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The *Persae* of Aeschylus
H. D. Broadhead

A major edition of the *Persae*, the oldest of surviving plays. It incorporates much new material, including a number of textual suggestions and elucidations. There is a full-scale commentary, a conspectus of metres, notes on Persian names and other topics, and an account of the battle of Salamis. 424 pages. 45s. net

Greek Word Order
K. J. Dover

Professor Dover explains and illustrates the principles which govern word-order in Greek. This is the only comprehensive treatment of the subject and all teachers of Greek and students, from first-year undergraduates onwards, will need it. 15s. net

Plato’s Later Epistemology
W. G. Runciman

An analysis of the logic and epistemology of the *Theaetetus* and the *Sophist*, which offers a new interpretation of both dialogues and, by reference to several others, traces Plato’s later attitude to the nature of knowledge and the nature of truth and error. About 30s. net

Plato’s *Meno*
R. S. Bluck

The last English annotated edition of the *Meno* was published in 1901. Dr Bluck takes account of the developments in scholarship since then, and his version of the text is based on a new examination of some of the most important manuscripts. *Autumn 1961* About 60s. net

The Presocratic Philosophers
G. S. Kirk & J. E. Raven

Welcomed as ‘An outstanding contribution to scholarship ... one which is sure to take its place as a standard work’ (*The Classical Journal*). This book is now available as a paperback. Paperbound, 25s. net Clothbound, 55s. net

Cambridge University Press
The Cretan Collection in Oxford
THE DICTAEAN CAVE AND IRON AGE CRETE

John Boardman
The University's collection of Cretan antiquities is the richest and most varied of all outside Crete itself. This volume presents a fully illustrated account of part of the collection, spanning 2,000 years of Cretan history. Illustrated £5.5s net

Menander: Dyscolus
Edited by H. Lloyd-Jones
Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford

This completely new text makes use of the published facsimiles of the edictio princeps which appeared in 1959, and takes full advantage of the proposals and comments of other scholars. (Oxford Classical Texts) 15s net
An English translation has been published under the title of The Bad-Tempered Man or The Misanthrope, the translator being Philip Vellacott; there is a Foreword by Christopher Fry. 10s 6d net

Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides
G. M. Bowra
An entirely new version by Sir Maurice Bowra of his book which was published in 1936 and has been out of print for some years.
‘... as satisfying as one could hope for ... Most valuable of all, here, too, we have the mature judgments and divinatory insights of an accomplished scholar and literary critic.' The Guardian Second edition 42s net

Aristotle: De Anima
Edited with Introduction and Commentary by Sir David Ross

Since the last commentary on the De Anima fifty-two years ago, there has been much discussion of the development of Aristotle's thought, the work of Jaeger and other scholars has made clearer the pattern of its development and much light has been thrown on its text by the publication of Forester's text, now hardly obtainable; publication of this new commentary therefore appears to be timely. 50s net

The Etruscan Lion
W. Llewellyn Brown
‘... a vivid picture of the genesis and subsequent development of a representative and remarkably comprehensive cross-section of Etruscan art ... it is to the discussion of the individual objects that the student will turn, and here he will find a rich store of quiet erudition and acute personal observation, scrupulously documented and transparently objective in its presentation.' The Times Literary Supplement. Oxford Monographs on Classical Archaeology Illustrated 84s net

A Patristic Greek Lexicon
Edited by G. W. H. Lampe

FIRST FASCICLE
A summary history of the use of all theologically important words by the Greek Christian writers of the period from the Apostolic Fathers to A.D. 800. The first fascicle consists of the Introduction and the letter α. 84s net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
A SHORT INTRODUCTION
TO THE GREEK LANGUAGE
by George THOMSON
Professor of Greek in the University of Birmingham

Royal 8vo, XV, 101 pages paper covers, 15s. net

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)
REPRINT CLOTH 20s.

LES SOURCES DE
PLOTIN
Ten Papers and Discussions in the original languages
by
E. R. DODDS, WILLY THEILER, PIERRE HADOT, HENRY-CHARLES PUECH, HEINRICH DÖRRIE, VINCENZO CILENTO, R. HARDER, H. R. SCHWYZER, A. H. ARMSTRONG, PAUL HENRY
XIII, 463 pp., CLOTH 55s. NET
Fondation Hardt: Entretiens sur l’Antiquité Classique: Vol. 5

HEFFER * CAMBRIDGE
GREEK PAINTED POTTERY

R. M. COOK gives a systematic and up-to-date account of Greek painted pottery from the Protogeometric to the Hellenic period. It treats the material by periods and, within each period, by schools. The style is clear and uncluttered by professional or art-historical patter. 'This work is distinguished not only for its incorporation of the results of recent research but also for its emphasis, proportions and outlook.' The Connoisseur 63s

THE DRAMA OF EURIPIDES

G. M. A. GRUBE, M.A., Professor of Classics at Trinity College, University of Toronto. Euripides is studied as a great artist of the theatre and no attempt is made to discover his personal views and beliefs. 36s

FROM MYCENAE TO HOMER

A STUDY IN EARLY GREEK LITERATURE AND ART

T. B. L. WEBSTER, Professor of Greek at University College, London, has used the new evidence from the discovery that the Linear B tablets were written in Greek to draw a picture of Mycenaean civilisation in its contemporary setting. '...This brilliant and adventurous book, stuffed as full with ideas as an egg is with meat, and argued with gusto.' The Times Literary Supplement 30s

GREEK ART AND LITERATURE

700-530 B.C.

THE BEGINNINGS OF MODERN CIVILISATION

T. B. L. WEBSTER writes a sequel to From Mycenae to Homer. From Homer and geometric art to the beginnings of Greek drama and red-figure vase painting. '...like the small superb treasure-houses of Delphi, it is much more richly endowed than many bulkier works.' The Guardian 22s 6d

IN THE BEGINNING

SOME GREEK VIEWS ON THE ORIGIN OF LIFE AND THE EARLY STATE OF MAN

W. K. C. GUTHRIE, Professor of Ancient Philosophy in the University of Cambridge. 21s
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
PHAI DON BOOKS BY GISELA RICHTER

ARCHAIC GRAVESTONES OF ATTICA
A definitive study of archaic Attic gravestones from 610–500 B.C. 172 plates, 80 pages text, 79 catalogue entries. 12 x 9 in. Recently published. 73s 6d

KOUROI: ARCHAIC GREEK YOUTHS
A study of 200 examples of Greek statues of male youths from 7th to 5th century B.C. Anatomical analyses, 593 illustrations, catalogue. 12 x 9 in. 7 gns

A HANDBOOK OF GREEK ART
'A masterpiece of selection, arrangement and comment' (Guardian). 511 illustrations, 420 pages. 10 x 7 in. 37s 6d

Please write for detailed illustrated prospectus

PHAI DON PRESS LTD · 5 CROMWELL PLACE · LONDON SW7

The wealth of the past
lies no deeper than the archaeologist’s spade. A trial trench through an olive grove uncovers clay tablets with an inventory of King Nestor’s worldly goods. Excavation for a modern sewer brings to light five masterpieces of ancient Greek sculpture. A great mound in Turkey yields the rich grave furnishings of a princely burial.

These are the spectacular discoveries of recent digging. No less significant are the lesser finds—the inscriptions, coins and household pottery—from which the excavator patiently pieces together the record of man’s early life in all its admixture of travail and triumph.

ARCHAEOLOGY
is the only American quarterly concerned with the presentation of the latest excavation material to the interested layman. Lavishly illustrated articles, prepared by specialists in non-technical language, acquaint its readers with archaeological progress in all parts of the world.

1 year £1 16s. 2 years £3 12s.
Make cheque or money order payable to ARCHAEOLOGY
Address: ARCHAEOLOGY, 5 WASHINGTON SQUARE, NORTH, NEW YORK 3, N.Y.
(Published by the Archaeological Institute of America)
SAMOTHRACE
EXCAVATIONS CONDUCTED BY THE
INSTITUTE OF FINE ARTS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
Edited by KARL LEHMANN

VOL. 1 THE ANCIENT LITERARY SOURCES
Edited and translated by NAPHTALI LEWIS
Demy 4to  £2.10.0

VOL 2
Part 1  THE INSCRIPTIONS ON STONE  P. M. FRASER
Part 2  THE INSCRIPTIONS ON CERAMICS AND MINOR OBJECTS
        KARL LEHMANN
        Demy 4to  PART ONE £3.0.0, PART TWO £3.0.0, THE SET £5.5.0

VOL 4
Part 1  THE HALL OF VOTIVE GIFTS  KARL LEHMANN
Part 2  THE ALTAR COURT  KARL LEHMANN and S. D. T. SPITTLE
To be published Autumn 1961

Further volumes in preparation  Routledge & Kegan Paul

INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY BOOKSELLERS LIMITED

IUB

issue regularly

CATALOGUES AND LISTS ON CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY
and other subjects within the field of the Humanities.
They also welcome offers of small or large collections
of books for sale.

39 STORE STREET  LONDON  W.C.1  Tel. Museum 8959
LANTERN SLIDES

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.

Nearly 2000 colour slides (2 x 2 in.) are now available. There are sets, with notes, on the Athenian Agora excavations, Athens, 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, Greek vases, 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.

HAROLD INGHAM LTD

arrange parties to Greece which allow for the best combination of economy, freedom and variety.

Our 1961 programme, which was fully subscribed shortly after publication, includes four parties to Athens, all offering travel, one way by air and one way by rail and sea, including an overnight stay in Venice. In Athens accommodation is in a good, centrally placed hotel on "bed and breakfast" lines, allowing for complete freedom both in movement and in choice of meals.

Professor J. J. Tierney, Head of the Department of Greek, University College, Dublin, acts as leader of all parties and conducts a series of lectures and visits. Our plans allow for optional excursions to Crete, Delphi, etc.

The charge which we make in 1961 for a 19 days holiday is 59 guineas and this includes all travel to and from Athens (one way air, one way rail and sea), overnight stay in Venice, all meals on ships and on aircraft, bed and breakfast in Athens and the leadership of Professor Tierney.

We suggest that you apply now for a copy of our 1961 programme which we shall be happy to send to you. This will give you a general impression of our holiday plans which include "Art and Architecture" parties to Athens, Rome, Florence, Naples, Venice, Prague, Barcelona, and Madrid; Language Study parties to Nice, Cannes, Vienna, Salzburg, Mayrhofen, Barcelona, Palma and Venice; Music Festival tours to Salzburg, Vienna, Verona, Passau, Aix-en-Provence, Munich and Lucerne and Painting Parties to Cadaques and Madrid.

In addition to sending you a copy of our 1961 programme for your general information we will be pleased to put your name on our "mailing list" so that a copy of our 1962 programme may be sent to you when this is ready in January. We expect our programme for next year to be more extensive and to include, also, parties to Leningrad and Moscow, etc.

HAROLD INGHAM LTD.,
15 ST. JOHN'S ROAD, HARROW
HARrow 1040 & 1087
Hellenic Air Cruises

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

from

72 guineas for a fortnight

The tour charge in each case includes the following:
- Air travel throughout the tour from London back to London.
- Hotel accommodation throughout the tour. First- or second-class hotels are used.
- Meals and refreshments on the flights.
- 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 service charges 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 you will not be pressed to participate in the excursions. We engage leading Greek archaeological guides to accompany the excursions.


A 14-day 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.

* * *


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, Persia

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 Damascus, Jerusalem, Petra, Cyrenaica, Memphis, Cairo and Luxor, Isfahan, Babylon, Teheran and Baghdad

from

165 guineas

Write or telephone for our Hellenic programme, or see your local travel agent.

WINGS LIMITED

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

Telephone: AMBassador 1001

AFFILIATED MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF BRITISH TRAVEL AGENTS
SOCIETY FOR HELLENIC TRAVEL

CRUISE PROGRAMME—1962

Fast, modern ships are used for the three cruises outlined below, thus enabling passengers to spend longer at many ports of call—in particular in Athens—where two days are spent on each cruise—in Istanbul and in Haifa. Cruise 18 is operated in the m.s. Moledet (La Patrie) 6,800 g.r. tons, built in 1961; and cruises 19 and 20 in the s.s. Jerusalem, 10,000 g.r. tons and built in 1937. Both ships are fitted with Denny-Brown anti-roll stabilizers, are fully air-conditioned and are equipped with the latest navigational devices.

CRUISE 18—14th to 30th April

to ITALY, GREECE AND THE HOLY LAND in the m.s. Moledet

visiting MARSEILLES, CIVITAVECCHIA—for OSTIA, ANTICA AND TARQUINIA; SALERNO—for PAESTUM AND POMPEII; ATHENS, HAIFA—where Easter is spent, with numerous alternative excursions to Biblical and archaeological sites, including NAZARETH, THE SEA OF GALILEE AND THE MOUNT OF THE BEATITUDES; JERUSALEM AND EIN KEREM; MEGIDDO, BEIT SHE‘ARIM AND CAESAREA; and the early Byzantine site of AVDAT in the Negev, from BEER SHEBA. The cruise concludes by visiting SANTORIN, DELPHI AND OLYMPIA on its way back to Marseilles.

CRUISE 19—15th to 31 May

to the AEOLIAN ISLANDS, GREECE AND TURKEY in the s.s. Jerusalem

visiting MARSEILLES, LIPARI, CRETE—KNOSOS AND PHAESTOS—EPHESUS or PRIENE, BURSA, THE BOSPORUS, ISTANBUL—where two days are spent—THE ISLANDS OF LEMNOS, DELOS AND MYCONOS, ATHENS—for two days—MISTRA and Marseilles.

CRUISE 20—9th to 25th August

to SARDINIA, SICILY, GREECE AND THE GREEK ISLANDS

in the s.s. Jerusalem

visiting MARSEILLES, CAGLIARI—for the archaeological site at NORA—AGRIGENTO, SYRACUSE—with an optional expedition to PIAZZA ARMERINA—ATHENS—for two days—THE ISLANDS OF SKIATOS, SKOPELOS AND THASOS, PHILIPPI, MOUNT ATHOS, THE ISLANDS OF DELOS AND CORFU, DELPHI and Marseilles.

Five Guest Lecturers will accompany each cruise, including


The very wide price range from 95 gns. to 298 gns. in the m.s. Moledet and from 88 gns. to 345 gns. (for suites) in the s.s. Jerusalem, includes large numbers of two-berth cabins in the middle and lower priced categories. In all cases, the journeys to and from Marseilles, with all meals en route, as well as all advertised shore excursions, are included in the price.

For bookings and all further particulars, apply to the Organizers and Sole Agents

FAIRWAYS & SWINFORD (TRAVEL) LTD.

18 St. George Street, Hanover Square,
HELLENIC TRAVELLERS CLUB

1962 HELLENIC CRUISES

Under the Patronage of the Vice-Chancellors of Oxford, Cambridge, Aberdeen and Reading Universities.

Cruise No. 28

Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey

30th March to 15th April 1962

Venice, Dubrovnik, Pylas, Eglianos, Knossos, Gortyna and Phaestos or Mallia, Rhodes, Lindos or Philerimos and Kamiros, Patmos, Ephesus or Priene, Pergamum, Bosphorus, Istanbul, Thassos, Philippi, Athens (Optional 1-day visit to Daphni, Osios Loukas and Delphi; or Old Corinith, Mycenae and Epidaurus; or Aegina, Hydra and Poros), Sounion, Delos, Milos, Olympia, Korcula, Venice.

Cruise No. 29

Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Lebanon, Cyprus

14th April to 30th April 1962

Venice, Dubrovnik, Olympia, Athens, Daphni and Eleusis or Sounion, Delos, Antalya, Perge, Aspendos, Beirut (Optional 2-day visit by air to: Petra; or Amman, Jerash, Jericho and Jerusalem; or Baghdad and Babylon; or Damascus and Baalbek. Optional 1-day visit to: Amrit, Tortosa and Krak des Chevaliers), Baalbek, Dog River, Byblos, Famagusta, Salamis, Nicosia, St. Hilario, Bellapais, Kyrenia, Rhodes, Kamiros, Knossos, Lepanto, Delphi, Venice.

Cruise No. 30

Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey

29th April to 15th May 1962

Venice, Dubrovnik, Olympia, Knossos, Antalya, Perge, Aspendos, Side, Rhodes, Lindos or Philerimos and Kamiros, Delos, Mykonos, Cape Helles, Gallipoli Peninsula, Troy, Bosphorus, Istanbul, Ephesus or Priene, Athens, Daphni and Eleusis or Sounion, Mistra, Sparta, Delphi, Korcula, Venice.

Cruise No. 31

Italy, Sicily, Greece, Turkey

15th August to 31st August 1962

Genoa, Salerno, Paestum, Palermo, Segesta, Syracuse, Olympia, Knossos, Santorini, Rhodes, Lindos or Philerimos and Kamiros, Delos, Mykonos, Samothrace, Troy, Bosphorus, Istanbul, Ephesus or Priene, Athens, Daphni and Eleusis or Sounion (Optional Overnight Stay in Athens with visit to: Daphni, Osios Loukas and Delphi; or Daphni, Corinth Canal, Mycenae and Old Corinth), Venice.

Cruise No. 32

Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey, Black Sea, Roumania, Bulgaria

30th August to 15th September 1962

Venice, Dubrovnik, Olympia, Knossos, Santorini, Pergamum, Istanbul, Bosphorus, Constanza, Mamaia, Eforie, Bucharest (with overnight stay), Stalin (Varna), Nessebur, Burgas, Troy, Delos, Tinos, Mykonos, Athens, Daphni and Eleusis or Sounion (Optional Overnight Stay in Athens with visit to: Daphni, Osios Loukas and Delphi; or Daphni, Corinth Canal, Mycenae and Old Corinth), Venice.

Cruise No. 33

Yugoslavia, Greece, Turkey

14th September to 30th September 1962

Venice, Dubrovnik, Olympia, Tiryns, Epidaurus, Knossos, Gortyna and Phaestos or Mallia, Rhodes, Lindos or Philerimos and Kamiros, Patmos, Ephesus or Priene, Pergamum, Bosphorus, Istanbul, Troy, Samothrace, Delos, Tinos, Mykonos, Athens, Daphni and Eleusis or Sounion (Optional Overnight Stay in Athens with visit to: Daphni, Osios Loukas and Delphi; or Daphni, Corinth Canal, Mycenae and Old Corinth), Venice.
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PHILOCHOROS ON PHRATRIES

FGrH 328 F 35a (Phot., Suid. s.v. ὄργεων): ... περὶ τῶν ὄργεων γέγραφε καὶ Φιλόχορος: 'τοῦ δὲ φράταρος ἐπὰναγκές δέχεσθαι καὶ τοὺς ὄργεων καὶ τοὺς ὀμογάλκας, οὗς γεννήτας καλοῦμεν.'

F 35b (Harp., Suid. s.v. γεννήτας, etc.): ... Φιλόχορος δ' ἐν τῇ δ' 'Αρτιδος φησὶ πρότερον ὀμογάλκας ὀνομάζεσθαι οὐδὲν γεννήτας καλοῦμεν.

Modern interpretations of this fragment differ widely,¹ but they agree in assuming that the two classes orgeones and gennetai between them made up the whole membership of the phratry, gennetai being the aristocratic minority, orgeones the great mass of commoners; and that the purpose of the clause here quoted was to safeguard the admission of orgeones to the phratry. Drakon’s law of homicide (IG ii 115 = Tod 87, 18–19) takes it for granted that a murdered man, if he has no near relatives, will at least have phrateres, and that social distinctions can be made among them. Already by his time, then, all Athenians belonged to phratries, nobles and commoners alike, and if commoners were ever outside the phratries their first admission belongs to a period before written law. Our fragment has thus had to be taken as referring to the repulse of a later attempt to exclude the orgeones, and it has generally been dated to the time either of Solon² or of Kleisthenes.³

There are grounds for uneasiness about these assumptions:
(1) ἐπὰναγκές δέχεσθαι should mean that the phrateres have no choice in the matter at all. But if orgeones and gennetai between them make up the whole of the phratry, automatic acceptance of both means automatic acceptance of every candidate, which seems improbable.

(2) The object of the verb has to be understood as ‘the orgeones as well as the gennetai’, and the whole clause has to be taken as addressed to the gennetai, who on this hypothesis had a powerful influence over admissions and were abusing it by discriminating against the orgeones. But literally the gennetai are as much the object as the orgeones. The incongruity is shown up by Busolt’s attempt to explain it: the immediate purpose of the legislator, he said, was to safeguard the orgeones, but he also took into account a possible future situation in which the orgeones might have gained the upper hand and begun themselves to discriminate against the gennetai—an improbable prevision.

(3) The epigraphic evidence on orgeones⁴ would never by itself have suggested to anyone that orgeones formed the main body of commoners in the phratry. In Ferguson’s Class A—the citizen orgeones as opposed to the votaries of Bendis and the like—we find some dozen groups, mostly small, apparently well-to-do,⁵ each with a hieron at which they met once a

¹ The fragment has been so widely discussed, both in general histories and in particular studies, that it would be reckless to attempt a bibliography. The following are referred to by author’s name alone: Busolt-Swoboda, Griechisches Staatsrecht (1920–1926), see esp. i 252 with n. 2; Guarducci, L’istituzione della fratia, Mem. dei Lincei vi 6 (1937), esp. 14–15; Hignett, A History of the Athenian Constitution (1952), esp. 61–2, 390–1; Jacoby, commentary on Philochoros, quoted by page of FGrH III b Suppl. vol. i (1954); Wade-Gery, Essays in Greek History (1958) 86–134 (= CQ 25 1931); Wilamowitz, Aristoteles und Athen ii (1893) 259–79. Ferguson, Org. = HTR 37 (1944) 61–140, The Attic Orgeones; id., Phr. = Cl. Ph. 5 (1910) 257–84, The Athenian Phratres; id., Sal. = Hosp. 7 (1938), The Salaminioi of Heptaphylai and Sounion: Sal. (by itself) = the first inscription of the Salaminioi there published, pp. 3–5. This paper arose from a discussion of phratries in a class held in Oxford early in 1957. I am grateful to all who took part, and besides and especially to H. T. Wade-Gery and M. I. Finley: but my errors are my own, and not for lack of warning.

² Wade-Gery, Ferguson, Guarducci, Jacoby and others.

³ Busolt, Hignett and others.

