long expounding the ideas of Wilamowitz, when no clear statement by Myres himself of his own view of Homer and the Homeric question is to be given? The author faithfully reports the ideas of a host of critics and commentators, but to find out what he himself thought, either before his death in 1934, or in 1931, is not easy. In a discursive book such as this, an index should be as analytical as possible; the fifteen page references grouped under 'Homer (personal poet)' followed by et passim do not give enough help. Myres never thought out clearly the historical problem presented by Homer: how did an Ionian poet know so much about Mycenaean conditions? Though Parry's proof that Homer's style is typical of oral poetry was published in 1928, Myres seems to have taken no notice of it in his lectures of 1931; his work was obsolescent even then, and consequently his part of the present book gives a misleading view of the Homeric question as it stood over a quarter of a century ago. Myres tried to date his Homer as early as possible and the survival of Mycenaean culture as late as possible, so that the two could overlap; but he never explained how historical tradition came down from the dark age, and never paid enough attention to the fact that there is no evidence for the use of the Phoenician script in the Aegean earlier than the eighth century B.C.

Miss Gray contributes an essay on the progress of Homeric archaeology in the active lifetime of Myres; here piety has also demanded that Miss Lorimer's views should be reported but not criticised. Finally there is a chapter on work on Homer during the last decade. She too has preferred to state problems and list other people's solutions rather than to offer any of her own; there is little attempt to sift the material, archaeological, historical and linguistic, that she has gathered. The style is allusive, and in places obscure. If her survey of recent work is intended for the specialist, then there are many matters on which Miss Gray could usefully have stated her own views at length: Mycenaean social structure in relation to Homeric; the suggestion that Homer dictated; the connection between the Odyssey and the epic cycle, to name a few. If she wrote for the general reader also, to whom Myres evidently addressed himself, what is he to make of 'Myc. Arc.-Cyp. Ion. Lesbian ὀδός, Dor. N. W. Gr. Beest. E. Thess. ὀδός' (p. 281)—an eyesore not even relegated to a footnote? Miss Gray follows most Mycenaean enthusiasts in implying that the Linear B tablets from Knossos are all of the same date and all written in Greek; a critical reader of Documents and other writings on this subject would perhaps say more cautiously that some of the Knossos tablets can be read as Greek, and most of the Pylos tablets also. The few illustrations, amongst them a fine photograph of Myres, are well chosen.

The lack of originality in this book is redeemed by occasional asides of Myres himself: of Ajax as a local hero of Rhoeotium because his tomb was shown there, 'Evidently no hero who hoped for immortality could afford to be killed overseas'; of Dörpfeld at Leukas who '... to the amazement no less of his Greek skipper than of his learned passengers, lectured on the topography of the Odyssey as if he had been Eumaios himself'. But there was no need even in the bitter peace after 1918 to call German scholars Teutons.

This is a disappointing book. The shelves of our libraries are heavy with books on Homer, many of them outdated; there is hardly room for one that tells us nothing new. This is a time for deep thinking about all aspects of the Homeric question. Bibliographical surveys are no substitute for original thought. But Miss Gray has done her work carefully, out of veneration for a great man, and others too may read with respect his account of the work of Homer's critics.

G. L. Huxley.


In retrospect, Professor Whitman remarks, 'it is not always easy to do justice to the efforts of those Homerists [of the last century], by reason of both the quantity and the waywardness of their opinions. The unitarian, like every fundamentalist, tended to reject reason, and the analyst erred in overuse of it.' Now, however, there is promise, he believes, of greater understanding and co-operation between the two opposing schools: the two main aspects of the poems, 'their triumphant art and their mysterious origin' are not truly separable: 'lit. criticism must make its peace with history'. He sees hope for a new settlement in the new spirit of humility and careful research which has superseded the polemical acerbity of previous generations. He himself is a convinced unitarian, and he hopes to convince others. Whether he will succeed, may be doubted. But his fresh-minded and stimulating book is likely to be widely welcomed both for its own originality and
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because it is the first full-length study of the Homeric poems by an American scholar who has fully accepted the principles laid down by Milman Parry.

The first chapter emphasises the significance of Parry's work. His demonstration that writing was not necessary for the composition of long epic poems 'outmoded with one lightning stroke a whole century of scholarship'. A new conception of unity and originality has emerged. It is now possible on Parry's principles, Whitman holds, to demonstrate the unity of the Iliad in its three main features: its architectonic design, its characterisation, and its transformation of the 'serviceable' materials of its predecessors into symbolical poetry. In fact, 'aesthetic analysis reveals in the Iliad not merely unity of conception, but a unity everywhere articulated in the minutest details with perfected formal mastery of a crystallised traditional medium'.

The next three chapters survey the historical background of Greek epic from Mycenaean to Peisistratean Athens. The Homeric epics give us 'the picture of Mycenaean reality which the Mycenaeans themselves wished to have transmitted to posterity'. In post-Mycenaean times Athens, a haven for refugees, created the conditions suitable for Homer's genius. But Homer himself may have belonged to Ionia, the New World of the Athenians. 'Ionic is a branch of Attic...and the dialect of Homer took shape in an Attic atmosphere, dialectically as well as otherwise, and not in an Ionic one.' Allegations of late Athenian interpolation are unjustified: the wrongly suspected passages reflect a situation about 1200 b.c., when Athens under King Menestheus dominated the whole Saronic Gulf with Ajax of Salamis as chief champion of the Athenian contingent. Homer probably dictated his oral compositions to a scribe (in the eighth century) for the sake of permanence and perhaps to enable other poets to recite his poems at festivals—hence the Homeridae.

The fifth chapter develops the theory—far from new, as Whitman of course indicates—that the Iliad is constructed according to the principles of Geometric art. The present reviewer must leave it to the experts in the history of art to appraise Whitman's dates and analyses of ceramic design. They show considerable discrepancies with Webster's views in From Mycenae to Homer (1958). Whitman particularly emphasises 'ring-composition', and endeavours with an elaborately set out table to demonstrate that the whole Iliad from A to Q is contrived in strict 'concentric' patterns of counterbalancing actions, figures, and motifs. If his rigorous schematisation is valid, then beyond doubt the Iliad, as Schadewaldt similarly argued, is an artistic unity. But everything depends here on the selection of the elements and the emphasis given to these selected. The reviewer found that his own list of salient incidents diverged too far from Whitman's to warrant general acceptance of his schematisation. Though a considerable amount of symmetry does seem to be indisputable, it is not enough to prove Geometric influence or unity of design beyond dispute. A comparison between the Odyssey and proto-Attic art is less stringently pressed. On the whole Whitman is inclined to think that the analogies indicate a date round 700 b.c. Whether both poems are by the same poet is, he thinks, a question which 'must probably remain unanswered'; but, he adds, 'there has yet to be produced a single cogent argument to the effect that they must belong to different hands, or different eras'. Few analysts are likely to accept so sweeping an assertion without more reason than is offered here.

In the remaining chapters Whitman discusses very subtly and instructively the other two criteria of unity, symbolism (here he makes effective use of Susanne Langer's Philosophy in a New Key) and characterisation. Homer, he believes, transformed the formulae of earlier poetry—'practically every phrase in Homer is formulaic', he holds—into symbolical language, and also re-created the Mycenaean world as an epic world, 'a visionary structure whose chief pillar is the heroic aspiration'. Most notably Homer uses the images of fire, air and water ('an image is primarily a word or phrase devised to evoke sense impression, visual, auditory, or any other') as symbols ('images...become symbols by association'). Similarly in characterisation 'Homer's genius is like a shuttle drawing the warp of profound self-consciousness across the woof of old, half primitive material, from the time when heroism meant chiefly physical prowess, murderous dexterity, colossal self-assertion'. Whitman discusses, sensitively and sensibly, the characters of Achilles, Agamemnon, Diomedes and others, as examples. There is also unity, he thinks, in Homer's conception of fate, time and the gods: 'the gods are, in fact, a kind of imagery, and their uses parallel, in a way, the continuous play of figurative language on the action'. These chapters are full of original and illuminating observations—and they point to many inviting prospects for further study.

Though Professor Whitman has hardly established his main contentions beyond dispute, and though some of his analogies may seem unjustifiable, his work is likely to rank among the more illuminating and stimulating studies of the Homeric problem in our time, especially in his applications of contemporary literary theory to the epic style. The polychromatic style makes the whole book a pleasure to read.

The following details might be emended in the next edition: p. 37, 'in capable' for 'incapable'; p. 113, Od. 8, 230-3 does not imply that Odysseus normally 'cannot run fast'; it explains why he cannot run fast just then; p. 116, Od. 5, 432-5 suggests no 'deviousness' in Odysseus' character (despite Theognis 213-16, where the concept, anyway, is adaptability, not deviousness); p. 242, 'amusing themselves with men' is a misleading translation of ἀνθρώπως κεραυνῶς in II. 7, 61; p. 293, Odysseus' 'dark hair' is not 'often mentioned': it is ἄσις; in Od. 13, 399), and neither of the other two references.
(Od. 6, 231; 16, 176) unequivocally states that the hair of his head was dark; p. 299, is it the whole truth to say that Odysseus' motive in exploring the lands of the Lotus-eaters, Laestrygonians, and Circe, was simply curiosity? What about dis and the hope of getting directions for his voyage home (cf. Od. 9, 229; 10, 190 ff.)? P. 302, I cannot find any statement by Homer that Eurykleia, Eumaeus and Philoctetus were 'present' when Odysseus got his scar; p. 326, not 'Sir Richard Bentley,' and 'Maas' not 'Maas'; p. 339, paia does not occur; p. 346, eneinein should be paroxytone.

W. B. STANFORD.


Two of the works listed above must be regarded as critical editions of authors whose works survive only in fragments, whether on papyrus or as quotations in the text of later authors. It therefore seems desirable to begin this notice by enunciating certain requirements which (as it seems to me after a fair amount of experience as a user of such editions) editors ought to satisfy if their editions are really to serve their proper purpose. I begin by postulating that a truly critical edition of an author whose works are known only from fragments is not (humanly speaking) attainable; and it seems reasonable therefore to claim that the primary duty of an editor of fragments is to act as a guide, from whom those who consult him may learn whether anything is recorded about a given author or his works which concerns the inquirer, and if so where the complete information on such points is to be found. Users of editions of fragments have a right therefore to demand that editors shall use the best available editions of their sources, and shall report those editions accurately, above all where they depart from them. Next, we may fairly demand completeness, and that in two respects: all the relevant testimonia and fragments should be reported (and 'relevant' in this connexion must be understood to include even such dubia and spuria as an inquirer might reasonably expect to find; for example, in an edition of Sappho one might fairly expect to find the quatrains δεδομένα πειράζον κακὰ ...), and as much of the context of quotation-fragments should be given as is necessary for the interpretation of the quotation. Then the fragments should be easy to find, and for this the only logically satisfactory principle is to arrange them according to the alphabetical order of the sources, with adequate cross-references where a given poem is quoted in, or can be built up from, two or more sources. In the case of a poem of whose structure a great deal is known (such as Callimachus, Aetia) this rule may be departed from with advantage; but the new fragments of Alcman have shown very clearly the disadvantage of arranging fragments according to the 'Book' from which they are believed to have come, since even when the book-number is plainly (and correctly) recorded in the source or (as in the case of Sappho's Sapphics) can be reliably inferred, the order of poems within a book (or of phrases within a poem) may well be highly conjectural. (Here a rider may be added for editors of texts which contain papyrus fragments: if a papyrus contains lines which are demonstrably parts of different poems, in a critical text a separate number should be allotted to each identifiable poem.) Users of collections of fragments, it should be emphasised, need signposts above all; and those signposts should be clear and dependable, with as little recourse to conjecture as possible. It follows, I believe, from this argument that two practices, common among editors of fragments, ought to be unsparring condemned: (1) the arrangement of fragments to suit some particular theory of their interpretation, or of their distribution among the various books of an author's works, and (2) the separation of quotations from their contexts, even if the contexts are reported in a separate apparatus on the same page.

It is with some regret that I put on record these two conclusions, though I must emphasise that I have not arrived at them ad hoc, since I observe that both M. Lasserre and Signor Gentili sin (though Lasserre more heinously than Gentili) against both of them. Some years ago, in a fascinatingly ingenious work (Les Épodes d'Archiloch [Paris 1950]; cf. CR 1952, 18–19), Lasserre set out to reconstruct the main outlines of the several poems included in Archilochus' Épodes, and to assign hitherto homeless fragments to these poems. This attempt was not, in my judgement, entirely unsuccessful, but it has hardly met with such acceptance in the scholarly world as would justify the use of this reconstruction as a basis for arranging the fragments in an edition intended for general reading—and still less the attempt to reconstruct poems from other books of Archilochus' works in the same way. In such cases (for example, the elegies of frs. 1–5), Lasserre holds up the testimonia, which he normally prints immediately after the relevant fragment, until all the passages which he believes to come from a single poem have been assembled. This is not only wasteful of space but trying to the reader's patience; to say nothing of the fact that uncritical users (and bitter experience shows that most users are likely to be uncritical) will simply accept even the most hazardous of Lasserre's arrangements at their face value. Apart from these points, however, it must be said that Lasserre's work deserves high commendation: his sections of the introduction (dialect, lvi–lxi;
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[In the National Museum, Copenhagen], inscribed ANAKPEI, followed by a 'Librorum Conspectus' (xxxi–xl) which seems to include practically everything which has ever been written about Anacreon, and could usefully have been pruned. The text (1–107) is provided with an apparatus of sources, to which one must look for the context of quotation-fragments, and with a short commentary in Latin; the following table will show how the texts are distributed, and with what degree of justification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book (or equivalent)</th>
<th>Number of fragments assigned by Gentili</th>
<th>Number of fragments assigned by our sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II? III?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Iambi'</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* +1 assigned by its source to Book I.

There are also five fragments of 'Elegiae' (two of only half a line each), fourteen 'Fragmenta papyrus', 112 fragments 'incipit libri', five 'Dubia' and sixteen 'Epigrammata' (all but four marked as doubtful or spurious). Even the facts here assembled show clearly the disadvantage of this sort of arrangement of fragments; and Gentili's editorial work is good enough to make one feel that it, like Lasserre's, would profit by some drastic re-arrangement. The text is followed by a prosodical and metrical index (108–115), concordances with Bergk and Diehl (116–21), and a simply invaluable index verborum (122–35). Then comes an Italian translation (137–75), and the book is rounded off by an appendix ('Studi sui frammenti papyrus', 177–218; a solid and valuable piece of work). From this it will be clear that there are two important omissions: there is no section for testimonia about Anacreon's life, and one may look in vain for the Anacreontea. Gentili argues in his introduction that 'the triumph of Anacreontism in late Hellenistic times . . . did irremediable harm to the tradition of [Anacreon's] poetical works'; but this does not alter the fact that the Anacreontists were better acquainted with Anacreon's works than we are, and that their jeux d'esprit can sometimes help in interpreting Anacreon.

Dr Thummer's work on the religious ideas of Pindar combines rather uneasily with Archilochus, and even more uneasily (it may well be thought) with Anacreon. The aim of the book is to consider the conflicting accounts of Pindar's religious opinions given by a number of recent workers in this field, and especially to weigh Nilsson's doubt whether Pindar was really 'a deeply religious man by nature' against Wilhelm Nestle's claim that Pindar was 'the last great representative of what we may call the religious
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feelings of the Hellenic middle ages'. The resulting work is divided into six main parts. In the first ('Literaturkritik'; 11–54) Thummer gives an account of the views of his chosen scholars (nine altogether) about Pindar's religious beliefs; this is a useful summary (though it ought to be said, in defence of Rudberg, that he never said, or implied, that the Hyperboreans were the people to whom Perseus brought stony death [p. 47]), and makes clear the need for further examination of the problem. The second main section deals with the 'political [and, it might be added, social] background of the Epinicians' (54–64); after which Thummer turns to more specifically religious problems: ‘Gottensächte’ (65–90); dealing with the qualities and achievements which bring men nearer to the Gods, ‘Fate’ (90–109), ‘Justice’ (109–21), and ‘Life after Death’ (translation of Olymphon ii and commentary, 121–30). In the last section I was surprised not to find any reference to Guthrie's Orpheus and Greek Religion. A short summary (131–4), a note added in proof mentioning an article by Defradas (REG 1957, 224–34) in which Defradas emphasises Pindar's Delphic connections with Mlle. Duchemin's view of his religious thought was Orphic-Pythagorean, and a full index locorum (135–7) complete the book.

Thummer's work contains a great deal of valuable information, conveniently arranged; but it leaves the question of what (if anything) Pindar thought about religion as obscure as ever. This is no discredit to Thummer; rather it shows that he has played fair by the evidence, and has not sought (as some more eminent students seem to have done) to force Pindar's very inconsistent statements into a coherent pattern. It is, I feel, the height of impudence for any would-be interpreter of Pindar to forget that he was essentially a 'jobbing' poet, and that he was bound to adapt himself to the wishes of his employers.

J. A. DAVISON.

PINDAR. Les scholies métriques de Pindare.

The metrical information contained in the Pindaric scholia is now known to be valueless. The interest of these scholia lies, as M. Irigoin says, in that they show the theories of ancient and Byzantine metrcicians applied to a particular work. His book is to be regarded as 'une contribution à l'histoire de la philologie antique et médiévale', a pendant to his Histoire du Texte de Pindare.

The first chapter deals with the traditional colometry accepted by editors until Boeckh. Irigoin attributes this colometry to Aristophanes of Byzantium. This chapter is probably the most interesting of the book to the modern metrcician, but it is also, necessarily, the most conjectural. Irigoin correctly recognises the two distinct motives influencing the Alexandrian metrcician: the desire to show the metrical structure of the ode as he understood it and the need to produce cola of more or less equal length for convenience of layout. In his analyses of particular poems, Irigoin shrewdly divines the various motives which sometimes led the colometrician into error. The argument of the chapter is, however, distorted and its value reduced by the application of Irigoin's own metrical theory, expounded in Recherches sur les Mêtres de la Lyrique chorale grecque (Paris 1953), in accordance with which he distinguishes the rhythmic elements of which Pindar's periods, or verses, are composed. The theory is not satisfactorily proved (see reviews: in this journal, 1954, by K. J. Dover, by Miss A. M. Dale in CR 1955, no. 1, and my article, London Institute Bulletin, 1958), but Irigoin proceeds as if it were. Thus, when he describes the Alexandrian colometry as 'correct', he may mean either of two very different things: (a) that it coincides with a verse-end established on Boeckh's principles, or (b) that it coincides with one of the divisions posited by Irigoin himself within the verse.

In the second chapter Irigoin studies the ancient metrical scholia, the description of the odes according to the system of Hephaestion composed, on the basis of the Alexandrian colometry, by an unknown grammerian in the second century a.d. In an interesting addendum to this chapter, Irigoin compares the Pindaric scholia with the metrical scholia on Aristophanes attributed to Heliodorus. He concludes that both commentaries represent substantially the same metrical concepts, and that, therefore, Hephaestion's manual is to be regarded as an exposition of theories generally accepted since the Alexandrian period.

The third and fourth chapters deal with Isaac Tzetzes' Commentary on Pindaric Metres and the use made of it by revisers of the metrical scholia. Irigoin is perhaps a little over-indulgent to Tzetzes. It was not into the 'arcanes de la métrie pindarique', but into those of Hephaestion's metrical theories that Tzetzes helped to initiate generations of scholars. How grateful we should be to him for this is disputable.

In chapter V Irigoin examines the metrical work on Pindar of Demetrius Triclinius. Triclinius' chief originality seems to have consisted in an unusually strict and logical application of the principle of analysis by feet or dipo ties. Thus the ancient scholiast analyses — — oo — uu — (e.g. Pyth. III, str. 4) as Ionic a majore + choriamb, but leaves — — uu — uu — as 'dactylic penthemimer'. Triclinius divides the latter into choriamb + anapaest or trisynactr (Pyth. XII, 3).

In chapter VI Irigoin discusses the first printed edition of the scholia, published at Rome in 1515 by Zacharias Callierges. He considers Callierges' sources and corrections, and also, briefly, the work of some later editors.

The appendices form about a third of the book. The first consists of an editon of the ancient metrical
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autonomous life, independent of a central personality, so that it can be said with truth: 'la crainte est donc
la voix du coeur, non celle de l'homme'. (It should
be said in passing that the chapter on 'La description
de la crainte' is a most valuable study, not only of its
specific subject, but of the language and style of
Aeschylus in general.)

In this method of description there is doubtless
something characteristic of Greek archaic poetry (and
the closest parallel we can find is perhaps Sappho's
description of the emotion of love). It is character-
istic that the emotion, in Mme. de Romilly's
words, 'plonge ses racines dans un monde inconscient,
irrationnel, et comme irresponsable'. But what
room has the moral world of Aeschylus for the irra-
tional and the irresponsible? At once issues are
raised which are of fundamental importance for the
understanding of his thought. What, for instance, is
the relationship between fear and remorse? And it
has first to be noticed that fear in Aeschylus is not,
primarily, reflective (though reflection may sup-
ervene): it is not so much that the sinner fears he will
be punished as that the transports of supernatural
fear are themselves a punishment. The relation-
between fear and culpability is indeed mysterious.
The fears of Clytemnestra can be regarded as a kind
of remorse-substitute. That Orestes should fear is
natural; and yet he will ultimately be acquitted of
guilt. To would seem to be guiltless, and yet he
fears; and it is only her fears that raise the issue of her
culpability. One of the most striking descriptions of
fear is Agam. 975 ff., where the emotion is that of
innocent spectators. Their fears arise spontaneously
from within, yet the song their θυμος sings self-taught
is the dirge of an Erinyes. In the Oresteia it is the
Erinyes above all who are the creators of fear. But
how are we to think of the Erinyes? As the
materialisation of a purely human anguish or as a
concrete divine reality which justifies the autonomy
and intensity of the human fear?

Mme. de Romilly is doubtless right to prefer the
latter alternative; and she adds the penetrating
comment that, whereas now a man believes himself
pursued by a God, because he knows that he is at
fault, then he believed himself at fault, because a
God was pursuing him. She points rightly to the
unique moment of time at which Aeschylus lived,
when an effort was being made to reconcile, on the
one hand, a world subject to arbitrary divine power
and, on the other, the world of conscience in which
man is both responsible and judge of his own actions.
Does this mean that Aeschylus was poised in an
uneasy compromise between the primitive and the
enlightened? I do not think Mme. de Romilly would
be among those who say so. It is fatally easy for
modern scholars to flatter the notions of these things
that we have derived from centuries of a different
tradition of thought. In the 'discovery of the soul'
much was gained, but something perhaps was lost,
which indeed our own generation has been forced
painfully to rediscover. Which is why, as Mme. de

L. P. E. PARKER.

ROMILLY (J. de) La crain t et l'angoisse dans le
théâtre d'Eschyle. [Assn. G. Budéc.] Paris:
stated.

The fear which Aristotle identified as a specifically
tragic emotion was that of the spectator. Clearly,
however, the fears of the spectator are to a con-
siderable extent bound up with the fears of the per-
sonages of the drama, which are in fact prominent in
the plays of all three tragedians. But, as Mme. de
Romilly has seen, not only is this emotion particu-
larly salient in the theatre of Aeschylus, but there are
certain peculiarities in his treatment of it—in the way
in which he describes it and in the significance which
he seems to attach to it. Her audiences in London,
Oxford and elsewhere will remember the brilliant
lectures which she gave on this subject and will be
grateful that she has now expanded them into a book.
Its value is out of all proportion to its length. It is
so rich and so subtle that the reviewer must be
brief, if he is not to exceed all bounds of space.

'La description de la crainte, chez Eschyle, con-
cilie deux traits qui, pour d'autres auteurs, ris-
quaient de s'exclure: elle est, à la fois, réaliste
et imagée, précise et poétique, exacte et méta-
phorique.' It is realistic, because it is so physical,
but its physical manifestations are described with
characteristic imagery. It is localised in the bodily
organs, and in organs which seem to live their own

scholia. In order to turn the text handed down by
the MSS. into an accurate description of the odes,
Irigoin emends much more drastically than Drach-
mann. He makes good use of Tzetzes, occasionally
of Triclinius, and also of conjectures made, but not
incorporated in his text by Drachmann. The boldness
of some of Irigoin's emendation may most easily be
shown by a comparison of his text of the scholia on
Ol. I, epode with Drachmann's: 2. Dr. υπερκατάληκτον
Ir. καταληκτικόν (conji. Dr.) 3. δήμητρον υπερκα-
tαλήκτων Ir. τρίμητρον καταληκτικόν 4. Dr. έκ δήμητρον
βραχυκατάληκτον Ir. έκ δήμητρον θανάτησθε (pro-
posed by Dr.) βραχυκατάληκτον και τρογικόν
πενθημερεώς (Ir. follows Dr.'s lead in emending
τρογικόν πενθημερεώς and transferring it from the
end of colon 3) 5. Ir. transfers έκ και φαλακρον
to the end of colon 6. 9. Ir. deletes ιππορώτες 11.
Dr. ιππορώτες παροδότουν Ir. ιππορώτες δήμητρον
παραποτημένων (from Tzetzes) 12. Ir. supplies και
κρυπτικό. Appendix II contains an edition of
Triclinius' hitherto unpublished metrical scholia on
Pyth. II-XII. Irigoin's work here has been much
less arduous. The MS. text has required only very
minor corrections.

Irigoin's conclusions are not revolutionary, but it
was hardly to be expected that they would be. He
has produced a detailed and painstaking study of an
abstruse subject and presented much information on
ancient and mediaeval metrical theory in an un-
usually accessible form.
Romilly says, we can interpret the Aeschylean texts either as particularly archaic or as particularly modern. But Aeschylus himself has dramatised the passage between two worlds, which is not the passage from the archaic to the classical age of Greece, but from unreasonable to reason wherever, and in so far as, it may be achieved. He has dramatised it through the change in the Erinyes, when they take their place in the ordered community of Athena, with which is bound up a change in the role of fear. The final procession celebrates a reconciliation which signifies 'la fin de l'angoisse et l'avènement de la bonne crainte'. The brief chapter with which the book ends represents a valuable contribution to our understanding of the closing scene of the Eumenides; and, if that is not understood, all interpretation of the trilogy goes for nothing.

R. P. WENNINGTON-INGRAM.


This volume follows the pattern of the author's earlier Ajax: list of differences from the Oxford text, short introductory, very full commentary. The English is flawless. The introduction deals with the sources, assumptions, structure, meaning, and date. All here is very sensible, if nothing is revolutionary. The evidence for the earlier existence of the bow story does not depend only on the seventh-century Attic vase fragment from the Argive Heraeum (Beazley, Development of Blackfigure, p. 7), as the note on p. 5 suggests; the contemporary Attic amphora in New York also has it (II. 210.1, JHS xxxii (1912) 372), and it is at least possible that Iole and the captives are represented on a contemporary vase in Berlin (A 32 Beazley, Development of Blackfigure, pl. 3) and Lichas carrying the robe on an earlier amphora in New York (21.88.18, Cook, BSA, 35 (1935) 184, pl. 50); therefore the story of the poisoned robe was perhaps already in the Capture of Oechalia. On the date the author is wisely cautious, but he inclines to a date rather before the Oedipus Tyrannus and regards Hippolytus 545 ff. as a probable terminus ante quem.

As in the Ajax, his text is extremely conservative, often wisely, but sometimes he is too shy of accepting minor emendations which cause a considerable improvement. He gives a very full explanation of grammatical points, and all questions of interpretation are fairly faced and sensitively answered. This is a very useful edition.

I append a list of detailed points: 66, MSS. rightly kept. 79, L wrongly preferred to A. 80, MSS. wrongly kept. 84, surely a doublet originating from the poet himself is unlikely. 122, the genitive participle is possible, but aoidia gives far better sense than abeiia. 141, comparison with Electra and Philoctetes does not help here; Tecmessa is much more like Deianira. 159, perhaps A's reading may be kept. 161, 'that I should take my marriage portion' (rightly). 179, LA perhaps rightly kept. 188, MSS. wrongly kept against Hermann. 267, Kamerbeek essentially follows Jebb here; Radermacher's later suggestion (Wien. Studen 1927, 135) that ψηφιν δὲ δοῦλος ἀνδρός αοίς ἔθελθεν is worth noting. 308, Brunck's emendation is rightly rejected. 316, surely there is no alternative; it must mean 'was she of Eurytos?' 323 δοῖεις will perhaps stand, cf. LSJ 2, 2. 327, A. Y. Campbell's τροφή (CQ 8 (1958), 18) should be noted. 362 ff., rightly preserved. 419, ἔσεσ is suggested. 491, the reading of LA is not restored here, although it might have been. Radermacher explained ἐπικτάκτως as 'imported', and none of the instances quoted mean anything else. 554, λυτήριον λητήμα is defended either as 'something which resolves pain' or as 'a delivering pain'; but the first is impossibly difficult and the second is not the sense required. Probably Jebb's λάθημα must be accepted. 555, A. Y. Campbell's ὑπάτων (loc. cit. ad 327) is worth quoting. 642, 647, 654, the metrical licences assumed here are unparalleled. 666 ff. πανήγυρος as a hyperdorism for 'wholly subdued' is a good idea. 695, κίταμα is not 'wool spun out' but wool prepared for spinning, cf. Ar. Lys. 503 (so also Pl. Pol. 282c, pace LSJ). 768, not, as Kamerbeek, the 'wet' drapery of the Parthenon fates but the sweaty chiton of a working carpenter or sculptor (Zijderveld). 794, rightly taken of the burning garment; cf. E. Med. 1187 and 1174. 837 ff. remains desirable; φάσαι μαίρει may be right, but hardly Νέασος ἐπιφώνησα γελόμεθα (the form of the genitive is no longer attested for Sophocles by Ach. Syll. col. II, 1, since that now goes to E. Telephos). The passage is sensitively interpreted by F. J. H. Letters, Sophocles, 72 ff. 841 ff. also remains desirable. Pearson's text makes a reasonable sense. The objections to the MSS. retained by Kamerbeek are: ἀκοννομ is impossible before μεγάλων; ὅτι τὰ προτεῖθ' is very difficult in the sense of 'she did not understand' and the meaning required is 'she herself applied the remedy' (Radermacher compares Ant. 1259). 855, unhealable. 874–5, a good note on the long vowels: add Aj. 992–5. 882 f. It should be noted that the nurse cannot sing (cf. A. M. Dale, CR 6 (1956) 106). 907–11 should be excised with Wecklein as coming from another play. 940, rightly preserved; perhaps also 946; not, however, 956, which gives no correspondence with 965. 1004 ff., Dain's assumption that 1004–17 responds to 1024–43 is hesitatingly accepted and supplements for the resulting lacunae are suggested. A. H. Coxon's article in CR 61 (1947) 69 might have been mentioned. Pearson's text involves less emendation and gives an interweaving of strophes and antistrophes not unlike that at the end of the Antigone (1261 f.). 1091, 1096, MSS. reading justified. 1108, Vollgraf's κακὸς μοῦν is suggested. Jebb's 'if I cannot move a step' is bad sense; it means rather 'if my movement on earth is nothing' with the curious use of ἐπεξεισ found in Ant. 613. 1136, interpreted as by Stevens, CQ 33 (1939)
NOTICES OF BOOKS

T. B. L. WEBSTER.


This is a systematic study of Sophoclean dramaticity. In an introductory chapter Professor Kirkwood discusses some previous writings on the subject and prepares his own way with a tentative definition—'a Sophoclean tragedy is a serious play in which a person of strong and noble character is confronted with a crucial situation and responds to it in his special way'. A cautious discussion follows on the effect of the ritual background, on the psychological appeal of myths and on Sophocles' attitude to them.

In Ch. II, 'Construction', we learn that character-study by means of character-contrast forms the structural basis of the plays. Of this the diptych plays are one manifestation, but it is also true of the other types which Kirkwood distinguishes—'linear' (O.T. and Electra), 'triangular' (Philoctetes), and 'illuminative' (O.C.). Sections follow on the restrictions which Sophocles imposed on himself—and we should impose on ourselves—with regard to his material, on the dramatic use of oracles and on different sorts of dramatic rhythm and scene building.

Kirkwood observes that in those plays which are probably earliest there is a disjunction of mood and intention between scenes, whereas later Sophocles preferred to portray the development of situations during the stage-episodes. Ch. III, 'Character Portrayal', explains in detail how Sophocles develops his characters by incessant contrast, Antigone compared with Ismene as well as with Creon; Electra with her unprincipled sister as well as her evil mother. Then comes an excursus on some psychological cruces, Ajax' Tragöde, Deianira's speech of submission, the 'Herodotean' lines and Neoptolemus' change of heart. Finally, Kirkwood cautiously attempts to re-establish ἀναφορά as the efficient cause of the hero's downfall or suffering.

Ch. IV, 'The Role of the Chorus', vindicates it as an integral part of Sophoclean drama rather than an ideal spectator; Kirkwood accepts with modifications Kranz' view of its function—to 'organise and give rhythm to the action'. He remarks that, whereas in the Theban plays the allegiance of the Chorus is civic rather than personal, in the rest they are closely committed to the protagonist. Ch. V comprises some useful notes on diction; and Ch. VI is a balanced account of Sophoclean irony, natural, artificial, and verbal. It stems not from the gods who are just if remote, nor even from impersonal fate, but from the malign promptings of the individual διάλογος. An appendix marshals the evidence for dating Trachiniae between Ajax and Antigone and the verdict is given with justified caution.

If intelligence and impartiality were enough to make a great book, this would be one of the finest ever written on Sophocles. It is refreshing to find a scholar who can defend the Herodotean lines without admiring them excessively and can answer a critic as Kirkwood answers Waldock on p. 169. But it seems to me that Kirkwood's discriminations are not always keen enough to protect him from serious error. I am reluctant to quarrel over terms, but I question if 'diptych play' has not caused more confusion than it is worth. On one side you have Ajax and Antigone entirely dominated by the protagonists, with an illusion of duality arising from the fact that their pursuit of ἀπερίδες ends in death and, particularly in Antigone's case, throws up one main antagonist; on the other you have Trachiniae, a title almost uniquely vague among all the plays and fragments of Sophocles, for the reason that neither main character can conceivably be regarded as dominating the other dramatically. As for the hero's ἀναφορά as source of catastrophe I sympathise and have toyed with it myself (Class. Rev. n.s. iii, 151) but it breaks down in the case of Antigone. It avails nothing to point to some disagreeable trait in the heroine, unless one can say that the situation would have been substantially improved if she had behaved otherwise. As a matter of fact, Kirkwood does imply just this on p. 174—'nothing could have been better calculated to fan the flame of Creon's wrong-headed determination to leave Polyneices' body unburied than Antigone's hostile and contemptuous disobedience'. But I have no doubt that there was never more than a straight choice between the right course of opposition and the wrong course of submission.

I append a few minor criticisms: p. 71, Ant. 536 should not be discussed without reference to Nauck's brilliant conjecture ἀπορρόθης; p. 105, the Chorus could hardly have covered up the body; p. 131, Oedipus is surely appealing to the city; p. 205 ff., it is Sophocles rather than the Chorus who is being ambiguous in the first three stasms of Antigone; p. 248, the old herdsman only knew that Oedipus was the murderer; p. 258 n., the μέτEuN clause in Ant. 1100 implies that the freeing of Antigone is a subsidiary matter rather than that it must be attended to first. For such a careful scholar, Kirkwood is a bit casual on points of construe, spelling and accentuation—p. 48, 'though he was (?) my enemy'; p. 253, 'this woman is his wife (?)'; p. 276, v. Murray, Rise of the Greek Epic, p. 87 n. for a correct construe of the MS. reading at O.T. 377; p. 221 n., 'Alóus; p. 224, ἄλοι ἔχι; p. 227, τοῦ μαθήτη (a misprint?); p. 244, ἔν (twice); pp. 266 and 282, θεία ρήγη (twice); p. 289, ἀνάγκας τῆς (twice). But this is a useful and thorough book which should be in every library.

A. D. FITTON BROWN.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

Papyrus Bodmer IV. Méandre: Le Dyscolos.

M. Bodmer’s remarkable library has added to its fame in acquiring what few of us would have dared dream of (even, let it be said, in the 1950’s)—a complete comedy of Menander. A text has been made available with commendable promptness, and with the great asset of complete and very clear photographs of the papyrus. For this, the editor and all those concerned in the work deserve thanks no less cordial for the fact that in a Journal which appears annually they must necessarily be expressed at a distance. The introduction acknowledges the collaboration of Miss P. J. Photiades and the help, in many passages of the text, of Professor P. von der Mühll.

Professor Martin gave an account of the newly rediscovered play to the Académie des Inscriptions in Paris on September 13, 1957. In this country, the news spread rapidly from a report in The Guardian of the following day. The prologue was published and discussed by Miss Photiades in Greece and Rome 5 (1958) 108 ff. After these and other preliminaries, the edition itself became available in mid-March 1959. At the time of writing this review (January 1960), the Dyscolos has already had several performances on the stage and in broadcast, and a good selection of the numerous problems which faced its first editor has become widely known from a vigorously growing swarm of over 50 publications.1

Martin was concerned with eleven leaves of a codex which he dated by its handwriting to 200-250 A.D. (Turner, op. cit., has given reasons for preferring a later date, 250-300). The first side is occupied by metrical hypothesis, didascalia, and dramatis personae, and is numbered 26. The play ends on the recto of the eleventh leaf: the text on the verso is not yet available. The papyrus is well preserved, but damage to the tops and outer edges of the leaves affects groups of lines at more or less regular intervals, and has left broken and uncertain letters. The eighth leaf is somewhat shorter than the rest, and the editor calculates that some lines have been lost at the top: four after 649, and five after 702. (It is unfortunate that this leaf, plates 15-16, has been reproduced, without scale or warning, at a size slightly less reduced than the others). Textual corruptions abound: many trivial, some apparently more complex, and not, or not yet, curable with anything approaching certainty; where gaps and corruptions occur together, the situation is indeed desperate. Further difficulties arise from mistakes in the system of indicating speakers, whatever ultimate authority we suppose the tradition to have had in this matter.

This being, in brief, the state of the papyrus, it is not surprising if much is found wanting in a first edition which set out to provide continuously readable Greek with the greatest possible economy of format and time. Supplements are admitted which do not accord with the space available or the visible traces; a transcript is given in parallel to the edited text in order to provide a control, but unfortunately abandons the usual papyrological conventions for indicating the length of gaps and letters which are doubtfully read; sometimes, e.g. at 545 ff., the transcript has been set out so that it corresponds to the text as restored, and not to the original, thus defeating its purpose. Many new readings have since been proposed: lists of some derived from or checked against the papyrus have been published by Harsh and by Turner (see n.).

Care was taken to collect and present in brief footnotes a useful selection of material relevant to the constitution of the text—quotations and reminiscences in later authors, and some parallels for words and phrases. There are (inevitably) a few false references: e.g. in 96 n., where one might read ‘Arist. Probl. II. 38 (870 a 32 ff.), I. 41 (864 a 13)’ instead of ‘II (864 a 13)’; I note three kinds of addenda: (i) other ancient copies. A fragment of a comedy published in Mélanges Nicole (1905) 220 ff. has been identified by C. H. Roberts as giving parts of Dysk. 140-50 and 160-74. This helps to fill a troublesome gap: it is to be republished in the Bodleian Record. Two minute scraps from Oxyrhynchus (which will appear in a future volume of P.Oxy.) give ends of 283-72 and 283-90. They were identified by E. G. Turner, to whom I owe the information. (ii) Testimonia: e.g. 514 f.: cf. Aristophanes, frg. dub. 57 D (= 913 a Edmonds), now recognisable as a garbled quotation. 533 f.: cf. Hesych. and Sud. s.v. ξοδόρω. This entry, if relevant at all, may reflect a wrong interpretation of the passage. The same may be true of frg. 830 Koe., which is (probably rightly) adduced by the editor in favour of reading βαθής in 527, and of Hesych. s.v. πεποθεπεται which is (I think wrongly) applied to the elucidation of 101. (iii) Textually relevant parallels: a striking case is Antiphans, Odysseus 34 K, which would have suggested a better restoration of 494 ff. (see now, e.g., Lloyd-Jones, op. cit.).
Leaving aside cruces (where it is difficult to envisage any demonstrably sound solution), and passages where alternatives are possible rather than preferable, one can point to many passages where a minor correction by the first edition has restored sense and correct Greek. There is a further class where superficially attractive emendations may well have been resisted, only to be proposed since to the probable or certain detriment of the text. (It goes without saying that some would-be improvements on the first edition are devoid even of superficial attraction; e.g. ἰδεῖν has been printed, contra metrum, for ἱδεῖνοι in 253.) There are, however, very many other cases where correct punctuation or simple emendation is required and not provided; and in several passages the abandonment of the papyrus is not only unnecessary, but has led to a wholesale misunderstanding of the dramatic situation: e.g. at 201–14, where, as several scholars have observed, the papyrus arranges the speakers better than the edited version.

The French translation is at least a beginning in interpretation, but, like the text, shows signs of misinterpretation and haste. The English and German versions of the text and introduction were made from the editor's French: the English one is highly unidiomatic. The index, likewise, is useful as far as it goes, but neither complete nor accurate. The introduction gives a summary palaeographical account of the manuscript, to be supplemented in a forthcoming number of Scriptorium. It also states the claims of the work in modest and unpretentious terms. Here it has seemed useful to emphasise some grave shortcomings which future users of the book will need to bear in mind. The positive achievement of the first edition will perhaps always be difficult to assess, not least because, as often happens, some of its less satisfactory results have proved fruitful in suggesting (or provoking) better ideas from others. When all the adverse criticisms have been made, there remain some valid reasons for satisfaction to the editor and to the readers whose interests he has endeavoured to serve.

E. W. HANDLEY.


Professor Trypanis, having written the best up-to-date account of Callimachus in his book Ἰδεῖνοι (Athena, 1943), pp. 80–186, has now, transplanted to Oxford, edited the poet's fragments in this volume of the LCL. It replaces Mair's edition (1921) of the fragments, along with the hymns and epigrams, in the same series. The additions to Callimachus since 1921 have been so substantial that a whole volume is now required for the fragments only, whereas the earlier book contained Aratus and Lycurgus as well.

Trypanis' edition is of course based on the great work of R. Pfeiffer (Callimachus, Vol. 1, 1949; Vol. 2, 1953). Pfeiffer assigns 806 fragments to Callimachus (725 definitely, 81 probably). Of this total 64 come from Callimachus' prose writings; none of these are included by Trypanis. Of the remaining 742 he includes wholly or in part 358, i.e. slightly less than 50 per cent. Most of those omitted are too slight or too corrupted to be included in such an edition as this, but there are a few whose exclusion seems regrettable, whether because they can be attached to other fragments that are included, e.g. 605 to 318, 481 to 93, 781 to 91; or because they are interesting for their matter, e.g. 507 (see Pfeiffer, vol. 2, p. 122), 514, 532, or by reason of their metre, e.g. 395, 635. Further the editor might have given more than he does from some of the included fragments. Thus 805–9 contains an interesting list of feminine adornments that Prier did not ask for; 193–23–33 reveal something of Callimachus' personality; 202, 79–82 (see my supplements in Pfeiffer) explain the poet's relationship with Leon. On the other hand 26 (Linus) might well have been omitted in view of its mutilated condition.

The post-1921 additions are for the most part more fragmentary than the earlier discoveries and, since the LCL does not aim at completeness in this matter, it must have been difficult for Trypanis to decide how far he should include in the text or the apparatus criticus the numerous supplements suggested by the original editor(s) or subsequently. It is true that such supplements have often been proved wrong by later finds, but rather more generosity in this respect on Trypanis' part would have facilitated the reader's understanding of the texts and made his translation less lacunose. The point can be illustrated from the first ten lines of Fr. 1 (Against the Telechines). In these Trypanis follows the text of Pfeiffer except that in 1.1 he adopts a supplement of Vogliano, condemned by Pfeiffer as spatio brevius, but none of the supplements suggested for 3–5 or 7–10 is even mentioned in the apparatus. Fortunately this austerity is on the whole exceptional, but other passages where readings or supplements should, I think, have been recorded are, for example, 1.23, 2.3, 43.41, 93.6, 94, 110.60, 177.8, 203.20. The suggestions made in these lines by Pfeiffer and others are certainly plausible and help the interpretation. I venture to claim a similar virtue for my own attempts (Classical Review, N.S. v. 3, 4 (1955), pp. 241–2) to fill some of the gaps in 177 (The Mousetrap), 18–28, but Professor Trypanis, perhaps rightly, does not share my good opinion of these supplements. He has himself made suggestions in a number of passages to improve the text. At 191.39 his [ἐννοεῖ] is convincing, at 384.39 [οὐκ ἔστω ἐκ] seems probable, and at 229.3 ὀκλαίσε is highly ingenious. There is one point as regards the text about which a warning seems necessary. Whereas Pfeiffer, following the usual practice, employs
NOTICES OF BOOKS


The author of the present work, who had previously published a study of Dionysius’ criticisms of Thuc. (Mem. Acc. Torino, 1956) and a book on the chronological sequence of the Scripta Rhetorica (Palermo, 1942), had already issued the first instalment, containing cc. 1–20, in 1952, and now presents a complete edition. There was undoubtedly a need for this, for although Usener-Radermacher had provided a good text and apparatus (Teubner, 1899), much relevant literature had accumulated, and there had been no commentary since 1823, when K. G. Krueger produced his Dion.Hal., Historiographica. Pavano’s text follows Usener’s closely, though without accepting all his proposals. Occasionally account might have been taken of conjectures made since the appearance of the Teubner text; at c. 50, for instance (I, 409, 15, U.-R.), where the style of historians is contrasted with that of public speakers and (τοῖς) τὰ δικαία λόγους, this expression is very peculiar, and H. Weil’s correction τοῖς δικαιολόγοις, ‘advocates’, which he parallels from Lucian, Timon 11, seems to me excellent (REG 12, 319). On the other hand, Pavano’s apparatus adds something in one respect to that of Usener, in that when Dionysius quotes Thuc. verbatim, P. does not merely record differences from the received text, but also adds references to other passages of D. where the same extract is quoted, sometimes with slight variations.

The commentary, which is conveniently placed beneath the text, is characterised by meticulous cross-references to criticisms made by Dionysius in other essays, and includes relevant observations of other Greek critics, those of Marcellinus being given particularly fully. But far too little use is made of Lucian’s essay on the writing of history, and the range of citation on D.’s criticisms of Thuc.’s treatment of his subject-matter, which sometimes run parallel to widely-held historiographical theory, is too limited. In references to modern Thucydidean literature the edition is markedly deficient. No use is made even of the first volume of the late Professor A. W. Gomme’s valuable commentary, which would have afforded some interesting comparisons and contrasts between the opinions of a recent and an ancient critic. Dionysius, for instance (c. 9), objects to Thuc.’s dating by summers and winters instead of by archons or olympiads; Gomme begins with a discussion of the disadvantages of archon-dating, even when the lists were available. Dionysius considered (c. 10) that the Pentecostalia was written κεραιωμοί καὶ ἐπιτροπαῖοι; the question of lack of revision and considerations of relevance and sources at Thuc.’s disposal did not occur to him, but Gomme also describes it as a ‘bleak summary’ and lists omissions of ‘events which should have found a place in the briefest of annals’ (vol. 1, pp. 364 ff.). H. D. Westlake discusses further in CQ, 1955, 53 ff.;

E. A. BARBER.


Book III of the Argonautica has not been edited separately for over thirty years, and the lapse of a generation makes a new edition desirable in itself, without prejudice to Fränkel’s forthcoming edition in the O.C.T. series of the complete Argonautica.

The preface deals with MSS. and their variants, without discussion of literary or historical issues; and there are three facsimile reproductions of Laur. G. 32.16 (Arg. 1.1–74, iii 1–70, and iii 693–706). The text (pp. 4–105) is faced by an Italian translation; the latter seems both to achieve dignified good feeling and also to avoid that curse of the Alexandrines and of those who deal in them, pomposity. The notes (pp. 109–244) comment principally on grammatical usage and indicate Homeric parallels: they too are succinct and lucid, and do not distract the reader with ‘epideictic’ accumulation of parallels where a single one is enough to illustrate the point at issue. There is a seven-page Index Verborum (pp. 245–53) in which a single asterisk shows words used for the first time by Apollonius, and a double asterisk shows words used by him alone.

Both printing and presentation are clear and attractive, and the whole is a welcome contribution to the study of Apollonius. It would have been more welcome still had it contained the editor’s own opinions on literary issues and values: but this may be a limitation imposed on the series as a whole.

M. M. GILLIES.
G. B. Grundy's book on Thucydides also sometimes offers similar material for comparison. Dionysius (c. 11) objected to the ἐστιν πρῶτον treatment of the immediate and ultimate causes of the war; Grundy went further and remarked: 'the most striking feature of the first book is the unexpected order in which its various sections appear in the text—a view with which N. G. L. Hammond disagrees (CQ 1940, 146 ff., 1952, 137). These are merely a few examples from the work of British scholars, and could easily be amplified from foreign sources; but some illustration of modern opinion, however limited, is necessary in an edition of this kind.

In dealing with questions of subject-matter, Pavano readily accepts the anti-Dionysian views of early nineteenth-century scholars such as Poppo and Krueger; but he is not so ready to accept the more favourable opinion of later nineteenth-century scholars in questions of style. Blass based his account of Thucydides' style, in the main, on Dionysius, and Hesse (Progr., Leisnig, 1877, p. 33) acknowledged the general fairness of D.'s observations; Pavano considers such scholarship outmoded. True, Blass dealt with the question as a detached entity, and later workers (Drewry, Finley) make a more historical approach, but here again one of the most important modern contributions is ignored. Dionysius laid special stress on the historian's constant and often disconcerting variations of construction—τὸ ποικιλὸν τῶν σχημάτων, αἱ μεταφοραί (cc. 24, 53). This whole question is studied in the exceptionally thorough and well-documented work of Jan Ros, Die metaphorā (variatio) als Stilprinzip des Thukydides (Rdt. Stud., Erganzungsband I, Paderborn, 1938), in which considerable attention is devoted to Dionysius (pp. 29-40, 49-68).

To declare, as does Pavano (Introdt. p. xxvi): 'oggi la critica su Tucidide si è liberata del tutto dalle anguste osservazioni del Nostro' is to combine exaggeration with bias.

E. C. Marchant (Introdt. to Book I) wrote quite appreciatively of D.'s essay; so does G. M. A. Grube in a fair and balanced article in Phoenix 4 (1950), pp. 95-110. This does not imply unawaresness of D.'s shortcomings—his misguided ideas of propriety, his political naïveté—or any wish to belittle Thucydides. But Pavano's book is full of open or subtly suggested disparagement of the critic, and gives him the barest minimum of credit. To take an example: in cc. 29 ff., Dionysius analyses in detail the difficult chapter, III, 82 (note Thomas Arnold's remarks at the beginning of it), and complains of the contorted and obscure style. When he reaches the pregnant remark about clever knives and honest fools (§ 7 ἄξιον . . . ἐπίκλετος), he, a Greek and a scholar, admits defeat. But P. declares (p. 238) that nearly all editors find the sentence clear, and then accuses the critic of deliberate malice in pretending not to understand in order to develop his thesis that Thuc. is obscure! Yet Gomme, in his note ad loc. (vol. 2, p. 378) admits the justice of D.'s criticism, and previously had even proposed (though here I should venture to disagree) to alter the text. It should be noted, however, that Gomme is quite prepared to censure D. when he deserves censure (cf. vol. 2, p. 181). We should also acknowledge that D. is not merely an obtrectator, but sometimes expresses the highest admiration for Thucydides' narrative style (cf. cc. 26-7 on VII, 69 ff.).

Roman literary criticism affords rather more parallels to Dionysius than Pavano's commentary would suggest. In metaphorical terminology, for instance, the critic's (exaggerated) description of Thuc. 'ποικίλος καὶ τοιχία' each individual word (c. 24) arouses no comparison with limae labor; his statement (c. 29) that a sentence might be recast οὐκ ἤρθε τὸν ρωματίδα, sailing upon the Atticist watchword, sanitas orationis; and, more generally, D.'s criticisms of Thucydides' brevity, whilst paralleled from Cicero and Quintilian, do not elicit any comparison with those of Roman critics on Sallust.

Pavano's translation is usually reliable, but there is a careless error on p. 201, where ἀκούομεν τούτον ἰδιωτικόν is rendered 'disordinata, rozza' when it means 'simple and in the common idiom'. In conclusion, I note that Max. Egger's book on Dionysius, first published in 1902, is said on p. xxxvi, n. 4, to have been reprinted from an original edition of 1849; that was the date of the first appearance of his father Émile Egger's Histoire de la critique chez les Grecs.

S. F. Bonner.


Vol. xii is a welcome addition to the Loeb Moralia, which one hopes will reach completion in the near future. This volume contains the de facie quae in orbe lunae apparat, translated by Professor Cherniss, and the de primo frigido, aquane un ignis sit utilis, terrestriane an aquatilia animalia sint callidora, bruta animalia ratione uti and the two de ess carnium orationes, all translated by Professor Helmbold.

The de facie is skilfully interpreted here by Cherniss, with an excellent introduction and expository footnotes and even textual notes that go some way towards making this a critical edition of merit. One does not expect so much in a series of this nature, and one can certainly be grateful to the editors for giving Cherniss the opportunity to present the fruits of his scholarship in this way. The introduction discusses clearly and intelligently the characters in the dialogue, its date of composition and dramatic setting, the date of the eclipse mentioned at 931D-E, the construction of the work and the interrelation of its parts, as well as a number of geographical and other questions. The text is Cherniss's own, and it compares well with that of Pohlenz in the 1955 Teubner edition, of which it is independent. It contains a number of interesting things already published in CP xlvi, 1951, 137-58, and in addition several new
readings, including a brave attempt to remedy the
difficult passage in 932C, which Pohlenz left with
lacunae and an obelus. In his translation Cherniss
is close to the Greek and fairly literal. This is
perhaps desirable in a work involving technicalities,
and probably helps in a number of places (e.g. 929E)
to make the interpretation clearer, but at times it
is indefensible, since Plutarch does not forget, as
Cherniss unfortunately does, that he is writing a
dialogue. The short speech of Pharnaces at 922F is
a case in point, where the speaker is made to say, ‘Well,
me you will not today entice into defending the
Stoics . . .’; and shortly afterwards Lucius, with a
laugh, replies, ‘Oh, sir, just don’t bring suit against
us for impiety’. There is similar awkwardness else-
where (e.g. the first sentence in 936E and the first in
938C). Nevertheless, the accuracy of the translation
amply compensates for what it lacks in readability,
and Cherniss takes pains in a number of his footnotes
to vindicate the interpretation he is offering, some-
times at the expense of other translators (e.g. p. 96,
ote a on αἰσθήσεως, p. 111, note c, etc.). The
footnotes themselves are learned, concise and much
to the point, and therefore of considerable value.