⁴ The lexica are not much use: see Ferguson’s analysis, Org. 62–4.

⁵ Ferguson’s contention (p. 77) that the orgeones of Hosp. 11 (1942) 282 no. 55 had sometimes not enough money for an ox depends on a restoration which he abandoned in Hosp. Suppl. 8 (1949) 131.
year for the festival of a hero, usually obscure to us but evidently old and well established. Below this small superstructure there may have been an enormous substructure of poor and obscure groups which have left no trace in literature or epigraphy, but there is no positive evidence for thinking this.

On the evidence of F 35b Philochoros quoted this law in his fourth book. The outside limits of this book are given by F 32 (book iii—464 B.C.) and F 40 (book v—395/394), and the actual limits were very probably Ephialtes' reform and the end of the Peloponnesian War (Jacoby 251–2). If the law was archaic Philochoros must have mentioned it in a digression, and he was given to digressions (Jacoby 246): but we must not lose sight of the possibility that he noted it under the year in which it was passed.

These are grounds enough for re-examination, and search for an alternative translation of the fragment. I here propose for discussion the following:

(a) Orgeones were just what the epigraphic evidence suggests—a fairly small and relatively obscure upper-class minority. They existed early, before the time of Solon, and were perhaps formed as a result of the rise to wealth and influence of families outside the gene.

(b) At a lower level the mass of the phrateres was not organised in fractional groups inside the phratri until the institution of thiasoi. These were created by a law of the Periklean period, and they subdivided the phratri without regard to the older boundaries of gene and groups of orgeones. They are attested only in the first half of the fourth century, and never took deep root in Attic society.

(c) The same law, or another of the same period, laid down certain general rules for the scrutiny of admissions to the phratri, the diadikasia which we meet in IG ii2 1237. From this scrutiny orgeones and gennetai were expressly exempted, a concession to upper-class privilege which was possible because these bodies would scrutinise their own members even more jealously than the phrateres would, and perhaps advisable because of the anomalies which would arise if the phratri accepted a candidate whom the genos rejected, or vice versa. This is the clause quoted or summarised by Philochoros (the δέ shows that it was not the sole or the main clause), and it means that 'the phrateres must automatically accept [properly qualified] orgeones and gennetai'. Whether the inserted words 'properly qualified' were expressed or merely understood, the acceptance of these candidates did not depend on the phrateres and can fairly be called automatic.

It is certain that there was legislation of some kind about phratries in the Periklean period, and the evidence about thiasoi strongly suggests that they were the fruit of such legislation. The available evidence on the relation between genos and phratri gives only partial and equivocal support to my main positive contention, that gennetai were exempt from the phrateres' scrutiny, and I would only claim that it suits this evidence at least as well as any other hypothesis, and provides a less awkward translation of the Philochoros fragment. But I would stress very heavily the negative point, that the usual translation is unsatisfactory, and that there is no evidence whatever for supposing that all the non-gennetai

There remains IG ii² 2355, an unbroken stone with a list of 16 names, and 2499 with its τροπή εἰς δόο τρίκλων (29–30). The orgeones of Amynus who adopted Asklepios (ii² 1252, 1253, 1259) seem to be richer and might be more numerous.

5 Kahrstedt, Staatsgebiet 235 n. 2, denied the connexion between 35a and 35b, remarking that Philochoros may have had many occasions to mention homogalaktes. But these are not just mentions, they are explanations, and in the same terms: it may be taken as certain that the lexica did not draw them from different parts of Philochoros' work.

6 Orgeones were mentioned in a law of Solon (Seleukos' commentary on the axones, 341 F 1), and they appear in many reconstructions of the corrupt passage of the law cited in Digest xlvii 22.4.

We had best leave out of account the wo-ro-ki-jo-nejo ese-reno (ka-ma) of Ventris and Chadwick, Documents, nos. 152.7, 171.11. Our orgeones present a specialised Attic sense of a word whose meaning elsewhere is perhaps more like 'priest': it is not impossible that there should be some organic connexion between the Attic and the Pylian orgeones, but it is not specially probable, and we have little idea what the latter were.

8 I say 'perhaps' because Athens is not always careful to avoid anomaly.
of the archaic phratry were organised in groups of orgeones. With this misleading assumption out of the way, we can imagine the growth and character of the Attic phratry in terms which, to me at least, are more satisfying than those which are usually offered.

1. Gennetai and Phrateres

It is not possible to discuss cases of admission to the phratry without frequent recourse to the fullest contemporary document, the ‘Demotionid’ decrees \( (IG \text{ ii}^2 1237) \), and I turn to them first.

Two decrees, inscribed by the same hand and proposed by Hierokles and Nikodemos either at the same meeting in 396/395 or at no long interval, make up the main body of the document.\(^9\) They refer to the phratry simply as \( \text{oí } \varphi ράτερες \) (15–16, 43–44, etc.), but two proper names also occur:

(i) Demotionidai. Hierokles’ first proposal is to complete a special scrutiny of those who have not yet been scrutinised ‘according to the law of the Demotionidai’ (13–15), and the names of the rejected are to be expunged from the register \( \text{ἐν } \Delta \mu οτιονίδων \) and from the copy (20–2). A later proposal allows appeal to the Demotionidai by those rejected on a normal scrutiny (29–32): if this fails, the penalty is 1000 drachmas (38–44).

(ii) The \( \text{Δεκελείων } όικος \). In such an appeal this ‘house’ is to appoint five synegoroi to sit with the Demotionidai (32 ff.)\(^10\): if a fine results, it is to be collected by the priest of the ‘house’ (40–2).

Wilamowitz was sure that Demotionidai is the name of the phratry: no one else could decide appeals or keep the register (p. 261). Over the ‘house’ he wavered slightly: it was roughly equivalent to the Dekeleia demesmen (p. 266); it was a privileged subdivision of the phratry (pp. 261 ff.) which had once possessed control of enrolments. Wade-Gery maintained that the phratry’s name was Dekeleies, and that Demotionidai were an aristocratic minority within it: the ‘house’ is simply a name for the phratry itself.

The heart of the matter lies in lines 26 ff., where Hierokles turns from the special to the normal scrutiny:

\[
\text{τὴν } \delta \text{ διαδικασίαν}
\text{τὸ } λοιπὸν \text{ ἐναι } \tau \omega \upsilon \tau ῥωμὲν ἔτει \gamma \nu \alpha \iota \alpha \nu \iota \nu \tau \circ \text{ορίῳ } \phi \rho \varepsilon \nu \text{ δὴ } \tau \nu \text{ ψῆφου } \alpha \pi \delta \text{ τὸ } \beta \omega \mu \omega \nu \epsilon \nu \text{ ἀν } \delta \epsilon \tau \iota \σ \beta \iota \lambda \iota \tau \iota \,
\text{ erection } \text{ ἐφείσει } \varepsilon \nu \text{ } \Delta \mu \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \nu \iota \nu \alpha \xi \nu \iota \nu \iota \nu \text{ τῷ } \kappa \tau \lambda
\]

Hierokles takes the procedure of the diadikasia for granted—it went ‘by the law of the Demotionidai’ (14–15) or ‘according to the existing decrees about introduction and scrutiny’ (68–71)—and he is concerned only with its date and the formality of voting from the altar. The nature of the diadikasia is clear enough: 15–18, the special scrutiny consists of a vote of the phratres;\(^11\) 78–81, Nikodemos proposes that when the diadikasia takes place the phratriarch should not hold the vote of the whole phratry until there has been a previous vote among the introducer’s thiasos. \( 94 \varepsilon \nu \text{ τὴν } \delta \text{ιαδικασίαν } \) evidently means in the debate

---

\(^9\) They are too long to summarise here again. See the translations and analyses given by Wilamowitz and Wade-Gery. The third decree, which is later, does not affect the present issue.

\(^10\) Wade-Gery (pp. 129–9) is clearly right to deduce from their oath that these are judges not advocates.

\(^11\) Wilamowitz insisted that we distinguish the procedure of the special scrutiny from that of the normal, and no doubt they differ in some respects: but the whole vocabulary need not change its meaning.
which precedes the vote of the whole body. The essential part of the diadikasia is this debate and vote of the whole phratry.

If so, the vote in 29 must be a vote of the whole phratry, quite apart from the natural assumption that an unexpressed subject will be the body which is voting the decree. But then Demotionidai must be some body other than the phratry. Busolt-Swoboda indeed maintained (p. 962 n. 2) that the appeal is from the phratry as an assembly to the phratry sitting as a court, but Wade-Gery’s objection (p. 127 n. 1) is decisive: improbable in itself, such appeal could not be called simply appeal ‘to Demotionidai’. Accordingly most recent writers have returned to Wilamowitz’s suggestion that the subject in 29 is not the phratieres but some smaller body, viz. the ‘house of the Dekeleians’, and that appeal is from them to the whole phratry, whose name was Demotionidai. The procedure is thus parallel to that of Nikodemos’ main proposal (78–106), whereby the introducer’s own thiasos votes first: if it accepts, the whole phratry has still to vote on the entrant; if it rejects, the introducer may either acquiesce or appeal to the whole phratry.\textsuperscript{12} Indeed, Wilamowitz (p. 264) explicitly took Nikodemos’ proposal not as a supplement to that of Hierokles but as an amendment of it.

If the subject in 29 is not the body which conducts the diadikasia, there is in effect a violent change of subject at that point, which has to be excused by saying that Hierokles is not giving the procedure in detail but refers to a known standing order. The transition is nevertheless harsh, and Nikodemos’ decree is in form an amendment not to Hierokles’ proposal but to standing orders. The full detail shows that the procedure Nikodemos puts forward is new, i.e. the whole idea of a vote before the diadikasia is a new idea. I cannot think that anyone would have found a preliminary vote in 29 had they not found difficulty in taking the appeal in 30 as an appeal from the phratry to some distinguishable other authority. Certainly there is no indication in 26–9 that the diadikasia was then a two-stage process, and on the face of it the appeal in 30 is an appeal \textit{after} the diadikasia, the appeal from thiasos to phratry in 96 is appeal from a preliminary verdict given \textit{before} the diadikasia. Hierokles and Nikodemos deal with different stages of the procedure, and one does not modify the other.

Wade-Gery’s interpretation puts much less strain on the text.\textsuperscript{13} Two objections have regularly been brought against it, of very different weight. One is to his taking the ‘house of the Dekeleians’ as a name for the phratry, but it must be stressed that this might be wrong without at all affecting his main argument.\textsuperscript{14} The other is more general and more serious, that there could not be appeal from the main body of the phratieres to a smaller corporation, that the law which regulates admission can only be a law of the phratry itself.

\textsuperscript{12} When the thiasos accepts, there is no appeal (and the verb \textit{eiquevau} is not used) but automatic reference to the phratry: appeal occurs, and the introducer has an option, when the thiasos rejects. These notions are clarified by Wade-Gery, 192–5.

\textsuperscript{13} His further argument from the nomenclature of the priest has not apparently been noticed except by Guarducci (p. 43), but is none the less valid.

\textsuperscript{14} There is not much agreement about the correct meaning of \textit{orkos}: Busolt-Swoboda, 939, ‘eine wohl mehrere ‘Thiasoi umfassende Kultgenossenschaft’; Kahrstedt, \textit{Staatsgesetz} 234, ‘ein \textit{orkos} kann terminologisch nichts anders sein als ein Teil eines Genos’, for which surprising assertion he refers to Wilamowitz 266, who only said, ‘haus, \textit{orkos}, ist ein gentilizischer begriff’, and produced examples to show that it could be; Latte, \textit{RE} s.v. ‘Phratriche’ col. 750, confines himself to saying that \textit{orkos} cannot be a name for a phratry. The confusion is natural, for the truth is that any sense of \textit{orkos} which is tolerable in this text is bound to be unique. There is no trouble with 41–2 ‘the priest of the Dekeleians’ house’: the Dekeleians, whoever they are, might have a literal house for their hiera like the Klytides of Chios (\textit{Syll.} 987: the Athenian Kerykes also have a house, \textit{IG} ii\* 1672.24), and their priest might easily be called the priest of such a ‘house’. The body which is to appoint synergoi (32–3) is another matter. If the ‘house’ is not (in both passages) simply the phratry, it could perhaps in 32–3 mean the officers of the phratry, as the persons specially concerned with the cult and its house: the ‘vestry’ of nineteenth-century English parishes would be a parallel, and it would not be hard to find others. But I must repeat that the interpretation of \textit{orkos}, which is difficult on any hypothesis, is a subsidiary point.
that the register must be kept by the phratry, that aristocratic privilege of the kind envisaged by Wade-Gery could not survive as late as 396/395. Here I can only quote Wade-Gery’s own caution (p. 129): ‘Our notions about the Attic aristocracy are exceedingly insecure, and we have to cut them to fit the instances, not the instances to fit them.’ Isaías 7, discussed immediately below, offers some interesting parallels. I take it, then, that Demotionidaí were a genos with a privileged position inside the phratry Dekeleia, and with this preface proceed to the orators.

(a) Isaías 7. 15–17. Thrasyllos claims that he was adopted by Apolloídratos in something of a hurry after the death of the latter’s son. So when the Thargelia came round, ἤγαγε μὲ ἔπι τοὺς βομοὺς ἐν τοὺς γεννητας τε καὶ φράτερας. They have (he continues) the same law, whether it is a real or an adopted son, that the entrant is eligible, and then the rest nevertheless vote, and if their vote is favourable the name is entered on the register. Thrasyllos was accepted, so ἔγγραψεν μὲ ἐν τῷ κοινῶ γραμματεῖον ψηφοσάμενοι πάντες. Gennetai and phrateres are closely linked: there appears to be only one transaction, on the same occasion, with the same sacrifice on the same altar, according to the same law, and it ends with entry on ‘the’ common register.

In outlining the situation in the opening sentence of the speech Isaías uses slightly different language: καὶ ἔπι τὰ ἱερὰ ἀγαγόν τοὺς συγγενεῖς ἄπεδεει καὶ ἐν τῷ κοινῷ γραμματεία ἐνέγραψε. Here Thrasyllos seems to be presented only to the genos, though he gets inscribed on more than one register. The main objection to supposing that the gennetai controlled the whole business is that Isaías, in the passage quoted above from 17, says that ‘everyone’ voted. But he writes loosely enough, even when he is not trying to deceive, and since everyone was apparently present at the meeting, gennetai and ordinary members alike, he would be quite capable of writing about the decisive vote as if it were a vote of the whole meeting. It seems in any case that admission to genos and phratry took place on the same occasion, and the fact that there was only one sacrifice suggests that there was only one effective vote. In such a joint meeting the ordinary phrateres could have no say about admission to the genos, whereas on my interpretation of Philochoros the gennetai might decide the issue for the phratry.

This case comes closest to proving my point, and it is unfortunate that it has to be

---

15 The privilege is by now very much attenuated: the law of the Demotionidaí is freely amended by the assembly of phrateres, and Hierokles dilutes their jurisdiction in appeal.

16 The point seems to be that the introducer’s oath was not enough by itself. It is presumably implied that others were more lax, but I doubt if (c) below is an instance: see n. 21 below.

17 Harp. (Suid.) s.v. γεννητας remarks that in this speech Isaías τοὺς συγγενεῖς γεννητας ὁνόμασεν, which seems to mean that he is speaking throughout of relatives and not of gennetai in the technical sense. It is generally assumed without question that he really meant gennetai (Wilamowitz; Wyse; Francotte, La polis grecque 56–7; Busolt-Swoboda, 957 n. 4; Latte, RE s.v. ‘Phratrie’ col. 750; etc.) Schoemann, seeing the difficulty, wished to emend to τοὺς γεννητας συγγενεῖς ὁνόμασεν. It seems incredible that Thrasyllos should say he was enrolled among his relatives (cf. not only 15–17, but 13 with 27), and I assume that Isaías meant gennetai in the precise sense of the word (Her. v 66.1 is some parallel). But Jacoby appears to accept the statement of Harpokration as it stands.

18 One would expect the Apatouria, but Apolloídratos may have feared that he would not live till then, and in fact he died before he could get Thrasyllos enrolled in his dème.

19 One would expect the Apatouria, but Apolloídratos may have feared that he would not live till then, and in fact he died before he could get Thrasyllos enrolled in his dème.
left to some extent in the fog in which Isaioi has enveloped it. But at least a genos is here very closely associated with a single phratry, the law of the genos is the phratry’s law, and the registers of genos and phratry are spoken of as if they were one—they can hardly in fact be identical, and in 13 they seem to be distinguished, but Isaioi’s language would be intelligible if they were both kept by the gennetai. This may make it easier to accept the view that the phratry Dekeleis admitted its members ‘according to the law of the Demotionida’), and that its own register was kept in Δημοτικαινίων.(b) Dem.] 59.59–61. Phrastor tried to introduce his son by Neaira’s daughter to his phraters, and also to his genos Brytidaei. The genos rejected the child and Phrastor brought a suit against them, but when they challenged him to an oath before the arbitrator he declined it, and this seems to have ended the matter. Here the proceedings in the genos are treated as decisive.

(c) Andokides 1.126–7. The relatives of Chrysilla brought her child to the altar at the Apatouria and bade Kallias sacrifice, but on learning that they maintained that the child was his own he took hold of the altar and swore it was not. Later he was induced to change his mind, and himself introduced the boy to the Kerykes at a later age than was usual. Kallias opposed the introduction, ἐνθίσκομεν δὲ οἱ Κήρυκες κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὅσ᾿ ἐστιν αὐτοῖς, τὸν πατέρα ὁμώοντα εἰσάγεν ἢ μὴν νόμῳ ἑντὸς εἰσάγεν. This is perhaps only marginally relevant, since nothing at all is said of a phratry, but it is to be noted that the first application was made at the Apatouria, the phratries’ festival, and the relatives of Chrysilla might find easier access to the phratry than to the genos.

(d) Demosthenes 57, with Lex. Patm. s.v. γεννήται (BCH 1 (1877) 152). Euxitheos’ object is to show that his father Thouskritos, his mother, and himself were Athenian citizens. For his father’s status he calls first the nearest surviving relatives (20–2); then phraters gennetai and demesmen; last, some relatives to say that the phraters had chosen Euxitheos himself as phratriarch (23—it is not clear why the phraters do not attest this themselves): except for these last we are not told precisely what the witnesses deposed. Phraters and gennetai were called separately (23), but this tells us nothing about the process of Thouskritos’ introduction to them, which in any case was so long ago that there can be no surviving witnesses. Euxitheos’ concern is merely with his father’s standing in later life, for which he accumulates all possible kinds of witness: cf. 67, the catalogue at the end.

But for himself introduction is important, to show that he was acknowledged by Thouskritos, and here the emphasis is all on the phratry: 54 ἀλλὰ παιδίου ὅντα ἐκέθεοι ἤγον εἰς τοῦς φρατέρας, εἰς Ἀπόλλωνος πατρίμου [ἴδιον], τοῦ Κλεοῦς ἰεραί . . . ἀλλὰ μὴν ὁ πατήρ αὐτῶς θαύμος τὸν νόμον τοῦ φρατέρων ὄρκον εἰσφαγάγει με, κτλ. Nothing is said about introduction to a genos, and if Euxitheos belonged to one his emphasis on the phratry would be a considerable objection to my thesis.

However, if Thouskritos belonged to a genos, it seems unlikely that his son should have

20 This has been understood to mean that in this case the child was registered with the phratry before application was made to the genos (e.g. Guarducci, 25). But it does not appear from the text that the phraters ever voted on the case. εἰσήγαγεν is perhaps ambiguous: the verb can be used of effective introduction (as IG ii 1237.18–19), but in itself it means no more than ‘introduce’, ‘present’, and I imagine, though the instances are inductive, that it could be used of the occasion when the meion was sacrificed, when the father probably swore an oath (Dem. 57.54, below) but there was no scrutiny or vote.

21 This is sometimes claimed as a case where the introducer’s oath was all that the law required (n. 18 above), but it seems unlikely that Kallias’ opposition and the vote of the genos were meaningless, as Wilamowitz (p. 271) alleged without argument. The proceedings would more naturally be taken as a real debate ending in a decision that Kallias should proceed according to the form prescribed by law.

22 For this, see below pp. 7–8. The alternative emendation <ε’> ἤγον (Blass) makes no difference for our purpose.

23 The subject of the earlier clause is οἱ οὐργεῖται, and in spite of Ledl, Wien. Stud. 29 (1907) 219, it seems likely that there are two separate occasions. The father perhaps swore his oath when he sacrificed the meion (cf. n. 20), but died before he could sacrifice the kourieion.
nothing to say about his own entry into it, and two other passages suggest that he did not.

(i) 24. εἰ δὲ ἐν ἀπαινή, ὀνομαστὶ ἐκαστὸς ὑμῶν, ἐξητασμένος φαίνεται καὶ ᾣῶν ὁ πατήρ καὶ νῦν ἐγὼ, λέγω φράττεσαι, συγγένεις, δημόταις, γεννηταις seems to mean that every member of the jury had the same relation to a genos as the speaker had. Wilamowitz (p. 272, citing Lex. Patm.) supposed that Euxitheos was not a gennetai but that gennetai controlled entry into his phratry, much as in his belief the 'house of the Dekeleians' did among the Demo

tionidae; Ledl, in Wien. Stud. 29 (1907) 207 ff., developing a position set out by Meyer in Forschungen ii 519–21, thought that every Athenian was a gennetai but that there were nameless plebeian gene as well as the aristocratic ones we hear about. Neither answer is satisfactory. These plebeian gene have left no other trace, and the distinction which Philochoros makes is proof that orgeones were not called gennetai. Wilamowitz is nearer the truth: the phrase must mean something other than admission to a genos, but we can hardly allow that as late as 346/345 no Athenian entered a phratry except after effective scrutiny by gennetai—there are too many cases in which entry clearly depends on unimpeded voting in a phratry.24

(ii) 67 εἰπ' 'Απόλλωνος πατρώφος καὶ Διὸς ἐρκεῖον γεννηται, in the list of witnesses to Thoukritos' citizenship, requires explanation—gene are usually referred to by their names, and these deities are not in any case likely to be the distinctive gods of any genos. Euxitheos is here examining himself in the style of an archon's anakrisis (66), in which the candidate was asked (Ath. Pol. 55.3) εἰ ἐστιν αὐτῷ 'Απόλλων πατρώφος καὶ Ζεὺς ἐρκεῖος, καὶ ποῦ ταῦτα τὰ ἱερὰ ἐστιν. Elsewhere it is, somewhat vaguely, stated that every true Athenian 'had' shrines or altars of these gods (Plato, Euthyd. 302c; Deinarchos and others in Harp. s.v. ἐρκεῖος Ζεὺς; Kratinos the younger, fr. 9 K, ii p. 291), but these passages do not make clear the relation of an individual to 'his' shrine, or where one might expect to find the latter; though Socrates uses the words βασιλικοὶ καὶ ἱερὰ οἰκεῖα, and lexicographers25 suggest that Zeus Herkeios was to be found in individual courtyards. Two gene had shrines of Apollo Patroos, Elaisidai (IG ii2 2602) and Gephyraioi (3629–30), and Salaminioi sacrificed to him on 7 Metagéttion (Sal. 89); one phratry had its own shrine, Therrikleidai (IG ii2 4973); there was a state cult of Apollo Patroos in the Agora (Thompson, Hesp. 6 (1937) 77–115), and an altar of Zeus Herkeios on the Akropolis (Philoch. 328 F 67).