The text of the de primo frigido is based mainly on
that of Bernebakin, but Wytenbach has been kept
in mind in cases of doubt. At the time when the
translation of this work was being made, the Teubner
edition of 1955 was thought of as a thing of ‘the
remote future’ (p. 228), and its subsequent appear-
ance is not acknowledged here. On the other hand,
the new Teubner of the other essays in this volume
had appeared in time to be consulted, but not soon
enough to make any thorough revision of the text
possible. Helmold attempts a number of emenda-
tions of his own, some acceptable, others gratuitous
and unnecessary (e.g. 973E μὲν added by W. C. H.;
998C προφήτης for προφήτος. Such things are not
textual criticism but attempts to rewrite Plutarch.
The translation is generally competent, but is marred
in places by ill-chosen expressions: e.g. 972E ‘it was
decent enough to glide away’ (κοιτήσας . . . ἀπηλ-
λότητο); 975D ‘goes whizzing up’ (ἀπαφορείται);
980A ‘it has a reserved seat (προεδρίαν ἔχει) in every
single book of his, whether ethical or physical’; 993E
‘beef-witted’ (παχεῖς). One also notices ‘different . . .
than’ in a note on p. 290. An unfortunate verse
rendering of a couplet of Theognis is offered at
978E, with an equally unfortunate alternative by
Professor Alfred C. Andrews in a footnote. In the
de primo frigido a judicious employment of the word
‘coagulate’ might have improved the translation from
time to time, e.g. 946C (cf. p. 232, note a) and 950C,
where olive oil ‘when it freezes’ is said to form ‘a
soft jelly’. Some doubtful renderings have been
noted (e.g. 970E τὸ φιλότιμον is not ‘probit’ in
Plutarch), and elsewhere the English does less than
justice to the Greek. A classified zoological index
is appended to the terrestrinae aquatilia. This was
compiled specially by Professor Andrews. The lay-
man must presumably accept the identifications of
animal species offered by the specialist, but Andrews
is less happy in note d on p. 563, and some readers
will be positively unhappy when they read on p. 481
that ‘the zoological material is a hodge-podge of
misinformation dredged up from various zoological
sources, seasoned here and there with personal
contributions, which are not necessarily correct’. Nevertheless it is a well-seasoned sludge.

A. J. Gossage.

BOMPAIRE (J.) Lucien écrivain: imitation et
création. [Bibl. des Écoles françaises d'Athènes

The introduction to this work points out how
much less was thought of originality in the ancient
than in the modern world, and Part I (pp. 13-154)
traces the doctrine of Mimesis up to the time of
Lucian, with illustrations from classical authors and
the rhetores. The Second Sophistic, in M. Bompaire’s
view, was neither a revolution nor a renaissance, but
a continuation. In spite of its Asiatic origins and
errors of taste its teaching, thanks to the doctrine
of Mimesis, kept alive the influence of the best authors
as models. The distinction between Atticism and
Asianism is arbitrary, and Atticism on the gram-
matical level was a mere heresy of grammarians and
imetical to true Atticism, which was the deep study
and appreciation of the classics. The latter conclusion
seems to the present reviewer unjustified: Lucian's
whole practice and that of his contemporaries, and of
not a few successors up to modern times, shows that
grammatical Atticism was consi-dered a necessary part of the wider Atticism.
Certainly Lucian attacked hyper-Atticism on the
grounds of vocabulary: in this connexion Bompaire's
analysis of the Lexiphanes, p. 634, forms a useful
appendix to the section in Schmid's Atticism.

Part II (pp. 555-543) is entitled 'La Création
Rhétorique': that is, the exploitation of the Greek
literary heritage in a somewhat crude manner, by the
direct use of material prepared by and for the
rhetorical schools. It has long been clear that
Lucian's famous renunciation of rhetoric cannot
be taken literally, and that the dialogues were intended
for performance before an audience no less than the
speeches. Bompaire now shows the degree to which
Lucian conformed with the strictest rhetorical prac-
tice. The historical characters mentioned by Lucian
are selected and coincide with those mentioned by his
contemporaries: Alexander as a great conqueror,
Croesus exemplifying the instability of fortune, and
so on. (Hence the curious prevalence of tyrants, or at
least of certain tyrants, in Lucian's works.)
Menippus, Diogenes and other Cynics represent a
type towards which Peregrinus also tends. Charac-
ters are simplified and few have much individuality;
some, like the philosophers in the Pisatar, are mere
names distinguished by a banal detail. The
numerous references to Homer, tragedy and comedy
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do not prove that Lucian read the authors; the same material had been used through a long tradition in the rhetorical schools. Lucian pursues a 'geographical and historical Atticism', adding verisimilitude by the use of names of demes and festivals. The barbarian world is treated with the condescension of one who has been thoroughly Hellenised (Bompaire finds humour in the Tovariz). From his personal knowledge of Egypt Lucian mentions no personal discoveries. He is neither bold nor original. In construction he uses the λόγος διευκρίνοις not only in full, as in the Tyrannicida and Apologia, but often in skeleton form—eight times in the Bis Acuratus. His epideictic works conform closely to the precepts of rhetores of the Imperial period; but exactly the same method, down to small details, is also used in the Imagines, Anacharis and some other works whose dialogue form is a transparent disguise. His philosophic ideas (Bompaire puts the word in inverted commas) rest upon collections of δόξα, his moral views on commonplace from cynical sources. Proverbs, citations and other stylistic devices are used mechanically and to excess: for instance the Demonax (one of the few works, according to Eunapius 454, in which Lucian was serious) is almost a string of anecdotes without composition. While most of Lucian's subject-matter is of literary origin, he probably got it through the collections of paroemiographers and other second-hand literature. The number of traditional themes and arguments in the Peregrinus, Alexander and other pamphlets is such that a personal attack, in Bompaire's view, cannot have been Lucian's main interest. The Roman references are mostly clichés and cannot support the theory that Lucian was a member of any form of resistance to Rome.

References to the contemporary world in Lucian are not cogent: they are swamped by his material of literary origin. According to the principles of Mimesis the latter would be more important, and it was only by the 'ruminations' of it that 'création littéraire' could take place. This is the subject of Part III (pp. 547-744). Bompaire explains Lucian's innovations under the headings of 'contamination' and 'transposition'. Thus he followed the highest tradition by which tragedies were composed from Homeric material (and incidentally practised a refined form of a rhetorical exercise). An analysis of Lucian's humour follows: it is at its best in parody, or more strictly pastiche, and could rise, as in the Vera Historia, to a new level of fantasy. But Lucian's aim was not so much to raise laughs as to give pleasure by recalling to an educated audience features of their cultural world. This is a pleasure which can be shared by modern readers; but for Lucian's contemporaries his best work would be seen in the form of the εκφάνσεις, which attempted a synthesis of art and literature to their mutual benefit.

Bompaire claims authenticity for the Patiae Encomium, de Parasito and Tragodopodagra. Since the method of argument and quality of wit are criteria, one might expect him also to support the de Saltatone, which, apart from its merits, contains a piece of 'création mécanique' in its catalogue of legends; and the stylistic objections to it are not worse than those to the de Parasito (cf. J. Bieler, Über die Echtheit des Lucianischen Dialogs de Parasito, Hildesheim, 1890). The originality of the de Saltatone, in Bompaire's opinion, stands against it.

This important and valuable book, as will appear even from a brief account, differs at many points from established authorities. It should help towards a fuller understanding of Lucian's aims and methods.

B. J. SIMS.


Paul Maas, himself among the best loved of classical scholars, has rendered a lifelong service of love to the authors of antiquity. Almost every waking moment has been spent in pondering, criticising and improving their texts. In 1927 in a German handbook he set out a system of textual criticism, which from precise definitions deduced a rigorous method, in accordance with which the critic could operate with the certainty of the scientist. His essay, classic in its economy of statement, has formed an essential element in the education of every European scholar, and has gone through three editions in Germany. The late Barbara Flower had prepared an English translation before her death in 1955, and the Clarendon Press are to be congratulated on printing it and making Maas' work available to the large circle of English students (and teachers) who read German only with difficulty. C. H. Roberts has seen the book through the press and added in an appendix a translation of the equally famous paper on Leitfehler, Byz. Ztschr. 37, 289. Four pages of 'Retrospect 1956' allow Maas to comment on latent evidence, Pasquale's dictum 'recentiores non deteriores', and the theory of diagnostic conjectures.

Hard thinking went into this book and hard thinking must result from reading it. But doubts will keep breaking in about the validity of systematisation. Is textual criticism susceptible of treatment as a science? Every scholar's answer will be to some extent personal. The reviewer must confess his own feeling that the textual critic operates in the field of τὰ ἐνθέλημα ἄλλως ἔγραν. In his section 10 Maas admits the great hindrance, if not impossibility of proceeding if two manuscripts have been contaminated. But does he appreciate the sheer frequency of contamination in the ancient world? The clear evidence of literary papyri, of Strabo, of New Testament papyri is that comparison of one exemplar with a second, and conflation of their readings was the ancient scholar's established method of reassuring himself that his text was reliable (most recently E. Lobel, P. Oxy. xxiv, p. 11). How is the critic to proceed when his text is contaminated?
That is surely a situation that admits no straightforward recipe.

E. G. Turner.

**CHADWICK (JOHN)** *The Decipherment of Linear B*. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. Pp. x + 148, with 2 plates, 16 text-figures, 1 folding diagram. 18s. 6d.

'This', says Mr Chadwick in his preface (p. ix), 'is an attempt to present ... to the general reader' the story of how Michael Ventris deciphered the Bronze Age script which Sir Arthur Evans taught us to call 'Minoan Linear B'; and since Ventris, to the grief of all who knew him, did not live to add anything to the account in *Documents*, which is too technical for the purpose, or to provide a running commentary for *Worknotes*, there is no one who is half as well qualified as Chadwick for the task. *Ἀρχὴ ἀρχαὶ δεῖξις*—and the frontispiece (a fine photograph of Ventris) together with the modesty of Chadwick's preface are a good beginning to the book, which is written entirely in Ventris' own spirit: it is highly factual, but digestibly as well as economically written, and it is decisive without (in spite of all temptations) ever becoming discourteous.

In the first short chapter ('Michael Ventris', pp. 1-4), which gives (in my opinion at least) an incontrovertibly true account of Ventris as a person, I should stress the importance of three facts mentioned by Chadwick: the speed of Ventris' mental processes, his insistence on the visual approach to the problem, and his training as an architect. It is clear from *Worknotes* that Ventris sometimes found himself 'stuck', with his mind uneasily contemplating an apparently random assemblage of facts, until suddenly (and quite without any consciousness of ratiocination on his part) a pattern became perceptible to him—and then his mind would begin to work so fast that even he 'toiled after it in vain'. That is to say that he was a natural intuitive (the visual approach is, I think, an essential adjunct of that type of mind), whose power of seeing patterns in things had been greatly strengthened by his professional training and experience. Here, if ever, was Browning's 'high man, Aiming at a million'; and whether he missed his 'unit' or not, it is no wonder that the rest of us, painfully scoring in singles and with our century nowhere in sight, should at times complain that he never made it clear to us how he amassed his hundreds of thousands.

Chapter 2 (5-25) gives an account of the Minoan scripts, with ample comparative material both in the text and in the illustrations. The third chapter ('Hopes and Failures', 26-39) carries the story of work on the texts down to the first publication (by Bennett in 1951) of the tablets found at Pylos in 1939, which made it possible for 'orderly analysis, begun by Miss Kober and Bennett' to 'take the place of speculation and guess-work' (39). Chapter 4 ('Birth of a Theory', 40-66) begins with some useful remarks on the problems of decipherment in general, and then takes the story down to the issue by Ventris, in June 1952, of his epoch-making *Worknote* 20. Then in Chapter 5 ('Growth and Development', 67-80) we have Ventris' broadcast (July 1, 1952), though Chadwick seems to put it earlier; 'June' in the footnote on p. 68 should be 'July'), which introduced Chadwick to Ventris and led directly to their joint publications ('Evidence for Greek Dialect in the Mycenaean Archives', *JHS* lxxxiii [1953] 84-103; *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge, 1956), and through them to all the work on Linear B which has been done since 1953. Naturally the collaborators expected opposition; but Chadwick can end this chapter with the words, 'Even before the theory could be published [sc. in *JHS*], Professor Blegen had put into our hands a decisive confirmation, a weapon so powerful that the failure of the opposition was certain before it had begun'. Accordingly the opening paragraphs of Chapter 6 ('The Decipherment and the Critics', 81-100) describe Blegen's finding at Pylos in June 1952 of the tablet now famous as Ta 641, before going on to an account of the first reactions (both favourable and unfavourable) to the article 'Evidence', and so to the earliest published attacks by Professors Beattie (*JHS* lxxvi [1956] 1-17; *Cambridge Review*, lxviii [1957] 568-71) and Grumach (OLZ, lii [1957] 293-342). These Chadwick answers with firmness and courtesy, though his description of Beattie's rejection of the approaches made to him by Ventris and Chadwick (90) suggests to me that the maintenance of that courtesy must have cost him some effort. Both Chadwick and his readers, it seems to me, are fortunate that this book was already published before Beattie's unsubstantiated attack on Ventris' good faith in his 'Plain Guide' (*MIO*, vi [1958] 33-104) became available. Chapter 7 ('Life in Mycenaean Greece', 101-33), together with the appendix ('Mycenaean Documents in Transcription', 141-3), may be taken as a preparation for the assault on *Documents*; but I am personally inclined to think that the general reader may still find the direct ascent from *Decipherment* to *Documents* rather abrupt. The last chapter ('Prospects', 134-9) looks forward to the decipherment of Linear A and to the many possibilities for the discovery of new Linear B texts; but for me the bright outlook is somewhat overcast by the thought that students of Linear B matters are now divided into two utterly separate camps, of which the smaller wages total war upon the larger. Chadwick's book shows that for this lamentable state of affairs, which has already caused much waste of intellectual effort (and will doubtless cause much more), Beattie's *ritiato* is almost entirely to blame; but it is an even more deplorable fact that, even since Chadwick's book was published, some of Ventris' most determined opponents have begun to show a really frightening disregard of the ordinary conventions of academic controversy—and one can only hope that these provocations will not turn what is still in most quarters a properly conducted inquiry into one of
the worst-mannered brawls which has ever disfigured
the history of Classical scholarship.

Chadwick's book contains much which will be
new to all but the most advanced specialists in
Mycenaean studies, so that many people will benefit
by it besides the general readers for whom it is
expressly designed. The publishers deserve all
praise for the way in which they have kept the price
of this book within reasonable bounds without
detracting from its elegant appearance.

J. A. Davison.

Woodhead (A. G.) The Study of Greek Inscrip-
Pp. xi + 139. 4 plates. 3 text figures. £1 2s. 6d.

Forty years have elapsed since the late Sir John
Sandy, in his Latin Epigraphy, provided scholars with
a fully-documented introduction to the study of Latin
inscriptions, but no comparable work in English has
hitherto been available for that of Greek inscriptions.
The need for such a volume is undeniable, and Mr
Woodhead has now produced one which will be
quickly and readily welcomed, in fact not only by the
'non-specialist' for whom it is designed in the first
place but by scholars in many fields of classical
learning. Although its length is little more than half
that of Sandy's book, the table of contents shows
how fully the ground has been covered.

In ten chapters W. deals successively with (i) Signs
and Symbols; (ii) The Origin and Development of
the Greek Alphabet; (iii) Boukastrophon and Stoichedon;
(iv) The Classification of Inscriptions; (v) The
Dating of Inscriptions; (vi) The Restoration of
Inscriptions; (vii) Squeezes and Photographs; (viii)
Inscriptions in the History of Greek Art; (ix) Epi-
graphic Publications; (x) Some Miscellaneous
Information. Instead of cumbersing the text with foot-
notes he has grouped his references and brief explana-
tory notes at the end of it (pp. 120-32), and a
concise general index (pp. 133-9) contains all that is
needed for his readers' guidance.

A special word of approval is due to the lucid
and judicious discussion of the origins of the alphabet
(ch. II), with its attractive suggestion (developed
more fully in AJA, 1959) as to the part played by
Greek merchants trading with the Phoenician coastal
cities in the adoption of an alphabet in versions
suitable to their own use and dialects. Similarly, in
ch. V and VI on the dating and restoration of
inscriptions the need for caution is justifiably empha-
sised, especially in dealing with fragmentary stones
where every feature must be accurately recorded
before starting on the task of restoration. Ch. VIII
breaks rather new ground, in its study of the aesthetics
of Greek inscriptions in relation to the history of
Greek Art, which should at least lead students to
know and appreciate the reproductions of Attic
inscriptions in Kirchner's Imagines; and perhaps to
regret that there is no comparable work available
to illustrate the development of writing on inscrip-
tions from elsewhere in the Greek world. Lacking
such a work it is not easy to verify the statement
(p. 90 f.) that by the end of the fourth century the
shift of political emphasis from Greece to Asia meant
'that there, and no longer in Attica, was . . . the best
epigraphic work done'. Here a word of guidance
would have been welcome to illustrations additional

to the few cited by W. from Kern's Inscriptiones
Graecae (1919). The 'miscellaneous information' in
ch. X includes a concise guide to Greek numerals,
the Athenian Tribes, the Athenian Archons and an
admirably clear summary of the many problems
involved in that complicated subject, the Athenian
Calendar.

Whilst readily conceding that the scale of the book
inevitably restricts the number of references offered,
and that citation of the invaluable material collected
by Hondius in his Saxa Loquentur goes a long way
towards meeting this need, I venture to offer a few
suggestions (amicus amico) for consideration when a
second edition is being prepared. P. 362, besides the
Temple-accounts at Epidauros those of the Tholos
and certain other buildings should not be overlooked.
P. 43, in the incidental mention of Tituli Agonistici
there is no reference to the contribution of Wilhelm
to the study of the dramatic festivals at Athens; that
the name of such a distinguished epigraphist does not
occur in the Index (or in the text?) may well come as
a shock to others as well as the reviewer. P. 47, a
reference to Saxa Loquentur, 137 f. would usefully
supplement the scanty details of local Protopraphiae,
which had their beginnings long before the recent
date implied in the text (e.g. Poralla, Protopraphiae der
Lakedaimonier, 1913). P. 60, a note seems needed
on the distinction between Ἀθηναίος—names with and
without the praenomen Μάρκος, for the former may
in many cases date back to the Emperor of that name,
whereas the latter are presumably all derived from
the Constituto of Caracalla. P. 91,1,15, in citing
'Kern 35, top' as an unsuccessful example of the use
of individual letters of decorative character, W. has
not appreciated the importance of this text for its
'semi-cursive' script, which might be compared with
that of the metrical epitaph from Gaza (SEG vii. 269,
c. 200 B.C.), of which several publications provide
a photograph. This is a valuable reminder that the
epigraphist, in seeking the aid of the papyrologist,
should be ready to overstep the strict limitations of his
own field as defined by Tod in his article 'Greek
Epigraphy' in OCD, and quoted with approval by
Woodhead (p. 120). No less important is it for him
to encroach on the field of the numismatist in his
study of letter-forms, especially those of the early
issues of Magna Graecia and Sicily.

Space does not permit of a discussion of W.'s views
on the nature and limits of the epigraphist's task, but
his statement (p. 54, ad fin.) that 'the skilled epi-
graphist must of necessity be something of an
archaeologist and something of a historian' can hardly
be intended as a complete definition, as it omits the
vital requirement of a mastery of the Greek language
as well as the readiness to cross the boundary-lines of his subject in other directions than those already mentioned. A few other suggestions may not come amiss: the list of travellers to whom we are indebted for scholarly copies of inscriptions (p. 96), might well be extended to include for the period 1750-1850 the names of Chandler, Leake, Spratt and Arundell; and for the generation from 1880 onwards, W. M. Ramsay and Sterrett, whereas Keil (still living and active) belongs, like von Premzerstein, to the present century; and somewhere in this roll of honour a place should be found for Wilhelm. The photograph of the Miletus decree (pl. 1) whilst valuable as an example of skilfully reconstructed fragments is inevitably on too small a scale for the letters to be read without a lens, so a reference would have been welcome to ATL II, pl. 4, where its lettering and its taping profile are more clearly visible. By a strange lapse, Oenoanda is located in Caria instead of Lycia (p. 31), and the caption of pl. 4, an exceptionally interesting document recently discovered in Phrygia, is not in agreement with the note on p. 126 which refers to it as of the second century A.D.; actually it includes a consular date, A.D. 257.

The press-work is admirable, and the omission of a final i from historical (p. 55) seems to be the only misprint. If this notice appears to draw disproportionate attention to minuteia, it is because the plan of the book and its treatment of the essential elements in the study of Greek inscriptions so admirably achieve the author's purpose, and will surely win for it the warm welcome which it deserves.

A. M. Woodward.


The Greek inscriptions found in Bulgaria, Jugoslovakia, Turkey, and even in Greece itself, have been and are being published in such diverse journals, often inaccessible and unobtainable and sometimes written in languages not easily understood, that it is virtually impossible to study them as a whole. If, for example, one is trying to form a conception of Greek inscriptions from Macedonia, it is necessary to try to obtain and read journals, sometimes even newspapers or local museum bulletins, in Greek, Serbo-Croat and Bulgarian. Scholarly communication has also been hindered by political conditions in the Balkans and this has given rise to national corpora of Greek inscriptions; we have already collections of Greek inscriptions in Jugoslovakia and a Rumanian corpus is being prepared. The latest national collection is the one by Professor G. Mihailov, whose laudable aim is to publish all the Greek inscriptions found within the confines of the modern state of Bulgaria and collect the disiecta membra into one corpus. Much as one may regret the cutting across of the ancient territories as recognised by the geographical divisions of IG, it is inevitable in modern political circumstances.

Professor Mihailov's corpus is designed to cover the territory in four volumes, with a fifth volume of indexes. Volume 1 covers the shore of the Black Sea; Volume 2 the region between the Danube and Haemus; Volume 3 that between Haemus and Rhodope; and Volume 4 Sofia, Pautalia and Nicopolis ad Mesum; each volume has a map of the relevant region and a small key-map to show its relation to the other volumes. Though Volume 5 will contain comprehensive indexes to the whole, the editor has thoughtfully provided provisional indexes in each volume; these are on a generous scale and will add enormously to the usefulness of the work as it progresses.

The first feature that strikes the user is the handy format, 24 × 17 cm., such a welcome change from the normal unwieldy size of epigraphical publications. Secondly, one is amazed at the wealth of illustration. One has always known that the only satisfactory way to publish an epigraphical text is to provide a photograph and originally this was the aim of MAMA, though latterly financial stringency and the increased cost of printing have led to a drastic reduction in this essential documentation. Professor Mihailov has provided more illustrations than in any other comparable corpus; he gives a photograph of the stone when he can, a photograph from the original publication, or a squeeze or a drawing, when he has no access to the original; out of 475 inscriptions in the first volume only 37 are not illustrated. This enables the reader to read the text on the stone for himself and it also gives a wealth of material for the study of letter-forms and decoration of the monuments. The plates are not always works of art, but they are always legible and that is what matters. One cannot praise too highly the generosity and far-sightedness of the Bulgarian Academy of Letters in providing the editor so lavishly with the financial resources for his work; the learned institutions in this country that could afford the money for this kind of illustration, with the prohibitive cost of printing, are surely very few indeed.

For the text of his edition Professor Mihailov has wisely chosen the international language, Latin, and has thereby earned the gratitude of all his readers, especially those to whom the Cyrillic alphabet is not familiar. It is in this that Professor Mihailov scores heavily over the Jugoslav scholars, like Vulič, who published mainly in Serbo-Croat. Warm praise is due not only to the editor, but to his learned printer who is equally at home in the Roman and Greek alphabets and to the publishers for providing such good quality paper and a dignified and durable binding. The lemmata giving the provenance and present position of the monument, its measurements and the various editions are excellent. The apparatus criticus, too, is clear and detailed, to a degree quite beyond the financial resources of the usual
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epigraphical publication. The commentary is mainly on chronological and historical points.

Armed with this equipment the reader need never stir beyond his study; in his hands he will have the complete collection of Greek inscriptions in Bulgaria, arranged in a more handy way than if he were studying them in situ. He need never travel to Bulgaria to re-examine a stone; Professor Mihailov has given him a photograph and a complete description. He need never refer to previous editions; Professor Mihailov has done all the work for him in the *apparatus criticus*.

In his exhaustive article on Greek inscriptions in Bulgaria (Rev. phil. xiii, 1959, 165-236), Professor L. Robert can find only 'quelques observations sur certains textes. . . Leur petit nombre sera un hommage à la qualité du travail de G. Mihailov.' The first volume of Professor Mihailov's work has been crowned by the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, and this award reflects the gratitude and admiration of all scholars for his admirable work, magnificently conceived and superbly executed; when it is completed, it will be a κτήμα ἐς δεί.

J. M. R. Cormack.


Excavating at Auja el-Hafir in the Negeb in 1937, Harris Duncombe Colt uncovered a hoard of papyri stored away in the remains of two churches on the site of ancient Nessana. The literary papyri were published in 1950 as P. Colt Ness. II, and are now followed by the documents, of which there are nearly two hundred in all, dating from the beginning of the sixth to the end of the seventh centuries A.D.

The information gleaned from them provides a unique picture of a small Hellenistic community outside Egypt during the crucial years before and immediately after the commencement of Mohammedan expansion. Nessana was a large-sized village, with a military camp attached and manned by a unit of the *limitanei* known as the Company of the Most Loyal Theodosians, possibly dromedarii. Situated one hundred miles south-west of Jerusalem on the main road to Egypt, it had originated as a halting-place for caravans en route from Aila, the modern 'Aqabah to Gaza, and had been made the site of a small fort by the Nabataeans in the second century B.C. and later of a larger one by the Romans; after a period of decline in the second and third centuries A.D., conditions again improved, and Nessana reached the height of its prosperity in the sixth and seventh centuries as a centre of the caravan-trade, being comparatively unaffected by the Arab conquest of Palestine in A.D. 634. But the withdrawal of the garrison towards the end of the sixth century and the integration of the Nabataean population with other Arab peoples brought a gradual return to a tribal system, and probably by the middle of the

The eighth century the village had been deserted by its inhabitants and reclaimed by the desert.

The documents tell us little about the world outside Nessana but a great deal about local and provincial affairs. For example, we learn much about the layout of houses (22), the administration of S. Palestine in the sixth century (39), agricultural and hydrological installations (31), the low state of education in Nessana at the end of the seventh century (56), the administration of the poll-tax in Syria (59, 76), the procedure for assessment and collection of taxes (60-7), the efficiency and organisation of the Arab bureaucracy (64, 92), the continuing toleration of Christianity (72), agricultural methods in Palestine (82), trading activities and prices (89), the details of the date-industry (90-1). Not the least interesting are the respects in which this information differs from, or supplements, that which we have on similar topics from Egypt: for example, 18 is an important addition to existing marriage settlements from Egypt, which it greatly resembles in form and language, 24, an ἐπιστολὴ συμπεριφορᾶς, in spite of differences in form, is parallel to like documents from Egypt in its essential formularies and even in minor points of language, 33 helps to fill in the details of our knowledge of divorce agreements, and 46, a loan of money, 48, a guarantee for a loan, and 60-7, enagasia, all conform in the main to known Egyptian practice, though they contain striking differences in phraseology. On the other hand, 29, a summons issued from the provincial capital Elusa, is unique while 57 has no parallel amongst other divorce agreements. (From 28, 33, and 95 it is clear that the editor had not seen Os xviii, i 175 ff. and the *repetitum* published there.) Again, we learn from 76 that the clergy were subject to the poll-tax, and from 35-6 that *διοικηταῖς* were probably scouts, like the διοικηταῖς.