It is widely believed that these cults were in the custody of gene,26 and though the belief is backed by no positive evidence except these passages from Demosthenes 57, it offers very much the easiest explanation of them. Euxitheos, that is, was not a gennetai, and is concerned only with the gennetai who had charge of 'his' Apollo and Zeus: hence the expression in 57.67, which would be eccentric if he were speaking as a gennetai about his own genos. To establish his relation to such cults the individual must be presented to their custodians, so Euxitheos was taken as a child to the shrine of Apollo Patroos among others (54, quoted above), and after this he can say he is ἐν γεννηταις ἐξητασμένος like other Athenians (24). So far as it goes, this is a test of citizenship—not an important test, and no great stress is laid on it here, nor is it used in any other surviving speech, though in lost speeches Hypercides and Deinarchos made some play with Zeus Herkeios (Harp. loc. cit.). In the fourth century it was the vote of demos and phratry that mattered: one would suppose that by that time the gennetai recognised without question the vote of an accredited son of a phratry to call a particular Apollo 'his'.


25 Harp., Suid. s.v. ἐρκεῖον Ζεὺς; Phot. s.v. ἐρκεῖον Διὸς; EM 375.24; schl. Plato Euthyd. 302d. Some of these allege that ἐρκος was Attic for a house, which at least shows how they understood ἐρκεῖος.

26 References in Busolt-Swoboda, 956; Ferguson, Sal. 31. The latter's objection that neither Kerykes nor Salaminioi had a separate priest of Apollo Patroos is not decisive: the archon of the genos, for instance, might discharge this function.
This would explain the text before us, and it does not conflict with the other evidence: for if the cults to which every Athenian was thus attached were cults presided over by the gene, that would not prevent individuals from setting up altars to Zeus Herkeios, or associations of any kind from having their own shrines of Apollo Patroos. The point is of some importance for the structure of early Attic society—this part of the anakrisis of archons is surely archaic, as opposed to more modern questions like father's deme or mother's father's deme—and it may be worth pointing to some of the consequences:

(1) There is no question of an aristocratic cult having spread to the lower classes with the growth of democracy (Busolt-Swoboda, 956, 1168): if Euxitheos depended on gennetai for an Apollo to call his own, he was in this respect in the same position as his ancestors in the seventh century. It may be that when a seventh-century candidate answered this question in the anakrisis affirmatively he meant that he belonged to the minority which controlled these cults, whereas a classical candidate meant that he had a regular hereditary connexion with one: but even so there would be no change in the quality of the cults or their custodians.

(2) Meyer was surely mistaken in insisting (Forsch. ii 519 ff.) that a gennete's descent from a particular god or hero excluded his descent from Apollo Patroos, in his view the older conception: indeed, by page 524 he had realised the difficulty of a proposition which, strictly held, would mean that no gennetae was eligible for the archonship.

(3) If the relevant cult was one controlled by a genos, it was irrelevant that the individual might have an altar of Zeus Herkeios in a courtyard of his own. The question in the anakrisis is therefore not concerned with ownership of land, and cannot be used as evidence that either citizenship or eligibility for the archonship ever depended on holding land (Wilamowitz, Aus Kydathen 95; Meyer loc. cit.).

To return to Demosthenes 57, there remains the question what is meant by the comment in Lex. Patm. s.v. γεννηται: ... Φώλοχορος δὲ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ Ἀθηνιδών γεννηται καὶ ὁμογέλακται καλεῖ. οὕτω δὲ τοὺς ἐγγραφομένους εἰς τοὺς φράτερας διακρίνοντες καὶ δικαίωντες εἰς πολιταί εἰσαι ἢ ξένοι ἐδέχοντο ἢ ἐπέβαλλον [ἀπέβαλλον Wil.], ὡς Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ πρὸς Εὐβοιλίδην· 'κάλει δὲ μοι καὶ τοὺς φράτερας καὶ [φράτερας, ἐπιτα Dem. 57.23] τοὺς γεννητας.' This odd passage has not received much attention since Wilamowitz referred to it in the course of his argument that there were two classes among the phratres. He took it, apparently, as literally true of the fourth century, but that can hardly be right. On no interpretation can the scholiast have extracted his doctrine from Demosthenes 57 alone, and we are bound to suppose that his original had digressed more or less widely. If he reproduces his original at all faithfully, then, since it does not fit the fourth century, we must suppose the reference is to a distant past when genetai in fact controlled entry into the phratry, which they may have done, and Athidographers might have known they did. If the comment has been garbled the possibilities are of course wider: for instance, Philochoros F 35 is touched on in the preceding sentence, and our sentence might refer to what I believe that fragment to mean; or there might be allusion to a right of appeal to genetai such as we find in IG ii² 1237—but there is not much gain in speculating what a lost original might have said, and the best we can do is to note this as another text in which it appears that genetai somehow played an important part in the affairs of a phratry.

(é) Isaios 2.14. The speaker is substantiating his adoption by Menekles: εὐάγγει με εἰς τοὺς φράτερας παρόντων τοῦτων, καὶ εἰς τοὺς δημότας με ἐγγράφηκα καὶ εἰς τοὺς ὄργεων. Philochoros' distinction between orgones and genetai is to a limited extent borne out by

27 It has been noted that Odysseus had an altar of Zeus Herkeios in his courtyard (χ 334), but Eumaios apparently not (ἐς 5 ff., 419 ff.): perhaps he depended for this on Odysseus.

28 All Spartans were descended from Herakles in the seventh century (Tyrtr. fr. 8.1), but of the tribal eponyms only Hylos was Herakles' son. (Plato, loc. cit., makes it clear that Patroos in the title of this Apollo means that he was the general ancestor of all Athenians, through his son Ion.)
the orators: in this, the only case where admission to orgeones is cited, there is no mention of gennetai, while in Isaos 7 and [Dem.] 59 there is no mention of orgeones. The fact that phratres and orgeones are called separately convinced Wyse and Ferguson that the group of orgeones was not a constituent unit of the phratry, while the variation in the verbs—‘introduced’ me to the phratres, ‘enrolled’ me among the orgeones’—persuaded Wilamowitz that the orgeones played a decisive part in enrolment in the phratry. As against Wyse, the speaker is not concerned to give a narrative record of his admissions, only, like others in similar cases, to make the most of each distinguishable group that can attest his adoption, so that his separation of phratres and orgeones need not signify that they were not connected. Wilamowitz is perhaps nearer the mark: we cannot indeed press Isaos’ language to mean that the man was not enrolled in his phratry, but the variation in the verbs may reflect a real difference between simple presentation and effective enrolment.29

(f) Aischines 2.147: a series of infinitives of which his father Atrometos is the subject, including εἶναι δ’ ἐκ φρατρίας τὸ γένος30 ἢ τῶν αὐτῶν βομιδόν Ἐτεοβουτάδαις μετέχει, δεν ἢ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος ἐστὶν ἀρχιερα. The roundabout phrase encouraged Ferguson (Phr. 281) and Guarducci (pp. 24–5) to deny that the Eteoboutadai belonged as a whole to this phratry, and indeed if that was all Aischines wished to say he could have said it more simply: but he naturally wished to make the most of the altars and the priesthood as well. It seems more likely that the genos had an organic connexion with the phratry who ‘shared their altars’.

(g) The Salaminioi sacrificed to Zeus Phratrios at the Apatouria (Sal. 92), a festival which each phratry celebrated at its own local centre (cf. IG ii2 1237.52–64), so that Ferguson was at some difficulty to explain how the Salaminioi came to be together for this sacrifice if, as he believed, they were spread over several phratries. It is clearly simpler to suppose that they were associated as a genos with a single phratry.31

This evidence is enough to show that in several cases a particular genos played, as such, an important part in the affairs of a particular phratry. It supports the thesis that in IG ii2 1237 Demotionidai could be a genos with a privileged position inside the phratry Dekeleias: it is not possible to sustain the objection that this would be an isolated case of the partial survival of archaic privilege into the full classical period. It does not decisively exemplify my guess that gennetai were admitted automatically to the phratry, but it does the guess more good than harm.

2. Thiasoi

In the second decree of IG ii2 1237 Nikodemos’ amendment to standing orders lays down that the three witnesses whom the introducer must produce at the preliminary hearing (anakrisis) must be from his own thiasotai (71–8); and that a preliminary vote must be taken within the introducer’s thiasos before the main vote of the phratres (78–106). Clearly all ordinary members of the phratry belonged to thiasoi within it. IG ii2 2345, dated by Kirchner to before the middle of the fourth century, gives a list of names with patronymic and demotic spasmodically added, divided up by headings of which ‘Hagnotheos’ thiasos’

29 For the meaning of ἐταίρειν see n. 20 above.
30 The subject is Atrometos throughout, so τὸ γένος must be taken adverbially, ‘he belonged by descent to a phratry. . . ’ If Atrometos had been a gennete, Aischines would have said so unmistakably.
31 The history of the genos Salaminioi and the relation of its two branches remain obscure, and none of the solutions so far proposed is wholly convincing: Ferguson, Sal.; Nilsson, AJP 59 (1938) 385; Daux, REG 54 (1941) 220; Guarducci, Riv. Fil. 26 (1948) 223; perhaps the assumption that the seven tribes of ‘Heptaphylai’ were Kleisthenic tribes is wrong.

The inscription too often leaves us in some doubt what the position was before the two branches were reconciled. Did each then sacrifice separately to Zeus Phratrios? and if so, with a different phratry? and if so, how was the difference resolved? We can only leave this open.
A. ANDREWES

(18), 'Antiphanes' thiasos' (44), 'Diogenes' thiasos' (58) survive. It has long been recognised as a phratry list: its structure is adequately explained by ii² 1237, and no other large body is likely to be subdivided in just this way.

Two names from Diogenes' thiasos, Στρατοφων 'Αγρυλὴς (77) and Δήμων 'Αγρυληθ (79), recur in the important document of the genos Salaminioi published by Ferguson in 1938, among the seven who swore to the agreement on behalf of the Salaminioi of Heptaphylai, Στρατοφων Στράτωνος 'Αγρυ (76), Δήμων Δημαρέτο 'Αγρυλῆ (79). Two pairs of unrelated homonyms from Agryle in the same period are highly unlikely: the Stratophon and Demon of the phratry, either or both, must be gennetai of the Salaminioi. But the Salaminioi inscription gives us six other names from this branch of the genos (three Acharnians, two Boutadai, and one Epikephisioi) and eight from the Sounio branch, and none of these appear in Diogenes' thiasos or elsewhere in the surviving part of the list. Ferguson was not troubled by this, since he believed there was no connexion between genos and phratry, and that members of a single genos might be scattered over several phratries (Phr. 281; Sal. 28): but on the evidence brought forward in the previous section of this paper we should expect that if some Salaminioi belonged to the phratry of ii² 2345 the rest belonged there also. In fact the six names on ii² 2345 qualified as 'Αγρυλήθων occur in a bunch at the end of Diogenes' thiasos (76–9, 83–4; perhaps add 74, see n. 32), and among them we find, precisely, the two known Salaminioi from Agryle. This encourages one to think that a similar bunch of Acharnians elsewhere contained the three Acharnian Salaminioi, and so on—we have only the lower part of the stone, and the surface of much of that is obliterated.

It is thus certain that a thiasos could include gennetai, and more likely than not, in the one instance known to us, that gennetai were split up among several thiasoi of the same phratry. There are only two phratries about whose internal structure we know anything whatever, and the fact that we find thiasoi in both of them may suggest that the system was general. The principle of division does not appear from analysis of i² 2345: it might perhaps be geographical.

The remaining evidence is more scattered and harder to identify, for though thiasos has evidently a technical meaning within the phratry it is also a non-technical word common in literature. Its most frequent association is Dionysiac, but the more general definition in Harpokration (Suid.) θιασός ἐστι τὸ ἀθροιζόμενον πλῆθος ἐπὶ τελετῇ καὶ τιμῇ θεῶν, is confirmed by the series of Attic inscriptions beginning at the end of the fourth century with IG i² 1261 and continuing at least through the third century. The special sense is not noted by the lexicographers, for all their zeal for Attic technicalities, and the only literary text known to me where the special sense is appropriate is Athenaios v 185c, τῶν δὲ νῦν δεῖπνων προοιμώντης οἱ νομοθετῶν τὰ τε φυλετικὰ [δείπνα] καὶ τὰ δημοτικὰ προσετάζων, ἐτὶ δὲ τῶν θιάσων καὶ τὰ φράτρικα καὶ πάλιν τὰ ὀργεωνικὰ λεγόμενα, where thiasoi occur in a context of tribes phratries and orgeoines, and are the subject of legislation.

---

32 Ferguson, Sal. 14, 28 n. 7. As he points out, Στράτων in 2345–74, three lines above Stratophon, might well be his father. It was also natural to guess that ΗΜΑΡΙΟΣ 'Αγρυλη in 2345.83 might be Demon’s father Demaretos, but Wade-Gery, who looked at the stone for me in 1956, assures me that this is impossible, and the squeeze in the collection of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, confirms this.

33 The view is therefore no longer tenable, that thiasoi and gene are exclusive terms, thiasoi being composed of orgeoines only (e.g. Higgett, 56); nor Wade-Gery’s idea that a genos might itself constitute a thiasos (p. 87, written before the document of the Salaminioi was found).

34 No intelligible pattern emerges from the de-motics on the stone, and the few that can be added by identification of individuals (Kirchner’s note on 33–35 should be corrected in the light of Lewis’ argument, BSA 50 (1955) 13–14). The bunching of members from Agryle in Diogenes’ thiasos is something that is liable to happen to any group whose membership is hereditary.

35 Harp. adds, Ἦδωρ (fr. 32 N²) δὲ ἐν Ὀμφάλῃ κοινῶς ἔτι παντὸς ἀθροισμάτως ἐτίσε τοῖνοι, and LSJ under θίασος give instances from Euripides for the general meaning ‘company, troop’: but these have all some suggestion of or comparison with religious activity. Ion is best treated as an exception.
Instances must therefore be examined individually. Thus the thiasos of Herakles in Isaioi 9.30 is almost certainly irrelevant—Astyphilos was introduced to it by his stepfather ἃνα τῆς κοινωνίας, and that does not sound like a stage in the young man’s presentation to a phratria. IG ii² 2343 of the early fourth century, a dedication by a priest of Herakles and a body of thiasoteis, with fifteen names round the edge and in the middle, looks like an exact parallel to Isaioi 9.30 and is probably not relevant either, nor 2347. The thiasoi with which Demosthenes (18.260) reproached Aischines, when he ran round the streets waving snakes above his head and crying euoi saboi, have nothing to do with our question: indeed the less emphatic phrase used earlier in 19.199, καὶ παῖδα ὄντω τῶν θασόων καὶ μεθούοντων ἀνθρώπους καλλικοῦμενον, rather suggests that respectable thiasoi played no large part in Athenian social life in 343. Finally, the series of thiasoi attested epigraphically from the end of the fourth century are autonomous religious associations, almost all evidently open to non-citizens.

Two inscriptions which do not mention the word thiasos have higher claims. IG ii² 2344, of the early fourth century, is headed Διὸς: Φρατρίοι: Ἀθηναίας: Φρατριάς | istringstream φράτερες, and the remainder is a list of twenty names with patronymics, with a high degree of family interconnexion. The list is impossibly short for a full phratria, and von Premerstein (AM 35 (1910) 113) was very probably right to suggest that this was a single thiasos within a phratria. If so, it is to be noted that they dedicate not to a special deity of their own but to the gods of the phratria. IG ii² 2723 (Finley, Land and Credit, horos no. 41) is a πραγματική λύσει of c. 350 with five creditors: (1) an individual, (2) φράτερα τοῖς μετὰ Ἐρασιστάτῳ Ἀναφλῆς, (3) Γλ[a]υκίδας, (4) Ἐπικλείδας, (5) φράτερα τοῖς μετὰ Νίκηνος Ἀναφλῆς. The second and fifth of these might conceivably be whole phratries, the person named being the phratriarch or someone specially concerned in the transaction, but for a phratria its corporate name of these might be more natural, whereas the thiasoi of ii² 2345 are identified by a personal name: again, von Premerstein (p. 103) was probably right in taking these as thiasoi of a phratria. IG ii² 2720 (Finley no. 43) must also be mentioned as a possibility (cf. Poland, Vereinswesen 19 n.), but it is a possibility on which nothing can be built.

An outlying instance from the early fifth century diverges somewhat from the rest, SEG x 330:

--- ε --- μ --- ο --- κλεο[ς]

The name is in quite a different style from the rest: the thiasoi of IG ii² 2345 are named from a current member; that of Isaioi 9.30 and those of the third century are named, if at all, from their cult (e.g. IG ii² 1261, 1262) and refer to themselves corporately as τῶν θασών, not by the collective noun thiasos. Etoniai has suggested a connexion with Etoniai, but whatever the connexion with this place or its eponym the name will have been understood in the fifth century as a patronymic name for a group connected by common descent. [h][δρω]ν shows that there was a real cult. The connotation of the word thiasos

--- The MS. reading εις τῶν θιάσων τῶν Ἱππακλέων seems improbable: Ferguson’s parallel (Org. 70-1, n. 12) from Dem. 18.260, 19.199 refers to much less reputable activities, and the text of Harp, s.v. θιάσος, does not really prove that Harp. read the plural in Isaioi. Suappe’s θιασώτα; seems the easiest correction.

--- IG ii² 1261 (302/301) and many of the following. For foreigners cf. 1263.21 (301/300), 1271.15 (298/297), etc.; Poland, Vereinswesen 20 ff.

--- Perhaps of the same phratria, and perhaps Glaukiai and Epikleiai were gene which also belonged to it, but we cannot be sure of this. In such transactions the ‘creditors’ might be inter-related, as in IG ii² 2870 (Finley no. 146) Κεκροπίδαι καὶ Ἀικοῦθεια, καὶ Ἀλκιάδαι: the Lykomidaei had their main shrine at Phyla (Plut. Them. 1.4), a Kekropid domicile.

--- Cf. Ferguson, Org. 133, app. 2; Guarducci, 45.
may have been somewhat different at this early date: at any rate, the Etonidae are not very like the subdivisions of phratries which we have so far examined.

Unless we admit the Etonidae, the evidence for thiasoi as subdivisions of phratries is confined to the first half of the fourth century. Wilamowitz (p. 263) was clearly right to say that these thiasoi existed before 396/395: Nikodemos in IG ii² 1237 takes their existence for granted and puts them to a new use. Again, he contemplates that a man might not be able to find three witnesses among his own thiasotai, and this implies that some thiasoi were unreasonably small. If they had been instituted as recently as the reorganisation after 403, it is not likely they would have collapsed in this way by 396/395, and the presumption is that they had existed before 413 and that the fall in numbers was due to the war and the occupation of Dekeleia.

On the other hand, they do not look like old and deeply-rooted institutions. They have no names of their own—in the headings preserved on IG ii² 2345 each is named from a current member, who heads the list underneath. These are not the founders, for whatever the date of the inscription they cannot all be veterans who were already senior members before 413, and we must take it that thiasoi changed their name when they changed their head. To judge from the one instance we can check, the boundaries of the gene were disregarded when these thiasoi were formed. It is probably significant that they attracted no literary attention, even from the orators, and so were overlooked by later scholarship, except for a possible allusion in Athenaios; and also that the word itself, thiasos, became or remained a favourite title for quite other types of association. All this would be amply explained if these thiasoi had been created in the latter half of the fifth century and had had a comparatively short effective existence.

We should of course be better off if we knew why they were instituted. Not to play a part in the admission of phrateres: that is something which Nikodemos added to their function in the Dekeleia phratry, and the silence of the orators is clear evidence that his system was not widely imitated. It does not look as if their function was primarily religious. The basic document, IG ii² 2345, itself remains a little mysterious: we do not know why the list was compiled in the first place; the names added in a different hand at the bottom of three of the thiasoi were perhaps added to keep the list up to date; but if this is a running list it becomes less likely that the figures attached to some of the names are a record of contributions on a particular occasion. About one name in five, of the 75 or so whose right-hand ends are preserved, has a figure added: mostly 5 or thereabouts, but there is one example each of 15, 50, 55, 100, 105. The explanation remains uncertain.

It would be well to remember that our highly selective evidence gives us, after all, little idea what the phrateres themselves did when they were not celebrating the Apatouria or giving evidence in court. It is likely enough that there were other activities, concealed from us by the rarity of phratry records, and the affairs of the phratry needed some administrative machinery. In the fifth century the gennetai may have retained a large measure of control—we have no records, and only know that Kleisthenes left them alone—and perhaps this was eventually felt to be out of date. The institution of thiasoi may be part of a deliberate democratisation of the phratries.

40 θιασοται are listed in the Solonian law in Digest xlvi 22.4 among those associations whose internal rules are allowed to be valid so far as they do not conflict with the law of the state. Thiasoi in Solon's time might be something different again: but (as Wade-Gery reminds me) this is not an antiquarian's quotation from the axones, but a lawyer's reference, so that the law as here presented may contain later accretions and there is no certainty that Solon legislated about thiasoi.

41 It is unlikely that the headship changed annually, if a personal name was enough for identification, i.e. if the creditors of IG ii² 2723 (p. 11 above) are thiasoi (v. Premerstein, 116).