The lexicographer and philologist will find many words in this volume which either appear for the first time or in a new sense, e.g. παραφρενίας, καθαλαμίως, ἐκλαθέας, παναθαλασσίον [sic], τρικλωμός, διαμπόρης, μεθαλλίον (bearing out Perry's suggestions for P. Oxy. 2083, 27, made in AJPh LX (1939) pp. 38 f.), ἐμβαθής (cited once by Sophocles but in an ecclesiastical, not as here military, context), συγκεκαλημένος used of an attached house, ἔμπροσθός (listed elsewhere only in the *MegaLexicon*), συναιτές, κακωθείς (or κακωθός?), ἀλεξέτως (probably 'limestone', as in modern Greek), δέκαμος, ἱερονομικοί in the same sense as ἱερόμινα, μαθητέως, τρωβέλων (or τροβέλων?) as 'charges for the use of the threshing boards and floor', οὐλόμας, φορτίων in the sense of 'taxes', ποιεῖν and ἐκβάλλειν in the sense of 'yield, produce', πεθοῦντι [sic] and ἐγείρητο [sic], for both of which the editor has been unable to find a certain explanation, though he tends to regard the latter as a corruption of *ex pediuit*, and, possibly, καμπανογένεια in the sense of 'make a levy of camels'. There are also useful discussions of the meaning of δομεστικός, οἱ τῶν δημοσίων ἐκπράκτορες.
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In compiling this impressive volume Madame Bon and her husband have kept in view a clearly defined objective: ‘le but que nous nous proposons dans cet ouvrage est de réunir les cachets imprimés sur les anses d’amphores de Thasos et d’en dresser le catalogue’ (p. 9). And this clarity is characteristic of the whole work, alike in expression and in arrangement. The preface sketches the history of the undertaking and acknowledges the authors’ debt to various scholars, especially to Miss Virginia Grace, the value of whose collaboration is further emphasised by the appearance of her name on the title-page. The introduction discusses the fundamental questions of the provenance of the documents in question, the character of the amphorae and of the stamps impressed on them, the purpose of such stamps, and their dating, which depends mainly on the archaeological context of their discovery and ranges from the late fifth century to about 200 B.C. An ample bibliography (pp. 49–55) is followed by a useful explanation of the principles underlying the catalogue and the signs and abbreviations used in its presentation, though nothing is said of the system of symbols adopted in the printing of epigraphical texts.

The catalogue itself comprises 2,297 items, divided into seven classes, and includes 39 stamped tiles (see p. 537) and 40 stamps of uncertain origin discovered at Thasos (nos. 2233–72). To appreciate the vast labour involved in its preparation we must bear in mind that a single item may cover several examples of the same stamp; no. 717, e.g., includes no fewer than 17 examples. The book is lavishly illustrated; in addition to the eight figures in the introduction (fig. 8, on p. 25, is inadvertently omitted from the list of illustrations on p. 539), there are in the catalogue proper 1,651 photos and 472 line-drawings. The elaborate index of names and monograms has been compiled with the utmost care, and indicates a large number of corrections made in the texts of previously published stamps; how drastic these can be is illustrated by no. 955 bis, where Νεομίσχων is emended to Νεομίσχου.[3]

The index of emblems (pp. 531–6) emphasises the remarks made in the introduction (pp. 29–30) about their astonishing variety, and the index of provenances other than Thasos and Athens (pp. 537–8) is of particular interest; we note, e.g., that the coasts of the Euxine supply 618 items, the Aegean islands 74, Egypt 59, mainland Hellas 8 and the West only one. Since the publication of the book a Thasian stamp has come to light in the Hellenistic settlement at Nimrud (Iraq xx, 120).

The texts of the Thasian stamps are remarkably simple and uniform, containing personal names, the Thasian ethnic, monograms and emblems; no month is mentioned, no title occurs unless the κεραμάρ(γο) of nos. 912–13 is such, énai appears only thrice (nos. 470, 1147–8), and one tile bears the graffito ΛΗΣΣΩΝ (no. 2273). The ethnic normally takes the form Θασίων, but the alternative Θάσιως is attested in 59 items and may have been written or intended in a large number of others where the abbreviation or mutilation of the word makes the ending uncertain. The authors mention this alternative (pp. 26–7, 59), but invariably write it Θασίων, while in scores of examples they write Θάσιων(ε)ν, or the like, where the penultimate letter is uncertain. Do they regard the o as a misspelt ω (cf. CIG IV p. 259, nos. 10, 14, 17, where ΑΣΙΩΝ is transcribed Θασίων) or rather a neuter singular like the Κήσων found on almost all Cnidian amphorae? Miss Grace, indeed, wrote Θασίων in AJA 138, nos. 1, 2, 3, but in her more recent publications (e.g. Hesperia Suppl. X 129 ff.) she rightly prefers Θάσιως. Other variants, Θασιώς (nos. 11, 500) and Θασιώς (nos. 192, 1582), are probably due to carelessness, while Θασιών (no. 471) is a misprint.

A loose sheet is inserted containing a list of errata, but a further volume is promised (p. 518), which will include addenda and corrigenda to the present work.

1 See the interesting theory stated in Hesperia, Suppl. X 119.
as well as the stamps discovered since the beginning of 1952. The errors I have noted are mostly trivial—accents misplaced or omitted (e.g. οἶνηρα for οἶνηρα on p. 24, ἔκτην for ἔκτην and μῆς for μῆ for p. 37, Ἀριστότελος and Πλατωνός on p. 521) or names wrongly spelt (Etty Goldman for Hetty Goldman on p. 15 and Himhoof Blumer for Imhoof-Blumer on p. 31)—and do not seriously detract from the value of the book.

The amphora-stamps are not inspiring individually, but taken in the mass their value for the economic history of classical and Hellenistic Greece is considerable, and we cannot but feel admiration and gratitude for those who have undertaken the arduous task of collecting and editing the available material so far as Thasos is concerned and have carried it out with such exemplary devotion.

MARCUS N. TOD.


This pleasant volume, adorned with an excellent photograph of the author and including his bibliography, was published to honour Professor Wade-Gery on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. It is a Festschrift in the nature of Kleine Schriften, and even the sworn enemies of Festschriften will warmly welcome this kind of homage to a man who has many friends and, I believe, no enemy. We are not told who selected the essays; but whether it was the author himself or Professor Andrews, who acted as editor, we have every reason to be grateful. There are thirteen papers in all, among them some that have made a great impact on the study of Greek history, such as the brilliant articles on the Spartan Rhetra, on the structure of early Athenian society, on Thucydides son of Melesias, on the Peace of Callias. All of them display Wade-Gery's great acumen, his scholarly accuracy—which is something different from pedantry—and above all his imaginative and constructive ways of discussing the ancient sources. Today these papers read as well as ever; we can understand, though we may regret, that they have been reprinted virtually unchanged. We naturally should like to know the author's reactions to some of the views expressed in the discussion which followed the publication of his papers.

A special attraction of the present volume is the addition of an unpublished article of recent origin on one of the most puzzling and most discussed Attic inscriptions, the treaty on εὐομόλωρα with Phaselis (IG I 1, 16. Tod, no. 32). Following the long line of distinguished scholars who have tried to restore the text and to understand its meaning, Wade-Gery once more discusses most of the questions emerging from a thorough interpretation of the decree. His chief result, on which alone I propose to comment, is that it was a single magistrate who then rendered judicial verdicts. It is well known that all our evidence for the fifth century shows the 'normal' procedure in which the magistrate presides, while the δικαιαται judge. If Wade-Gery's interpretation and dating of the inscription (between 460 and 462) are right, the obvious conclusion would be that the power of jurisdiction was taken from the magistrates by Ephialtes in his reforms of 462. The new conclusion is based on two 'vital phrases': (1) 1.60 ff. Cases of contracts between an Athenian and a Phaselite made at Athens will be heard at Athens μιαν τοιούτων, and nowhere else. The Greek words can only mean 'at the Polemarch's tribunal', but that translation seems to me to allow for two different meanings; the Polemarch was either as usual the presiding magistrate or actually rendered the verdict. Wade-Gery is fully aware of the two possibilities; he decides for the unusual one, chiefly because of the second 'vital' clause. (2) 1.15 ff. Here we learn that ἦν θατη τον ἄργουν accepts an action at law against a man from Phaselis, if he (or it?) decides against him, the decision shall be void. We know that ἄργυτα can mean an office or a board of officials, a 'magistracy'; it is less easy, though not impossible, to take it as a single magistrate. There remains a good deal in favour of Wade-Gery's thesis, but some doubts also remain. Incidentally, what happened when the 'other' magistracy decided in favour of the Phaselite?

As in his earlier papers, Wade-Gery puts new searching questions, and by his vivid and poignant treatment compels the reader to re-think what frequently had become an accepted routine solution. We are looking forward to many more of his penetrating papers, though (may we say so?) most of all to his Early Greek History in the Methuen series.

VICTOR EHERNBERG.


This fourth volume of the Entretiens Hardt is devoted to Greek and Roman historiography and records in full seven discussions by a group of distinguished scholars in August 1956, introduced by the following papers: (1) Kurt Latte, 'Die Anfänge der griechischen Geschichtsschreibung'; (2) Jacqueline de Romilly, 'L'utilité de l'histoire selon Thucydide'; (3) Kurt von Fritz, 'Die Bedeutung des Aristoteles für die Geschichtsschreibung'; (4) Krister Hanell, 'Zur Problematik der älteren römischen Geschichtsschreibung'; (5) Ronald Syme, 'The Senator as Historian'; (6) Marcel Durry, 'Les Empereurs comme historiens d'Auguste à Hadrien'; (7) Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Gli Anicii e la storiografia latina del VI secolo d.C.'

Latte concentrates almost entirely on Herodotus, giving a sensible and judicious account, without shedding much new light on his subject. In his paper and the discussion which follows (pp. 17-18,
23, 25–7), the ‘Xerxesgeschichte’ of Hdt. VII 8–18 figures prominently: here, indeed, we are confronted with a ‘doppelt Motivierung’ which makes it hard for us to define Herodotus’ conception of causality. Why, in Herodotus’ view, did Xerxes revert to his intention of invading Greece? In von Fritz’ opinion (p. 26), ‘hier zeigt sich hinter der religiösen Verkleidung eine ganz realistische psychologische Geschichtskausalität’. But von Fritz himself is doubtful whether Herodotus was conscious of this, and in any event the supernatural elements in a Herodotean narrative can never be treated as a mere façade: for Herodotus, the supernatural was part of the very stuff of the universe, sometimes not visible, but liable sometimes to intrude, sometimes to overwhelm. It is only in quite recent times that believers in the supernatural have learnt for the most part to leave it out of their writing of history.

Collingwood, in a brilliant but perversive passage in The Idea of History (pp. 29–31), accused Thucydides of diverting history into a wrong channel and ‘turning it into something that is not history’, owing to his obsession for affirming ‘psychological laws’. Mme. de Romilly effectively destroys the basis of all such attacks upon the historian, by showing that he is concerned to establish not ‘des véritables loi’s but rather ‘des vraies similitudes’, that Thucydides is ‘système de vraies similitudes indiscutable, rigoureux et complet’ (pp. 57, 59, 62). In Gomme’s words, ‘Thucydides was always thinking of general laws—but thinking of them rather than formulating them’. Mme. de Romilly goes too far, however, in trying narrowly to limit the scope of the word ὑφήλια in I 22.4 (reinforced as it is by κρητικός ἐπί τῆς, to what is certainly its primary meaning: ‘utilité dans le domaine de la seule connaissance’ (p. 42). Here, of course, she is at one with several recent commentators, including Gomme. One might as well try to claim that early Hippocratic works like Epidemics I and III, which offer no therapeutic advice, were not intended to be of practical use in treating the sick. A better understanding of the aims of Thucydides, and of the precise implications of I 22.4, is shown by Klaus Weidauer, Thukydides und die Hippokratischen Schriften (Heidelberg, 1954), pp. 50–71.

Von Fritz’ wide-ranging paper, almost twice the length of any other, is more important for the problems it raises than for its actual conclusions, which do not seem to have commended themselves to his hearers. The debate has continued with a paper containing some criticism of von Fritz’ views by F. W. Walbank ‘History and Tragedy’, in Historia ix (1960) pp. 216–34.

The last four contributions, dealing with Roman historians, can be described briefly in this Journal. Hanell, in his account of early Roman historiography, discusses the relations between Philinus, Fabius Pictor and Naevius. He puts Naevius’ epic before Fabius’ history and sees Philinus’ ‘kathargische Propagandaschrift’ as the stimulus and main source for Naevius’ Roman reply. He makes a reasonable case, but the evidence is inconclusive. Syme’s paper, characteristically the shortest and most compact, and one of the most stimulating, is centred, needless to say, upon Tacitus, that ‘fierce and gloomy’ writer, who need not necessarily, as Syme reminds us, have been the opposite of ‘a robust, balanced and cheerful character. The writer and the man are not always the same person’, Durr’s contribution emphasises, and indeed over-emphasises, imperial influence on the Roman historical tradition during the first century or so of the Principate. At several points one cannot help feeling that the paper itself and the discussion which follows can hardly have been printed entirely in their original form. Momigliano’s impressive essay, opening up new perspectives, and far more amply supplied with references than any other, is a sequel to his British Academy lecture on Cassiodorus (1955). It is the more welcome for dealing with the twilight period of Roman history (as it seems to us) which is so unduly neglected at present in this country.

A volume such as this would benefit from revision by a single competent editor, who might have removed some of the puzzling (though seldom important) discrepancies, eccentricities and misprints found here. If, for example, the compiler of the Index, M. Alain Michel, was able to recognize Hemmerding in the ‘Hémeradique’ of p. 80, might not the name have been corrected in the text as well?

G. E. M. DE STE. CROIX.


When, half a century ago, Jacoby began his great work, he published a plan based on a view of organic development in Greek historical writing, and proceeded to carry it out. The plan changed in detail but the general principles have stood; the work is almost complete and the resulting gain for Greek history is immense. Jacoby already occupies a large space of every Greek historian’s bookshelves and a monumentum is hardly necessary, but the eightieth birthday could not be allowed to pass, and this volume of essays and reviews is the result. Of the 259 listed items of his published work, a selection has been made to form a sort of supplement to FGH itself. It begins with three general discussions of Greek historiography and works through the historians. Use as well as piety will prompt many to acquire the book.

Although there is no author or period of Greek history of which J. does not have intimate knowledge, naturally his writings have not covered all parts equally, and the attempt to represent all in this book is not entirely satisfactory. To have in one volume the essays on Pherecydes, Ion of Chios,
Charon of Lampscus, Thucydides (on the dating of the battle of Potidaia) and the Oxyrhynchus historian is most useful, and the essay entitled Griechische Geschichtsschreibung (published in 1926) deserves the widest possible audience, but some of the smaller articles and minor reviews, masterly though they are, must have done a lot to push the price too high for most. This is hardly a serious complaint, and it is better to have erred on the side of extravagance for some of these reviews are particularly deserving of a more accessible domicile, e.g. the generous review of Bury’s Ancient Greek Historians (ein gutes Buch, dessengleichen wir in Deutschland leider noch nicht haben... Was B. über Thukydides sagt, ist das Beste, was ich seit langem über ihn gelesen habe.)

J. is never easy to read. This is not just a matter of style but also of profundity, and he is merciless to the uninstructed. Yet the effort must be made. One may disagree quite often on minor points, but on the major issues he is a Jupiter that no common giant can assail.

G. L. Cawkwell.


This book is a study of ‘dependent places’ in Greek antiquity. The title is intentionally vague, for, as the author states (152), no term at once precise and all-embracing can be found for the phenomena he treats. These are, as he says in the preface (p. vii), the special intermediate forms in the frontier area of ‘Staats- und Völkerrecht’, where it is difficult to decide whether two or more communities should be called one state or several, or whether a dependent community has a separate existence or not. Because, as he freely admits, the examples do not fit into one pattern, G. has arranged his book in two parts: the first and larger part takes in the individual examples, such as Corinth and her colonies, and tries to give a plain exposition of the situation in each case; the second ‘general part’ of the book seeks to draw general conclusions from the particular examples. Such an arrangement may be unavoidable, but it has the drawbacks that repetition is frequent and the general themes tend to be divorced from the examples on which they should be based.

The book has grown out of a thesis (p. vi) and G. gratefully acknowledges his debt to his teacher Professor F. Hampf (ibid.). Hampf himself made a bold and original attempt to find a pattern behind some of the instances G. discusses in his article Poleis ohne Territorium (Klio 32, 1939, 1-60), and since G. frequently simply follows him, the thesis he advanced must be mentioned. He postulated the existence of several poleis in a legal sense whose territory was owned by another state, and found in this legal position the key to much foreign expansion by Greek states. For example, he laid down the principle that the mother city owned the territory of its colony, although the colony formed a poleis in a legal sense. In most of his examples, in this reviewer’s opinion, Hampf had to force the evidence to yield this sharp, legal distinction between people and territory. The concept poleis must, for example, be given a single strictly-defined nature, which in many of G.’s own instances it clearly did not possess. The difficulties which naturally follow are revealing. They include the facts that the people on Kaudos off Crete have no ethnic, although they have been given freedom and autonomy by Gortyn (40), and that communities of Athenian cleruchs were described in antiquity as poleis (103). A general consideration about such theories is that the Greeks themselves were advanced in political thought. It is therefore hazardous to suggest a political theory not found in ancient writers in order to explain ancient political circumstances. Such a procedure is only justified if the theory clearly illuminates the circumstances discussed. Here it seems rather to obscure the reality. It is not without significance that no historian from antiquity gives special attention to the phenomena G. discusses (as he notes, p. 179). It is therefore unfortunate that G., though himself well aware of the practical variety of the conditions he discusses, is also trying to follow the highly artificial and over-legalistic theory of Poleis ohne Territorium.

Apart from this G. is generally judicious. Most of his discussions of the individual instances are sensible and helpful. Thus of the relatively few detailed disagreements and criticisms only one or two need be mentioned. It is a pity that he follows Kahrstedt on Argos, Knossos and Tylissos (44 n. 1). There is no evidence in the famous inscription(s) that Tylissos alone was a dependent of Argos: it is on the same plane as Knossos, though less powerful. Vollgraff’s interpretation (see ibid.) is to be preferred. The section on Athenian cleruchs (98-112) is full and careful on the situation after 400, but it is a pity that the far more complicated problems of the early cleruchs are handled so much more briefly (110-12). That Lemnos was a cleruchy in the fifteenth century (against G., 102 n. 3) seems to be shown by the inscription IG P 948, where Lemnians are members of Athenian phylae. He seems to go beyond the evidence (Thuc. I 36.2) when he talks of the Kollegium of ἐπάθημαναρι as ‘die oberste Magistratur’ at Potidaia (131).

In the generalising second part G. is right to stress that the explanation for the conditions he treats lies in the constant opposition between the tendency to particularism in Greek states and the individual moves to expansion by ambitious powers (184). In such circumstances one meets what G. calls fluidity in the concept of the state (143). But, as G. himself notes (141, e.g.), we are really looking at many individual examples of practical power politics, so that the attempt at generalisation is in constant danger either of deserting the facts for artificially comprehensive theories, or, if true, of saying the obvious. It is to G.’s credit that he often succeeds, when he is not
forcing the distinction between territory and people, in steering between these two perils, as for instance in a good discussion of the varying degrees of dependence (175) and in his consideration of the chronological development of the problem (182 ff.).

Misprints are commendably rare: the page reference is missing at 1.8 on p. 175, and the misplaced C (I CIV) on p. 55 might mislead. The index is accurate and serviceable.

A. J. GRAHAM.


An Italian professor not only has to deliver his lectures, he has to provide cyclostyled copies ("dispense") of them for circulation among the many students who find it inconvenient or impossible to attend. The present volume consists of a series of extracts from the "dispense" of Gaetano De Sanctis' post-war lectures on Greek historiography, edited by his pupil Eugenio Manni. Seven historians are treated: Hippys (pp. 1-8), Antiochos of Syracuse (pp. 9-16), Philistos (pp. 17-42), Timaeus (pp. 43-69), Philinos of Akragas (pp. 70-4), Silenus of Kale Akte (pp. 75-7), and Diodorus (pp. 78-102). An Appendix (pp. 103-19) discusses the chronology of the tyrants of Syracuse and Akragas in the late sixth and early fifth centuries. In all but the shortest sections the evidence for the life and writings of each historian is first weighed, one or more fragments are critically discussed to illustrate problems and methods, and finally a general characterisation of the historian is attempted and his usefulness as a source evaluated.

Never ambiguous, never vague, De Sanctis handles the complex evidence with the ease and lucidity which sixty years' experience brings, and without the least trace of any dulling of the sharp edge of his mind. These last lectures of his are models of academic communication. Judged by English standards they would seem more appropriate to a postgraduate audience, but Roman students may well know more facts than their English colleagues. It is important to bear in mind the date of each chapter, since some of these courses (those on Hippys, Antiochos, Philistos and Timaeus) were delivered before the corresponding section of F. Gr. Hist. appeared.

For Jacoby Hippys is a Hellenistic historian (RE 8 (1913) 1927 ff., F. Gr. Hist. III B Kommentar, pp. 482-3), while De Sanctis, following the late ancient tradition, dates him in the fifth century. The argument turns principally on a comparison of F2 with an inscription from Epidaurus (IG IV 3, i, 121-4) of the second half of the fourth century. According to De Sanctis the Hippys text must be earlier than that of the inscription because it is 'il più ingenuo e insieme il più maligno e il più logico'. The argument is not convincing, and Jacoby's words in F. Gr. Hist. III B Kommentar (Noten), p. 287 ('Die von Wilamowitz und mir geübte Kritik an dem antiken Datum für Hippys wird durch F2 nicht berührt') though written in ignorance of De Sanctis' argument, still stand.

Antiochos receives sympathetic treatment. De Sanctis argues convincingly that he is Thucydides' sole source for early Sicilian history in book VI, and sees in him a follower of Hecataeus who 'esercitava consapevolmente sulla tradizione la sua critica, sebbene senza l'arditezza, anzi l'audacia di Ecateto', and who placed events in a firm chronological framework.

A number of fragments of Philistos are critically examined, and some new results attained. De Sanctis argues that F 45 shows Philistos drawing upon Thucydides for the early history of the western Greek world. This will not do; Philistos and Thucydides give different dates for the arrival of the Sicels in Sicily, and Philistos is following an author, perhaps Hecataeus, who believed the Ligurians have been the dominant people in the west (cf. Jacoby, F. Gr. Hist. III B Kommentar, pp. 570-1). On F 1 = P. Oxy. 665 De Sanctis takes the argument for attribution to Philistos a little farther than Jacoby F. Gr. Hist. III B Kommentar, p. 608 and provides a careful commentary. So too on F 2 = PS 1289, which Jacoby did not admit as a certain fragment, De Sanctis rejects Timaeus as a possible author on stylistic grounds, an argument which seems weak in such a trivial narrative passage. Diodor. xiii 14.4-5.5 is claimed by De Sanctis as a certain fragment of Philistos, and xiv 41-4 as Philistos via Timaeus. Both arguments are worthy of attention, though not conclusive.

On Timaeus De Sanctis in general takes a more positive view than has been usual, anticipating to some extent (the lectures were delivered in 1946-1947) the rehabilitation of Timaeus in T. S. Brown, Timaeus of Tauroctono (Univ. of California Publications in History, Vol. 55), 1958. His long examination of Polybius' critique of Timaeus in the matter of the origin of the Epizephyrian Locrians (Polyb. xii 5 ff.) and of the bull of Phalaris (Polyb. xii 25) results in the vindication of Timaeus as 'un critico coraggioso della tradizione' who 'lavorava nella scia di Ecateto e di Tucidide' (p. 67).

The section on Diodorus is a patchwork from the lectures of three different years. It expounds the problems of Diodorus' chronology with crystal clarity and as an example of 'Quellenforschung' studies books xviii-xx (history of the Diadochi). The unique source for Greek affairs is found to be Hieronymus of Kardia and for the tyranny of Agathocles Doris of Samos. The exposition is lucid, and few would dispute the results.

Lectures are not 'litera scripta', and one may question the propriety of publishing them, particularly since De Sanctis would certainly have revised them after reading Jacoby's F. Gr. Hist. III B. But the present volume has been tactfully edited, and will serve to introduce students to the strict canons of
NOTICES OF BOOKS

historical criticism observed by one of the masters of that delicate art.

ROBERT BROWNING.


The history of Thessaly is no easy matter. No surviving Greek historian has much directly on the subject, and what allusions there are frequently do no more than tantalise. As a result, the subject is often neglected. This book will greatly help to concentrate interest; it contains much that is new, and it is well balanced, keeping discussion within reasonable bounds. Given the nature of the evidence, there are many matters in which judgement must be suspended, and the book must be used with caution, but all in all, it is most stimulating and touches on many matters of general interest to students of Greek history.

The book opens with a challenge. S. argues that the Thessalians came to Thessaly by sea from the East Aegean; the first settlements were in the Malian gulf and the gulf of Pagasa, whence in the course of the eighth century they were pushed inland by the inhabitants of Achaia Phthiotis and Magnesia: only the ridge on which Pherae and Pagasa were situated remained in Thessalian control. Confirmation is sought from archaeology, place-names and religion. All this must be left to specialists. (On p. 75 they will read that Aleuas the Red manufactured in the late sixth century the evidence which has led so many to believe in a migration from Thesporgia.)

Passing to the establishment of the Delphic Amphictyony at the end of the seventh century, S. argues that the Amphictyony of Anthela was a sacred league opposed to the Thessalians, and the later Amphictyony was a grand reconciliation. Whatever the truth of this, S. unfortunately proceeds to drag in the Lelantine War by dating its conclusion to the end of the seventh century and ‘ben difficilmente può apparire casuale la circostanza che la costituzione del primo organismo panellenico sia avvenuta negli stessi anni in cui si concludeva il primo conflitto generale del mondo greco’.

Chapter III contains a new view of Thessalian expansion into Phocis and Boeotia. Aleuas the Red is down-dated to the end of the sixth century, successor to the joint ταρποι Scopas and Antiochus, son of Echecratidas, who are made to succeed the Cineas who was βασιλεύς in 512 (Hdt. V. 63); thus the last decade of the sixth century saw the subjection and organisation of the Perioeci peoples and the southward extension of Thessalian power, which was reversed in the first decade of the fifth century by the defeats of Ceresus and Hyampolis. Having got Thessaly so close to Athens, S. then feels justified in relating Thessalian policy to the fortunes of the Pisistratids and Cleomenes. All this leaves one most uneasy. To crowd all these figures into one decade makes a curious family history for the Aleuas: Aleuas appears to have acceded to power as a very young man (Plut. Mor. 492, which S. takes seriously), yet in 498 his sons are spoken of by Pindar (Pyth. X) as men ruling Thessaly. Further, one would expect that the subjection of Perioeci peoples took Scopas more than the year or two this chronology allows, and it is unlikely that it was so complete as to let Thessaly push southwards in the next year or two. When one investigates what forces S. to postulate this tightly-packed decade, one finds that, because the Delphic oracle supported the Alcmaeonids while Thessalian Cineas fought for Hippias, S. supposes that Thessaly lacked the majority in the Delphic Amphictyony which strict control of the Perioeci peoples would have given her. This presupposes a view of the Delphic Oracle which not all will share.

There is engaging discussion, both in the text and in the first two appendices, of the constitutional development of the κοιναί. S. argues that the ταρπαί was not an exclusively military office, and could be collegial, and that the league assembly may have been representative (cf. especially p. 331), but her most interesting discussion is centred round a theory that there was a major constitutional reform at the time of the Athenian failure to restore Orestes in 457. A central part in this is played by a new inscription from Delphi, dated to this very period, in which polemarchs are mentioned. S. points out that this is a blow to theories of reform in the 560s based on Σύμβολα 184, but her own theory is far from secure. The inscription has been published by Daux in BCH 82, 1958. S. supposes that it contains four polemarchs’ names in the genitive with πολεμάρχους τόνδε, and infers that polemarchs have already replaced the tetrarchs as the chief magistrates. Those who follow Daux rather than S. as to the cases of the names concerned, will hesitate to make this new inscription play so important a part in theorising about Thessalian constitutional history. It remains the case that we are distressingly ill-informed about the whole matter, and S. has sought a degree of precision the evidence does not permit. (Cf. discussion of a change in the status of Penestae pp. 122 and 326.) One can only admire the confidence with which it is asserted that ‘la principale innovazione portata dalla rivoluzione del 457 nella tagia, fu quella di aver dato ad essa carattere elettivo e non dinastico’.

The history of the fourth century is presented satisfactorily and should prove generally useful. The principal novelty is the theory that Philip was elected ταρποι as early as 352, but on this S. is not wholly convincing. Not everyone will be content with the excision of Thebani in Justin 8.2.1, and Demosthenes 1.22 and 6.32 are far from implying that Philip’s powers were conferred before 346; nor does the silence of the First Philippic favour the theory. The matter is of importance, and S. may be right, but the evidence is slight. In two matters many will more confidently dissent. First, the πατρί Πολίστεια is dated to 401-400, which vitiates the
discussion in Ch. VI. Secondly, in the chapter on Jason, the view is adopted that Jason intended to attack Persia. There is, of course, no question that he talked of it, but whether he seriously thought of doing so is very doubtful. His military preparations in 370 appear to be directed towards controlling Delphi.

With a subject so scarcely attested, disagreement is inevitable, but, even where one disagrees, this book is most interesting and worth while.

G. L. CAWKELL.


To span the whole gamut of Greek and Macedonian warfare in six short chapters is a massive task. A. reduces this to workable proportions by concerning himself largely with the factors which determined the character of warfare at each successive stage and which caused development from one stage to the next, and by employing an economical style which yet sacrifices nothing of precision or charm. The result is a book surprisingly full of information and of interpretations always interesting, sometimes provocative.

Chapter I deals with the hoplite-warfare peculiar to the typical city-state. A. emphasizes in a striking and novel way that this simple, stereotyped mode of fighting imposed a severe brake on military progress particularly because generals had so little occasion for applying any unusual strategic or tactical ability they might possess. Even conflict with Persia failed to inspire new ideas, for the _μαραθονόμοι_ and the Dorian spearmen amply vindicated the reputation of the 'hoplite-phalanx'. Greek warfare remained in a deep rut. A. seems unduly kind to Pausanias in linking his name with Miltiades and postulating these two as generals who displayed unconventional genius in restricting circumstances. Any Spartan _προσποιώτατος_ at Plataea, one imagines, would have known when to make the desperate charge which surprisingly but decisively turned the tables on the over-confident Persians. Pausanias seems rather to illustrate admirably the main thesis, and Miltiades remains the only genuine exception.

Proceeding to the 'development of infantry', A. considers the first effective employment of light troops in subsidiary operations during the Peloponnesian war, the results of increased professionalism, Epaminondas' tactical innovations, and the creation of the Macedonian phalanx. Epaminondas' main contribution was to show that battles are won 'not by evenly applied pressure along all the line', but by exerting maximum force at a selected vital point. The Macedonian phalanx was a developed version of the hoplite-line, modified to allow more supple manoeuvre and hence closer co-operation with more mobile units. A brief but penetrating analysis of the battle of Chaeronea (338) well demonstrates this suppleness and manoeuvrability.

Admirers of the trireme will no doubt raise their eyebrows when they read, in the account of naval matters, '...it may be a matter of some surprise that triremes ruled the waves for as long as they did'. Yet the limitations of the trireme are exhibited in a most convincing manner, though full attention is paid to their positive achievements and their performance particularly when directed by Athenian virtuosos. The chapter contains a broad survey of the importance in naval strategy of Cyprus, Bosporus-Hellespont, sources of heavy timber, and combined operations.

The fourth chapter is devoted to cavalry, elephants, and siegecraft. Apart from treatment of the more usual factors affecting Greek cavalry—absence of horse-shoes, stirrups, firm saddle, etc., a paradoxical and illuminating theory is propounded: the Macedonian cavalry of Alexander was superior to the Persian, because its horses were inferior and, therefore, more controllable. An apposite remark of Wellington's is quoted to lend authoritative support to this theory. As for elephants, A. effectively disposes of the suspect affirmation that these beasts were 'the tanks of ancient warfare'. He quotes one occasion when 'after warlike exchanges, the elephants were found to be on one side and the mahouts on the other', and concludes that they were as much like a broken reed as elephants can well be expected to be'. Under the heading 'siegecraft' considerable prominence is given to catapult-artillery, but its effect is somewhat underestimated. The success of Alexander who 'pressed his sieges home with fiery and resourceful determination' is contrasted with Philip II's previous failures at Perinthus and Byzantium, the implication being that will-power was the crucial factor. But it is not without significance that Alexander was the first besieger to possess torsion _πετροβόλου_ and that his _σφαίρα_ were probably of more advanced design than his father's. Again, A. overstates the Greek tendency to approach military engineering problems in a theoretical rather than a practical manner. Even in the case of catapults, he maintains, the Greeks 'were more fascinated by the problem of calibration than in the adaptation of materials'. Philon Byzantinus (Book IV) demonstrates that the Greeks at least explored further material possibilities, and proper determination of calibre was not just a pastime for pure mathematicians but a thing of the utmost practical importance for _ἀρματολος_ who were trying to build efficient engines.

Chapter V provides a fascinating review of the factors affecting 'major strategy'—finance, geography, man-power, use of a fifth column, conflict between general and demagogue. For instance, the point is well made that Sparta relieved her deficiencies in man-power by forming her league and by producing a long line of skilful diplomats, one of whose aims was to avoid using her precious army. There is little on operational strategy.
The final subject is generalship in battle. Though believing strength of character to be the prime quality desirable in a general, A. shows how the technique of command progressed by giving a series of vignettes (adorned with many a piquant comment) of personalities and their activities from Pangadas at Delium to the Diadochi and Philopoemen. Among other points, one finds that 'the progress . . . in generalship is most readily tested by the position of the general in battle'. A. well demonstrates the gradual development in this respect, but one cannot believe that any except possibly the very earliest hoplite-generals were ever actually in the front rank of their armies (cf. Plut. Lyc. 22.4, whence it appears that the Spartan king was normally protected by the reigning Olympic wrestling champion).

An appendix briefly reviews the main sources of military information.

The work excellently reproduces the atmosphere of Greek warfare and clearly embodies the mature deliberations of one who has for long been an enthusiastic and sympathetic interpreter of ancient military affairs.

E. W. Marsden.

HEYDEN (A. A. M. VAN DER) and SCULLARD (H. H.)


Readers, says Dr Scullard, introducing the English edition of this work, 'who already know and have enjoyed the *Atlas of the Bible* (1956) and the *Atlas of the Christian World* (1958) will know what to expect, but newcomers to the series will be pleasantly surprised to find the wealth of treatment covered by the word 'Atlas'. The claim is justified. What the publishers and editors have given us, with the help of an international team of contributors, is a succinct history of the culture of pagan Greece and Rome, lavishly illustrated with maps, photographs (including many new and excellent air-views), and a series of line-drawings illustrating the development of art and architecture. It has not always been easy to fuse these elements. The continuous history, which runs through the volume, cannot always be 'synchronised' with the illustrations; in pp. 108-17, for instance, ten pages of maps and plates come between an adjective and its noun, and the plans and line-drawings of the Maison Carrée at Nîmes and the basilica of Trajan appear on pages headed 'The Republic'. But this letterpress, well translated by Miss Mary Hedlund, gives a brief and reasonably up-to-date history of the classical world, embodying the facts wanted by an earnest 'general reader' setting out, whether in the flesh or only in these pages, on a course of Graeco-Roman travel.

The maps are clearly printed, and many of them adorned with brief but plentiful historical notes; a good example is no. 35 (p. 109), which contains, if one knows in what order to read it, a complete outline-history of the Second Punic War. Opinions will differ as to the value of these compositions, but they are often interesting, and will no doubt be found useful by some. The three-coloured Map I, which is purely physical, gives a good idea of the relief of the Aegean area. But it is the photographic plates (usually several photos to a page) which deserve the most unstinted praise. Freshly chosen and 'shot' by photographers and editors neither wedded to the familiar nor straining after novelty, they give an excellent idea of Greek and Italian landscape, of famous or otherwise interesting sites, and of works of art chosen either for their own sake or, with much judiciousness, as illustrations of daily life, military antiquities, etc. The recent studies of Roman centuriation are also not forgotten. It is only rarely that one could wish anything changed; for instance, the aerial view of the flat battlefield of Cannae is not very informative, and that of Lindos, on its rock by the sea (one of the many excellent pictures taken from a service aircraft made available by the Greek government), though good, is hardly as suggestive of the aspect of a polis nestling against its citadel as the familiar view, available from the last col on the way from Rhodes.

A few errors, mostly trivial, may be mentioned for the attention of any who may be recommending this excellent book.

P. 7: Salamvrius is misprinted Salamorans. P. 19, map 7, Iapethus should be Lapethus. P. 20, map 9: Is it true that 'study of dialect [my italics] shows that before the coming of the Achaeans the whole northern fringe of the Peloponnese must have been inhabited by Ionians'? Surely this story (first found in Hdt. i. 145) is simply part of a fifth-century Greek attempt to infer the ethnology of prehistoric Greece from legends. P. 28: Glâ is not 'upon a rock 263 ft. high'; that is the height above sea-level, but it is more like 25 ft. above the surrounding Kopaïs. P. 57, map 18a: Sagalassos misprinted Salagassus (and in 18, 'Minerva Lindia' would be better called Athena). P. 39: It is not true that a Greek citizen could never be made a member of another city. P. 48: Archaeology shows that Poseidonia was founded over a century before the date given (530). P. 50: for 'Thermal' read 'Thermæ'. P. 51: Heracleatus of Ephesus is called 'of Miletus' (correctly assigned on map 72). P. 54: the caption to a view of Athos sounds as if the 'republic of monks' were confined to the mountain. P. 62: Philip of Macedon was brother, not nephew, to his predecessor. P. 68: for 'Phaenadriada' read -es. P. 81: the probable connexion of the Boston and Ludovisi thrones might have been explicitly mentioned. P. 88: the Hermes of Praxiteles, in the line-drawing, is un-noted. P. 125: Legion I Adiutrix fought for, not against, Otho. P. 185 (map 72): Phrynichus (the tragedian) has lost his second h; and (the only serious error noticed), the authors of Ceos, Simonides, Bacchylides and Prodicus, have been by an oversight grouped among those of Cos.

A. R. Burn.

Toynbee's Study of History is a work full of 'curious information', stimulating in detail even to many, to whom its sweeping theories appear ill-founded; and the promised volume of maps to illustrate it has been awaited with interest. Unfortunately, it proves most disappointing. The sketch-maps, which show by circles, ovals and arrows on maps of the world or of large parts of it, the 'cradles' and 'radiation' of the civilisations and higher religions do not add much to the presentation of the author's theses (it is perhaps a pity that they could not appear in the text); and the larger and more detailed maps are often so crammed with names that they become difficult to use. An example of this, within the field of interest of our Journal, is western Asia Minor in Map 20, a large folding map of the Achaemenian Empire. By no means all these names appear in the text of the main work, at least if one may judge from their absence from the Gazetteer and from the Index in Volume X. It appears that Dr Toynbee has aspired to make of this volume an Atlas not merely to his Study, but to world-history at large; but unfortunately the scale of the volume and the fact that, no doubt for economic reasons, no use could be made of colour, except for a rather unpleasant shade of brown in a few places, have left him with insufficient resources for such an ambitious project. In the circumstances, it would have been better to have attempted less and obtained greater clarity.

Dr Toynbee has also failed to resist on occasions the temptation to present theories as though they were facts. Two more maps that fall within the purview of this Journal are Nos. 14 and 15, respectively The New Empire of Egypt and its Neighbours, c. 1458, and The Hittite and Minoan Worlds after 1350 (the author's full titles for each are much longer). In the former, the Minoan-Mycenaean world is encircled by a boundary-line, with an extension reaching to the Thermaic Gulf, and labelled 'Thalassocracy of Minos'; and north-west of this area we read 'Doric-speaking Greeks (Achaeans)'. This, to say the least, begs some questions. In the latter, the area covered by Homer's Catalogue of Ships is similarly encircled and labelled 'Thalassocracy of the Achaeans'. From the two maps together, therefore, the innocent non-specialist is invited to infer that, exactly between the mid-fifteenth and mid-fourteenth centuries, 'Doric-speaking Achaeans' from the frontiers of Albania had entered and taken over the Minoan world as far as Crete and Rhodes. Similarly in Map 24, The Extension of the Hellenic Civilisation Overland, 171 B.C., a solid though sinuous arrow-line running from Antioch via Seleucia-Ctesiphon and Ecbatana to Drangiana is marked 'Eucriaditas, 168 B.C.' That Eucriaditas came to Bactria first as a Selucid general was a theory of Tarn's, which may be right, and is recognised as such in Toynbee's text (viii, p. 410 n.); but here on the map one can only wonder whether such a representation of his journey was really necessary, or justified.

Both the gratuitous multiplication of details and the presentation of information which is far from certain are best exemplified in the above-mentioned 'Hittite' Map 14. Scores of places are assigned two or three names each, Hittite, modern Turkish, and sometimes Graeco-Roman too. Many of the Hittite names are not certainly identified, as the author knows well; so well, indeed, that he devotes an appendix of fourteen double-columned pages (an eighth of the space allotted to all the maps) to an attempt to elucidate the problems of Hittite geography. Clearly here as elsewhere, he has been fascinated by the details of his subject; a very proper experience for any scholar. But one is left wondering, both in what way all this detail illuminates the theme of his Study, and why he considers an Atlas, intended for a large non-specialist public, the proper place in which to publish his speculations?

A. R. BURN.


The late Charles Vellay, well known for his outspoken and strongly argued views on the true site of Troy, left this work ready for the press when he died in 1953. That it appears in this handsome form is due to the liberality of the Prince of Monaco; the pagination of the two volumes is continuous, the printing for the most part correct (a few errata are put right on p. 661), except for Greek words, in which strange things happen to the smooth breathing especially.

The author's intention was to make a complete corpus of all the Trojan traditions, taking that phrase in its widest meaning, for he begins with the local tales about Mt. Ida, the Skamandros and so forth and ends with 'survivances et traditions', which come down to Francus son of Hektor and ancestor of the French nation; he might have mentioned Brut as well, but does not pretend to be exhaustive in this particular offshoot of the saga. Readers, who it is to be hoped will include not classicists only but folklorists and students of literature generally, are helped by two very elaborate indexes, one of the authors quoted and another of names and a few important words such as temple.

Thus the work is a convenient and on the whole dependable source-book for future researchers in more than one branch of study. It is therefore necessary to point out some few faults which, once seen, are easily allowed for and not really misleading. Vellay does not seem always to have used very modern texts of his authorities, who range from
Homer down through Dares and Dictys to mediaeval Byzantine compilers. For instance, on p. 417, he quotes Daniel's Servius from some antiquated edition which corrupts the place-names badly. Also, the warning 'pseudos' should be prefixed to the names of several authors, including Plutarch and others of considerable importance. Here and there a lack of acquaintance with recent studies of ancient literature betrays itself; thus in the index of authors, it surely is unnecessary to speak of 'Simonide d'Amorgos' when it is well known that his name was Simonides. And (p. 241) why write Phavorinus for Favorinus in the twentieth century?

Rather more serious than these and similar small details, of which one may justly say emendaturus, si licisset, erat, is a certain credulity with regard to what classical and post-classical writers tell him. He does indeed make some allowance for pure invention, as p. 137, n. 4 (Ovid), p. 171 ('l'imagination des mythographes'); but again and again, especially in his introductory remarks, he inclines to suppose that practically all the many variants, differences and distortions of the legends go back to some kind of early tradition, Epic or other. He seems never to have fully realized how freely traditional material was handled, especially by poets from Euripides on, nor how largely this was apparently due to the conviction that all the events recorded had been deliberately embroidered by poets of earlier times, with the corollary that if a later writer chose to alter their pattern or add to it, he had full licence to do so. It is therefore advisable that a user of the compilation, when he has read one of the tales recorded and comes to the list of authors at the end of it, should go to those authors for himself and consider what claim each of them has to represent anything older than his own date, also whether or not he deals much in paradox, like the repentant Stesichorus (Helen never went to Troy at all) or Dion Chrysostom flattering the people of Novium Illium (Troy was never taken). It is but too easy, when confronted with a formidable mass of tradition real or other, to confuse the side-lanes with the main road and come to grief in a Bypath Meadow.

But when all criticisms are made, this remains a work of vast diligence and a storehouse to which I can think of no parallel for all who can read limpid French and are 'besy for to bere up Troye'.

H. J. ROSE.


This short and extremely useful study, with its compact references, is devoted to the latrodi dēmyouforotēs of Hellenistic times as its main theme, though naturally earlier periods are treated for their contributions to creating these. The author’s chief point is that comparisons with a modern Health Service, such as that of Great Britain, are thoroughly misleading. Thus these doctors would not have been praised in Hellenistic decrees for having given constant and devoted service without fee, if in any case they had appointments requiring this as a duty. The more likely conclusion, he argues, is that they received from the State an annually renewable income for remaining in one city, so as to be available at all times in an age when doctors were still migratory, as they had been earlier. This did not exclude private practice with fees. (Any more than panel doctoring in England did before the Health Act.) Side by side with the dēmyouforotēs were other doctors who had no public appointment. The dēmyouforotēs would differ from these by his greater reputation and probably longer experience, and he might give advice to the authorities on public health. Though our information is still rather scanty, this conclusion is not contrary to the evidence of inscriptions, and is consistent with the amateurish methods of the Greeks. Certainly a Health Service with many auxiliaries and fixed rules is most unlikely. Nor can the practice of the Roman period, with its organisation of public services, be projected back into earlier ages. In particular the public physician of Roman Egypt was also heir to an elaborate Egyptian tradition of organised medicine.

The author is by no means civil to his predecessors and may often be unjust, but in social questions and in the history of science a periodic stripping away of modern preconceptions about the ancient world does no harm.

E. D. PHILLIPS.
of a climax in the history of Greek philosophy, and many more books will be written describing the intellectual battle between them. Professor Guthrie is content to sketch the positions of the two sides. Since he decided to concentrate upon the world of biology, and the battle was largely fought in the field of cosmology, he could certainly do no more here; we may hope for more, no doubt, on other occasions.

Most of the book is devoted to describing, first, the natural philosophers' views on the origins of life, then their notion of the life-giving soul and its connexion with the cosmos as a whole and with the rest of the living world, and, finally, two contrasted ideas about the development of civilisation—as a process of decline from a Golden Age, and as a progress from a primitive 'brutish' state. Professor Guthrie is to be congratulated on presenting in a polished and elegant form a great deal of information from a wide range of sources, many of them probably unknown to the non-Classical hearer or reader. Some readers may in fact be bewildered by the wide range in time; on p. 74, to quote at random, we find Plato, Aristotle, Dicaearchus, Porphyry, Empedocles, Hesiod and Lucretius. Certainly all is well if the reader keeps his head—the company has all been properly introduced; but a chronological chart at the end might perhaps have been kind.

Although not designed primarily for Classical scholars the book has much to interest them, particularly in the thirty pages of notes collected at the end. There is an extended examination of texts relating to spontaneous generation, and some excellent remarks on the meaning of the Prometheus-myth in Plato's Protagoras.

In appraising the achievements of ancient thinkers for a modern audience, ought one to stress their conclusions or their arguments? Both at once, perhaps. The atomists are interesting because of their atomism, but we get a wrong idea of it if we fail to notice with what arguments they justified their theory. Similarly with the ancient 'evolutionists'. Professor Guthrie lays stress on the evolutionary views of the early Greek thinkers—notably Anaximander and Empedocles—and adds: 'It was, one must admit, Aristotle who burdened science for centuries with the dogma of the fixity of species.' But this is too unfair. Which had the better arguments—Empedocles who said 'arms wandered bare for lack of shoulders and eyes strayed alone in want of foreheads', or Aristotle who said 'man begets man'?

D. J. Furley.


Chroust begins by stating an uncompromising position. We do not know the man, he says; we only know the myths and cannot extract historicity from the correction of Xenophon's myth(s) by Plato's or of Plato's by Xenophon's. Plato is further from hard facts than others because of 'artistic temperament and talents and self-revelatory individualism'. Xenophon's Socratica belong to the literary genre of ἔργα Σωκρατικά and are a vehicle for his own views. The exception is Memorabilia 1.11.1—1.2.64. Here we have nothing more first-hand than the rest, but we have here his more significant ἀπολογία: for it is a detailed answer to the κατηγορία of Polycrates, and the κατηγορία can be reconstructed out of this part of the Memorabilia and the Apologia Socratis of Libanius. By p. 100 Chroust has in fact reconstructed the κατηγορία of Polycrates for us in full detail. One might like the book better if this reconstruction had been its avowed aim.

But worse is to come. Apparently we can best hope to detach myth from Socrates by distinguishing Antisthenes from Diogenes (our old friend the παραγιόμενος turns up again) and then detailing the 'Antisthenian-Cynic' elements in Xenophon's Socrates. In so doing we seem to be turning the same material over several times, and we are not surprised to find in the notes (at the end of the book and numbered 1 to 147b) internal cross-references. This process unearths interesting details and shows wide-ranging research on the author's part; but its value is for anyone investigating the commonplaces and the more revolutionary elements in early fourth-century moral and political doctrines. It is a corrective to concentration on Plato, or on Isocrates, or on Alcidamas and the 'liberal temper'. But is it much help on the 'Socratic question'? Only if one concedes the axiom that Antisthenes is everywhere. Polycrates used materials found in the writings of Antisthenes, but 'as a matter of fact we would be inclined to surmise that on certain important points Antisthenes probably deviates rather considerably from the views which Socrates might have held' (p. 215). Probability is hardly the guide even to probability, it seems! Later on the same page we read that we have to adjudge the controversy (which is really over Antisthenes and only nominally over Socrates) 'faced not only with the nearly complete loss of all the writings of Antisthenes, but also with the total absence of any authentic works by Socrates'.

Has Chroust really helped us to be unflinching realists knowing that we know nothing? For the dangerous Plato, and even Aristophanes too, play about his pages. They are only secondary witnesses, but there they are. Chroust's notes mention Hackforth's Composition of Plato's Apology with respect, and his preface refers us at least to the bibliography in the great work of V. de Magalhães-Vilhena. It is a pity Chroust has not absorbed more from these works—from the former a realistic evaluation of all kinds of evidence from a standpoint fixed in generally accepted history, and from the latter the realisation that one can be miles away from Schleiermacher and yet find in Plato—more in his asides and implications than in his dogma—some of the best help available to us to reconstruct Socrates; for Chroust admits at the end that there must be a real light to be so variously
refracted. We all admit that the literary genre of Socratic discourses creates a primary uncertainty in the Socratic question. But this genre is neither self-generated nor self-contained, and it is a retrogression in criticism, not an advance, to assume that a blank ignorance of 390 B.C. prevailed in 393 B.C.

J. B. Skemp.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

Aristote. Les Parties des Animaux. [Bude]

This new text and translation of the Parts of Animals has the advantage over A. L. Peck's Loeb edition (1937, revised 1945) of being provided with an adequate apparatus criticus, though for most English readers this will naturally be offset by the translation of many technical biological terms from Greek into an equal degree of obscurity in French. As far as a foreigner can judge, however, the translation is accurate, and it certainly reads smoothly. Brief notes are printed at the foot of the page, and where this will not hold them all, continued in an appendix at the back of the book. These are mainly confined to necessary guidance, but include a few interesting references to recent works of scholarship. The translator is much indebted to the commentary on the Parts of Animals published in 1943 by I. Düring, whose interpretation is followed in many disputed passages.

In a clear and concise introduction Louis discusses the place of the Parts of Animals in Aristotle's work as a whole. He follows Nuyens in finding it an amalgam of writings from different periods of Aristotle, and his book, in the first book, which has a more general character than the other three, to be intended as an introduction to the whole series of biological works. A few very good pages are given to a description of Aristotle's rather irregular style of writing in these treatises. But Louis does not regard this as merely a result of their being originally lecture-notes; on the contrary he believes they were meant for a fairly wide circle of cultivated readers. This introduction, though brief, makes good use of recent studies in Aristotelian chronology and is well worth reading.

In a fairly thorough evaluation of the manuscript tradition Louis rejects the authority of the MS. Y, which gives a much rewritten version of several pages near the end and was mainly followed therein by Peck. He accepts Düring's view that Y was written by an officious 'improver'. In general Louis' text sticks pretty closely to the best MSS., even to the extent of keeping the frequent anacolutha, ellipses and other constructions of varying degrees of awkwardness. Wherever it is at all possible to make out the sense these passages are left alone, as in Düring's commentary. Nevertheless, there are some places where one might prefer other readings or emendations to those chosen by the judicious Louis, e.g. at 651b11 ἀδικησμόν (Throt) for ἀδίκον παθητικόν (despite Michael Ephesius' characteristically plausible extenuation), at 663a16 τοῦτοῦ (Düring, with some MSS.) for τοῦτο, at 675b6 πρῶτον (Peck) for πρῶτον. At 673a17 the ‘Ἀρχαῖαν of Z surely fits the context better than Kaplan, as Peck points out. The reading of P adopted at 682a7, οὐ δυνάμει δ' ἐνεργεῖ τοιεύ μόνον ἐν, ἄνωμέν δ' ἐν πέλεο, has been justly described by Düring as 'sheer wish-wash'. On the other hand, at 683a17 I find Düring's defence of ἐπιστροφάς, which is kept by Louis, unconvincing against Throt's ἐπιστροφή. Peck's δικήρη δοτικά is rightly accepted at 664a28. At 652b32 the text reads πολλάδε, whereas the translation gives 'troubles'. This is evidently based on the emendation βολερός, which has been inferred from William of Moerbeke's turbido and Michael Scot's turbid, though none of these readings are given in the apparatus at this point.