42 IG ii² 1241, and the reference to the Medontidai in Hep. 10 (1941) 16, no. 1.16 ff., tell us something about the business transactions in which a phratry might be concerned.
3. Periklean legislation on phratries

Though the democracy in general worked through Kleisthenes’ tribes and demes, Periklean legislation affecting the phratries is clearly not impossible. When we find in Isaio 7.16 that the law of the genetani and phrateres prescribes an oath *μὴν εἰς ἀστής εἰσάγει καὶ γεγονότα ὧδε* (cf. 8.19), it is at least clear that Perikles’ citizenship-law of 451/450 affected their practice, and it may well be that this law imposed explicitly an amendment of their old oath.

The clearest sign is the word φρατρίζη in Krateros 342 F 4 (Harp., Suid. s.v. ναυτοδικαί): Κράτερος γονὸν ἔν τῷ δ’ ὑπὸ φυσισμάτων φησίν ἓ εἰν ἐν τῇ εἰς ἀμφοῖν κείνον γεγονός φρατρίζη, διότι εἶναι τῷ βουλομένῳ Ἀθηναίων, οὗ δικαι εἰσί ταλαχόνει δέ τῇ ἕνη καὶ νέος πρὸς τοὺς ναυτοδικαί. The clause is cited to explain the term nautodikai, and with it lines from Kratinos’ Cheirones (fr. 233 K, between 436 and 431) and Aristophanes’ Daitaleis (fr. 225 K, 427) which confirm that in this period cases about illegal citizenship came before the nautodikai. Krateros F 4 is clearly not from the law which gave these cases to their jurisdiction, and indeed φρατρίζη is inappropriate to any law dealing with this subject, for such a law must refer to illegal membership of the deme as well as (or rather than) the phratry.

It seems inevitable that the law of which this is a fragment must have dealt with phratries and admission to them, which is unlikely for the law of 451/450. Jacoby (on 342 F 4), stressing the importance of φρατρίζη, maintains that our law must belong to a period when foreigners were creeping illegally into the citizenship by way of the phratries, and says the thirties are a likely period: but he does not say why, and neither Kratinos nor Aristophanes was speaking of phratries. But we can point to a time when the question of μητροδίκης in the phratries might call for regulation by the state, and this may help us to an answer. In spite of Jacoby’s argument on Philochoros 328 F 119, it is likely that the law of 451/450 did not apply to existing metrooxenoi like Kimon, but was explicitly restricted to those born after its passage. If so, complications were likely to arise in the case of metrooxenoi born before the passage of the law but not yet enrolled in demes by 451/450, and these would be specially acute in the middle 430’s when the demes came to deal with candidates allegedly born just before 451/450. There need not have been many of these: one or two disputed cases would be enough to draw attention to them, and to the phrateres who would be the primary witnesses to their status and the date of their birth. This situation could easily produce a law dealing generally with admission to the phratries and particularly with the treatment of such metrooxenoi: and an appendix to such a law might point out that phrateres alleged to be of foreign birth on both sides should be dealt with not by the phratry but before the nautodikai by any qualified citizen.

It is thus certain that there was Periklean legislation affecting the phratries, and an occasion can be found when such legislation would be likely. I should suppose that Philochoros F 35 is a clause from the same law as Krateros F 4: and since we should look in this

---

43 Jacoby’s text is beyond reasonable doubt. *ἐξων*, the reading of the MSS. of Harp., is implied also by Suidas’ *γένος*: the *μὴ* between τις and *ἐς ἀμφοῖν*, attested by Bekker for MS. A of Harp., can only be taken into the text if we are prepared to go to the length of altering *ἐξων* to *ἀτοίν*.  
44 Jacoby’s further objection that 451/450 lies outside the limits of book iv depends on his dating of F 1, from book iii, to 446/445 or later. The authors of *ATL* (iii 9–12) argue that F 4 belongs to 451/450 and F 1 must be earlier, and this is doubtful for the reason given above: but they rely mainly on the probability that Doros in F 1 is the known city of Phoenicia, appropriate for 454 but most unlikely later, and this seems to me the weightier argument. That book iv could have begun before 451/450 is no positive argument for assigning F 4 to that year, but it cannot be so very much later: the fact that book ix included a document from Sept 411 prevents us from allowing a long span to book iv.  
45 I am glad to find that an explanation on these lines had also occurred to Wade-Gery, though he is more inclined than I am to refer Krateros F 1 to Perikles’ law of 451/450.
period for the institution of thiasoi in the phratries, it would be economical to ascribe this
too to the same occasion.

4. Conclusion

My interpretation of Philochoros F 35 must stand or fall by the merits of the translation
and its conformity with the evidence presented. No further argument is needed here, and
I turn therefore to the more general implications of rejecting the standard interpretation, of
denying that the commoners in the phratry were organised in groups of orgones, and of the
evidence that in some cases at least a particular genos held a position of privilege and
influence inside a particular phratry even as late as the fourth century.

In the fourth century, when the orators and the epigraphic texts first give us any detailed
insight, the Athenian phratry governed itself in the main in democratic style through
decrees passed at an assembly (agora) of its members. There is, however, a residue of
undemocratic practice and language which is best explained as the survival, in a backwater
unaffected by Kleisthenes' reform, of some vestiges from an earlier aristocratic period when
the phratry was really governed by the law of the gennetai, and the gennetai really con-
trolled its membership. By 396/395, when we find the Dekeleia phratry amending its law
with such freedom that to call it the 'law of the Demotionidai' can have been little more than
a verbal habit, the archaic survival was not on an alarming scale. The question is, what
such verbal habits imply for the archaic past.

It is a clear implication of the hypothesis I am considering that there should be many
phratries, roughly speaking as many as there were gene:\(^{46}\) but of course we have the names
of many times more gene than phratries. For this disproportion there may, however, be
straightforward reasons: gene survived into Roman times but phratries did not; the religious
functions of certain gene interested hellenistic scholars; gene were more often involved in
litigation;\(^{47}\) for these and perhaps other reasons the lexicographers preserved the names of
many gene but no phratries. It is to be noted that epigraphically the balance is a good
deal more even,\(^{48}\) and some indication of the scale on which phratries existed may be
obtained from the close association which IG ii² 1237 shows between the phratry Dekeleia
and the deme Dekeleia, or 1241 between Dyaleis and Myrrhinous. If there were only
half as many phratries as there were demes, that would amply provide one for each known
and certain genos.\(^{49}\) We are not accustomed to think of phratries as existing in these
numbers, but there is no real bar against doing so.

Turning to the remoter past, the phratry may have been an established institution
among the Greek-speaking peoples before they reached the Greek peninsula: that is perhaps
implied in the linguistic fact that all dialects of Greek abandoned the original sense of φαρτυς
and adopted other words for a literal brother. But it does not seem that such primitive
phratries survived with undiminished vigour through all the long centuries between the first

\(^{46}\) We must not expect absolute regularity. See
n. 31 for the possibility that the Salaminioi were
split between two phratries; n. 38 for a possible
phratry with two gene.

\(^{47}\) The case between Krokonidai and Koironidai,
in which both Lykourgos and Deinachos spoke, is
referred to in several entries in Harpkration, e.g.
Koironidai. Cf. also Phrastor and the Brytidae,
p. 6 above; and the arbitration between the two
branches of the Salaminioi.

\(^{48}\) It was a surprise to learn that Medontidai were
a phratry (Heid. 10 (1941) 16, no. 1.16 ff.), and there
might be other surprises.

\(^{49}\) Toepffer's Attische Genealogie lists 58 possible
gene: a few more have turned up since, but at least
as many of his are extremely doubtful. The demes
created by Kleisthenes, primarily the city demes,
should perhaps be left out of account, but there may
have been city phratries. The scheme set out in
Ath. Pol. fr. 3 is at variance with all we know of
Athens at any later period, and if Aristotle assigned
this scheme to Ion he was describing something other
than the origin of the phratries and gene of his own
day (Ferguson, Phr. 257 ff., defended its historicity,
but abandoned it in Class. Stud. presented to E. Capps
(1936) 151 ff.). See, however, Hammond, History of
Greece (1959) 153.
appearance of these peoples in Greece and the composition of the Iliad. The Mycenaean and Homeric evidence, which I have examined elsewhere, suggests the reverse. Kinship is improbable as a principle of organisation at the time when the Pylian bureaucrats compiled their elaborate lists, and is positively excluded by the epic convention which Homer inherited, a convention which I take to have been formed, as regards its military and political aspects, in the period of the migrations: and it is also excluded from the social background which M. I. Finley in *The World of Odysseus* assigns roughly to the tenth and ninth centuries. On the other hand, phratries were familiar to the poet of the Iliad himself, as is shown by the two passages in which he uses the word, B 362–3 and I 63. The conclusion which emerges from this evidence is that phratries as we know them from the classical period were not to any important extent survivals of the primitive institution, but rather a creation of the aristocratic world to which Homer was accustomed.

The situation in Attica in the archaic period does not of course derive directly from the situation in the East Greek world in Homer’s day, but the Athenian evidence suggests that the development was fairly closely parallel. The decline of the monarchy, we must imagine, left the field open to aristocratic competition, in which size of retinue and extent of territory played an important part. The nobles themselves were organised in gene, whose alliances and rivalries decided the issues of the day: their dependants were organised in phratries, each under its own genos. How far there was genuine kinship between members of a particular genos, or phratry, we cannot hope to tell, for the transference of kinship terms to alien contexts is common enough in comparable societies, and Greek associations of almost any kind have a high capacity for growing eponymous ancestors, so that the meaning of the terms is not a safe guide. The essential point is the poor man’s dependence on his betters, for his place in the social and political structure, and for his access to the cults which were the mark of the true Athenian (pp. 7–8 above). The question could hardly be pursued further without raising the question of his economic dependence too, and that would require another equally long study. We need to imagine, in concrete and intelligible terms, the whole transition from the social and economic structure displayed in the Odyssey to the structure with whose breakdown Solon had to cope, a transition about which our sources, inevitably, have little to say, but in which the formation of phratries is an important element.

The aristocratic structure inevitably loosened in time. The orgeones, I imagine, represented a breach in the strict system, small groups of relatively wealthy non-gennetai who had achieved their independence by Solon’s time. With Solon a new phase sets in, and it may be doubted if the phratries played much part, as such, in the political struggles of the sixth and early fifth centuries: judgement on this must depend partly on the extent of one’s belief that gene, as opposed to individual families, were effective political units in this period. But the phratries survived Kleisthenes, and still performed a social function. In Perikles’ time they were still worth a measure of reorganisation, and the orators show them still vigorous in the fourth century. It was not till the hellenistic period that they died.

*New College, Oxford.*

HARPALUS

The importance of the Harpalus affair in Athenian history has always been recognised, and many scholars have laboured to clarify its obscure details and to evaluate its consequences. What has, on the whole, not been attempted has been to see it against the background of Alexander’s Court—yet that alone can enable us to make historical sense of it. The reason for this apparent neglect is to be found in the nature of our sources: as is well known, Alexander, within a generation of his death, became a legendary figure—a superman or demon, a subject for nostalgic worship or philosophic animadversion. The injection of corrective doses of Court historiography, though in itself an improvement, yet did a great deal of harm with its illusion of restraint and objectivity, which captured a large part of subsequent scholarship from Arrian to Tarn. As a result, between legend and apologia, both (for us) fragmentary and adulterated, and in the absence of really important documentary evidence, we cannot at all easily write an account of Alexander’s reign that will satisfy the reader accustomed to genuine political history and unimpressed by eulogy and denunciation. Yet there is more to be done than might at first sight appear: detailed study of individual incidents, approached through the relations and movements of men and (as far as this can be recovered) the chronological sequence of events, will often establish a pattern into which scattered items in the sources can then be fitted. Naturally, not all these results will be equally secure; but probability is often cumulative, and a pattern, once established, will give value to pieces that fit into it and that might otherwise have been ignored or rejected. This concrete approach, which has made other periods of history intelligible to us, may then provide some criteria that will enable the traditional argument about the sources and their relations to aid rather than retard the progress of scholarship. Above all, it may tear away the veil of unreality that still envelops the history of Alexander’s reign, so that the modern student can see it in terms of human history, as he can, for instance, see the reigns of Augustus or of Napoleon.

I. ALEXANDER AND THE SATRAPS

The reign of terror among Alexander’s satraps immediately before and (particularly) after his return from India is amply attested in the sources. Curtius notes a deterioration in the King’s character and ascribes it in rather a facile manner to the corrupting influence of good fortune. Arrian, in gentle censure influenced by his acquaintance with delatio, regrets that Alexander should now have been too ready to listen to accusations and to punish minor faults with excessive severity. It seems that even Court historiography could not dissemble the facts: it could merely interpret them. If Alexander’s wrath was excessive, he was, we are told, merely punishing wrongdoers and protecting his subjects against unjust masters. This view, so congenial to most modern historians of Alexander, is widely repeated in their accounts. The fact is that—here as elsewhere—it is extremely difficult to penetrate behind the official story and trace the motives and connexions that it tries to conceal. Yet

1 See Bengtson, Gr. Gesch. 319 f. There is a most useful mise au point by Walser in Ét. Suisses d’Hist. Gén. 1956, 156 f.
2 Arrian, Anab. vii 4, 3; Curtius i 1, 39 f. Cf. Plut. Al. 42, 2.
3 Arr., loc. cit. (cf. vi 27, 5: ὃ> ἐξήρ ἐπὶ τῇ 'Αλέξανδροβ βασιλείᾳ ἀδικεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀρχιμένους ἐπὶ τὸν ἀρχιτόντων); Plut. Al. 68, 3; Diod. xvi 106, 2, Curt. x 1.
4 To be expected, e.g. in Tarn (Al. i 109); but found even in more critical accounts, like Schachermeyer’s (Al. 39 f.): ‘Die grosse Säuberung’—though the discussion is more critical than this heading suggests; e.g. (p. 395): ‘das Denunziantentum blühte’.

1956, 156 f.
this must be attempted, if we are to have any understanding of the political situation in the empire in 324 B.C. It will be best to begin by listing the satraps and senior officers of whose deposition during this period we are informed. (References henceforth are to A[rian, Anabasis], C[urtius], D[iduon], P[utarch, Alexander].)

(1) *Tyriaspes (A vi 15, 3; cf. C ix 8, 9—the form of the name is very uncertain). Deposed from Paropamisadae late 326 and executed (C); his satrapy was given to Oxyartes, Alexander’s father-in-law.

(2) *Apollonophanes (A vi 27, 1). Deposed from Gedrosia when Alexander was at Pura. His successor was Thoas, who died soon after and was succeeded by Sibyrtius (to whom Arachosis was also assigned, we do not know why).

(3) *Astaspes (C ix 10, 21 and 29). Deposed from Carmania during Alexander’s stay there, apparently by rather underhand methods, and then executed. Succeeded by Sibyrtius, it seems (A vi 27, 1—not mentioning Astaspes), who, however, was soon transferred to Gedrosia-Arachosis (see above) and succeeded by Tlepolemus (ibid.).

(4)–(7) Cleander, Sitalces, Heracon, Agathon (A vi 27, 3 f.; C x 1, 1 f.). Met Alexander in Carmania. C mentions all four and says that, after charges had been made against them, they were put in chains; after this nothing further is heard of them. A says that Cleander and Sitalces were put to death, while Heracon suffered the same fate a little later. Almost certainly all four (including Agathon, whom A does not mention) were in fact executed.

(8) *Orxines, satrap of Persis: the victim of Bagoas (see CQ 1958, 147 f.). Succeeded by Peucetas.

(9) and (10) *Abulites and his son *Oxathres (?) (A vii 4, 1; P 68, 4), satraps of Susiana and Paraeacene, executed in their province(s).

(11) *Autophrrades (= Phracades: C x 1, 39), satrap of Tapuria.

(12) *Antipater: superseded by Craterus and summoned to Court (see below for discussion).

Berve’s list of satrapties includes a total of twenty-five; of these, in 325, twenty are known (or may quite safely be presumed) to have been under separate governors; if we add Europe and Paraeacene (of doubtful status), the total is twenty-two. Our list shows that eight out of the twenty-two governors of these provinces (those marked * in the list) were superseded—all but two of them executed—during this critical period, in addition to the various senior commanders listed. It is clearly no exaggeration to speak of a reign of terror (though the reader of modern accounts usually fails to gain this impression) and to inquire into the reasons for it.

But before we do so, there is more to be said. First, several governors, during this period, died a natural or a violent death other than by execution, so that the King’s intentions towards them cannot be known: what we happen to know of the case of Apollonophanes (and we are lucky to piece the information together in his case) makes it clear that it would be very rash to assume that Alexander had no hostile intention towards those who died in time. They are Menon, Thoas, Balaurus and Philip. In two further cases (Babylonia phanes had been killed in action, and Antipater’s recall was, after (it seems) a period of negotiations, made void by Alexander’s death. (On this, see discussion below.)

For the sake of completeness we might add the client prince Abiasares. For all these men the sources are collected in Berve, Alexanderreich ii (this volume will henceforth be cited by the author’s name only), s.vv. Меров (519), Тебас, Балaurus (200), Филевнос (730), Ἀβάσαρης. On Apollonophanes, see CQ 1958, 148 f.
and Bactria) a change of governor takes place about this time, without our having any indication of how or precisely when it came about.\textsuperscript{8} No less important is the fact that several governors were, at various times during this period, summoned to the King’s presence. One was later allowed to return, others (marked $\dagger$ below) were with him at the time of his death.

(1) $\dagger$Stasianor, satrap of Areia-Drangiana (A vi 27, 3; 29, 1).

(2) Atropates, satrap of Media (A vi 29, 3; vii 4, 1; cf. vii 13, 2 and Ath. xii 538a): detained at the Court for some time, then allowed to return.

(3) $\dagger$Peucetias, satrap of Persis (A vii 23, 1).

(4) $\dagger$Philoxenus, satrap of Caria \textit{(ibid.)}.

(5) $\dagger$Menander, satrap of Lydia \textit{(ibid.)}.

The account of Medius’ banquet\textsuperscript{9} confirms that the three last-named were at Court just before the King’s death and that Stasianor, summoned long before, was still there. Quite possibly these were not the only satraps in that uncomfortable position: it is quite by chance that we hear of Stasianor’s long detention. When A refers vaguely\textsuperscript{10} to ‘the satraps’ of the newly founded cities and conquered territory as bringing the 30,000 ‘successors’ to Susa, it is more than likely that one or two of the governors of the Iranian provinces were among them. (Thus we should like to know about Bactria.) It may be thought that such a summons did not necessarily have any sinister implications. Not necessarily, indeed; but it well might. While there is no real reason to think that the King had come to distrust Peucetias,\textsuperscript{11} on the other hand the fate of several of the men on our first list shows that such a summons could be the prelude to summary trial and execution. And if anyone was frightened into ignoring the order, that was deemed to be rebellion.\textsuperscript{12}

After this preliminary survey of the numerous governors superseded, removed by natural or violent death, or at least summoned—with ambiguous prospects—to the King’s presence, during this relatively short period of time, we may now proceed to draw up a list of those to whom none of those things are known to have happened.

(1) Demarchus, satrap of Lesser Phrygia. The date of his appointment is anything but certain. (He succeeded Calas, as Berve assures us, ‘before 327’.) It depends, on the orthodox interpretation, upon the date of his predecessor’s defeat, which, itself based on the reconstruction (from Memnon’s indications) of the list of Bithynian dynasts, can only be a rough approximation.\textsuperscript{13} Moreover, there is little to support the orthodox interpretation that Calas was killed on that occasion: our only source certainly does not say so, and it might well be expected to, if indeed he was: that would have been a major success for the Bithynians. In view of what we have seen of the extent of the reign of terror, it is more likely that the disappearance of Calas is to be connected with the disgrace of his cousin Harpalus, a prominent victim.

\textsuperscript{8} See Berve, \textit{s.v. "Aρχαν and Φίλασιος} (no. 785: the suggestion that Amyntas was killed in the settlers’ revolt in 325 and that Philip succeeded him in that year is a mere guess, no better than any other). On these provinces, and also on the interesting case of Lesser Phrygia, see further below. As we have no firm dates for any of these changes, it is best to assign them all to a period in which so many similar changes are in fact attested and political explanations for these particular ones obtrude themselves.

\textsuperscript{9} See Berve, 261 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{10} vii 6, 1.

\textsuperscript{11} Though his popularity with his Persian subjects (A vi 30, \textit{fin.}) may have gone far enough to make the King prefer to remove him from the province for a while. \textit{Cf. D} xix 48, 5. It must be repeated that, on the whole, we can use the facts, but not the \textit{interpretations}, of Court historiography.

\textsuperscript{12} A iv 18, 2 (Autophradates).

\textsuperscript{13} Memnon (\textit{FGHist} 434), 12, 4. Reconstruction by Beloch, \textit{GG} iv\textsuperscript{2} 2, 211 E; \textit{cf.} Jacoby’s note \textit{ad loc.} (iii b, Kommentar, Text, 276): ‘Die zuverlässigkeit der zahlen ... ist m.e. nicht über allen zweifel erhaben.’ An understatement, but welcome. On Calas, see Berve, \textit{s.v. Kallias}.}
(2) Antigonus, satrap of Greater Phrygia.
(3) Cleomenes, satrap (?) of Egypt (see below).
(4) Oronetes, 'satrap' of Armenia (but hardly a true satrap: see Berve, s.v.).
(5) Phrataphernes, satrap of Parthia-Hyrcania. His two sons, we may note, had to attend at Court and seem to have stayed there.\textsuperscript{14}
(6) Peithon, satrap of one of the Indian satrapies: only appointed 326.

Thus, if we ignore Oronetes, who could hardly be coerced, we find only four cases of satraps who (as far as is known) survived the reign of terror without molestation or danger; and of these four, one was a very recent appointee and one had to send his sons to Court. We are left with no more than two (Antigonus and Cleomenes) who seem to have avoided trouble of any sort, though well settled in their posts. This, as has been stressed, does not mean that the other twenty were all victims (or even prospective victims) of the terror, as eight of them certainly were; but it does mean that in about ten cases that possibility must be considered, and it would be equally rash to say that they were safe. This must be borne in mind, if we are to grasp the full extent of the reign of terror.

We are now in a position to examine the causes of that upheaval. The conventional explanation, in ancient and modern works, is that it was the punishment (perhaps, as we have seen, excessive) meted out to scoundrels for the oppression of those they had governed. Maladministration on such a large scale is not by any means incredible; and one might say that, whereas the Macedonians, lacking an administrative tradition, were easily led into it, the Iranians, on the other hand, may have been guilty of disloyalty and hoped for independence. On this latter motive (only advanced as subsidiary) we shall have a brief comment to make later. But the former, which Court historiography has imposed with such surprising success, can now be seen to be palpably false. Of the two governors certainly left unmolested, one (Cleomenes) was known to be flagrantly oppressive; and indeed, it is not even certain that he held full satrapal powers from the King and had not simply arrogated them. Yet not even his enemy Ptolemy (on whom, incidentally, we do not depend for a picture of Cleomenes' extortions) has the slightest hint that Alexander intended to punish him. By useful service to the King (even if at great personal profit) and careful attention to his master's desires, this Egyptian Greek, safe through the very harmlessness of his origin, succeeded in gaining Alexander's special favour and approval, when noble Macedonians and Persians were put to death on doubtful evidence after perfunctory trial.\textsuperscript{15}

It cannot be denied that charges of maladministration were conveniently advanced to justify the punishment of some hated figures, whose disappearance, once the King had decided upon it, might be made to gain him useful popularity.\textsuperscript{16} But the assiduously sponsored myth that this was the essential criterion, the prime cause of their downfall, should now be recognised for what it is.

More genuine motives can, however, be conjectured. It is widely recognised that Alexander's long absence in India aroused in many the expectation that he would not return.\textsuperscript{17} Among Iranian nobles, this led to some unrest, apparently a last series of efforts to liberate their country from Macedonian rule. We hear of several rebels and pretenders: Ordanes, Ozines (if a different person), Zariaspes, Baryaxes.\textsuperscript{18} One or two of the Iranian

\textsuperscript{14} See Berve, s.vv. Φρατάφαρσης and Σωίγης.
\textsuperscript{15} On Cleomenes, see the standard works (especially Berve, 210 f.). His status cannot be decided for certain; but it looks as though, if he had indeed arrogated his satrapal powers, this was confirmed (as it was certainly tolerated) by Alexander. On the famous letter to Cleomenes about honours for the dead Hephaestion (A vii 26, 3), see (against Tarn) Hamilton, \textit{CQ}, 1953, 157, showing that it fits in well enough with the King's frame of mind at the time and that there are no grounds for rejecting its authenticity.
\textsuperscript{16} E.g. Cleander, hated by natives and soldiers alike (A vii 27, 4; C x 1, 5 f.), and Antipater, hated by the Greeks (see below).
\textsuperscript{17} A vii 4, 2 f.; P 68, 2. \textit{Cf.} C x 1, 7.
\textsuperscript{18} A vi 27, 3; 29, 3; C ix 10, 19 f.
satrapes were punished for attempted treason: thus Astaspes and Autophradates.\textsuperscript{19} This, of course, had been happening ever since Alexander began the practice of appointing Iranian satrapes. But it is worth noting how remarkably few such cases there were during his long absence: even Autophradates perhaps belongs to an earlier series, and it was the loyal Atropates who brought in one of the pretenders.\textsuperscript{20} It was, on the whole, the disappointed Iranian nobles—those not promoted to high office—who now attempted rebellion, without gaining much support from those who had more to lose. We may safely say that this was not a major factor in causing the reign of terror.

Another motive, less obvious and perhaps less reputable, accounts for much of Alexander’s severity.\textsuperscript{21} The mutiny on the Hyphasis had marked the end of Alexander’s dreams of conquest in the East and had shown him his dependence on his men. It was, in fact, his first defeat. He had spent many years—using force, diplomacy and crime—in subduing the recalcitrant Macedonian nobility, with the help of his army which he had led to victory.\textsuperscript{22} Now, with the nobles apparently loyal or at least cowed, the men themselves had defied him—and won. Although the fact could be dressed up,\textsuperscript{23} the very disguise proclaimed its importance. Moreover, it suddenly presented the terrible threat of co-operation between the nobles and the men. That might be the end of the King’s power. Coenus, one of the greatest of the nobles, had presented the men’s case: he was dead within a short time, and Alexander (we are told, though, of course, not by Arrian–Ptolemy) had not forgotten his speaking out of turn.\textsuperscript{24} We are not given any suggestion that his death was due to the King; though his magnificent funeral and Alexander’s grudging grief prove little to a generation that witnessed the death of Rommel. The fact is that Coenus had been instrumental in bringing about the King’s defeat and in bridging the gap that the King had carefully created between the men and the nobles; and Coenus, whom it would have been dangerous to put on trial before the army whose interests he had just defended, opportunely died. The gods were compensating Alexander for the unfavourable omens on the Hyphasis.\textsuperscript{25} We shall return to the consequences of his death.

The defeat on the Hyphasis ranked; what is more, it presented real political and military dangers. To reassert his authority, Alexander, although he knew that his Indian Empire would now be limited in extent and in degree of attachment, imposed on his troops ‘some of the hardest fighting and worst marching in their lives’.\textsuperscript{26} When they seemed to have no stomach for it, he relentlessly exposed his own person, threatening them—in the manner that had succeeded after the death of Clitus—with his own death (which would leave them leaderless in hostile surroundings), while inspiring them with his example; until the rumour of his death in the city of the Malli—a rumour not far from the truth—at last

\textsuperscript{19} C ix 10, 21; x i, 39.
\textsuperscript{20} A iv 18, 2; vi 29, 3.
\textsuperscript{21} On what follows, see CQ 1958, 148.
\textsuperscript{22} E.g. in the intrigue that destroyed Philotas and in the events that followed the death of Clitus (C viii 2, 12).
\textsuperscript{23} Alexander ἐπὶ τῇ διαμάχῃ οὐδὲν μείον ἔθετο, θεομάχαν δὲ οὐκ ἔχεντο αὐτῷ τὰ ἱερά (Ptolemy ap. A v 28, 4): it was this that was the official reason for his turning back, so that Alexander submitted to the gods and not to his men. The trophies he erected were to make it quite clear that this was no defeat. All this care to disguise the plain facts is worth noticing.
\textsuperscript{24} A vi 2, 1; C ix 3, 20 (slightly differing in time and place, which do not matter much). Cf. Alexander’s vindictive comment (C, loc. cit.): ‘propter paucos dies longam orationem eum exorsum, tamquam solus Macedoniam iuritus esset’. This, according to Berve (218), ‘trägt den Stempel der Unwahrheit’; but he fails to define this useful mark. Tarn’s statement (Al. ii 287 et al.) that Coenus could not have made the speech because he had been left behind on the Acesines (‘perhaps already a doomed man’) hardly needs refuting. He obviously followed Alexander later, like Porus (A v 24, 4), as Mr Brunt points out to me. Tarn characteristically notices that both A and C make Coenus the army’s spokesman, but refuses to admit that this disproves his assertion that Coenus was not there (ibid. 290).
\textsuperscript{25} On Coenus, the son of Polemocrates, and his family, see below.
\textsuperscript{26} Tarn, Al. i 100.
re-established his ascendancy. Henceforth he had no further trouble, even when he ordered the march through the Gedrosian desert.

The reasons for this march cannot be discussed at proper length in this context. "To support the fleet... by digging wells and forming depots of provisions" was probably only one of the King's motives, and ignorance of the hazards of the route can hardly be accepted as a plea in mitigation. The fact was that the King defeated by his own men had to restore both his self-esteem and his reputation for supernatural achievement by surpassing the exploits of legendary rulers in overcoming Nature herself; and the army, now again firmly loyal, had to expiate its contumacy, and be tested for future use, in unprecedented hardships. But the gods, this time, proved less accommodating: the suffering and the losses were appalling, surpassing what could reasonably be expected—or forgiven. The King had to deny responsibility. As soon as Pura was reached, the search for a scapegoat began: Apollodorus, the satrap of Gedrosia, where the disaster had happened, was summarily deposed. When this turned out to have been embarrassingly precipitate (for the army soon heard that he had died in action), the search continued: the execution of Abulites and Oxathres can be ascribed to it, as can the summoning to Court of various satraps who succeeded in avoiding the King's wrath and secured reinstatement. The mystery of the change of governor in Bactria (and perhaps that in Babylonia—though this can more naturally be connected with the disgrace of Harpalus, who resided in Babylon) can surely best be explained in this context. The reign of terror had begun.

We have noted one of the causes of this terror. Its action was reinforced by what so often inspires reigns of terror—fear, with the power to remove its cause. Fear of rebellious Iranian satraps was (as we have seen) no longer a serious factor. When the King, soon after his return from India, issued his famous order disbanding all provincial armies of mercenaries, it was clearly not this fear that was prompting him. This brings us back to the execution of Cleander and the generals with him.

Cleander himself is by far the most important man in this group. He and his brother Coenus had at one time belonged to Parmenio's following and no doubt owed their rise to him. Coenus was a son-in-law of Parmenio, Cleander the old general's second-in-command. In the obscure events that led to the death of Parmenio they played important and unsavoury parts: Coenus was one of the chief accusers of his own brother-in-law

---

27 A vi 6, 51; 7, 51; 8, 3 f. (It is clear throughout that the infantry were not supporting him as they had been accustomed to and as he had come to expect.) For his threatened suicide (and its effect) after the death of Cibus, see C viii 2, 12, with Curtius' comment: it was his success on this occasion that showed him that he could break the noble opposition.

28 Tarn, Al. i 106.

29 Both these pleas were later put forward by his faithful friend Nearchus (A vi 24, 2 f.)—who thus enables us to see that other motives were commonly believed. It was, however, left to Tarn to assert that "there was nothing foolhardy about it". See Schachermeyr's masterly analysis, Al. 382 f.

30 A, loc. cit.; Strabo xv 2, 5.

31 But with his usual skill Alexander, once the hardships turned out so much worse than he had expected, refrained from enforcing relentless discipline and stressed the fact that he was bearing his fair share (A vi 23, 4 f.).

32 On what follows (especially Apollodorus), see CQ 1958, 148.

33 Notably Atropates (Media), who brought with him the pretender Baryx (see above); yet he was only sent back from Susa. Phrataphernes (Parthia-Hyrcania) sent his sons, whom we may well regard as hostages (see above). Stasander (Areia-Dran- gania), like the sons of Phrataphernes, came with large supplies for the depleted army and avoided disaster. He was still with Alexander just before the King's death, but seems to have retained his satrapy (at least nominally) all this time, as we find him confirmed in it after Alexander's death (D xviii 3, 3 et al.).

34 See n. 8 (above), with text. On Harpalus, see further below.

35 D xvii 106, 3.

36 On Coenus and Cleander, the sons of Polemo-crates, see Berve, s.v.v.—usefully marshalling the evidence, but with no recognition of what it adds up to. (Cf. his final summary on Coenus: 'In anspruchsloser, soldatischer Pflichterfüllung...und nicht zuletzt in seiner aufrechten Männlichkeit...').
Philotas, while Cleander was personally in charge of Parmenio's assassination. After the success of the plot, they earned the expected reward: Cleander appears to have succeeded to Parmenio's position (though probably—like Hephaestion in succeeding Philotas—not to sole command), while Coenus—like the other chief participants in the conspiracy against Philotas: Hephaestion, Perdiccas and Craterus—ultimately rose to be one of the marshals of the Empire.37 We have seen how Coenus' rash championship of the common soldiers at the Hyphasis was at once followed by his opportune death. However this came about, it is not surprising that his brother Cleander with his associates was now summoned to Alexander's presence and sacrificed to the numerous enemies he had made: his own soldiers, once Parmenio's, did not forgive him for his betrayal of their commander. The elimination of this clique seems to have been quite thorough: Sitalces and Agathon, now struck down (the former certainly, the latter probably, executed), had both been involved in Parmenio's death; Heracon, mentioned together with them and sharing their fate, must thus also have taken part in the murder, though this does not happen to be attested by Arrian.38 Only one of the senior officers who had been involved in it may have escaped: Menidas, who at this time was in command of some cavalry forces (we do not know where).39 He is one of those summoned to Court in 323 and may thus have owed his final escape to the King's death.

We cannot quite penetrate the mists surrounding the downfall of Cleander and his clique, except to note that its coming so soon after the death of his brother Coenus cannot be mere coincidence. These were the men whom Alexander now feared. In the background, however, there was another figure, more sinister and potentially perhaps even more dangerous: Harpalus, the son of Machatas, with the Imperial exchequer at his disposal.40 As Droysen saw long ago, his father Machatas, brother of Dardas and of Phila (one of the wives of Philip II),41 must belong to the princely house of Elimiotis: Coenus, leading the contingent of that region, must be his fellow-countryman.42 This sheds new light on the intrigue against Parmenio and Philotas: we remember that the murder, which was its culmination, took place at Ecbatana, which, at the time, was the residence of the Imperial Treasurer.43 Again coincidence need not be supposed to stretch so far: the faithful Harpalus, fellow-countryman of Cleander and stationed with him at Ecbatana, must have had his part in what was going on. As so often in the history of Alexander, his figure is shrouded in a romantic haze: apart from his boyhood friendship with Alexander and his 'first flight', the reasons for which we are left to conjecture from inadequate evidence, Harpalus, the man who intended to hold Athens against the King himself and who has rightly been called a precursor of the Successors, is known to us chiefly for his relations with Athenian hetairai.44

37 On the Philotas affair and those involved in it, see especially C vi 8, 17 f. On the reorganisation of the army before the Indian campaign, see Schachermeyer's attractive interpretation (Al. 494 f.—unfortunately the detailed treatment he promises at n. 250 has not yet appeared). On any interpretation the importance of the hipparchoi is unquestioned; it is thus most interesting to see all the chief enemies of Philotas promoted to this supreme rank.

38 This is stated by C (x 1, 1), but denied by Berve (168), on no good grounds. C often gives much fuller information than A, especially in matters of prosopography, and his statement on such a point must prevail over A's silence (iii 26, 3). For good measure, Heracon is mentioned by A as having been left behind under Parmenio together with Cleander and Sitalces (vi 27, 3).

39 See Berve, 257 f. It is impossible to believe (with Berve) that these are the forces which, over four years earlier, he had been sent to Macedonia to collect—especially as the two men who had been sent with him on that occasion are not mentioned together with him in 323. That mission had surely long been completed, and (as in so many cases of commanders not with Alexander himself) we simply do not know Menidas' next assignment. The despicable Polydamas seems to have survived to be sent home with Craterus (Just. xii 12, 8); he was not a man of importance.

40 On him see Berve, s.v. "Aραταλός."

41 Ath. xiii 557c.

42 Thus rightly Berve, s.v. "Κοιφρός, init."

43 See Berve, 76.

44 Evidence in Berve, loc. cit. (his judgment p. 78). On the "first flight", see my Note in Historia 1960, 245 f.
History must be disengaged from tawdry novelette and posthumous eulogy or imprecation.

Linked—we can no longer say precisely how—in the plot that culminated in the death of Parmenio, Harpalus and the sons of Polemocrates are also linked in disaster. We have seen how Coenus's mysterious death in India was followed, on Alexander’s return, by the extirpation of the clique centred in his brother Cleander, which had entered upon Parmenio's inheritance. Both the sources that report this incident place it during Alexander’s stay in Carmania. The chronology of Alexander’s return from India, though not perfectly known, can be reconstructed with sufficient accuracy for our purpose. Alexander’s stay in Carmania must be put at the very end of the year 325. We have noticed, however, that these generals were not all arrested and at once executed: Curzius does not mention their execution at all, but states that they were put in chains; while Arrian mentions the execution of Cleander and Sitalces and implies that Heracon was executed at Susa. (As we have seen, he does not mention Agathon.) This suggests that it was only the arrest of the four generals that took place at the same time (in Carmania), and that it was followed by the execution of two of them before long (perhaps still in Carmania, perhaps in Persis) and of a third somewhat later. (Of Agathon we cannot say anything, except that Arrian’s silence, of course, does not imply that he survived.) The final destruction of this group should therefore be dated early in 324. This places the order to the satraps to disband their mercenary armies in its proper context. Diodorus dates it between the Bacchic procession through Carmania and the games at Salmous (Gulashkird?), where Nearcitus first rejoined Alexander—i.e. (whatever the truth about the ‘procession’), there is no doubt that the order was issued from Carmania. Having seized the persons of an important group of army commanders, whom he had reason to fear, the King could now venture to assert his authority over the rest (scattered as they were) collectively. As usual, the King prepared his blows well, and when he struck, he struck decisively.

It must be at this point that Harpalus decided to flee. As we have seen, there is good reason to think that he was linked with the faction of Coenus and Cleander. Alexander’s coup in Carmania at once warned him of the danger approaching him and deprived him of the allies who might have helped him meet it. The execution of the generals showed Harpalus that he could not hope for mercy, once he had lost his power. It would not be difficult to find crimes with which to charge him: the Imperial Treasurer was bound to have enemies: we need only read our sources on his life with his hetairai. If he now gave up his mercenaries and quietly waited for the royal summons, he would one day find himself deposed and under guard, with new appointees, loyal to the King, in charge of his Treasury and the forces he had collected. Harpalus knew the King’s methods. But for once, in his old friend, Alexander had almost met his equal.

No one would insist on the details, especially in view of the inaccuracy of Arrian’s summary of Nearcitus (see FGrHist ii (Kommentar), no. 133, especially pp. 452 and 452).

Especially Theopompus ap. Ath. xiii 586c and 595d.

Alexander’s mastery of intrigue followed by the decisive coup should surely be more widely recognised than it is: not to mention Philotas and Parmenio (and other attested cases in the early period), we can watch it at work during the period here discussed in his action against Cleander and his group and in his treatment of Astaspe (C ix 10, 21 and 29).

See n. 44 (above), with text.
he could get together and made for the coast. What his plans were, we cannot know for certain. But he was certainly in touch with feeling in Greece and particularly Athens, where in his days of power he had been made a citizen and might now hope for sympathy and support. This time, there was no chance of reconciliation with the King. Around February 324, Harpalus left Babylon.\footnote{Sources in Berve, s.v. "Ἀρπαλός; Harpalus cannot have waited until the King's arrival at Susa.}

Though the changes of satrap in Babylonia and Lesser Phrygia are not dated in our sources, they can hardly be dissociated from Harpalus' flight: Babylon had for years been his residence, and Lesser Phrygia was under his cousin Calas. If we were asked to name two satraps likely to be immediately affected by his escape, there is no doubt that we should unhesitatingly pick these two. Once again, we are surely entitled to exclude coinidence.\footnote{On Calas, satrap of Lesser Phrygia (the key to the Straits), and on his supersession, and on the change of governor at Babylon, see above nn. 8, 13.}

With the King's dispositions at Susa, culminating in the marriages and the decoration of loyal officers, the reign of terror was, for the moment, officially closed. Very few of the satraps, or important commanders not attached to the King himself, had escaped it altogether. Of those few, we find Philoxenus, Menander and even the newly appointed Peucestas—and, perhaps more ominously, in view of his past connexions, Menidas—called to the King's presence a little later, and Antipater superseded and in fear of his life.\footnote{On Antipater's fear for his life, see C x 10, 14 f.; P 49 fin.; Just. xii 14, 5 (not to be rejected merely because it is linked with the rumour—whether true or false—that he had Alexander poisoned; indeed, the fact that this rumour found widespread belief shows that the motive was there). Whether the other satraps were in disgrace, and what was to be Menidas' fate, we simply do not know (see above). But Menidas, as we have seen, was involved in the murder of Parmenio, and this was ominous.}\n
Of the two satraps who certainly escaped the King's attention to the end of his life, Cleomenes, as we have seen, was protected by the obscurity of his birth and had taken great pains to gain Alexander's favour, especially in the period that followed Hephaestion's death, when there were few who could be trusted and loyalty was doubly welcome. And, of course, Egypt was very far away, and its natural strength was known to no man better than to Alexander himself.\footnote{See his carefully balanced arrangements there, with Arrian's comment (A iii 5, 7).}\n
Antigonus is puzzling, in this respect as in others. We hear practically nothing of him under Alexander; yet he not only survives undisturbed, but after the King's death is confirmed in his large and strategically important satrapy, although not even present at Babylon. We must be content to note the fact: though we know that he had good friends at Court (e.g. Eumenes), there is at present no adequate explanation for his success.\footnote{Lycia-Pamphylia seems to have been added to his original satrapy of Phrygia by Alexander. On this and our other information, see Berve, s.v. 'Ἀντίγονος. It is possible (although not attested) that he had something to do with the mysterious change of satrap in the neighbouring province of Lesser Phrygia: some such hypothesis is certainly helpful in explaining his success. On the arrangements at Babylon after Alexander's death, see D xviii 3, 1 et al.}

The flight of Harpalus thus begins to find its place in the history of Court intrigue and faction—a history which, in spite of the sources, we can occasionally piece together, but to which sufficient attention has not hitherto been paid. It is worth noting that, having dealt with his excessively formidable subordinates, the King took care to see that their places were taken by unimportant men. We do not know who succeeded Cleander and his
friends: that alone is perhaps significant. Harpalus' successor Antimenes, and the men who were appointed to satrapies during this period, were harmless nonentities. The point is frequently made that they were all Macedonians and Greeks; yet, as we have seen, the King had shown no particular distrust of his Iranian satraps and, on the whole, had had no reason to be dissatisfied with them. It is well known how he trusted Iranians in the reorganised army. But he was equally wary of Iranian and Macedonian nobles and preferred men who owed everything to him. The real point is perhaps that Iranians not of the highest rank were simply not suitable for administrative posts, while Greeks and even Macedonians might be.