On the whole and within the limitations of the Budé series this is a very satisfactory edition. One may hope that more Budé volumes of Aristotle are in preparation, for this is only about the sixth to appear so far.

E. R. Hill.


A foreword states that this book is based on a thesis written in 1940 and after various vicissitudes revised in 1956. Most of the author's references to other writers are taken from long-standing works, but some more recent books and articles are listed or discussed; see (e.g.) note 68, pp. 117-19.

In this study of the chronology of Plato's pre-Republic dialogues, the author's main contention is that the Gorgias stands at the outset of a fully planned series, while the Protagoras, Meno and Phaedo form a sequence at the end of the period. Böhme bases his inquiry on the evidence of ethical theory—discussion of the nature of ἀρετή and its attainment, and of the question τίς βιοτέρων. It must be recognised at the outset that almost anything can be proved by confining one's study of a Platonic dialogue to one topic alone.

After reviewing other pronouncements on the early chronology, especially regarding the position of the Protagoras, the author sets out to place the Gorgias and the Crito. By establishing ten parallels between passages in the former and brief references in the latter, he reaches 'the (generally unknown) fact that the Kriton is apparently a complement to the Gorgias' (English summary, p. 155). The Apology is similarly attached to this small group, which is held to mark (starting with the Gorgias) the opening of Plato's literary career shortly after the death of Socrates. At the other end of the period under review, B. works out a similar set of parallels which place the Meno directly after the Protagoras, its abrupt opening being thus explained. Meno again leads on
to Phaedo — probable enough, though the only passages cited from the latter are taken from the discussions of true ἀρετή and ἴδων ἔοι in early chapters. Laches is prefixed to this group as a 'prelude' (p. 90).

Other early dialogues, Euthyphro, Charmides, Lysis, Ion, ‘Thrasyymachus’, are conjecturally placed, though not arranged in order, between these two main groups. The Euthydemos is hardly mentioned, but is by implication (p. 146) set, with the Cratylus, later than the Phaedo.

In placing the Gorgias early and the Protagoras late in this series, Böhme follows Taylor, whose judgement on literary grounds he quotes (p. 13). It must remain a question how far the 'undramatic and rather unduly diffuse' character of the Gorgias justifies its relegation to the very outset of Plato's work as a writer, or again why after a manifesto of such length and earnestness, closing with an elaborate myth, he should have gone on to produce a series of slight and 'aporetic' dialogues. The Protagoras is plausibly set well on in the period. But to append the Meno directly to it, on the ground that the ostensible subject is the same, is to ignore great differences of style and tone. There is much of interest in this essay and in the copious notes appended to it; but one can only deprecate its single-line approach to a complex problem.

D. TARRANT.


These three volumes appear in a series entitled 'Clasicos Politicos', which already contains the Republic, the Gorgias and some works of Aristotle. The parallel text is in each case preceded by an introduction and supported by critical and explanatory notes. The translations are both faithful and readable. The introductions to the two longer dialogues, in particular, contain much well-documented and valuable material; the editor of the Phaedrus discusses several aspects of the work and ends with an interesting study of 'El Fedro y la Posteridad'. For the Meno we are given detailed exposition of the text tradition (with a photograph frontispiece giving part of the MS. Y) and of the sequence of translations; also an elaborate note on the crux geometrica at 87 a-b.

This interesting series is good evidence of recent activity in Platonic studies in Spain.

D. TARRANT.

ANTON (J. P.) Aristotle’s Theory of Contrariety.


Pp. xi + 253. £1 5s. 6d.

This book contains a review of Aristotle’s philosophy based on the various types of opposed principle which are fundamental to it, e.g. form and privation, actuality and potentiality, prior and posterior, coming-to-be and passing-away, up and down, hot and cold, wet and dry, and so on. Most of these, of course, in one form or another are likely to be found at the bottom of any philosophy that has been worked out in detail. The intention here is no doubt to illuminate Aristotle’s theories by looking at them from this unifying point of view. But it does not work. Aristotle’s philosophy is much clearer and more assimilable in its original somewhat higgledy-piggledy series of expositions than when strung together on this artificial thread and hung about with this stultifying mass of subsidiary exegesis. Contrariety as a subject is of necessity highly abstract, but Professor Anton’s style of writing does nothing to make it more comprehensible. In fact it suggests so much under its weight of grossly abstract expressions and super-generalised formulations that it passes intermittently into the unintelligible.

For what sort of reader is the book intended? Others in the same series, e.g. Cornford’s expositions of some of Plato’s more abstruse dialogues, have been notable for their clarity and helpfulness. They can be put straight into the hands of a student, and yet have much to interest the mature scholar. But any student who is required to wade through Aristotle’s Theory of Contrariety is likely to be choked off Aristotle for good. And yet there is not much in it that will strike the more experienced Aristotelian as particularly new or well put. What there is is buried in such a quantity of laborious analysis that one’s brain has been plunged into insensibility by the time one comes upon it. I never expected to find a book on Aristotle in which the actual quotations from him (here given mostly in the standard translations) stand out from their surroundings with luminous clarity, but on many a page of this book it is so.

Professor Anton rarely uses simple words if there is a chance of parading forth some pompous and obfuscating polysyllables. For instance, in this sentence on p. 175, ‘What the nature of diurnal ethical practice denied Socrates felt should be granted by the essence of ethical reason itself’, no dark hints are really being dropped about Socrates’ nocturnal ethical practices. The word simply means ‘daily’ or ‘ordinary’, or, as often, it could have been left out altogether. On p. 198 Aristotle is said to have led ‘a life replete of research’. Some of the writing suggests a poor feeling for the classical origins of modern words, e.g. ‘the meandering wanderings characteristic of novel explorative undertakings’ (p. 174). ‘Each particular sense viewed from its products is a kind of knowledge, gnosis, and its depreciation as such is without justification’ (p. 196). There are some unnecessary and barbarous neologisms, e.g. ‘Intellecting frequently operates co-operatively’ (p. 137), ‘the limits of survivability’ (p. 142), ‘stoichiology’ and ‘invece’ (passim). A word which is constantly used in the last chapter is ‘mesotis’, for ‘mean’, an extraordinary
and superfluous solecism. There are numerous sentences of a tiresome clumsiness, e.g. 'it would have carried this study to unnecessary length and to repeat what has already been the object of much literature on Aristotle's ethics' (p. 186), 'the motion of the soul must be either of the four types' (p. 226), 'Touch precedes the other senses in the sense that . . . ' (p. 234), 'Since he (man) cannot be totally divine he can be supremely human and becomingly divine' (p. 198). The printing of Aristotelian titles in a note on p. 109 makes one wonder about the author's Latin. For sheer philosophical gobbledegook take these examples: 'All movement is essentially connected with the completion or career of the structural interdependence of all the functions present in a locus for the fulfilment of the subject's nature or eidos or end' (p. 59), 'To the delight of the scientist, reason as a natural event was found to be universally distributed as a fact of psychology' (p. 176).

The book is not without observations of some insight, though it also contains some judgements which, so far as I can understand them, I should reject. The most astounding is the characterisation of Aristotle on p. 176 as 'the philosopher without a speculative cosmology'. (Has Professor Anton never looked into the De Caelo?) But only the most dogged of jargon-jugglers, who can take 'subject-in-process' and 'distributive being' (passim) in his stride, will get much out of this study. Perhaps it would have some success if it were translated into German. For most English readers it will be simply a case of obscurum per obscurs.

E. R. Hill.

---

Car Eusèbe est ordinaire un copiste exact. Et il y a ici entre les deux textes parallèles 10 variantes en moyenne par page, soit une variante toutes les 3 lignes. L'historien ecclésiastique a pu trouver le texte qu'il cite à la Bibliothèque de Césarée fondée par Origène. Et vraisemblablement cette édition est celle à laquelle fait allusion le scholion d’Enn. IV, 4,29, signalant que, d’après Eustochios, la division des traités était différente. C’est peut-être cette édition que Porphyre lui-même avait sous les yeux quand il composait ses Sententiae. Partout où il se trouve réalisé, l’accord des deux éditions est signe d’authenticité. Leur désaccord suggère nombre de corrections.


Une précieuse nouveauté de cette édition consiste à présenter en face du texte des Ennéades les textes arabes correspondants (dans la traduction anglaise de G. Lewis), et même à marquer par des italiques les formules qui reproduisent littéralement le texte grec. Ces fragments arabes sont empruntés à l’ouvrage intitulé Théologie d’Aristote, à l’Epistola de scientia divina découverte par Paul Kraus, enfin aux divers morceaux plotiniens groupés sous le nom de Dicata sapientis graeci.

En 1937, le P. Henry croyait que la Théologie d’Aristote contenait les notes prises par Amélias aux cours de Plotin (Vie de Plotin, 3). Cette thèse avait suscité de vives objections. Elle faisait de la Théologie une source antérieure à notre édition porphyrienne et donc plus autorisée. Abandonnant maintenant cette position, le P. Henry estime désormais que les fragments arabes sont la traduction d’un manuscrit grec très ancien des Ennéades, déjà peut-être développé en commentaire. Ils ne permettent donc guère de corriger notre texte grec, mais ils sont un précieux témoignage de l’interprétation qu’en donnait dès le début le monde arabe et syriaque. Quand Plotin déclare dans VI, 7,9 que tout intelligible est une pensée, la Théologie commente ainsi: ‘For if that is so, mind cogitates about the object of its cogitation, while the object of its cogitation is not cogitative. This is absurd, and if this is absurd the first mind does not cogitate about anything that has no mind.’

Aucun plotiniste ne pourra ignorer cet admirable instrument de réflexion.

Jean Trouillard.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


This book begins with the surprising claim that no previous study has been devoted to its subject. In fact the bibliography is vast and there is little that is new in the present investigation. Essentially it is a series of studies of individual moral concepts. After two very sketchy chapters on the Homeric Age, and the Values of Early Greek Society, which show no awareness of discussions as those summarised in books like W. C. Greene's Moira, we have accounts of the Cardinal Virtues, Friendship, Eros, Philanthropia, Homonoea and Autarchy, followed by two chapters on Roman ideals, one on Judaism and one on Agape. The presentation is traditional apart from certain aberrations. The derivation of Plato's thought from Indian originals, probably mediated by the Pythagoreans, is regarded as certain, Sappho's second poem — γαλαξται μοι κιριος — becomes 'the famous description of the emotions of Brochio's lover' and the Lalage of Horace's Integra vitae has become not a demi-mondaine but 'a little girl ... perhaps the daughter of Horace's estate manager'. On the other side Tarn is followed too uncritically on Homonoea and the Brotherhood of Man.

The general thesis is the inadequacy of Greek moral values in comparison with the Christian ideal of Agape. The principal moral values of the ancient world are regarded as 'incapable of providing that basis for an universal morality for which people were seeking'. Three (really four) reasons are educed — on the pagan view the attitude of god to man is one of condescension, the pagan values have no function except when reciprocated, morality cannot be expressed solely through particular principles, and finally introspection is a dangerous test for a moral standard. The main burden of the argument seems to rest on the last two considerations, both of which are in fact unsound. The virtues of the ancient world did not rest upon introspective standards. Ferguson's failure to understand this is surely related to a second failure in comprehension. The Hellenic virtues, with which we are mainly concerned, were not simply particular moral virtues adopted in isolation from each other. Through the general doctrine of Areté they were related, in ever varying ways it is true but none the less always, to a doctrine of man. The Hellenic doctrine of man likewise underwent many changes and developments, but it was always there and gave an underlying unity to Hellenic moral thought. This is never discussed in the present book, and the effect of this omission is to load the discussion improperly in favour of the Christian view. The true comparison is between Hellenic doctrines of god and man and Christian doctrines of the same. Certainly Christianity need fear no such comparison and to avoid the comparison is no contribution to the history of thought.

G. B. Kerferd.


As might be expected from the site and the date, this careful exploration and exposition of the archaeological remains at Thasos has yielded nothing very exciting or unexpected. The finds throw interesting sidelights on the history of a community chiefly mercantile, which, after some embarrassment caused in the days of Brutus and Cassius by their using it as an arsenal, was left generally in peace by the Roman power, to preserve at least the form of its old ways with a few necessary additions, such as the introduction of the cult of the Divi Imperatores. That its commercial importance declined, the effect no doubt of Roman competition, is plain from the history of its once widely used currency, which for a time seems almost to have been the dollar of the Thracian region (p. 5 ff.). Yet the island continued to all appearances to enjoy a modest prosperity; it had after all its favourable situation and its good wine, sold according to a standard measure, the simple apparatus for which has been found (p. 101). Even the ill-fated third century A.D. does not seem to have brought anything like ruin, for the time being at all events (p. 187). Various inscriptions testify to the existence of rich and public-spirited men, although there must at times have been a shortage of eligible candidates for expensive public posts, else it is hard to see why a god now and then was elected a magistrate (p. 118). However, these and other conclusions of a like kind must still remain tentative, for, as the authors point out (p. 153), the material is still very imperfect.

Coming to details, we find many little indications that one reason for the generally good relations of the island with the Roman government was a cheerful willingness to become superficially Roman, a tendency extending to all classes of society (p. 135), although the population did not cease to be fundamentally Greek or Graeco-Thracian, as the names on numerous inscriptions attest (e.g. p. 147). As indicated above, official Roman cult made its way in; we find for instance a Διος Σάβατοι ιερεύς, and inscriptions 179 and 180 (pp. 66, 69) show that while Claudius would not accept a temple when it was offered him, apparently he raised no objection to having a priest, whose pious conduct of his office is praised in the latter inscription. But the native cults continued to flourish, that of Herakles of course and also that of Theagenes, as he is called for the first time on an inscription (no. 322, p. 157), thus agreeing with the literary evidence (epigraphy had so far known only the form Theogenes), and apparently styled θεός; also, thus confirming the statement of Pausanias, vi. 11, 8.1 The cult of the dead, or

1 Plate xxxviii, 2 shows clearly τὸ θεός ἠτέλειος, with what looks like ω before it; the authors make out another ω above, hence the restoration τὸ θεός ἠτέλειος is at least plausible.
rather the reverent tendance of their tombs, led as usual to the production of a considerable amount of not very inspired and not always correctly metrical verse. In Imperial times the regular, though not invariably formula for a prose epitaph is (name) προοριζόμενος χάιρε. Besides this, hero-cult went on with some new developments. There was a festival, presumably annual, the ἡροομεία, and a public benefactor was on occasion admitted to a share in this after his death (p. 93, inscr. 192, 22-3). On the whole, the traditional cults seem to have continued very much as before (p. 183). The great innovation, in Thasos as elsewhere, was Christianity, which clearly was vigorous and flourishing at all events from the fourth century onwards, if not earlier; the authors even ask if St. Paul may not have visited the island during his journey from Philippi to Alexandria Troas (Acts xx. 6); see pp. 192-7. Matters of minor interest are some oddities of nomenclature and phraseology. A decree communicated from Lampakos (inscr. 171, p. 23) begins its covering letter importantly with a fairly literal translation of the familiar Latin formula S.V.B.E.V. The date is apparently not far from 80 b.c., and it would seem that to show some knowledge of Latin was respectable. That such knowledge did not go very deep is suggested by the odd forms which Roman names take; the sepulchral inscriptions, nos. 239 and 240 (p. 128) introduce us to a Satroneilos and an Ollerios who may be Saturninus and Valerius, though an error or two of the stone-cutter may have helped in the deformation. But some of the Greek names are odd enough; Empeithousa (p. 131, inscr. 246) appears to be new, and p. 165 shows us a man whose father was apparently called Philosophos; another novelty is Elephon (no. 298, p. 126).

Every effort has been made to furnish the book with all the aids needed for handy consultation (the bibliography and indexes are very elaborate) and to include every scrap of material; hence on pp. 223 ff. we find several inscriptions which for one reason or another had escaped earlier publications, especially a few of date earlier than 156 b.c., but discovered too late to be included in Vol. I of this work (reviewed in JHS bxvii, 1957, pp. 341-2). It would be superfluous to praise such diligence.

H. J. Rose.

TAYLOR W.) MYCENAEAN POTTERY IN ITALY AND ADJACENT AREAS. Cambridge: University Press. 1958. Pp. xx + 204. 27 text figures, 2 maps, 17 plates. £2 15s. 6d.

In this easily intelligible and very readable book, evidence hitherto scattered and relatively unknown is brought together in detail to give a survey, based on the archaeological facts, of Mycenaean influence in the West. The main interest lies in the date, distribution, and possible origin of the pottery, which forms the bulk of the evidence.

The contact with the Aeolian Islands begins re-markably early with Matt Painted ware (though not necessarily of MH date) and has its floruit in Myc. I and II. If, as is suggested, a partial reason for this was the need for obsidian which could not be obtained from Melos because of Cretan influence there, this must be remembered in discussion of Cret-Mycenaean relations in Myc. II.

The evidence from Scoglio del Tonno, however, is even more impressive. The pottery is shown to go back to the earlier part of Myc. III A and to continue into III C and perhaps beyond. Moreover, a large part of the material seems to find its closest parallels with Rhodes, particularly in the earlier period, and several features are ones often associated only with Rhodes. Here I feel we must treat the evidence with particular care until the Mycenaean pottery, known from publication, is more representative. Mycenaean influence in Rhodes itself was not extensive until the later part of III A, and further evidence to support the existence of such a remarkably long trade route is needed. Makryasia, the site near Olympia, mentioned as a possible intermediary point, is not itself on the coast, and though much new evidence is available from Elis excavation is badly needed. The large piriform jars from Mycenae (PAE 1950) are of identical fabric and decoration with the rest of that pottery and therefore are not likely to have come from Rhodes, but Karageorghis has suggested an itinerant 'Rhodian' as the painter of the Duck Vase, which comes from the same area. At Pylos there was obviously a strong eccentric local tradition derived from Palace Style amphorae. Some mainland area may well prove the origin of both the eastern and western manifestations of the various 'Rhodian' features.

The character and distribution of Myc. III C is becoming steadily more important historically and chronologically. In this book considerable evidence from three sites in South Italy is presented as belonging to this period. However, the criteria by which the stylistic division is made are not stated and on several occasions are obviously subjective and not those of Gurumark. Moreover, much that is classified as 'Myc. III B or C' would be better as 'Probably III B'. General discussions of fabric, which is often the only apparent reason for assigning late date, would have been useful. It appears that there are relatively few contacts with the main streams of III C though there are parallels with the Ionian Islands. Exceptions are the Octopus stirrup jars and here the recently discovered examples from Monenvasia and Perate must be remembered.

Unfortunately the format and discursive style, especially in the catalogues, have led to the omission of important facts (e.g. a diameter for p. 116, no. 151 if it is not to be considered a tankard). This with the poor quality of some illustrations makes the material difficult to assess adequately. No profiles are given of imported wares (could p. 91, no. 44 be FS 504 on which this design is common?) and the more unusual decorations might well have been
shown in line-drawings. The cross references and index are more than adequate but a diagrammatic summary would have been valuable. In other points of detail I would query the identification of the patterns of p. 40, nos. 102, 103. The error p. 84, n. 4 in identifying Pae 1950, p. 208, fig. 5: 3 as Foliate Band instead of Multiples Stem leads to the omission of this as a parallel to p. 89, no. 34. The name applied to FS 312 is not consistent, though this is indeed a multi-purpose vessel. Here the examples from Mycenae, House of Sphinxes, and the ideogram 214 on Ta 709 may be noted. In the quoting of parallels it would have been useful if the Furumark reference for specific vessels had been used. To quote separately the type number and the vase from which the type is taken is misleading. A few points of connexion with the pottery from Mycenae are quoted but many more might be made. Unfortunately the large deposit of Myc. III A2e pottery of domestic origin from the 'Atreus Bothros' is not used. For instance bowls like p. 45, no. 3, are a common feature there, and there are parallels for p. 92, no. 48 already published. The early occurrence of Scale F 70: 8 has also already been noted at Mycenae.

These failings, however, are minor and will annoy only those who must study every sherd. The book gives a serviceable presentation of the pottery and, with its summary of the more nebulous factors, paints as clear an overall picture as can now be determined.

ELIZABETH WACE FRENCH.


This admirable work is the result of Dr Verdheils' researches while he was archaeological ephor of Thessaly. It is divided into two parts, the one setting out the material, the other discussing it: both parts are important.

The first section does not indeed publish in detail all the Protogeometric vases of Thessaly, as for most of the sites this has already been done. The great virtue, however, of this section of V.'s book is that it contains the detailed publication of a whole new body of material, that from the rich tholos of Kapakli, close to Volos. (Not that this material is exactly new, as the excavation of the tomb was reported in 1914.) The vases found span a considerable period of time, from Protogeometric down to the sixth century, and consequently what V. has now given us is still only a part of the whole. It had indeed been V.'s intention to publish the entire series, and one must regret that this was not possible. It should nevertheless be stressed that what V. has done is a great achievement: an ephor of the Greek Archaeological Service, especially in the provinces, is plagued by constant reports of new finds, all of which must be investigated, and some of which may lead to excavation; furthermore, in the spare time which he may have for research, his library facilities are very restricted. In the case of these vases from Kapakli, further difficulties arose from the neglect they received during wartime conditions. Therefore V. deserves all our gratitude. He has in fact made an excellent job of publishing these vases, and the figures in the text are meticulously drawn. He has set a standard which has unfortunately not been followed by the printers in the case of the plates.

The second part of V.'s book introduces his main thesis, namely that the Thessalian Protogeometric style is homogeneous, and that it develops originally from a combination of local native and sub-Mycenaean influences. On the question of the homogeneity of the style, there is little that need be said, except unfortunately that in the case of Halos, which lies at the southern end of the Krokian plain, the argument is vitiated by the use of evidence from the Geometric period only.

The discussion on the origin of style, in so far as it concerns the influence of local native wares, seems to be sound. The direct evolution from a locally existing sub-Mycenaean style is rather a different matter. In his argument V. first produces evidence of certain ceramic material in Thessaly which he claims to be late Mycenaean or sub-Mycenaean. He then analyses the shapes and manner of decoration of the Thessalian Protogeometric vases, and concludes that the following shapes have their origin in sub-Mycenaean or Mycenaean: the hydria, a type of amphoriskos, the trefoil-lipped oinochoe, two kinds of one-handled jug, and the high-footed and low-based skyphos and cup. He reaches a similar conclusion for the decorative motives of wavy lines, groups of lines slanting in alternate directions, compass-drawn semicircles and circles, and also for the general system of the clay-ground style.

Properly speaking, the shapes and decorations should be connected up with what is previously known in Thessaly, and this V. attempts to do wherever possible, but the available instances given are few, and the validity of some is not beyond doubt.

So far as concerns his list of late Mycenaean or sub-Mycenaean in Thessaly, V. is right to stress the evidence from Ktouri, though continuity into Protogeometric times is not a certainty. As to the lekythos from Theotokou, V. may be right in claiming this vase as local; in fact, Skeat (Dorians, 23) was the first to state that it was an import. The jug from Pteleon is not necessarily sub-Mycenaean, to my mind, nor is the amphoriskos from Retzioumi, even though it was found together with hand-made vases of local ware — the site is a little remote, and I feel that the hand-made ware might have survived rather longer there than elsewhere. Thus V. has not a great deal of evidence on which to hang the evolution of a Thessalian Protogeometric style; in fact, perhaps rather less than he claims.

The doubts expressed above produce similar doubts
NOTICES
OF BOOKS

in V.'s analysis of shapes, especially for the amphoriskos and the large jug. For the small jug, V. cites parallels from Naxos, but these cannot be proved to be early in the Protopogeometric series.

These are not the only instances where one may doubt whether V. has proved his case, as his analysis of the decorative motives is not entirely convincing. Even so, one cannot therefore say that V. is wrong—only that he has not proved his point. The hypothesis remains one well worth bearing in mind, but it needs further concrete evidence to support it, evidence which could be forthcoming from the excavations at Iolkos. To my mind, although V.'s arguments are not always valid, he has done a service in bringing the hypothesis out into the open.

There is much else of value in this book, as V. also discusses the connexion of Thessalian Protopogeometric with neighbouring pottery styles, and analyses the interplay of influence between the one and the others. He rightly stresses the continuity of the Mycenaean tradition into the Dark Ages. In conclusion, although I differ from V. on certain of his interpretations, I have no doubt that his book is an important contribution to the history of the period.

V. R. D'A. DESBOROUGH.


L'Oeil du Connaisseur is a series of short handbooks written by experts for students and serious amateurs. This addition to the series is particularly welcome since the only other handbooks on the same subject—Neugebauer's Antike Bronzestatuetten and Miss Lamb's Greek and Roman Bronzes—have long been out of print. Les Bronzes grecs is wider in scope than Neugebauer's book in that it includes figured reliefs as well as statuettes; narrower than Miss Lamb's in that it excludes all implements and utensils lacking figured decoration. Etruscan and Roman bronzes are reserved for a separate volume in the same series.

M. Charbonneaux has divided his subject into three main sections, in the first of which he discusses the alloys and technical processes employed in ancient bronze working, and describes the classes of bronze objects which the Greeks were in the habit of decorating with figures in the round or in relief. This is followed by a historical survey tracing the stylistic development of statuettes and reliefs from Minoan times to the end of the Hellenistic period. The last section is concerned with public and private collections and with some of the problems confronting those responsible for them: the discrimination of Roman and Renaissance copies and modern forgeries; the conservation and restoration of ancient bronzes; the best methods of displaying and lighting a collection.

On all these topics M. Charbonneaux writes with the authority of a distinguished scholar and a museum official of long experience; and he manages to pack a quite remarkable amount of information into his relatively short text without sacrificing clarity or balance. Particularly successful, I think, is his treatment of regional schools in the archaic period, in which he steers a skilful course between the excessive confidence of some scholars and the no less excessive agnosticism of others. His groups are small, but they hold together; and his regional attributions convince. The only surprise, perhaps, is a tentative ascription of the Modena Kouros and its group (Louvre 1688, Boston 04-7, Hermitage mirror) to Aegina. I find it hard to detach the Kouros from the Perachora Herakles and its Corinthian associates.

A few doubts and disagreements are perhaps worth mentioning. Pp. 8, 62: were Geometric figures ever formed by hammering and cutting bars of metal, a technique wholly inappropriate to bronze? The bar-like appearance of some figures is better explained by the use of carved wax models (cf. R. Raven Hart, JHS lxxviii 87-91). Pp. 12 f.: C. rightly questions Kluge's theory that the Delphic Charioteer was cast in piece-moulds taken from a dissected wooden model; but could it have been cast by the direct lost wax process, as C. suggests? It would have involved cutting up a figure composed of friable dried clay on a complicated iron armature: a formidable, if not impossible task. The use of the negative lost wax process seems more probable. P. 35 hardly does justice to the cast Geometric tripods as opposed to the hammered examples; they are the most impressive achievement of early Greek metal-working. P. 44: does the handle of the Sala Consilina oenochoe belong? As Miss D. K. Hill has pointed out, it looks like a hydria handle. P. 58: casting-webs on Minoan bronzes would imply casting in piece-moulds; one would like to know more about this. P. 61: most Geometric animals, I think, were cast in one with their stands, not soldered to them; cf. the waster Olympia IV, 230. I cannot believe that the perforated stands were used as seals; the close relation that their patterns often bear to those on cast tripod legs suggests that they were purely decorative. P. 75: the 'Zeus' from Perachora should be Herakles, as on p. 77. P. 100: figures of the same type as the 'Adonis' Louvre 411 have been found at Aosta (NSe 1950, p. 185, fig. 3), Centuripe (British Museum 1579), the Peloponnesse (Louvre 492) and the Trucial Oman (British Museum 1948, 5-25-1). They are all presumably Roman in date. A particularly elaborate example in Munich (Inv. 542) comes from the collection of the Countess of Lipona and may, therefore, have been found at Herculaneum or Pompeii. It wears the headdres of an Egyptian priest (Exped. Sieglin, Text Vol. I, 263 f., fig. 109).