2. Mercenaries and Exiles

When the war in Asia began, Darius had considerable forces of Greek mercenaries in his service, and in the early fighting they play an important part. But it is difficult to trace their movements and their fate after defeat. After the battle of the Granicus, all those captured were sent to forced labour in Macedon, as having assisted those whom the decree of the Hellenic League had declared enemies. This act of political terrorism proved a costly mistake: the mercenaries, having nothing to hope for, were henceforth unwilling to surrender. When able to escape and too weak to resist, they fled; when they did resist, they fought to the end. Alexander, quick—as usual—to recognise a mistake, at the first opportunity initiated a change of policy: 300 mercenaries at Miletus, preparing to fight to the end, were granted terms and allowed to enlist in his own army. Naturally, this change could not be proclaimed from the housetops: if it was important that the mercenaries should realise it, it was, for the moment, equally important that the Greek world should not. As so often, Alexander was caught between two incompatible political aims. This perhaps explains why the new policy was not immediately successful: at Halicarnassus the mercenaries again offered desperate resistance. But Alexander quietly persevered in his new generosity. In fact, he did not even always demand enrolment under his own banner. At Issus, the mercenaries fought bravely, and after the battle 8,000 of them, in good order, made their way to the coast, where they found ships to receive them. Here our accounts diverge a little. One tradition (C and D) assigns 4,000 men to Amyntas, who invaded Egypt and lost his life there; the other (A) gives 8,000 as the number of those who escaped from Issus under four named leaders, states that they all went to Egypt, but reports only Amyntas' death there. Most probably the force in fact split up after escaping from Asia, and only half of it was involved in Amyntas' disaster. Attention next turns to Agis, who tried, in 333, to obtain men, ships and money from the Persian admirals for use in Peloponnesse against the Macedonians. While negotiating at Siphnus, they all heard the news of the battle of Issus, and Agis got only 10 triremes and 30 talents of silver, which he sent to his brother at Taenarum for use in Crete. This incident is important as giving us the first mention of Taenarum as a major base. In spite of what

---

56 Most of them are known, at most, as trierarchs of the Hydaspes fleet—a very mixed lot (see Arrian's detailed list, Ind. 18, 3 f.): thus Archon, Peucetias, Thoas (on all these men, see above). About the following nothing seems to be known before their appointment: Sibyrtius (Carmania, Gedrosia-Arachosia), Demarchus (Lesser Phrygia), Arcalesus (Mesopotamia), Argeasus and Coenus (successively in Susiana). Only Tlepolemus appears earlier in a responsible position (A iii 22, 1). Peucetias owed his rapid promotion to his brave defence of the King's person (A vi 9 f. et al.). No one says that he was of outstanding rank or family. On Harpalus' successor, see Berve s.v. 'Antimēnous.'

57 A i 16, 6.
58 E.g. at Ephesus (A i 17, 9).
59 Miletus (A i 19, 4 f.).
60 A i 19, 6.
61 A i 20, 2 f.
62 A i 24, 4.
63 A ii 13, 2 f.; C iv 1, 27 f.; D xvii 48, 2 f.
64 Thus Parke, Greek Merc. Soldiers, 199.
65 A ii 13, 4 f.
has often been asserted, it is clearly (as, indeed, was to be expected) a Spartan base, and there is no room for an international hiring-fair there.

Agis himself remained in the islands and later went to Halicarnassus. The city had fallen some time before, but some forts remained under Persian control (we do not know for how long); and Agis seems to have collected 8,000 Greek mercenaries who had escaped from Issus. The war that he waged with the help of these men, first in Crete and then in Peloponnese, cannot be treated here. After his death, a weakened Sparta lost control of the base at Taenarum, and it is now that the old Spartan base develops into an extra-territorial mercenary market. At some time that cannot be specified (but clearly after Agis' death), we find the Athenian Chares in charge of a mercenary force there: all that we really know about it is that Hyperides opposed the dissolution of that force. The force must have consisted, to a large extent, of remnants of Agis' army: they would find Taenarum—probably familiar to them as their base in the Spartan service—a convenient refuge and a useful place in which to wait for further employment: on that wild promontory no regular Macedonian forces were likely to seek them out.

There were, of course, many more mercenaries in the Persian service than those who fought at Issus. Some of the mercenaries followed Darius in his flight and, after his death, surrendered to Alexander. These men were treated according to a new principle: those who had been in the Persian service before the foundation of the Hellenic League were discharged; those who had enrolled since were not punished, but simply absorbed into Alexander's own army, which by now contained considerable mercenary forces. Other contingents no doubt simply disintegrated after the Persian defeat; but there were mercenary garrisons, no doubt, in all important cities, just as we find them in the ones about which we happen to be informed, and many of these must have been mopped up by Alexander's subordinates, who (we may presume) applied the same principle as the King himself. In other words, a large part of the Greek mercenaries once in the Persian service would before long be absorbed in the armies of Alexander and his subordinates, while the rest were trying to make their way home as best they could.

Soon Alexander began to settle his Greek mercenaries in his newly founded cities in the East. These cities were all on strategic sites, and the settlers, though officially volunteers, were probably chosen by methods not unknown in other armies and were in any case garrison troops, not allowed to leave. Before long, it is clear, many were kept at their posts only by the fear of punishment, and when a rumour of Alexander's death among the Malli reached Bactria, early in 325, 3,000 mercenaries rose in revolt under one Atenodorus, who announced his intention of leading them home. Curtius, our chief source on this incident, obviously had good information on this subject (as on so many others),

---

66 E.g. RE, s.v. 'Tainaron', coll. 2040 f.; Launey, *Recherches sur les Arm. hell.* i 105, n. 1. See further below.
67 A i 23, 5. Certainly until after Issus, as appears from ii 13.
68 C iv 1, 39; D xvii 48, 1. We cannot tell where and how he picked them up; but the figure probably includes the 4,000 who had not gone to Egypt with Amyntas (see above): otherwise it would seem excessively large for scattered survivors.
69 Chares surrendered Mytilene to Hegelochus in 332 (A iii 2, 6; C iv 5, 22) and sailed to Imbros (C, loc. cit.). We are not told how long he stayed there; but it is most unlikely that developments were so swift that Hyperides' speech is to be put before the battle of Megalopolis. If Chares took part in the Persian attack that captured Mytilene (A ii 1 f.)—as is very likely, since he was then left there to command the garrison— he will have met many of these men before. Here, as probably in the case of Leosthenes later (see below), personal connexions between leaders and men must be looked for.
70 [Plut.] X or. 848f. We do not know whether Chares was at the time an Athenian strategos, or whether the force was in fact dissolved. The latter is very likely, as we hear no more about it.
72 See Parke, *op. cit.* 136 f.
73 For a discussion of them, see Tarn, *Al.* ii 232 f.
75 The story is told in C ix 7 and (very summarily) in D xvii 99.
but is mainly interested in the struggles for leadership among the rebels; but he does tell us that they finally succeeded in making their way home. These men, therefore, will have reached Greece some time early in 324. As we shall see, their presence there must not be forgotten.

We now come to the puzzling statement in Pausanias that Alexander wanted to settle all the mercenaries (50,000 in all) who had served under Darius and the satraps in Persia (i.e. in Iran), but that the Athenian Leosthenes brought them over to Europe. The first part of this statement is (as we have seen) certainly false as it stands. Yet it is far from absurd: in the light of our brief investigation, we may say that it is inaccurate, but has an important element of truth. What about the second part? We have seen that, late in Alexander's reign, there will have been bands of mercenaries, once in the Persian service, wandering about Asia and hoping to return to Greece. We have also met a large group of them—3,000, at least at the outset—that would be ready to cross into Greece in 325/324 and that consisted, in fact, of men who had deserted from the colonies in the East where Alexander had wished to settle them. It is surely not too hazardous to take Pausanias' statement as referring principally to these men. Many of them probably were men who had served the Persians, before Alexander had taken them over; and as they passed across Asia, they were bound to attract to themselves as many of the discharged mercenaries making for Greece as could join them. Thus we may put Leosthenes' ferry service from Asia to Greece early in 324. Whether Leosthenes himself was one of them, or whether he was at the time in Athens (perhaps in high office), having once (perhaps) been in the Persian service, we cannot tell for certain. We first meet him, in fact, in 324/323 στρατηγός ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν. The office—the oldest, as far as we know, of the specialised strategai—presupposes previous experience; and, of course, if he was a strategos in 325/324, the transport of these men—not a simple task for a private citizen—would be easy to arrange. But that is as far as we can safely go. His popularity with the mercenaries and his skill in leading them, as well as the military ability he was to show later, certainly suggest experience as a condottiere; and his hatred of Macedon, as well as the fact that he was apparently in contact with these men and knew that they would want to be shipped across, may seem to indicate that he had fought under Darius. But of all this we cannot be certain. What we know is that in this way, and at this time, Leosthenes took charge of a body of mercenaries without a paymaster.

It was at this very time (as we have seen) that the problem of the wandering mercenaries was made virtually insoluble by Alexander's own action. Early in 324 the satraps and commanders learnt that they must disband all their mercenary forces. Thus those of the mercenaries once in the Persian service, who had, on dismissal, been absorbed into these armies, as well as all the Greeks signed on during a period of up to ten years, were added to all the other mercenaries wandering about Asia without a home or a livelihood. The order was not lightly given: we have seen that the King's fears were real enough, and that he struck the highest as well as the lowest. But the social effects, in any case, were disastrous, filling Asia (in Diodorus' grim and vivid description) with bands of starving marauders, seeking a chance of spilling over into Greece as well. And since many of them succeeded in making their way to Taenarum (now a recognised mercenary centre), it is very likely that they, at least, were in time to secure places in Leosthenes' convoys, which (as we have

76 This (C, loc. cit.) must be accepted against D, who says that the men were massacred after Alexander's death. As it was their intention to go home, they can hardly have been in the Far East two and a half years later. D, in his abbreviated account, has simply confused this rebellion with the greater one after Alexander's death.

77 i 25, 5; cf. viii 52, 5.

78 His figure for the men concerned (50,000) cannot be taken seriously.

79 In the Oropus dedication of (it seems) 324/323 (best discussed by Mathieu, RPh 1929, 159 ff.).

80 See RE, Suppl. vi, coll. 1087 ff.

81 See n. 47 and text (above).

82 xvii 111. 1.
seen—though unfortunately precise chronology is impossible) were taking other mercenaries across about this time. If we do not hear of serious disturbances in Peloponnes, it must be because at Taenarum there were men willing and able to pay these mercenaries at least a retainer—enough for bare sustenance and the prospect of future employment. It is surely clear that otherwise the whole of Peloponese (if not of Greece) must have been at the mercy of well-organised and desperate brigandage. As it happens, the presence of such leaders (who would have to be postulated, if they were not attested) is indicated in the sources: Diodorus tells us of ‘Persian satraps and other leaders’ who also succeeded in making their way to Taenarum. It is a pity that we cannot put names to these shadowy figures. Diodorus, as usual, is sketchy, and our other sources are interested almost entirely in Alexander and his Court. The fate of Cleander and his associates must have frightened many of the strategoi, as it apparently frightened Harpalus. Perhaps—if Diodorus’ language is, for once, literally accurate—even one or two of the satraps so mysteriously superseded escaped with their lives and some men and money. Hyperides, in a passage that deserves serious consideration, implies that Harpalus’ example was at least watched with great interest and would have been widely followed, if he had succeeded.

This, then, was the situation confronting Alexander in the spring of 324. His fear of his subordinates and of his men (a fear itself ultimately due to his chosen policies) had led to the reign of terror and to the dissolution decree; and they had brought about a situation in which social unrest had assumed disastrous proportions, while there were leaders willing to use this explosive force to bring about precisely what the King had feared. The most obvious way of dealing with this situation was to enlist mercenaries for his own service; and indeed, it is clear that Alexander did so: we need only consider the armies that Menander and Philoxenus brought to him at Babylon. But we can see from Diodorus’ account that this did not solve the problem—the numbers were too large, no doubt, and (above all) these mercenaries, imbued with hatred of Macedon and warned by their own or their comrades’ experience of colonisation in the East, were no longer eager to serve the King. Thus the problem remained, and clearly no ordinary administrative measures would solve it.

It is against this background that we must see the famous decree ordering the restoration of the exiles. The first fact that attracts attention is the number of the exiles concerned. Diodorus gives the number of those of them who heard Nicanor’s Olympic proclamation as over 20,000; and they can only have been those within easy reach of Olympia. We shall not go far wrong, if we postulate a figure of the same order for those exiles who did not attend the Games; and with their wives and families added, they formed a sizeable population. It is beyond belief that such numbers could be produced by the normal play of stasis in the cities. Fortunately we can see that unusual forces had been at work. We know that, whenever Philip and (after him) Alexander could impose their will on cities that lacked the strength of Athens or Sparta, they ensured loyalty by imposing puppet oligarchies, just as the Persians had done in Asia Minor. This, in fact, aroused so much bitterness that it became convenient to attribute official responsibility to Antipater: it seems that, when Alexander at last began to plot the viceroy’s downfall, he prepared to make political capital out of it in this way. The establishment of these régimes according to the normal Greek pattern (reinforced by Macedonian demands) led to the exile of their

---

83 Hyp. Dem. col. 19 (however restored).
84 A vii, 23, 1.
85 xviii 8, 5.
86 The census of Demetrius of Phalerum (a useful, since ancient, basis for comparison) gave 21,000 adult male Athenians (Ath. vi 272c). Cf. modern discussions of population figures, such as Jones, Ath. Dem. 76 f.; Gomme, JHS 1959, 61 f.
87 See Berve, op. cit. ii 48. [Dem.] xvii makes it clear that this was going on in Europe while Alexander, after the famous order to Alcimachus (A i 18, 1), was posing as the liberator of the Greeks in Asia. (Cf. also P 34, often mistranslated by modern commentators.)
88 P 74, 2; Just. xii 14, 4 f. For complaints against Antipater and their encouragement by the King, see below.
(and Alexander's) numerous enemies. Nor is it difficult to conjecture where, in the early days, many of them would go: we have the attested instances of Athenians like Chares and Charidemus—not to mention even prominent Macedonians like Amyntas\(^89\)—to show us what, at that level no less than at that of the anonymous commoner, offered itself as a way of making exile both materially and spiritually less unbearable. The extreme bitterness shown by many of the mercenaries in the Persian service against Alexander can now be better understood: the 8,000 who decided to continue the war on their own after Issus must have been in part made up of such men, driven from their homes by pro-Macedonian régimes, or thinking it safer—or at least preferable—to leave home and join the Persian forces.

This leads on to a further point. We have seen that at the beginning of the Hellenic Crusade mercenaries who remained in the Persian service were proclaimed guilty of treason against the League.\(^90\) It follows that any known cases of this crime must have been punished by the death penalty in absence (i.e. in practice exile), with the economic penalties that went with it. Alexander, as we have seen, would in the interests of policy temper 'justice' with mercy, giving these men another chance for his own benefit. But we need only look at the decrees that later implemented the return of the exiles at Mytilene and Tegea\(^91\) to see that for a city, even if (what was unlikely enough) its government were willing and Antipater permitted it, it was far from easy to change its mind on this subject. Alexander's departure from the rigour of the Granicus policy was his personal affair and could have no influence on the legal status of the men concerned in their own cities: set free after capture, or dismissed after re-enlistment by the satraps, these men had no homes to go to.

We have now seen that the problems of the wandering mercenaries and the wandering exiles—both, as we happen to know from different traditional contexts, involving vast numbers of men and both, as it happens, particularly attested for Peloponnese—were both acute by the middle of 324 and were in fact to a large extent the same problem. It is only the inadequacy of our sources that tends to conceal this. Once we have recognised it, the 'exiles decree' that Nicanor brought to Europe\(^92\) at last becomes intelligible. This decree has received strange treatment in most modern accounts. It has been dragged in by ingenious apologists to explain Alexander's reported demand for deification, on the ground that the exiles decree was a flagrant violation of the King's oath not to interfere in the internal affairs of the cities of the League and that nothing less than divine standing would give him a right to do so. This attempt to justify perjury by blasphemy is now (one may hope) worth citing chiefly as a curiosity of scholarship.\(^93\) We know that, despite the League oaths, interference had been common enough before.\(^94\) But those who made this attempt can at least claim the merit of having drawn attention to the very enormity of this act of interference. Their error, in that they were more concerned with excusing than with explaining it, unfortunately diverted the attention of those not misled by them from the fact that it needs explanation.

---

\(^{89}\) See Berve, s.vv. This is glimpsed in passing by Tarn (ii 370).

\(^{90}\) See above. Cf. Wilcken, Sitzungsber. preuss. Akad. Wiss. 1922, 112 f., rightly insisting that the punishment of the mercenaries after Granicus must be based on a League decision. Alexander's later practice simply departed from this (as, no doubt, he could claim to be entitled to do by virtue of his position). It is worth noting that the leaders of the 8,000 mercenaries after Issus (see above) are called deserters in the official version (A ii 13, 2). For League action, cf. Tod, GHI ii 192, ll. 10 f.

\(^{91}\) Tod, op. cit. 201–2.

\(^{92}\) See further discussion, below (nn. 98 f. and text, and next Section).

\(^{93}\) The theory, which—despite opposition by great scholars like Wilcken—had a surprisingly long run (explicable only in terms of the psychology of many modern writers on Alexander), has now been finally killed (one may hope) by Balsdon, Historia 1950, 369 f. A little earlier, it had been brilliantly restated by Tarn (Al. i 111 f.; 138 f.; ii 370 f.).

\(^{94}\) See n. 87 (above).
Not only is this act of interference so different in degree from the kind of intervention in individual cities that we know about as to become almost different in kind—to appear thus (that is to say) not to the scholar, who has no good reason for preferring a multiplicity of minor breaches of an oath to one major one, but to the cities themselves, whose opinion even the conqueror of the East could not altogether ignore: more important still, some states (notably Athens and the Aetolian League) were so vitally affected by the new decree that armed resistance was not impossible. And that, in the dangerous days that followed Harpalus’ escape, was a risk that Alexander would not lightly run. Moreover, as we have seen, most of the exiles had reason to be his implacable enemies. This has in fact often been pointed out by his modern admirers, and his astounding generosity has received generous praise. But again, explanation has been neglected; for what is there, in the actions of the historical (as distinct from the romanticised) Alexander, that would justify us in believing that he pushed generosity to the pitch of insanity? His failure to extend the benefits of the decree to the Thebans provides a sufficient commentary.

The explanation, once we attend to it, is simple enough. By his own actions—the policies that led to the reign of terror; the decision on mercenaries in the Persian service; the maintenance of puppet régimes in Greece; and finally the dissolution of the satrapal armies—the King had created an unprecedented and apparently insoluble social problem, which now turned out to be an unprecedented political and military problem as well: a mass of men with nothing to lose, and with military skill and training of the highest order, had suddenly been provided with leaders willing and able to use it. Nowhere in the short history of Alexander’s reign does his ultimate political failure appear so nakedly as in the spiral of terrorism and fear that culminated in the situation of 324 B.C. Confronted with this result of his policies, Alexander acted quickly and boldly, as he always did when faced with a major crisis. He could not disband the concentrations of desperadoes; he knew that he could not, on the whole, re-enlist them; he had found that he could not resettle them. The only solution was to send them home. If there was one place to which a Greek exile would be ready to go and where (given adequate protection) he would stay, it was his own city. Alexander was strong enough to run the relatively smaller risk of antagonising the cities not firmly under his control, and of abandoning (to some extent) the security of the oligarchies that had served him for so long, in order to disperse the immediate and appalling danger. With his usual resilience, he soon proceeded to make political capital out of his betrayal of his supporters.

It was, of course, quite clear to his contemporaries, and above all to the exiles themselves, that Alexander was solving a problem that he had himself been instrumental in creating. With this in mind, we may now look at the puzzling text of the decree proclaimed by Nicanor, as it is reported in Diodorus. It is clear—and recognised—that this proclamation, explicitly addressed to the exiles themselves, is different from whatever instructions

---

55 D xviii 8, 6.
56 See Section 1, above. The proclamation of Alexander’s intention is fortunately dated for us to his stay at Susa (see Dittenberger, Syll. i 912, with notes; cf. Wilcken’s comments, op. cit. 115 f.). It seems clear that Athenian resistance, at any rate, was expected (see especially Ath. xii 538b).
58 Heuss (Hermes 1938, 139 f.), in what is probably the most valuable discussion of this question, rightly insists that, by giving up the puppet régimes in the cities, Alexander was taking a step diametrically opposed to his previous policy, unprecedented in Greek history (though we may perhaps compare, in a very different context, Athenian policy after the Sicilian disaster), and rather puzzling to the Greeks. But he too fails to find a proper explanation for this radical departure: that Alexander was strong enough to risk it was a necessary condition, but hardly a motive.
59 xviii 8, 4. This wording, probably from Hieronymus, is generally accepted as authentic (see e.g. Wilcken and Heuss, loc. cit.). It would be bad to imagine a reason why it should have been invented in this peculiar form.
60 Ἡράκλης Ἀλέξανδρος τοῖς ἐκ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πόλεων φηγᾶται.
the King in fact sent to the cities affected. But it must surely at once strike the reader as odd that the King should thus stress the fact that he had not caused the men’s exile—odd and, to those familiar with political propaganda, illuminating. For it shows that the accusation was, at least, commonly made and had to be met—a fact that the rest of our tradition had not led us to expect. Again the nature of our tradition has made a true appreciation of history all but impossible. But in the light of our discussion, the wording in Diodorus at last becomes fully intelligible and illuminating. With a claim to literal accuracy, the King took pains to deny that he had in fact been personally responsible for the men’s misfortunes: technically, of course, they had all been exiled by their own cities, after a decree of the League. In the same way Alexander, at the threshold of his career, had avoided responsibility for the sack of Thebes. That this claim was morally very thin, we can see (if it needs demonstration) in the case of Athens. But henceforth it would be official policy, drawing the returned exiles towards Alexander, whose support they in any case needed against their internal enemies. Nicanor’s proclamation thus takes its place among many similar documents—we need only recall the Res Gestae of Augustus—that tell the truth, perhaps nothing but the truth, but far from the whole truth. It is as well that we have the text.

3. The Coming of Harpalus.

It was while the whole of Greece was in a state of great agitation over the arrival of Nicanor with the exiles decree and other instructions that Harpalus appeared outside Athens. As he came with a sizeable fleet and army, he was refused admission: though officially an Athenian citizen, he could clearly not be trusted to introduce such private forces into the city. The matter seems to have been brought up at a meeting of the Assembly, and the general in charge of the Piraeus undertook to see that he should not gain entrance. Thereupon Harpalus took his forces to Taenarum (as we have seen, the obvious place) and returned with three ships and 700 talents of silver, this time as a supplant. In this capacity an Athenian citizen could hardly be refused, and he was admitted. But by this time the agents of the King’s friends and governors had caught up with him: envoys arrived from Philoxenus, from Antipater and even from Olympias, to demand his extradition. Harpalus threw himself on the mercy of his old friend Phocion, to whom he was willing to entrust all the money he had brought with him. But that shrewd politician, they seem to need renewed discussion. That the Athenians, at this stage, were anxious for their own safety in view of Harpalus’ forces—and not, as is sometimes assumed, afraid of Alexander—is clear from the speeches at the trial (especially Din. iii).