These are all minor matters which do not detract from the excellent impression made by the book as a whole. One general criticism, however, remains to be made from a practical point of view. Time and
again a bronze is mentioned as being in such and such a museum, but no reference to a publication is given, despite the fact that in most instances an accessible publication exists. No doubt the editors of the series have set their faces against footnotes as being too deterrent of the wider public at which they aim; but would it not have been possible to give references in parentheses? To do so would have added only a page or two to the text. Apart from this, the reader is well served by indices of proveniences, of artists and subjects, and of museums and collections; and there is a useful bibliography. The black and white plates are good, the colour plates tolerable, the line-drawings in the text of uneven quality. The captions of Pl. VII nos. 2 and 4 should be interchanged.

D. E. L. Haynes.


This handsome volume is the result of two wise decisions, namely to print the literary and epigraphic Testimonia as a separate book rather than as an annexe to the volume planned to deal with the topography of the Agora; and secondly to entrust the task of preparing it to Professor R. E. Wycherley, than whom no more suitable choice could have been made.

The difficulty confronting the author lay, above all, in the arrangement of the extensive material he had so diligently collected, and after various experiments the solution reached, as he explains in the Preface, was 'to divide the material into broad but not very clearly defined classes, beginning with the stoas, those buildings which were especially characteristic of the agora' . . . within each section he has 'adopted mechanical and mainly alphabetical methods', i.e. 'Authors of all kinds are given in strictly alphabetical order . . . where one author quotes another or several others, the whole passage is given under the name of the quoting author . . . when an item is relevant to more than one section, the original serial number is repeated in parentheses in the later section.'

Following these clues we find, first, an Introduction in which the authors quoted (numbering about 140) are grouped and briefly discussed in chronological order, grouped as 'fifth century B.C.'; 'fourth century B.C.'; 'Hellenistic Period' (down to Diodorus Siculus inclusive); 'Latin Writers'; 'First and Second Centuries after Christ'; 'Late Roman Empire'; 'Lexica'; 'Late and Byzantine Writers', ending with a lucid summary of the pertinent epigraphical material. Then follow, in six sections, the Testimonia for I, the Stoas: II, Shrines; III, Public Buildings and Offices; IV, Market; V, Honorary Statues; VI. 'Miscellaneous', subdivided under Boundaries, Trees, Kerameikos, Panathenaic Street, Old Agora. The Index of Authors and Inscriptions (pp. 227–46) is followed by that of Subjects (pp. 247–59). The four plans, of which the first three are the work of Mr. J. Travlos, the surveyor to the excavations, show respectively the Agora and its environs (including the Dipylon, Pnyx and Acropolis) in the second century A.D.; the 'Actual State' plan of the Agora, with a lettered and numbered grid; the Agora, with the buildings named, in the second century A.D.; and finally a plan showing the route of Pausanias through the Agora, with the buildings numbered in the presumed order of his tour. That these will be of invaluable assistance to the reader needs no emphasis. No doubt other plans showing the area in earlier stages of its development will appear in the volume on the Topography.

This arid summary will not, I hope, discourage intending readers, for they will find that the author has provided for them 'bald and literal' translations of his own for all the passages quoted, as well as notes when required on the context of both literary texts and inscriptions and also on variæ lectiones and conflicting statements; and, as a welcome expansion of the strict plan of the book, a short summary of the evidence furnished by the sources for each of the principal buildings dealt with in Sections I–IV. Moreover, on certain topographical problems of major import he provides a helpful review of the combined evidence from Testimonia and excavation, adding his own considered conclusions. These include the identification of the Stoa of Zeus with the Stoa Basileios, the evidence for the position of the Stoa Poikile and of the Theseion (neither located within the excavated area), the Enneakrounos-Kallirhoe problem (clarified by the suggestion that there were two springs bearing the latter name, of which that in the Agora region was made and named Enneakrounos, while that by the Ilissos retained its original name). Longer, but always concise, discussions are devoted to the site of the Eleusinion, of the Hellaia and other Law-courts, the Desmoterion, and the exact extent of the Kerameikos and what it denoted to different authors. In these discussions we find, as might have been expected, a clear-cut distinction between certain, probable and possible identifications; the evidence is weighed carefully and fanciful solutions find no place here. Controversial topics are handled with commendable—sometimes almost excessive—restraint. The recent attempt to identify the Hephaistos-temple with a joint temple of Theseus and Herakles put forward in a substantial monograph by H. Koch (reviewed in JHS, lxxvi, pp. 135 f.) is summarily dismissed with the remark that 'there is no evidence for such a temple' (pp. 98, 281); and Judeich's acceptance in his revised Topographie (1930) of Dörpfeld's location of Enneakrounos in the low ground between Pnyx and Areopagos is written off as 'a rash conclusion' (pp. 140, 447 note).

The printer's far from easy task has been achieved
with most commendable accuracy; in fact apparently his only lapse is 'Basili' for Basileios (p. 21, col. ii). The few remarks that I have to offer will be seen to be of trifling weight to set against the solid merits of this book. P. 29, 89, for 'Ελευθερία read 'Ελευθερία, as printed in Ἑστερία, xxi, p. 374; p. 38, 77, ἔρχηθα, surely not 'carriages' but 'yokes of oxen'; p. 80, 216, does ἄρτοις ἐν 'Ελευθερίᾳ really mean 'a rider dismounting in the Eleusinion'?; might it not refer to a contest in the Eleusinian festival (συν. ἐγκάλημα), in spite of the appropriateness of Xenophon's suggestion (p. 78, 203) that the cavalry 'should gallop in tribal contingents, from the Herms as far as the Eleusinion'?; p. 201, 681, surely Theophrastos 'Mean Man' would not hire for his wife's attendent from the women's market 'a lad' but a slave-girl (πάντοιος is so translated in the Loeb version); p. 204, 684, perhaps 'snuff out' rather than 'wash out' the name of Hyperbolos, would better catch the point of ἄρτοις ἐν. And in the valuable note on περίπτωσις, the quotation of π. μέγας ἔς[ω] from IG ii2, 1641 is misleading, since this is from a list of the Amphiktyonic treasures, of which most of the pieces were found on the Acropolis; and in any case the restoration is questionable—in fact π. μέγας ἔς[ω] would be a preferable alternative.

Finally, sporadic testing of the Index of Subjects revealed no omissions except that under 'Demes' a reference might have been added to p. 99, 286, which prompts the suggestion that it is regrettable that the author has not included a brief discussion of the Demes in and adjoining the Agora.

A. M. Woodward.


Until Broner published his book on lamps from Corinth, no adequate attempt had been made to put Greek lamps on a reasonable archaeological and typological basis. But his work is a generation old, and our knowledge has increased, considerably since it appeared; it is still extremely valuable, but H.'s book has supplemented it, and superseded it in many respects. H. deals only with the Greek and Hellenistic lamps from Athens (and their survivals in the Imperial period); the Roman lamps are to be published in the near future by Miss Judith Perlzweig.

H. has recounted the history of the clay lamp in Athens with reference to the material found in the Agora by the American School of Classical Studies since their work there began. With perhaps a few minor exceptions (for example, BMC Lamps No. 161), I think it is safe to say that practically every variation, and certainly every major type of Attic manufacture has been found there and is described in this book.

The earliest lamps mentioned were made in the early seventh century B.C. No lamps can be ascribed to the Geometric period proper, and their introduction is another example of the borrowing from the East which, from the second half of the eighth century, added so much to the development of Greek art. These early lamps were in conception very similar to the open 'cocked hat' lamps of Palestine and Syria (and also some Phrygian examples found recently at Gordion), but the Athenians usually put a handle on— they liked handles on their lamps. The first lamps were unglazed and hand-modelled, and there were not many of them.

The unbridged nozzle introduced with these first open lamps was used for nearly two hundred years, although the more developed and, one would think, more efficient bridged nozzle came in about the middle of the seventh century; the makers of the unbridged types could not make up their minds whether an incurved rim was an advantage or not, but the bridged examples show an ever-increasing desire to cover in the top.

A little before 625 B.C. lamps were first made on the wheel, and also glaze was used (functionally). This set the pattern for the main technical production of Attic lamps for the next three to four hundred years—wheel-made and glazed, and indeed, after the introduction of moulded lamps, wheel-made examples continued to be manufactured throughout the period covered by this book.

As time went on the rim encroached more and more on the central orifice, the nozzle lengthened, profiles changed from angular to curved (for example, the classically neat Type 22C, surely one of the most satisfying shapes). H. takes us skilfully and effortlessly along with him as he follows each line of development through to its end; the lamps get deeper, with vertical sides, and the globular and popular lamps of Type 25 appear with their heavy bases and impression of attractive usefulness, to be copied widely around the Mediterranean.

Thereafter Attic lamps decline, the glaze and much of the workmanship are not so good, the shapes get somewhat sloppily and the increasing use of moulds does not help matters; there is a tendency again, as in the early days, to copy imports, and many of the Athenian types fail to achieve the crispness of, say, Types 40A or 49A from the west coast of Asia Minor. There is a revival of workmanship and originality in the lamps of the early Roman period and just before, but one gets a general impression of rather depressing sameness, only alleviated by the use of signatures in some cases.

These Hellenistic forms linger on well into the Imperial period, as H. shows, but the new shapes from Italy finally replace them.

Not only are the main lines of development covered, but H. treats exhaustively of the details of
the lamps themselves: central tubes (which in most cases must have been a finger grip); shoulder lugs, pierced (for hanging up when not in use) and unpierced (natural conservatism); handles and nozzle shapes—whether chronologically significant or not; the use of glaze, etc.

H. has tried to date all the lamps as closely as possible by the use of pottery, terracottas, coins, etc., and by comparison with lamp types which have a fairly firm chronological basis. Historically dated deposits are also used. But the evidence presented by him with regard to the date of the deposits in which the lamps were found, appears to suggest in some cases that the periods of manufacture or use were rather longer than the dating given to the lamps. These differences—and in most cases they are very slight—are probably due to H.'s knowledge of the material; but the dating of the deposits themselves may possibly be too precise: the chronology of Greek pottery is not the exact science we are often inclined to hope that it is.

After a brief and informative introduction the description of the lamp types begins. Such is the diversity of the material (which is, not surprisingly, predominantly of Athenian make, but does include a good proportion of imported lamps) that the author has had to divide it into 58 different types, which have further subdivisions so that there are 150 categories and also variations on these. The types are numbered from 1 to 58, which are subdivided by the use of the letters A, B, C, etc., where necessary. This is taken a step further by the use of the term 'prime' to denote lamps which are unglazed, at least on their exteriors.

Each type or subdivision of a type is presented under the following scheme: type number, brief description, the catalogue numbers of the lamps included in the type (followed by the quantity of similar lamps found and inventoried but not included in the catalogue. It is unfortunate, but I imagine necessary from the point of view of cost, that only a selection of the Agora lamps are here published: of about 2,050 Greek and Hellenistic lamps found between 1931 and 1954, 889 are described), the plate number and the Bronner Type number—if any. The type is then dated, with reasons given for the date assigned. There follows a description and a discussion of the type, and then each piece is given a catalogue number (followed by its inventory number) and described separately.

The quality of the photographic plates is good, but one wishes that the lamps on them were shown rather larger. Also side views would have been very useful in some cases when using the book to identify lamps. The twenty-one plates of profiles help here, of course; they are well-drawn and essential, but again one feels that whole- instead of half-profiles would be better. But what is ideal would probably double the cost of the book; half a profile is better than none at all, and the book is quite easy to use, even with one finger in the plates, one in the profiles and another searching for the description in the text.

But these are mere technical quibbles and do not detract from a work of immense industry and undoubted usefulness stemming from complete familiarity with the material—enhanced by plates of graffiti and makers' names, an extremely informative chart showing the chronological distribution of the types (rather marred by the inclusion of Type 41—sanctuary lamps—which were admittedly used over a long period but are not really a type as such. Could they not have gone at the end in the same way as the 'miscellaneous moulded lamps'?), an index of deposits, and good general and particular indexing. This book is surely essential for all excavations where Attic imports might turn up—which means the whole Mediterranean area and much of the Black Sea coast.

D. M. Bailey.


The title is somewhat misleading, since the buildings are described in their complete archaeological context; only burials are excluded, though the sculptured and small objects will receive more detailed attention in another volume. This manner of publication was wisely chosen; in fact no other could have met the requirements of the site. The Danish excavators at Hama were faced with an unusual problem. The flat-topped mound, along the rim of which stood the ruins of a mediaeval Arab citadel, appeared to have been formed entirely as a result of habitation, and was so tall that there could be no question of investigating the lower levels by trenching; too much damage would inevitably have been caused to buildings of the historic periods. A vertical excavation was therefore made through the bottom of a cistern, which had probably been constructed in the Roman period; the shaft was so dug that it contracted only in the upper portion and thereafter was sunk like a well, keeping a diameter of 5 ft. as it penetrated the remains of the fourth and fifth millennia. At the bottom lay the detritus of a weathered rock-surface; when the first neolithic squatters came to live upon it, this must have stood some 20 ft. above the bed of the Orontes, but it is now buried under 100 ft. of deposits, which by overspill have also extended the mound laterally to a quarter of a mile. The complicated stratification is admirably represented in sectional drawings of the various excavated areas, and is summarised in a diagrammatic section which combines the evidence obtained from the deep shaft with that from areas where higher levels had remained undisturbed and could be stripped layer by layer.

It is particularly regrettable from the classical
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point of view that Hama should have been virtually abandoned from 720 B.C., when Sargon destroyed it, till the second century, when it was refounded as a Hellenistic city. Moreover, the older town has yielded remarkably few imported objects, even though full allowance be made for its inland position, on the edge of the Syrian Desert; some Cypriot pottery began to arrive about 1400 (pp. 123, 125, 126, 128), and Mycenaean sherds have been found (p. 133), but the definitely Greek material is limited to Cycladic geometric ware, notably a skyphos (p. 261). Analogies are often traceable with other parts of western Asia, and in one instance (p. 47) the Trojan culture is involved as well as Mesopotamia; evidence from Thermi IV-V enabled a semi-anthropoid object to be identified as a jar-cover, and since its use, though rare, continued at Hama for apparently a couple of centuries, probably around 2700, contemporaneity at both sites is plausible. Furthermore the oldest complete building, associated with Tell Halaf and dated c. 3100 (p. 21, fig. 11), is compared with a great house at Troy (Ib no. 102, to complete the reference). The parallel holds good as regards the structural technique and the central hearth, but in other respects the comparison seems unjustified, since the size was less than one-third as large and the entrance came through the long side at a corner, outside which there probably stood a diminutive covered platform, while a second doorway, diametrically opposite, led to a smaller room. Little buildings of tholos type had a brief vogue, around 3000, and are explained as granaries because of the Aegean parallels (p. 27); later granaries were cylindrical. Pits became numerous in the houses of c. 2400-1900 and obviously served diverse purposes; the larger were cesspits (fig. 84), others contained grain, others again ashes which had been deposited when cold, while some, which in the Aegean would be called bothroi, resemble the modern bread-ovens of the district and may have been so used (p. 50).

About 1500 the strange practice began of building almost exclusively in pisé instead of the mud-brick which had previously been universal—or perhaps, it is suggested, the smooth appearance resulted from using damp brick (p. 117). On the latter explanation, surely they would also have had to be laid in abnormally wet clay-mortar? Pisé, in any event, seems unlikely at a place where wood for shuttering must have been expensive, especially in the Bronze Age when sawing thin boards would have been a laborious, if not difficult, piece of craftsmanship. An equally sure means of producing the same effect is the African technique of building with handfuls of moist clay, which are well-kneaded and then slammed down with the utmost force; this method requires no shuttering, and is considered preferable to mud-brick, which, however, has occasionally been used in the same localities when an enormous length of walling was built in a hurry. Mud-brick would also be more suitable for rectangular pillars, and was used for that purpose at Hama at the time when the supposed pisé was prevalent.

The second half of the volume is devoted to remains of 1200-720, chiefly to the palace, which covered 2½ acres; owing to another of those conquests which punctuate Hama’s story, the style is that of the Turkish–Syrian borderland—Aramaean. The information given by the preliminary reports has been vastly supplemented in this definitive account. The sequence of construction has become fairly clear; some re-used decorative features must belong to the tenth century, but the buildings date predominantly c. 900-840 and were somewhat reshaped during that brief period. A prototype of the Solunto throne was found in the palace courtyard (pp. 195-6).

The text is straightforward, the illustrations genuinely illustrate it, and the production is admirable.

A. W. LAWRENCE.


In this volume Professor Demargne presents with admirable clarity the first fruits of the French excavations at Xanthos during the years 1950-1959. The chief aim has been to throw further light on the archaic and classical Lycian city, and it is fitting that the final publication should begin with a study of the six funerary pillars which are the most uncompromisingly Lycian feature of the site.

During the earlier campaigns these huge monolithic structures were cleared of rubbish and their immediate vicinity explored by the excavators. They recovered valuable fragments of sculpture from the frieze of the Inscribed Pillar, one of which joins with a block in the British Museum. They also found the back of the head belonging to the seated dynast on the south side of the Harpy Tomb, whose appearance on the site is now vastly improved by the erection of a good marble copy of the whole frieze. For the Theatre Pillar we now have much of the late Greek inscription recording its removal, perhaps to make way for the theatre, and also a fourth-century lion’s head. A new archaic relief was found inside the Sarcophagus Pillar, used as a cover-slab for an intact Hellenistic burial; it represents two wrestlers, a lyre-player and an onlooker (possibly a flautist) executed in a fleshy Ionic style of c. 525, perhaps associated with traces of an interment of this period found underneath. These new discoveries are concisely presented and ably discussed; with the help of good photographs and drawings of the pillars (the latter might have been more conveniently placed in the text) D. offers a complete and definitive study of the architectural evidence relating to these singular monuments.

For the sculptured friezes, most of which had been removed by Fellows, D. has no such comprehensive
aim in view; he restricts himself to the new French material now to be seen in Istanbul. The sculptures of the Inscribed Pillar justly receive the fullest treatment. Although only a small proportion of them could be recovered, the useful join with BM. B.679 makes the subject of the south side quite clear—a scene of combat, plausibly equated with the dynast's victory over the seven Arcadians mentioned in the Greek metrical inscription on the pillar itself. D.'s analysis of this composition shows how extraordinarily persistent were the canons of Lycian narrative art: the differentiation in scale between the dynast and his enemies, the humiliation of the vanquished, the row of captured shields to symbolise the conqueror's triumph—all these features survive from the archaic world of the Iotis-Belenki pillar. One might even go further in noting the prevalence of a stocky and muscular figure in all the Xanthian pillar friezes. In an archaic horizon, as with the new wrestler relief, one may be reminded of Ionian plumpness without the saving grace of Ionian finesse, but the same physical type is still traceable on the Nereid monument. It has too often been assumed that the whole series betrays the hand of the Greek artist working to the requirements of his Lycian patron. The style, of course, depends closely on contemporary Greek models, but D. has rightly ascribed the frieze on the Inscribed Pillar to an indigenous sculptor sufficiently in touch with the Attic technique of his day to achieve a bold three-quarter view, but at the same time still occasionally falling back on the archaic (and oriental) device of parallelism when showing warriors in profile, running side by side. Similar anachronisms could be cited from the earlier friezes, making them difficult to date by Greek standards: thus Akurgal, in his study of the Lion Tomb, was inclined to assume two stages in its execution, separated by an interval of twenty years. The Harpy Tomb, which D. sets apart from the rest of the series, has the only truly homogeneous frieze, and is perhaps the only one to justify attribution to a Greek hand. For the rest, may one not postulate the existence of a local school, strongly conservative in its iconography, but ever looking towards Greece for fresh stylistic inspiration? For further light on this subject we await with keen anticipation the subsequent volume on the Xanthian sarcophagi and rock-tombs which Professor Demargne has promised us.  

J. N. COLDSTREAM.


The excavation of this small cemetery of the Geometric period over forty years ago passed almost without comment at the time, and had been virtually forgotten in recent years. Much of the material, left behind in the museum of Rhodes, has been lost, but, mercifully, not before it had been fully recorded by Kinch, the excavator, and drawn by Frau Kinch. It is especially fortunate for us that the difficult task of publication, after such a long delay, should have been entrusted to the authorative pen of Professor Johansen, whose well-known Vases Sicyonenses made such a valuable contribution to the study of early Greek pottery.

In a brief introduction the author describes the site of Exochi with its scanty traces of settlement and small compact cemetery, where cremation is the rule, and the shaft the commonest type of grave. No plans, alas, were drawn of the burials, but Kinch's notes were reasonably informative. In the main body of the book the various finds are set out and discussed in an exemplary manner, following the classical scheme contrived by Dragendorff in Thera II which has never been bettered. First the contents of each grave are described and illustrated by drawings and photographs in the text: it is thus possible to see the whole of each group at a glance. Discussion is deferred until the subsequent detailed analysis where the pottery is considered by shape and the small finds by material. This long and important section amounts to a penetrating review of almost the entire scope of Rhodes' contribution to the arts in the late eighth and the early seventh centuries. Although the finds from Exochi are rich enough, the value of the discussion is further enhanced by the publication of more Rhodian material from Copenhagen and an interesting series of Camiran vases in the British Museum.

The pottery, which rightly receives the fullest treatment, mostly belongs to the Late Geometric period, when a lively, if rather loose style was current in Rhodes, whose decoration owes little to external influences. For its dating, important new evidence is offered by Grave A, the richest, but by no means the latest of the groups: here, among local vases still Geometric in character, are two Proto Corinthian kotylai datable to c. 700, and a fascinating neck-amphora reflecting the simultaneous influence of at least two distinct Cycladic styles: on the neck appears a naked man with arms raised, drawn in a very early Orientalising manner. But the Geometric tradition remains strong even in the later graves B and C, where there is only the occasional spiral hook or stylised palm-tree to suggest that the Orient was making any impression on the local potter. J.'s lower limit of c. 675 is reasonable for everything except the poor grave G with its 'Ionian' cup; the lack of any trace of the Wild Goat style, cited as chronological evidence, is perhaps less significant than the absence of bird-bowls, which must have been introduced at the latest by the second quarter of the seventh century.

For the later material there are many useful parallels in Clara Rhodes: this is not so of the earliest pottery at Exochi, which belongs to a Middle Geometric style with a strong Attic flavour, previously only known to us by a handsome krater from Camirus in London. This important vase, just
earlier than the oldest groups at Exochoi, becomes the key to J.'s upper chronological limit of 750, being a fairly close imitation of an Attic Middle Geometric krater in the Kerameikos. He also calls our attention to the export of contemporary kraters to Amathus and Salamis in Cyprus, and fragments of a third in Hama, assuming the Attic origin of all three; these, when considered in connexion with the Atticising trend of many local Geometric styles at this period, lead him to suggest that Athens played the leading role in re-establishing commercial relations with the Orient in the middle of the eighth century. This argument is open to question on three counts:

(1) Can we be sure that the three kraters in the east really are Attic rather than imitations from other parts of Greece? For the bulky lozenge of the Salamis vase (JHS, 1957, Archaeological Supplement, Pl. II), cf. PAE, 1903, 7, fig. 2, from Eretria, where similar kraters are said by the excavator to have been found in nearly every one of about fifty tombs. The Amathus piece, originally published as Argive, looks more genuinely Attic, but its fabric, like that of the Salamis vase, has not yet been described.

(2) Even if their Attic origin were to be granted, would they be enough to indicate 'mit dem östlichen Mittelmeergebiet lebhafe Handelsverbindungen'? Large open vases could hardly be imported for their contents, and we could assume no more than that the Attic Middle Geometric pottery which was admired and imitated in the Aegean found its way to the Eastern Mediterranean because of its intrinsic excellence, possibly through middlemen. Ceramic influence should not be confused with commercial initiative. For the latter, the large proportion of imported Cycladic wares in levels 8-9 at Al Mina is more revealing. The lowest level, 10, seems unlikely to tell a different story (JHS lviii, 16; JHS lx, 2, n. 1).

(3) Did Rhodian potters learn their Atticising habits directly from Attic imports or through the mediation of the Cyclades? Some comparisons argue in favour of the latter hypothesis: for the ovoid body and the narrow foot of the Exocho oinochoai V. 1–2, cf. Delos XV pl. XIII, Aa55 and contrast Kerameikos V. 1, pls. 71–5. The skyphos Exocho V 5 follows Delos XV, pl. XXVII, Ae29, in its lack of vertical bonding lines for the chevrons, such as always appear in the Attic examples (Kerameikos V.I, pl. 91). The amphora fragment Exocho Z2, more likely to belong to the earlier than the later stage, is admitted to be after the Cycladic model.

After these minor criticisms it only remains to congratulate Professor Johansen on this excellent publication of vitally important material. As a consolation for the delay, we have the benefit of his masterly handling of other Rhodian finds, already published, but never before so fully digested. He has achieved the first reasoned and well-documented account of Rhodian Geometric art.

J. N. Coldstream.
THEINER.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

REUSCH (H.) Die zeichnerische Rekonstruktion des Frauenfrieses im boötischen Theben.
Pp. vii + 76. 15 plates. 21 text figures. DM. 25.

The fresco of women from the Mycenaean palace of Thebes (the 'House of Cadmus') has been known for over half a century, but is chiefly familiar from the partial reconstruction first published in Delion 3 (1917), fig. 193. Only a few of the fragments, however, have received the publication they deserved. Gerhard Rodenwaldt had made careful coloured tracings of them all before the First World War, as a first stage towards a reconstruction and detailed study, and it is on these tracings that the present work is based. A provisional report of Miss Reusch's work appeared in AA 1948-1949, 240 ff.; her conclusions, and her examination of the evidence, are here fully presented, with Rodenwaldt's tracings reproduced at full scale and in colour. Unfortunately it was not possible to refer to the fragments themselves, which are still inaccessible; some may even have been destroyed through the accidents of the Second World War. It seems unlikely, however, that much could have been added to what is here extracted from the evidence of the forty-two fragments described and discussed. Only a few remain unexplained. The composition, which decorated the walls of a room measuring 5.35 by 2.70 metres, included at least nine standing female figures, shown about life-size (1.59 metres high), wearing typical Minoan or Mycenaean dress and in most cases carrying vessels or posies of flowers. The fragments are sufficiently well separated in position to allow restoration of whole figures in considerable detail; but of the grouping little can be said, except that some face left, some right, so that a purely processional arrangement (unless in two separate files) is ruled out. The background seems to have been divided into horizontal bands of different colours (blue, yellow, white, blue, red, white, yellow, red, etc.), separated by wavy lines. Black and red are also used in the figures; but the attractive folding plate 15 is only intended to give a schematic idea of the colour effect, as reference to the originals was impossible.

The fresco belongs to the earlier Mycenaean age (LH I-II), for the destruction of the palace was probably no later than LH III A; and as other Mycenaean fresco fragments of this phase include scarcely anything from figure-scenes it well deserved the care and skill that have so profitably been bestowed upon it in this monograph.

F. H. STUBBINGS.


The sarcophagi from the crowded Royal Necropolis at Sidon, discovered in 1887, are important in the history of art for their high intrinsic merit and as evidence for the artistic trends of the borderland between Greece, Egypt and Persia during the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., the age of Classical Greece. They are very varied, ranging from 'Egyptian' to 'Lycian' and almost pure Greek. Scholars have differed on their place of manufacture, and Reinauch even believed that they reached Sidon secondhand. This book concerns the Satrap Sarco proved, apparently the earliest to carry full reliefs in a purely Greek style.

After discussing the shape of the sarcophagus, its exterior, half-way between a Greek building and a chest, and its anthropoid inner cavity, Kleemann describes the four carved friezes. On one long side a throned ruler with attendants watches a figure mounting a four-horse chariot and also a single horse and groom. On the other, ruler and attendants hunt a wild cat. One short side shows four armed guards, the other a banquet.

Kleemann purports to discuss three main questions: where the sarcophagus comes in the Sidonian series, for what prince it was made, and to what school the design of its reliefs would appear to point. She concludes as follows: All such relief-sarcophagi are from the Greek borderland. But comparing its anthropoid (Egyptian) cavity and other features with those of local examples, we find that ours falls in a truly Sidonian sequence. The lotus-and-palmette frames for its friezes, like the akroteria, with their early forms of acanthus and their resemblances to Sunium, point to a date for it around 430.

Chapter V, the best and most convincing part of the book, contends that Tomb-Group B precedes Tomb-Group A, and that Sidonians made their tomb-groups by (1) sinking a square shaft, (2) hewing out a chamber on each side for a single sarcophagus, giving a cruciform tomb-group, (3) hewing out others between the arms of the cross, (4) crowding the chambers with more sarcophagi. Reconstructing Stage (2), Kleeman finds that Tomb-Group B contained Egyptian-style sarcophagi, and so did all but the fourth arm of Tomb-Group A, which received the oldest Greek example, massive but plain. So all the Egyptian-style examples precede the Greek, and we can reconstruct an uninterrupted sequence of Sidonian sarcophagi, made for this cemetery.

The dress in the reliefs is thoroughly Greek, and Tritsch (JHS 1942) was wrong to see in the long chitons a sign of Oriental ceremonies with men dressed as women. Sculptural types and attitudes are Greek, but selected with an eye to Persian customs. Thus the thoroughly Greek horses and chariot appear, because Persian rulers paraded horses and chariots as symbols of their power. A long, tendentious argument maintains that the treatment of these types is Ionian, not Athenian, that the art of the Ionian coast was very important e. 430, and that Greek art may even owe the acanthus to it.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

This is an uneven book. The abstraction of one sarcophagus from a large cemetery is bound to leave awkward questions of relevance. Kleemann's second main question is neither very important nor very easily answered. Other important questions—why, for instance, in these relief-sarcophagi the architectural ornament seems mechanical and out of scale with the exquisite reliefs—are barely touched. On the other hand, the text swells with irrelevant polemics—against Riegl's theories of Egyptian compound plants, against his view that the acanthus is a more realistic palmette, against Schede's belief that the circumscribed palmette began in isolation and against Wiegand's reduction of the lotus and the lily to palmettes. This is 'to knock down walls of pasteboard with a loud din'; and these digressions become even less bearable when there is no index and no proper table of contents.

Granted that Kleemann has done a great service in tidying up the series of tombs, one may well ask what else she has achieved. Is it certain, for instance, that by contemplating his chariot and single horse the prince is behaving like a thorough Oriental? A contemporary of Alcibiades? Note, too, that in adding the horse and chariot painted in the tomb of Kasanlik (Bulgaria) as a parallel instance of half-Oriental princely custom, Kleemann ignores the Greek-style chariot-race in the centre (AJA, 1945, p. 414).

The dogma of a strong school in Ionia c. 430 B.C. subtly vitiates the later part of the book. While keeping an open mind, may the reviewer pose as advocatus diaboli? Who was artistic leader of the Ionians in 430, if not Athens? And do we not know, e.g. from Tod 93 of the Athenian attraction for the dynasts beyond Ionia? The fourth-century connexion of Athens and Sidon is well known; and I like to recall here that a pretty parallel to the akroteria of the Alexander Sarcophagus is an Attic anthemion-crown now in Cambridge (Conze, No. 1543). What causes Kleemann on pp. 70 ff. to date the early specimens of acanthus-ornament as she has? Why, for instance, must mainland Bassae be so late? On p. 84 Kleemann notes that the acanthus-capital there looks like the first step in the style. Again, the tendril on our sarcophagus, which grows out of the lotus, is anticipated not only on Delphic Treasuries (Ionic, but hardly Ionian) but also on Attic simas (cf. Buschor, pl. 7 and 12).

Kleemann divides fifth-century friezes into those of Ionic and those of Doric tendency. Drawn-out friezes are Ionic; but those with compressed groups are Doric, for they show the influence of the crowded compositions on metopes. The Satrap Sarcophagus pulls its Attic types out laterally, and so reveals itself as Ionic. But (1) the figures on most Classical metopes are not more crowded or compressed than those on Ionic friezes. (2) I can see no striking differences of spacing between the hunt-scenes, which Kleemann cites, on Attic sixth-century vases and that on our sarcophagus. Moreover, Attic vase-painters were masters at giving friezes lines of horizontal interest. (3) Various parts of the single Parthenon Frieze would be, on Kleemann's view, 'Doric' and 'Ionic'. It is simpler to suppose that these great artists arranged their friezes as they wished, unhampered by the designs of metopes. They did not even have always to spread their figures out, so as to secure empty intervals for the joints in the stonework. (4) Kleemann has not discovered all the Attic prototypes. For instance, the fallen horseman on the sarcophagus recalls, to my mind, the fallen Amazon on the Penthesilea Vase (Pfuhl, pl. 185). I do not believe it was invented by the sarcophagus' 'Ionian' sculptor.

The photographs in this book are excellent, and its author, who can reason acutely, can also make a great display of thoroughness and exhaustive learning. I fear that it may win high esteem in many quarters, and for that reason I feel bound to draw attention to its unnecessary polemics, its superfluous distinctions, its compression of its subject into categories too tidy and too artificial and its perverse fidelity to conclusions reached prematurely and rather uncritically.

HUGH PLOMMER.


La présente étude, une thèse de doctorat présentée en Sorbonne, s'efforce de retracer l'une des étapes de l'histoire de l'apologétique chrétienne, dont l'effort continu vise à maintenir ou à rétablir le contact entre des mentalités irréductibles: celle du croyant qui poursuit la vérité vivante au-delà de lui-même, parce qu'il en reconnaît l'image en son esprit, et celle de l'homme qui prétend se trouver et s'accommoder dans les limites d'un humanisme athée. La Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques de Théodore de Cyr (393 environ 460), dont le R. P. P. Canivet vient précisément de publier une édition critique précédée d'une introduction et accompagnée d'une traduction française et de notes (Coll. Sources chretiennes, no. 57, en deux volumes, Paris, 1958), occupe le centre de cette étude exemplaire que je présente aux lecteurs de cette revue.

Composée ou plus exactement compilée dans les années 420-423, alors que sans doute son auteur était encore moine aux environs d'Apatame, avant de devenir évêque de Cyr, la Thérapeutique des maladies helléniques est la dernière et peut-être la plus belle apologie du christianisme de la période patristique, héritière assurément d'une longue tradition littéraire, mais nullement dépourvue d'actualité et d'originalité. En effet, ce copieux ouvrage en douze livres n'est pas tellement une défense du christianisme qu'une préparation morale et un exposé des principaux points du dogme catholique. Tout à la fois 'Protreptique', 'Pédagogue' et 'Démonstration', c'est
une œuvre où le jeune moine d'Apamée use de sa science des choses spirituelles pour guérir de sa souffrance l'âme incrédule et l'ouvrier subtilement au don de Dieu, tandis que l'humaniste chrétien 'démontre' méthodiquement les articles du Credo. Tour à tour, la Thérapeutique invoque les Livres saints et les textes 'profanes', les articule, les comprennent pour donner plus de relief à cette idée que la Vérité est une et que, pour l'homme de foi, il n'y a pas de divorce entre le sacré et le 'profane', l'ordre de la raison et celui de la foi.

Cette démonstration du christianisme par les textes et à coup de citations parfois très longues, est en fait dirigée à la fois contre les Juifs et les Grecs. Au terme d'une tradition qu'illustrent Justin, Clément d'Alexandrie et Eusèbe de Césarée, la Thérapeutique rassemble tous les aspects des apologies antérieures. Synthèse originale autour de l'idée directrice qui la traverse et lui imprime son mouvement, elle apparaît justement comme l'ouvrage le plus représentatif d'un grand genre littéraire; mieux encore, comme une étape dans l'histoire de l'humanisme chrétien et un suprême effort pour concilier des cultures et des mentalités qui ne cesseront jamais de s'attirer et de se repousser.

L'histoire de l'entreprise apologetique de Théodoret contre les Juifs et les Grecs s'identifie partiellement avec l'histoire des mentalités religieuses au Ve siècle dans la région d'Antiocho-Apamée. C'est pourquoi le R. P. Canivet a consacré la première partie de sa thèse à décrire en premier lieu la situation politique et religieuse de l'empire romain d'Orient de 385 à 430 et à brosser une peinture, foisonnante de détails concrets, du milieu social antiocchien au début du Ve siècle. Cette excellente synthèse historique, qu'ont rendue possible les travaux récents de P. Petit et de M. Simon, met l'accent sur le caractère cosmopolite d'Antioche, sur la coexistence généralement pacifique des chrétiens et des païens, sur l'école publique, milieu où s'opère le brassage des mentalités, et sur la séduction religieuse qu'exerçait l'importante communauté juive de la grande cité.

Dans les deux derniers chapitres de la première partie, l'auteur expose en détail la genèse de l'entreprise apologetique de Théodoret. Après avoir retracé la polémique judéo-chrétienne au IVe et surtout au Ve siècle, il étudie en détail les écrits de Théodoret contre les Juifs. Passant ensuite à la polémique dirigée contre l'hellénisme, il montre que le milieu intellectuel à Antioche demeurait encore fermé aux influences chrétiennes, que l'école néo-platonicienne contemporaine restait hostile au christianisme et que les païens cultivés ne cessaient de cultiver des préjugés persistants contre certains dogmes chrétiens, le culte des martyrs, la virginité, et le monachisme.

Dans la Thérapeutique, Théodoret s'efforce de réfuter les arguments qui arrêtent les païens sur le chemin de la conversion ou de réouvrir les difficultés qui inquiètent secrètement les chrétiens. Il met en relief les questions les plus controversées à son époque et donc les plus actuelles, notamment celles relatives à la Providence divine, à l'anthropologie (l'homme, sa nature, sa destinée), à l'anthropologie et à la démonologie. Il consacre le livre VIII tout entier à justifier le culte des martyrs, et fait l'apologie de la morale chrétienne, spécialement du mariage chrétien. D'autre part, il tente de réhabiliter et de faire apprécier l'idéal monastique promis par les abus et décrié dans le public.

L'auteur clôt cette première partie par une étude serrée du dessein que poursuivait Théodoret, lorsqu'il confrontait hellénisme et christianisme, et proposait à ses lecteurs un remède à l'hellénisme.

Les deuxièmes et troisièmes parties de l'ouvrage sont davantage philologiques; elles contiennent des recherches complètes, minutieuses et menées d'une manière impeccable.

Dans la deuxième partie, la section la plus neuve et la plus originale de cette thèse, le R. P. Canivet expose en détail les principes de la méthode apologétique de Théodoret et étudie l'usage qu'il fait des citations 'profanes'. Le recours au texte 'profane' constitue évidemment la pièce maîtresse du système apologétique de Théodoret qui, à la suite d'Eusèbe de Césarée, a porté la méthode au plus haut degré de perfection, en n'y tenant qu'une seule source sous un deluge de citations. La comparaison que l'auteur instaure avec Clément d'Alexandrie et Eusèbe de Césarée montre à l'avantage de Théodoret, qui cite avec plus de littéralité et de précision que ses prédécesseurs. Après avoir relevé un nombre assez considérable d'erreurs et de négligences qu'a commises le compilateur, l'auteur insiste davantage sur l'usage tendancieux que Théodoret a fait de certaines de ses citations 'profanes'. Il les a quelquefois tirées à lui, arrangées, écornées, coupées aux bons endroits surtout. Plus souvent encore, il ne s'est guère soucié, comme on pouvait s'y attendre, du sens de la citation dans son contexte original, au point qu'il lui est arrivé d'utiliser un même texte à deux fins différentes.

Je ne puis suivre le R. P. Canivet dans l'étude minutieuse et méthodique qu'il a faite des sources littéraires de notre apologiste. Il a énuméré d'avoir précisé avec autant de clarté que de rigueur les principes de critique qu'il a appliqués à la recherche de toutes les sources littéraires. Le spécialiste ira avec intérêt et profit cette étude très analytique et ardue (pp. 170-253), d'où émergent des résultats en partie nouveaux et solidement établis.

Dans la troisième et dernière partie de l'ouvrage, l'auteur dresse le bilan de la culture 'profane' de Théodoret, telle qu'elle apparaît dans la Thérapeutique. Il distingue à juste titre les sources avouées, par exemple Eusèbe de Césarée, et les autres sources réelles mais inavouées: Clément d'Alexandrie (Protreptique, extraits des Stromates), les Placita qu'il ne mentionne qu'une fois et la source X, qu'il identifie avec vraisemblance avec une florilège platonicien aujourd'hui perdu et qu'il s'efforce de

Of the eighteen Homilies of Photius here translated two (IX and X) were first published in the seventeenth century; four more (III, IV, XVII, XVIII), were edited, albeit inadequately, by the Archimandrite Porfirii Uspenskii, in 1864; a further nine (I, II, V, VI, VII, VIII, XIV, XV, XVI) were edited by a Phanariot dignitary, the Great Logothete S. Aristarchos, in successive volumes of the Constantinopolitan periodical Εκκλησίαστική Ακίνητα between 1881 and 1886; Homily XI first appeared in the Trieste periodical Νέα Ημέρα for 1900; in the same year Aristarchos, who combined great erudition and ingenuity with an almost complete absence of critical powers, published in Constantinople a collection of eighty-three Photian Homilies, including besides the sixteen already published, sixty-seven compiled by the editor from excerpts out of other works of Photius. Fortunately for scholars, his book was almost from the outset a bibliographical rarity. Finally Homilies XII and XIII were first published by G. P. Kournoutos and Basileios Laourdas in the Athenian periodical Θεολογία for 1954. Several have appeared in Latin or Russian translation, none has been translated into English.

The revival of interest in Photius in recent years, and the reappraisal of his position now going on both in Orthodox and Roman Catholic circles, make a new edition of the Homilies, based on the whole of the manuscript evidence, much to be desired. Some day soon, it is to be hoped, Dr Mango will give us such an edition. In the meantime we are offered an English translation, based on the texts of Aristarchos and Kournoutos-Laourdas. But the translator has checked Aristarchos' text against the available manuscripts, removed his unsuccessful conjectures, and made a few conjectures of his own. So the translation corresponds neither to the existing Greek texts nor to that of the critical edition which will some day appear. So far as can be judged from the evidence here presented, the utility of the translations as historical and theological sources will hardly be impaired by the eventual publication of a definitive text.

Photius writes appallingly difficult Greek, and unlike some Byzantine writers he always means something by it. To translate him intelligently and with reasonable elegance is a stiff test, which Dr Mango passes with flying colours. Where he is not sure what the Greek means, or whether it is really what Photius wrote, he says so in a footnote. Where there is no footnote, his translation can be relied upon by the Greekless.

All the Homilies date from Photius' first Patriarchate (858-867) and are probably the remains of a collection made by his adherents during his first exile. Several can be dated with precision (e.g. III and IV, on the Russian attack on Constantinople, in late June and early July 860, XVII on March 29, 867, XVIII in September 867), while others can be approximately dated on internal grounds. On the basis of these dates, Mango inclines to suppose that the whole collection is arranged chronologically, and to date the remaining Homilies accordingly.

The Introductions to the Homilies summarise what is known of their historical and theological background, and occasionally add suggestions by the translator. On Homilies III and IV he guides us in admirable fashion through the labyrinth of literature on the Russian attack of 866, emphasising that where Photius and the later sources are at variance, the wise critic will prefer Photius' version. On Homilies XV and XVI, on the history of Arianism, his introduction and copious notes both reveal Photius' compulsory method of composition and suggest that, since he had access to historical, conciliar and hagiographical sources since lost, there may be valuable gleanings in these Homilies for the Church historian. On Homily XVIII, delivered only a few weeks before the assassination of Michael III by his co-emperor Basil I and the deposition of Photius, Dr Mango argues convincingly that its occasion was the successful conclusion of the Council of 867. As the activities of this Council were regularly misrepresented, and its very existence sometimes denied, in the later record, Photius' Homily is a document of considerable historical importance.

All those who, from one standpoint or another, are
concerned with Photius, will be deeply indebted to Dr. Mango.

[Since this review was sent to the press, a critical edition of the Greek text by B. Lauurdas has appeared: Φωτίου Ομηρία (Ἐλληνικὸς Παράργιμα 12), Thessalonica, 1959, pp. 107 + 128 * + 269. It comprises introduction, critical text, and commentary. The editor adopts a different chronology of the Homilies from that followed by Dr. Mango.]

ROBERT BROWNING.


In the first of the two works under review Dr. Argenti offers yet another serious contribution to the history of his native island. This formidable publication consists of transcripts from various Archives and Record Offices of Western and Central Europe (from Austria, Great Britain, France, Holland, Italy and the Vatican). It covers the greater part of the Turkish period of Chian history with the exception of the section dealing with religion, which contains certain documents concerning the years previous to the Turkish occupation of the island in 1556.

As there exists no full sequence of official records either in Greece or in Turkey, which go back to the end of the Middle Ages, the examination of documents filed in the archives of the West is of primary importance for the student of Greek history. The present collection has been amassed with great care and knowledge, and will serve as a guide not only to the students of Chian history, but also to those of other Greek areas. For a great number of documents relating to other parts of Greece can be found in the same file, and full reference of the whereabouts of each Chian document is given in this admirable edition.

The material contained in these volumes consists mainly in reports of Western and Central European diplomatic and consular agents, who served in Chios during the period under examination. They are divided into documents concerning (a) the Physical Structure of the islands, (b) Topography, (c) Political History, (d) Economic history, (e) Social history, and finally (f) Religion. Dr. Argenti explains that he has chosen this classification, because it corresponds to the divisions of his *Bibliography of Chios.* In the section, however, on the political history the documents included in these volumes do not allude to the major milestones in the history of the island of that period, since these have already been examined and printed by Dr. Argenti in separate studies.

The importance of the historical information that emerges from the Diplomatic Archives of Chios can hardly be stressed too much, nor is it confined to that island alone. It embraces many other Greek areas and throws light on the conditions prevailing in the Ottoman Empire and the policy of the Western powers in the Eastern Mediterranean in those days. The present reviewer found of special interest the relations between the Greek Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Churches as they emerge from these documents; the number of mixed marriages and the use of common chapels and churches by both creeds indicates a very different attitude from that usually accepted.

Dr. Argenti rightly draws the reader’s attention to the fact that these documents in no way represent the Greek point of view. But, as representatives of different nations with opposed interests have often reported on the same events, the conflicting narratives help to elicit the truth. An appendix on the trade routes of the period and a most serviceable index enhance the value of this book.

The second work under review is of two parts. The first volume treats in detail of the Genoese occupation of the island, which covers the years 1346–1566, and the second and third give the principal sources from which this account is derived.

Dr. Argenti subdivides his material into five principal sections, comprising political history and administration, economic history, topography, social history, and finally the ecclesiastical history of the period. A high standard of scholarship is maintained throughout the work, though the narrative occasionally indulges in excessive detail and tends to become over-involved. The work is a notable contribution not only to the history of Chios, but also to the collapse of Byzantine power and the rise of the Ottoman Empire.

Of the primary sources included in Vols. II–III, the first in importance is the *Codex Berianus Chienis,* published here for the first time. It contains all the conventions between the Commune of Genoa and the Mahonia, the chartered company of Genoese citizens that governed and exploited the island, as well as the more important statutory decrees concerning the island. With it are examined the three more extensive *Codices Giustiniani,* which were used, though not in extenso, by Carl Hopf in his study of the Giustiniani family of Genoa. The work ends with the inclusion of a number of other official documents and notarial deeds. In these combined sources a full account of the Genoese occupation of Chios is preserved.

These admirably produced volumes do not only show how the people of Chios fared and the system of government under which they lived in that period, but, as Sir Steven Runciman points out in his Introduction, they constitute the first full history of Genoa as an Italian as well as a Mediterranean power to appear in English.

C. A. TRYFANIS.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


This, the latest volume in the main series of the MMB, contains a facsimile of a musical MS. at the monastery of Chiliandari on Mt. Athos. Professor Roman Jakobson is the principal editor; but several Danish, Swedish and American experts have collaborated with him, under the general supervision of Professor Hoeg. The cost of production has been met chiefly from American resources. The reproduction is perfect; and nearly all the hymns are easily legible. They were written with Slavonic words in Russia in the twelfth century, and comprise part of the Triodion (Hymns for Lent and Holy Week) and most of the Pentecostarium (Easter to Whitsunday). The hymns for Easter Sunday (which are missing from many Greek MSS.) are included; of four of these no Greek original is mentioned. As a rule the Slavonic hymns in the MSS. are translated from Greek with syllabic equivalence. The fragments begin at Friday before Palm Sunday and end at Whitsunday, covering 190 leaves. A full list of hymns, with the beginnings of the Greek originals and with an explanation of the rubrics, precedes the musical text. There is also a Slavonic-Greek glossary of liturgical terms. The short preface and several footnotes contain much valuable information about the monastery, the MSS. and its contents—all in English. Of the musical notation, which is called Early Semitic and resembles the Byzantine Coislin system, a study is promised in a later publication. Meanwhile we may commend the present book as a thoroughly sound and scholarly work. It is hard to write about Byzantine music without deploring its neglected state in our country. This is partly due to the reluctance of the publishers to advertise the MMB through the usual channels. The indifference of professional musicians and critics is more easily explained than excused. Were it not for the talks broadcast by Professor Wellesz, the British public would be left in total ignorance of the subject.

H. J. W. Tillyard.


Arodafnusa is an anthology Mr Bruno Lavagnini has compiled from the works of thirty-two modern Greek poets writing between the years 1880 and 1940. The texts are elegantly and accurately edited, and accompanied by Italian verse translations, short introductions and notes. As the author explains in his general introduction this collection is bound to be 'both limited and personal', and excludes three of the most distinguished poets of the period, Porfiras, Kavafis and Sikelianos, their work he has already included in an earlier publication the Trigono.

The title Arodafnusa (=Oleander) derives from the first poem of the book, no. 86 of the Hundred Voices by K. Palamas. The selection of poets and of the examples representing their works is on the whole successful. But the space dedicated to some of the less important figures (e.g. twenty pages to Marino Siguro) as compared to that given to others of a much greater calibre (e.g. four pages to John Polemis and four pages to Lorenzo Mavilis) is misleading, especially as there is hardly any indication of their relative literary value in the introductions. Moreover, some of the shorter masterpieces of the period are missing (e.g. C. Hatzopoulos' Χωρίς τὸν Ταύρον, C. Karyotakis' 'Υπέρ, or M. Polydouri's Πατη πο' ουράνιας). Nikos Kazantzikis himself is most inadequately represented by two short extracts from his lesser works, whereas a number of minor poets like K. Karthaisos, L. Karzis or E. Melissanthi, who could easily have been omitted, take up too much of the available space. In all, Mr Lavagnini's Arodafnusa with its elegant Italian translations and useful introductions and notes will be of great help to those who wish to acquire a general picture of the course followed by modern Greek poetry from the eighties of the last century, when the New School of Athens was founded, to the beginning of the Second World War.

C. A. Trypanis.
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Books and slides can be sent to Members by post. Communications about books and slides should be addressed to the Librarian at the above address.
Four general meetings, with lectures, are held in London annually, and there are other meetings in different parts of the country.
Subscribers receive, free the Society's two annual publications: The Journal of Hellenic Studies, one of the foremost British periodicals in the field of Greek scholarship, containing articles, illustrations, and book reviews; Archæological Reports, a fully illustrated account of fresh discoveries in Greece and Greek lands, with bulletins announcing important new acquisitions by museums in Britain.
These two periodicals are on sale at the general public at £3 and 75. 6d. respectively.
The annual subscription to the Society is £4. The composition fee for life-membership is twenty guineas for persons over fifty years of age and thirty guineas for others. The subscription for Libraries and Student Associates is £2 and £3 respectively. There is no entrance fee.
Applications for membership or inquiries about the Society should be addressed to the Secretary.

The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies
31-34 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1
President: Professor I. A. Richmond, C.B.E., LL.D., F.B.A., F.S.A.
The Society was formed to promote the study of the history, archaeology, and art of Rome, Italy, and the Roman Empire in general down to about A.D. 700. In particular, so far as its resources permit, and so far as is possible without prejudice to its wider objects, the Society endeavors to encourage the study of British under Roman occupation, by devotion to its Journals, Journal of Roman Studies, and Journal of Roman History, and by occasional publications.
Members meet in conjunction with the Hellenic Society, a joint library of works on classical antiquity and a collection of lantern slides. Members are entitled to borrow books and slides, which can be sent to them by post, and may also consult books in the library of the London University Press of Classical Studies, which is complementary to that of the Societies. Communications about books and lantern slides should be addressed to the Librarian.
Meetings for the reading and discussion of papers are held in London about four times a year. Meetings are also held in various parts of the country.
The Journal of Roman Studies contains articles written by leading British and foreign scholars, an annual summary of Roman-British discoveries, and reviews of recent publications. It is abundantly illustrated. It is published annually and is sent to members free of charge, the price to the public being £3.
The annual subscription for membership of the Society is £4. The composition fee for life membership is £21 for those over fifty years of age and £25 for others. Student-associates are admitted at the reduced subscription of £1.
All inquiries should be addressed to the Secretary.

The following may be procured from International University Booksellers, 39 Store Street, W.C.1.
2. Supplementary Papers:
   No. II ECCLESIASTICAL SITES IN ISABRIA (Cicilia Triace) By A. C. Headlam. Folio. London. 1893. Price 11s. for both volumes.
   Note: Supplementary Papers III, IV, V and VI are out of print.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claims of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is £5 (life composition, £55). Members receive a copy of the annual Proceedings of the Association. They may also obtain the Classical Review and Classical Quarterly at reduced prices, though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer of the Association (Mrs. Edna M. Hooker, M.A., The University, Birmingham, 13). Inquiries should be addressed to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association, Prof. W. Mellink, M.A., King's College, London, S.W.7., and Professor L. J. D. Richardson, M.A., 1 Howells' Crescent, Llandaff, Glam., or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the Local Branches, viz., Aberystwyth, Bedford, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Taunton, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.

Contributions to the JOURNAL should be sent to John Boardman, The Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
Books intended for review should be addressed to The Librarian, Hellenic Society, 31-34 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1

Printed in Great Britain by L. win Brothers Limited, Woking and London.
"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
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Please help us to keep the book lean and moving.