101 On this matter (which does not concern us here in detail) see Heuss, loc. cit., refuting Wilken’s fanciful reconstructions.

102 τοι μεν φηγόμεν όμως σοι ἤρετις αἰτον γεγονομεν ... (perhaps, as Mr Brunt points out to me, a veiled reference to Antipater).

103 See A i 9, 9; D xvii 14.

104 A i 10, 6.

105 Hyp. Den. 18. What the other instructions were is not at all clear, as there is a large gap in the papyrus at this point. But they concerned the Achaean, Arcadian and (it seems) Boeotian Leagues: Colin’s reading τοι[το]ν[το]ν[το]ν[το]ν for the usual ἤτοι[το]ν[το]ν[το]ν[το]ν makes no real sense. They must have contained some restriction or punishment, perhaps later re¬minded as the result of embassies, and in any case soon cancelled by the King’s death. On Harpalus in Athens, see bibliography in Bengtson, G.G. 345, n. 3.

106 The sources are collected in Berve, s.v. "Ἀρταλως. They will be discussed here only where they seem to need renewed discussion. That the Athenians, at this stage, were anxious for their own safety in view of Harpalus’ forces—and not, as is sometimes assumed, afraid of Alexander—is clear from the speeches at the trial (especially Din. iii).

107 See n. 117 (below) and text, and—for the ships—n. 161 (below).

108 Philoxenus’ envoys reached Athens about the same time as Harpalus himself (Hyp. Den. 8). We are not told when those of the others arrived (see D xvii 108, 7), but it will have been before long.

109 Plut. Phoc. 21, 3. Plutarch has obscured the point by his usual anecdotal treatment and lack of real comprehension. But the authenticity of the story, and its true interpretation, seems to be established by the accurate figure of 700 talents, which was the amount that Harpalus in fact had with him. His friendship with Phocion, in particular, is well known: it was Phocion who, with his son-in-law, looked after Harpalus’ daughter by Pythonice (ibid. 22).
whose judgment was never distorted by prospects of financial gain, refused to have anything to do with such a dangerous trust.\textsuperscript{116} Finally Demosthenes procured a decree ordering Harpalus to be taken into custody and his money to be held on the Acropolis.\textsuperscript{111}

The details of what happened next in Athens are obscured both by the paucity of our evidence and by the nature of what we have. The former, fatal to any serious attempt to reconstruct Athenian politics at this time, can be simply and decisively illustrated. When, in due course, it was decided to bring certain leading citizens to trial on charges of having accepted bribes from Harpalus, the People appointed ten prosecutors.\textsuperscript{112} Out of these ten, at most six names have been preserved for us, and only five refer to identifiable politicians;\textsuperscript{113} yet not in a single case (except possibly that of Hyperides) can we make confident assertions about political alignments.\textsuperscript{114} Nor does the quality of the evidence make up for its quantity. Demosthenes and Phocion, two of the chief characters concerned, soon became—as the malignant patriot and the incorruptible statesman respectively—the heroes of legend and propaganda; and if the \textit{Letters} said to have been written by Demosthenes (with commendable, though unavailing, assiduity) to the Council and People of Athens are highly suspect,\textsuperscript{115} the anecdotes in Plutarch’s \textit{Life of Phocion} can be shown to be muddled and distorted.\textsuperscript{116} In the circumstances it is best to give up any attempt at presenting a coherent picture of Athenian politics and see what conclusions the evidence does permit.

When Harpalus was put under guard, his money (as we have seen) was ordered to be taken up to the Acropolis. The amount was ascertained to be 700 talents, and a special commission (including Demosthenes himself) seems to have been responsible for seeing it safely stored.\textsuperscript{117} As we have seen, the arrival of Philoxenus’ envoys coincides with that of Harpalus himself, so that not much time elaps between the latter and the arrest. But we do not know how much time passed between the arrest and the escape, which followed in due course. It must be more than a few days, since we are told that the guards gradually relaxed their vigilance and then melted away,\textsuperscript{118} and this certainly requires a period of some length. The result, in any case, was that Harpalus escaped and rejoined his mercenaries, though before long he was killed by a subordinate in Crete.\textsuperscript{119}

Meanwhile, with Harpalus still in custody,\textsuperscript{120} Demosthenes had gone to Olympia to

\textsuperscript{116} For muddle, see n. 109 (above). A clear case of distortion is Phocion’s virtuous repudiation of his guilty son-in-law Charicles (\textit{Phoc.} 21, 5f.), with whom, after Harpalus’ death, he nevertheless continued to share the guardianship of Harpalus’ daughter and who was later involved in Phocion’s downfall (\textit{Phoc.} 33, 3f.). This case, fortunately clear, should warn us against taking Phocion’s reported actions and sayings at their face value, where they cannot be checked.

\textsuperscript{117} Hyp. \textit{Dem.} 8 f.; [Plut.] \textit{X} or. 846 b (citing Philochorus). That Demosthenes had some official connexion with this is made clear by Hyperides’ \textit{νῦν τὰ Ἕλληνων ἀναφέρεις}, which confirms what would in any case be the obvious implication of the whole fuss: that it was his business to know of the discrepancy. There is no reason to deny the possibility of such a special commission, in the special circumstances.

\textsuperscript{118} Hyp. \textit{Dem.} 12. (Cf. [Plut.] \textit{loc. cit})

\textsuperscript{119} See Berve, \textit{loc. cit}.

\textsuperscript{120} For the justification of this chronology, see Appendix.
HARPALUS
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negotiate with Nicanor about the question of the return of the exiles, which was of particular concern to Athens because of her seizure of Samos, where she had a cleruchy.\textsuperscript{121} What he achieved we are not told: clearly not a cancellation of the decree, but perhaps a stay of execution, until an embassy had been sent to Alexander; perhaps even some advice on how to placate him.\textsuperscript{122} The obscure problem of Alexander’s deification may well be connected with these negotiations, though the evidence does not permit us to trace a certain connexion.\textsuperscript{123} However, some time after Demosthenes’ return Harpalus was allowed to escape.\textsuperscript{124} This startling contempt for a decree of the People aroused resentment and suspicion, and they were no doubt fanned by circles— their composition, unfortunately, all but impenetrable to us—that hoped to derive political profit from the situation. The atmosphere, as it emerges from the sources, seems not unlike that engendered by the mutilation of the Hermae. Treason and plots against the Demos were suggested and (apparently) believed, and suspicion in due course was allowed to range widely: apart from those ultimately brought to trial, we know that it embraced, among others, such diverse characters as Phocion and Hyperides.\textsuperscript{125} It was increased by the fact that the sum deposited on the Acropolis now\textsuperscript{126} turned out to be only 350 talents, while Harpalus had brought 700 with him.\textsuperscript{127} Naturally, this suspicion centred on Demosthenes, who had moved the decrees concerning Harpalus and had (it seems) been responsible for their execution: he was now suspected of having received no less than 50 talents.\textsuperscript{128} Demosthenes and most of the others concerned denied the charges, and Demosthenes himself proposed that the Areopagus should inquire into the matter.\textsuperscript{129} No doubt he relied on the Areopagus, with which his relations had long been excellent and whose powers he had helped to strengthen,\textsuperscript{130} to exonerate him and make a public trial unnecessary.

The Areopagus undertook the inquiry, but dragged it on without publishing its conclusions, despite requests by the Assembly, where the matter was not allowed to die a natural death.\textsuperscript{131} The reasons for this delay can only be conjectured. \textit{Bona fide} investigation cannot have taken six months,\textsuperscript{132} and intense political activity may be presumed in the background. This, unfortunately, cannot be clearly gathered from our evidence. But one or two points invite comment. For these months, as we have seen, were a time of delicate negotiations with Alexander. It is interesting to observe that the Areopagus’

\textsuperscript{121} Din. i 81 f. (cf. 103). For Samos, see especially D xviii 8, 7, and compare Dittenberger, \textit{Syll.} i 312. It is very likely that Demosthenes also wanted an opportunity of talking to the envoys of the other Greek states.

\textsuperscript{122} The tone of the Olympic proclamation (D xviii 8, 4) precludes any possibility of negotiations; yet we know that embassies were sent about the matter (D xvii 113, 3; cf. A vii 19, 2), and Alexander may in the end even have decided to leave Samos in the Athenians’ possession (P 28, 1 f.; cf. Hamilton, \textit{CQ}, 1953, 153 f., and Habicht, \textit{AM} 1959, 161—but it is not certain that the letter quoted by Plutarch, even if genuine, belongs to this late date: Plutarch himself certainly implies an earlier date). The incident of Demosthenes’ attack on the orator Lamachus (see Berve, \textit{s.v.}) can hardly be assigned to these Games: such conduct is inconceivable in the midst of these delicate and important negotiations, which we know were Demosthenes’ main object in going to Olympia.

\textsuperscript{123} See, e.g. Hamilton, \textit{loc. cit.} Demosthenes’ change of mind, with which his enemies later reproached him (Hyp. Dem. 31; Din. i 94), may have had something to do with the question of Samos (\textit{cf.} Demades’ comment about losing the earth (sources in Berve, 132)); though this whole business comes somewhat later in the year, when the Areopagus inquiry was already in progress (Hyp., \textit{loc. cit.}). For the date of its beginning, see Appendix.

\textsuperscript{124} On the chronology, see Appendix.

\textsuperscript{125} Plut. \textit{Phoc.}, 21, \textit{fn.}—22; Ath. vii 341 f.

\textsuperscript{126} Modern accounts sometimes imply that the discrepancy was discovered immediately and Harpalus nevertheless made good his escape. This is quite inconceivable.

\textsuperscript{127} See n. 118 (above).

\textsuperscript{128} Ath., \textit{loc. cit.}

\textsuperscript{129} Din. i 4, 61, \textit{al.; Hyp. Dem.}, 2, \textit{al.} Demosthenes did not, at first, deny having received money from Harpalus, but claimed that he had spent it in the public interest. On this, see further below.

\textsuperscript{130} Dem. xviii 132 f.; Din. i 62 f. (\textit{cf.} 9 f.). See Sealey, \textit{AJP} 1958, 72 f. I should like to acknowledge Mr Sealey’s help, particularly on Athenian matters; though I know he does not agree with many of my conclusions.

\textsuperscript{131} Hyp. Dem. 31.

\textsuperscript{132} Din. i 45.
refusal to publish its results coincided with Demosthenes’ grudging change of mind on the question of the deification: it looks like a patriotic compromise. We must remember, too, that Demosthenes, far from being powerless in Athens and persona non grata with the King, had long been a successful protagonist of a policy of moderation in the city’s foreign policy and had a guiding influence in its policies and a powerful protector at Court—no less a person (we are told) than Hephaestion; Demades—like Demosthenes, his friend and collaborator, one of the principal suspects—was a protégé of Antipater, whose power was close and real; while Phocion was a friend of the King himself. Nor did even the escape of Harpalus in fact bring any trouble upon the Athenians: Alexander did not even demand the remains of the money that Harpalus had brought to Athens. The discovery of major scandals at this time was not in the interests of the City any more than of the individuals concerned; and the Areopagus successfully avoided it.

By early 323 some things had changed. Late in 324 Hephaestion died. When the news reached Athens, a few months later, the position of Demosthenes would undoubtedly be weakened. A little earlier, perhaps, the Athenians had heard that Demades’ protector had also ceased to be formidable: it was after the reconciliation at Opis, before he left for Ecbatana, that the King entrusted Craterus with the task of superseding Antipater in Europe. The latter’s son Cassander, who reached the Court not long before the King’s death, found him very unfavourably disposed. We know that some Greek cities

---

132 Hyp., loc. cit. The frequentative optative and the implication of dishonesty are no doubt a prosecutor’s device; but we should certainly accept the coincidence itself (at least on one occasion) as fact. In what form Alexander’s divinity was finally recognised (i.e. whether as a new god or, as a compromise, by identification with Dionysus—a view which, though not in favour at present, has something to commend it) is uncertain.

133 See Berve, s.v. Ἀραχείον. The myth—implied or expressed in many modern accounts, but unknown to the sources—that Demosthenes was kept out of power and had little influence during this period should not need detailed refutation. Not to dwell on the affair of the Crown and earlier events, see, for the period with which we are immediately concerned, Din. i, passim (e.g. 11; 100 f. (his collaboration with Demades)); Hyp. Dem. 12 (στὶ δὲ τὸν τῶν δῶν προμαχῶν ἐπιστάτην)—amply borne out, as we have seen, by his initiative in the case of Harpalus and his negotiations with Nicanor. There is good reason to think that Demades, whom he never attacked (Din., loc. cit.; cf. Plut. Dem. 8, fn.—and all the facts we know) and who had saved his life after Alexander’s accession, was a distant relative of his. The absence of any positive statement in the sources is no evidence to the contrary: nothing (except his enemies’ stock abuse) is known about the family of Demades; and we need only remember the tenuous chance that has preserved the knowledge of Lycurgus’ high descent in [Plut.] X or. The name ‘Demaeas’ (which is that of Demades’ father, as of his son) recurs in Paeonia in one other family, perhaps connected with the Bouzysae and certainly characterised by its use of Dem[ο]. names; as it occurs twice in this family, twice in that of Demades (in which, in fact, only these two names are known), and nowhere else, there must surely be a close connexion. On the other hand, this family shares its use of Dem[ο]. names with that of Demosthenes; and in each case we have an ample assortment of such names, including ‘Demosthenes’, which is common to both. And, in case we might think that this type of name is obvious and common, it is worth noting that in the massive surviving records of the deme Paeania, no other family before the third century uses any name of this type. The obvious prima facie conclusion is that the two families sharing (and monopolising) these names are related—we do not know how closely—and that the family of Demades (of which, as I have said, we know practically nothing at all) is related to both of them, and quite closely to that branch with which it shares the name ‘Demaeas’. For information on these families, see Prosopographia Attica s.vv. Ἀραχείον, Ἀμαῖνα, Ἀμαῖνης, Ἀμαῖης. This helps to explain the puzzle of the attested collaboration between Demades and Demosthenes.


136 Din. i 68.

137 In October, according to Berve (173). There seems to be no precise date in the sources, but the campaign against the Cossaei, which Alexander undertook after a long time devoted to mourning (A vii 15, 1 ff.), began in winter. The envoys whom he had sent to Ammon, presumably straight after his friend’s death, returned not long before his own (A vii 23, 6): seven or eight months seems about right for their journey.

138 Berve puts Craterus’ departure about August. We know nothing about his movements. At the time of the King’s death he was still in Cilicia, though we do not know of anything he had to do there (D xviii 4, 1; 12, 1). See next section for further discussion.

139 P 74. Cassander’s later hatred of Alexander’s family is a fact of history.
now took heart and formulated complaints against the Viceroy, and this situation must have had its effects on the friends of Antipater in the cities. Thus, by the spring of 323, Demosthenes and Demades were much more exposed to attack at home. It was probably now (though the exact time is uncertain) that the Areopagus published its list of the guilty; although several others were on it, the names of Demosthenes and Demades were by far the most important.

We need not follow the trials in detail; but it is worth noting that we cannot even be certain that anyone apart from Demosthenes and Demades was in fact condemned, at least to a serious penalty. Demades at once went into exile, without awaiting trial. This is often denied or ignored, but Dinarchus' statement must be accepted. He was, however, back in Athens by the time the first rumour of Alexander's death reached the city: we do not know when and why he had been permitted to return and, apparently, to speak in public. Perhaps—as has often been suggested—he found he could afford to pay the fine, which was not as large as he must have feared when he fled. Moreover, we shall see that there is good reason to believe that his friendship with Antipater might now again be an asset. And, clever intriguer that he was, he may well have found further Macedonian protectors whom the City would be wise not to ignore.

Demosthenes' exile is too well known to need discussion; nor did he find any prominent Macedonians to save him, though attempts were apparently made. The disgrace of Demosthenes was the only important
drachmas or 20 talents. The context must be quoted: ἐν σοὶ μὲν [Demosthenes] εἶχοι τάκαρτα λαβῶν ἐνίατον ἔδωκεν ἐκεῖ, ἐπερώ δὲ πεπεκάθαρσε, Λεμνὸς δὲ ἐκκακηλίον χρυσὸν συμαίνει, ἐπερώ δὲ . . . . It seems almost inconceivable that Demades' sum should have been precisely the same as that of Demosthenes. The change (after 20 and 15 silver talents) to a less familiar denomination can only be explained, if the sum in question was in fact smaller than those that preceeded and the orator wanted to make it sound impressive. It is certainly quite inexplicable, if the total was exactly the same as the first mentioned. Moreover, since Dinarchus seems to put the total traced by the Areopagus at 64 talents (see apparatus ad loc.), this would hardly leave enough for all the other whom we know to have been named. It looks as though the mention of χρυσοῦ is an orator's trick, and Demades' sum was in fact 6,000 silver stater (= didrachmai; i.e. 2 tal.?). There is no evidence that stater, at this time, meant a tetradrachm; see RE, s.v. 'stater'. As it happens, we can catch Dinarchus out in a precisely similar trick: cf. the use of χρυσοῦ in ss. 6, 45, 53: the εἰκών τάκαρτα χρυσοῦ of Demosthenes are clearly impossible, in the literal meaning, since Harpalus' funds could not have stretched as far as that. If this is correct, Demades' bribe was only 2 talents, and the fine (especially if imposed on the same scale as that of Demosthenes) would seem trifling to him. Thus he might well pay it and return. That his flight had been due to panic and had preceded his trial is clear from the facts that Demosthenes' trial was the first to be held (Din. i 105) and that Demades was already abroad at the time.

146 Cf. his relations with Perdiccas a little later (D xxviii 48, 2).

146 Paus. ii 33, 4 f.: Philoxenus. But he was summoned to Court before long (A vii 23, 1; 24, 1).
and lasting result of the trials. Our evidence, as we have seen, does not permit us to see it against the proper background of Athenian politics. Nor—as prolonged argument among scholars has shown—can we provide a certain answer to the question of his guilt. But there at least part of the truth can be glimpsed by careful study of the background, such as we have it. For it is indissolubly linked with the whole complicated question of the origins of the Lamian War.

4. Towards Revolt

By the spring of 323 the unsettled state of affairs in Alexander's Empire might appear to have been coming to an end. The flight of Harpalus had failed to produce a major revolt among the satraps; the reign of terror was over, and faithful nonentities had taken the places of all those whom, rightly or wrongly, the King regarded as dangerous. But one difficult task remained: the removal of Antipater. It is interesting to observe that, although relations between the King and the Viceroy had visibly deteriorated, his removal had not yet been accomplished at the time of Alexander's death. That was in June, ten months after Craterus' departure: Craterus was apparently waiting in Cilicia, less than three months' march from his starting-point. Yet we have no reason to believe that he had any major operations to carry out there.

The removal of Antipater was clearly not a straightforward task. That depended on whether he would go quietly. Antipater, Philip's loyal minister and general, to whom, above all others, Alexander had owed his safe accession to the throne, can have had no illusions on what his fate was to be. He had long ago seen his son-in-law Alexander arrested and (as far as we can tell) judicially murdered; he had been shocked by the elaborately prepared trial of Philotas and the assassination of Parmenio, and, no doubt, by the fate of Callisthenes, with whose philosophical circle he seems to have been in touch; he had been spied upon and calumniated by Olympias, until he had forced her to take refuge in Epirus, from where her calumnies continued. That she in fact pointed out to the King Antipater's secure and uncontrolled power is far from incredible; not that the King needed these reminders. For years the increasing distance between the two men put off the need for an accounting: neither had reason to risk an open clash by open action against the other, and both were too prudent to take unnecessary risks. The reign of terror, with Alexander coming nearer again, must have increased Antipater's fears, even though (like Cleomenes) he was sufficiently strong and sufficiently far away to be safe for the moment. When Harpalus appeared in Athens, Antipater asked for his extradition, as did his enemy Olympias and—clearly going outside his own province into Antipater's—Philexenos. The multiplicity of demands is interesting, but was self-defeating. It was soon followed by the order for Antipater's supersession and—somewhere in these months, though we cannot tell where—Antipater's firm disapproval of Alexander's plans for deification. In the autumn or early winter of 324 Antipater's son Cassander was despatched to the Court. His treatment there was so unfavourable that it created lifelong hatred for Alexander and his

149 See n. 138 (above) and text.
150 See, most conveniently, Berve, s.v. 'Ἀντίπατρος' (94).
151 D xvii 118, 1. Whatever we think of the story of the poisoning of Alexander by Antipater's youngest son (see Berve, s.v. 'Τόλας' (386)—it is impossible to decide, since, if true, it was bound to be denied or ignored, and if false, bound to be asserted), we have no reason to doubt Antipater's reaction to Alexander's measures against his old friends.
152 Berve, 47.
153 A vii 12, 5 f. (unfortunately cut short by a major gap).
155 It is significant that Demosthenes proposed to turn down Philoxenus' demand, yet asserted that the Athenians could avoid offending Alexander (Hyp. Dem. 8).
156 Suid., s.v. 'Ἀντίπατρος'. This again is often disbelieved a priori. Thus each piece of evidence is often individually ruled out of court and the pattern is not allowed to emerge.
house. He had obviously been sent to negotiate with the King, particularly (no doubt) in an attempt to have the supersession revoked. Perhaps the offer of a hostages was calculated to make the King desist from unnecessary risks. As we have seen, Craterus meanwhile refrained from making any move to carry out his instructions. If it came to open conflict, Antipater would be in a strong position, quite unlike that of a satrap in Asia. The Macedonian army had sufficiently shown its dislike for the King’s orientalising policy, while Antipater was known and trusted. Later history shows much attachment to Antipater’s name and family in the homeland, and little to Alexander’s; and if Alexander did not know the position, he had Olympias to tell him.

Meanwhile Antipater naturally looked round for support. The two powers chiefly affected by the exiles’ decree were the most obvious allies, particularly since they were not specially embittered against him by his support of hated governments. It is in this light that we must see Antipater’s negotiations with the Aetolian League, entered into late in 324, when the exiles’ decree had ordered them to give up Oeniadae. There is, unfortunately, no actual report of negotiations with Athens. But, considering the amount and nature of our evidence, that would perhaps be too much to hope for, and silence is certainly no argument to the contrary. There is, in any case, more to be said about Athens; and we have already noticed the return of Antipater’s friend Demades, which may be a pointer.

The Harpalus incident had failed to bring about a general explosion—a combination of disaffected satraps and commanders, with Athens in alliance with them, such as some circles in Athens had hoped for. The net profit for Athens was small enough: a quadrireme, two triremes and 350 talents, which Alexander might even demand back. Yet the Athenian navy, thanks largely to Lycurgus and Demades, was now a powerful force, well equipped with the latest capital ships; it was natural that some of the leading politicians should at least consider whether it might not be best to use the windfall while it was still available: 350 talents would hire a fair number of soldiers. As luck would have it, a supply of mercenaries was available at Taenarum, and Leosthenes, strategos for the land, had connexions with them. They were, however, a wasting asset: not only might the men enlist under some other paymaster, but the exiles’ decree, once fully implemented, would succeed at least to some extent in its purpose of breaking up these dangerous forces by absorbing many of the men back into their cities, with some sort of restitution of their property. For those who wanted to act, quick action was necessary.

In the spring of 323 Leosthenes was re-elected general—this time, it seems, ἐνὶ τὰ δημα. Clearly a considerable section of the Athenian voters envisaged offensive operations. The chronology of what preceded and followed this election is very difficult. We know that at some time Leosthenes, with the consent of some official quarters in Athens, began to prepare a revolt against Macedonian rule. Diodorus is unfortunately our only source for this, and of information on a priori grounds as ‘contrary to Antipater’s character’ (thus, e.g. Berve, 50: ‘unbedingt königstreut’), thus begging the whole question and closing our eyes to the facts.

---

157 See n. 139 (above) and text.
158 See n. 138 (above) and text. Compare the attempts by Greek cities to have the exiles decree revoked.
159 P 49, fn. Plutarch appears to put the negotiations straight after Parmeno’s death, where they certainly make little sense. That Parmeno’s death had impressed Antipater and made him fear a similar fate in 324 is no doubt true: Plutarch has, as so often, presented a logical as a chronological connexion. Fortunately, the reference to Oeniadae, which we know (D xviii 8, 6) was the point at issue between Alexander and the League in 324, settles the chronology and redeems the unnamed source. In view of the Diodorus passage, it may well be Hieronymus. We have no right to reject such items
161 The ships appear in the navy lists (e.g. IG ii² 1631, 170 f.; 1632, 123); for the precarious retention of the money (no doubt the ships were equally precarious), see Din. i 68.
162 See the lists for 325/324 f. (IG ii² 1629, 808 f.; 1631, 172 f.).
163 See Section 2 (above).
164 This is the prima facie inference from the fact that he commanded the Athenian forces outside Attica in the Lamian War (cf. Ar. Ath. pol. 61, 1).
his chronology, never reliable, is here at its worst. He refers to the matter twice—one, before Alexander’s death, in connexion with the mercenary problem, and once, after Alexander’s death, in connexion with the exiles decree and the causes of the Lamian War.165 The first account—from the flocking of the mercenaries to Taenarum to Leosthenes’ preparations for war with the support of the boule—is synchronised with events in Asia from the end of the Opis revolt and Hephaestion’s death, and is followed by Alexander’s winter expedition against the Cossaei: clearly the autumn of 324 is meant. Yet all these events (partly, at least, owing to his complicated Athenian and Roman dating) are put in the archonship of Anticles (325/324), which is impossible. The second account explicitly states that it was only after Alexander’s death that the Athenians began to prepare for war, and only after reports of his death had been confirmed that these preparations were openly completed. We are not helped by the fact that the two accounts (differing in other details as well as in their chronological setting) are linked by a cross-reference from the second to the first.

We have seen from independent considerations that Leosthenes’ great convoy operation should probably be dated early in 324, as it appears to have brought over to Europe at least some of the mercenaries affected by the dissolution of the satrapal armies, as well as those who had revolted in Bactria. Perhaps this is what Diodorus found under the year of Anticles. The exiles decree, as we have seen, reached Europe just before the end of that archon year. But it was surely only after the overt threat of the Olympic proclamation that the Aetolians would consider war at all seriously. The second part of Diodorus’ first account—Leosthenes’ secret appeal to the boule (which must therefore be that of 324/323) and his contacts with the Aetolians—must belong at least to the autumn of 324. Perhaps this helps to explain Diodorus’ false synchronisation. At any rate, it seems clear that Diodorus’ source assigned all these events to a time well before Alexander’s death.

It is, of course, very doubtful whether a really reliable account of Leosthenes’ activities at this time, and of official support for them, ever existed. The secret decisions of the boule and the secret contacts between Leosthenes and the Aetolians are precisely the kind of information that a non-Athenian historian (whether Hieronymus or another), however conscientious, must have found it impossible to elicit with real akribeia—particularly after the end of the Lamian War, when men had good reason to obscure the truth. The fact that these secret activities are put in the autumn of 324 by one source and in the summer of 323 by another need neither surprise nor dismay the historian: the facts, as it happens, have their own logic. The only facts we know are Leosthenes’ connexion with the mercenaries at Taenarum (early 324, as we have seen) and the beginning of open hostilities in the autumn of 323, when clearly everything was ready for war. These facts make it fairly clear that some sort of contact was kept up between Leosthenes and the mercenaries during the whole of the intervening period. For this purpose money must have been available, and it is an obvious question whether, after the summer of 324, some of Harpalus’ money was not employed in this way.

The inevitable answer is that it probably was; and there is at least one channel that we can trace. In a rather mysterious (since very fragmentary) part of his speech against Demosthenes, Hyperides informs us that Demosthenes at first attempted an answer to the charge: he admitted receiving some money, but claimed that he had used it on public business of a nature that could not be divulged. Naturally, he was not believed, and he seems to have abandoned the defence and changed to a plain denial.166 The disbelief has been echoed by many modern writers—not surprisingly, as it sounds like a thin excuse.167

165 D xvii 111; xviii 9.
167 E.g. Berve, 140 (with bibliography). That Demosthenes, under pressure, hinted that the money had been used for the Theoric Fund—which (as Berve has no difficulty in pointing out) is most unlikely—is not really relevant to the problem, as he was bound to say something of the sort either if he was guilty or if the truth could not even be hinted at.
Although various worthy purposes for which the money might have been used have been suggested, no really satisfactory reason for the extreme secrecy on which he insisted has been found. But once we realise that, at this very time, Leosthenes would need—and obviously must have received—secret funds for the maintenance of a body of mercenaries, we can find a sufficient reason why Demosthenes, claiming that he had used Harpalus’ money on secret business of public importance, might prefer disgrace and exile to any possible revelation of the truth. As so often, two facts independently reported may confidently be put together, and the result makes good sense of both. If indeed Demosthenes diverted some of Harpalus’ money towards this purpose, we cannot conceive of his acting, at the trial, in any other way than he in fact did: publication of the truth, though perhaps justifying him morally, would not save him from punishment and would be ruinous to the city. Nor is secret co-operation between these two men surprising. Not only do we find them co-operating later, in the Lamian War (which, by itself, might not be significant); but their past may also have led them together. We know little of the background of Leosthenes the son of Leosthenes; but the name is so rare that he must be the son of the general Leosthenes of 361, who was probably an associate of Callistratus; while Demosthenes appears to have begun his career under the aegis of the same politician. This is not by any means conclusive; but in view of the fact that we know so little both about the past of Leosthenes and the political beginnings of Demosthenes, the coincidence is significant. Nor—whether Demosthenes was guilty or innocent—could Leosthenes or anyone else do much to save him, once the case came up for trial. Demosthenes had made too many enemies. Chief opponent of Philip, yet responsible for the Peace of Philocrates; architect of rebellion against Alexander, yet ready to abandon Thebes and Sparta; co-operating with both Lycurgus and Demades, insuring himself by contacts at Alexander’s Court, yet ready to plot against the King behind the backs of his associates; surviving all political changes unharmed, and, apparently, always disposing of large sums of money for which he did not account to anyone—he had at last been caught in the web of his own intrigues and, with his chief Macedonian friend dead, fell an easy victim to the unscrupulous rivals who envied his success and the many honest men whose suspicions he had increasingly aroused. It is not surprising that he was the only man who really suffered as a result of the trials: in the tense situation of those months, there must have been many men in Athens who felt safer and happier for his absence. It was soon after this, as we have seen, that Leosthenes was re-elected, this time probably for offensive operations. While Athens was still sending ambassadors to the King and hoping for peaceful concessions, Leosthenes, now in need of more money, approached the boule and found them not unwilling to listen. If his continued contact with the mercenaries is to be explained, the semi-official support that (according to Diodorus) he received cannot have begun later than in this period following the trials, when the sums that Demosthenes (and perhaps others) had been able to place at his disposal were no longer available. It is inconceivable, in any case, that what remained of such funds could have lasted until news of Alexander’s death reached Athens about mid-summer 323; and if there were no funds, there would be no mercenaries.

168 See the Budé Hyperides (ed. Colin), pp. 228 ff. (with bibliography). Detailed earlier discussion (a little vague, but with many good points) in Bauer, Demosth. u.d. Harpal. Prozess (Freiburg i. B., 1900).

169 On the elder Leosthenes, see Sealey, Historia 1956, 202. On Demosthenes’ political beginnings, see Plut. Dem. 5 (his admiration for Callistratus’ speech on Oropus), and his references to Callistratus (xviii 219; xix 297; xxiv 135—I owe these to a private communication by Mr Sealey).

170 The details of the case are well beyond recovery. But the anger of a man like Hyperides (who will hardly have been ignorant of Leosthenes’ activities) is significant. The charges of converting foreign subsidies to personal profit, so often repeated against Demosthenes on various occasions, did not necessarily lack all foundation: the picture that Aeschines and Hyperides and Dinarchus, from different points of view, paint of his avarice and political trimming is remarkably consistent; and the latter, at any rate, is obvious enough from the facts.
On the other hand, in the light of Athenian fears about Samos, there were probably good reasons why the *boule* might feel confident enough to encourage Leosthenes’ policy of retaining the mercenaries at Taenarum. As we have seen, Antipater had not taken kindly to the idea of his supersession and summons to Court. While sending his son Cassander to negotiate, he himself had simply stayed on and begun to treat with the Aetolian League, which had reason to be worried by the Olympic proclamation. As we know from Diodorus that Leosthenes began to negotiate an alliance with the Aetolians as soon as he had the promise of public funds from the *boule*, it is surely likely that he had in fact been in touch with them for some time and had been able to inform the *boule* of the secret preparations and negotiations for rebellion. Thus the future might well look more promising to the *boule*; with the help of Antipater and the Aetolians, resistance to the King would no longer seem hopeless, if Athens were driven to it by his intransigence. Many Macedonians, cowed into temporary support of the King’s policies, might be ready to support Antipater, if the chance offered: and would the army that had mutinied at Opis stand together with the Eastern units, which Alexander had forced into their ranks, against the forces of the homeland? All this, of course, was still in a hypothetical future; but against the background as we now know it, we need not be surprised that the *boule* was persuaded by Leosthenes to give him secret and limited support. Perhaps Alexander, before his death, had begun to realise the danger threatening from Europe—if indeed he reversed his decision about Samos and, in order to win the favour of Athens, returned the island to the Athenians. But of this, at present, we cannot be certain.171

6. Epilogue

The thunderbolt of Alexander’s death put an end to all the secret plotting. The marshals bargaining at Babylon realised that no firmly established governor could now be deprived of his post—least of all the General of Europe, whom the King himself had not succeeded in removing; though this necessarily meant that Craterus’ position was anything but clear172—not that this would be unwelcome to the new regent Perdicas. Antipater, again secure in his control of Macedon, now had much to offer Craterus, who, no longer a rival for control of Macedon, would be a useful ally in case Perdicas proved overbearing. It is not surprising, therefore, that Antipater’s first reaction to the news was to invite Craterus to join him—as far as we can see, even before he heard of the Greek revolt.173 Craterus, however, preferred to watch and not commit himself too soon.174

As for the Greeks, they saw no reason why they should now become Antipater’s allies. For a long time the very personification of the hated Macedonian rule, he had seemed a convenient ally to some states when resistance to the King himself was contemplated. With the King providentially removed, the hatred long felt for the Viceroy erupted irresistibly—there was no longer any need to disguise it; while Antipater for his part, now secure in his tenure of Europe, had no incentive for giving the Greeks their freedom, since he could hope to continue ruling them. Thus we hear no more of the attested negotiations between him and the Aetolian League and the projected triple alliance, into which Leosthenes had apparently been ready to lead Athens. Instead, the Greeks—led by Athens, which could now openly use the remains of Harpalus’ treasure—now aimed at freedom.175 As usual, diplomatic manoeuvres accompanied military preparations, showing that the Greeks were well aware of what the situation required and promised. Seuthes, the Odrysian, was an obvious ally: an old friend of Athens, he seems to have gained *de facto* inde-

---

171 See n. 132 (above).
172 D xviii 3 (cf. Arr. suc. 3).
173 Ibid. 12, 1. He also allied himself with Leonnatus, holder of the key satrapy of Hellespontine Phrygia.
174 Cf. D xviii 16, 4.
175 D xviii 9, 4 f. (especially 10, 2 f.).
pendence towards the end of Alexander’s reign. But his new opponent Lysimachus kept him fully occupied before long, and he could give his allies no help. We know of other barbarian allies among the tribes surrounding Macedon; though they all proved unavailing or treacherous in the end. For those calculating diplomatic chances there was further hope in the inevitable disunity among the Macedonian marshals. With the common menace of Alexander removed, Antipater, long out of touch with the Court and its changing factions, might find himself isolated. Craterus was the chief enigma. Baulked of succeeding to the rule of Europe, left insecure by the bargainers at Babylon, who seemed glad enough to have him out of the way, he might well be induced to make concessions in order to strengthen his position in the general struggle for power. We have seen that Antipater, recognising his importance, lost no time in offering him alliance. Yet Craterus hesitated. For several months, even after the outbreak of the Lamian War and the desperate plight to which it soon reduced Antipater, he did nothing to help him, leaving Leonnatus to go to his death. It was only when Perdiccas himself appeared in Asia Minor, in order to instal the faithful Eumenes in Cappadocia, that Craterus realised where his future lay. Perhaps Ptolemy also offered some hope. Cleomenes had been most unpopular, especially in Athens, and his supersession by Ptolemy may well have aroused some hopes there. But Ptolemy, chiefly concerned about Perdiccas’ power, in the end allied himself with Antipater; though perhaps only when the latter’s success in Greece was certain. The cities of Greece were now merely the victims and the prizes of high politics: in the greater game that was beginning, their alliance was not worth buying at any real cost.

We have now pursued the inquiry into the origins and effects of Harpalus’ escape to its natural end: the Lamian War and the end of Greek freedom. The scrappy remains of ill-informed and often deliberately misleading sources, which are all we have on the last year—and not only on the last year—of Alexander’s reign, have yet furnished the outlines of a pattern into which much disparate evidence, unintelligible (and often rejected) in isolation, can profitably be fitted. The pattern is that of a period of tension, plotting and surprises, and the period begins to become intelligible, at least in outline. Much remains to be done to fill in these outlines; and more (it seems) can be done than has usually been attempted. The picture of the King himself, as it is likely to emerge against this background, is not likely to please the worshippers and the romantics. But then, we never had any serious reason to think that the period that opens with Hephaestion’s drinking himself to death and closes with the King’s slow and meticulously chronicled end (whether from the same cause or from poison) would, on closer investigation, turn out to be an edifying climax to a great life.

**APPENDIX: SOME POINTS OF CHRONOLOGY**

There has been endless discussion of the chronology of Harpalus’ arrival and stay in Athens (bibliography: Bengston, *GG* 346, n. 3), but no agreement has been reached and certainty is impossible. However, the problem is basic to any study of the period, and certain firm conclusions and plausible conjectures are possible. I shall therefore here review the chief evidence that bears on the problem. For the sake of brevity I shall omit

---

176 See Berve, s.v. Σεκθηκ. 177 D xvi, 14, 2 f. 178 Ibid. 11, 1. 179 See n. 174 (above). 180 See especially [Dem.] lvi 7 f. 181 D xvii 14, 2. 182 For modern views of Alexander’s personality and policy, see Walser, *Ét. Suisses d’Hist. Gén.* 1956, 179 f. I should like to thank Mr R. Sealey and Mr P. A. Brunt for valuable comments and help. I am afraid they disagree with several of my interpretations and opinions; and though they have helped me to eliminate some errors, they are not, of course, responsible for those remaining. I am also obliged to Mr. J. R. Hamilton for help in the study of sources for the history of Alexander.
items that have been adduced by some scholars, but are in fact of no help in arriving at a definite chronology. These will easily be found in the various discussions cited by Bengtson.

There are two reasonably firm dates that bear on Harpalus' stay in Athens. First, it is clear (and nowadays fairly generally agreed) that he must have been admitted into Athens before the end of the archon-year 325/324. This was revealed by an inscription of the tribe Leontis, which shows us Philocles honoured as cosmete in what must be 324/323. Since Philocles was the general who admitted Harpalus, after promising not to do so (Din. iii, init. and passim), and since earlier years are obviously excluded, this must have happened in 325/324. (On all this, see the excellent discussion by Mathieu, cited n. 79 (above). Discussions in which this inscription is not taken into account are now useless.) But it now appears that 325/324 was intercalary, and 324/323 began on July 22nd (see Dinsmoor, Archons 372, 429; cf. Pritchett–Neugebauer, Calendars 55 f.). This means that Harpalus was in Athens by July 21st.

The second date can be deduced (less precisely) from Timocles' comedy Del(i)us. There (op. Ath. viii 341f–342a) various people are accused of having accepted bribes from Harpalus. Out of five names mentioned (and the quotation seems to be, for our purpose, complete), only one (Demosthenes—with the wrong sum) is identical with a name on the list published by the Areopagus. Admittedly, our information about that list is not complete; but this must be more than accident, especially as one man mentioned by Timocles (Hyperides) later became one of the chief prosecutors. The only possible explanation is that, when the play was performed, the list had not yet appeared: rumour was still ready with charges against all and sundry. There are, however (though distinguished scholars, like Colin, have not always seen this), only two occasions, after Harpalus' arrival, when the play could have been performed: the Lenaeae and the City Dionysia of 323. The dates of these festivals can be worked out as, respectively, January 28th and March 25th (first day), and the calculation (based on Dinsmoor, op. cit. 429) is certainly sufficiently accurate for our purpose. It follows that the Areopagus did not publish its findings until the end of January at the earliest. But we know from Dinarchus that the inquiry took six months (I 45), and this in a context where he had no reason to distort the facts, since 'five' or 'seven' would have served equally well. (Both he and his audience, of course, knew the facts well enough.) Thus the inquiry cannot have begun before the middle, and is most unlikely to have begun before the last week, of July 324. But since the public outcry that followed Harpalus' escape led to the institution of the inquiry without delay (see Section 3, above), this also gives us an approximate terminus ante quem non for Harpalus' escape: Harpalus must still have been in Athens some time in the second half of July.

Beyond this, the ground is more treacherous; yet some progress is possible. When Harpalus arrived in Greece, he found great excitement there over the arrival of Nicanor with his instructions (Hyp. Dem. 18—the passage that misled so many earlier commentators into putting his arrival after the Olympic Games). We have seen that the King seems to have proclaimed his decision on the return of the exiles at Susa, where he arrived in or (probably) after February 324 (see nn. 43 and 96, above). Thus Nicanor—not an express messenger, but an envoy travelling in state—cannot have arrived in Greece before about the beginning of June 324 and probably arrived much later: we must remember that it took three months—for there had been no speeding up of communications since the days of Herodotus—to travel from Susa to Sardis. This fits in well enough with the time it would take Harpalus himself. We have seen that his flight from Susa is best put at the beginning of 324. Since he had a force of 6,000 men with him, and, naturally, had to avoid the King's garrisons and armies, the journey to the coast must have taken him far longer than the official minimum time; moreover, it is very likely that he attempted intrigues and negotiations en route, whether or not any other figures of importance actually joined him. (On
this, see nn. 82 and 83 (above), with text.) If we take average times throughout, Nicanor is not likely to have arrived in Greece before the second half of June, nor Harpalus before the end of the month. Not much time will have elapsed between his first and his second appearance off Attica: he was determined to come to Athens (as is shown by his returning as a supplicant), and we may be certain that he did so as soon as he had left his men at Taenarum and made the necessary arrangements there. Some time, of course, must be allowed for that too: the journey both ways would take several days, and so would arrangements for 6,000 men and several thousand talents. Since, as we have seen, Harpalus was certainly in Athens by July 21st, it is safe to put his arrival there in the second or third week of July.

We must next consider the Olympic festival, at which Nicanor made his proclamation. It appears to have been celebrated from July 31st to August 4th (see Sealey, CR (forthcoming)). Demosthenes (Din. i 81 f.; 103) had himself chosen architheoros, in order to negotiate with Nicanor (and, no doubt, with the envoys of other Greek states). Unfortunately there seems to be no information on how far in advance a theoria was chosen, nor on whether it was the incoming or could be the outgoing boule that chose the representatives; nor do we know precisely—though a minimum can easily be calculated—how long the envoys were away. But it is clearly incredible that Demosthenes could have secured election to this sacred and distinguished office, or have been allowed to proceed on the mission, if he had at that time been involved in the eruption of public suspicion (centred in Demosthenes himself) that immediately followed Harpalus’ escape and the consequent discovery of the discrepancy in the accounts. (Bauer, Dem. u.d. Harp. Proz. 8 f., firmly makes this elementary point.) As we can be certain that Harpalus’ stay lasted more than a few days (see n. 118 (above) and text) and he seems to have arrived in the second or third week of July, we may rule out an escape before the Olympic festival. Nor is he likely to have escaped during Demosthenes’ absence: Hyperides (Dem. 17) charges Demosthenes with permitting Harpalus’ guard to disintegrate without doing anything about it; and that experienced orator was not likely to present the accused with an opportunity of demonstrating his innocence by means of a splendid alibi and thus distracting the jury from the other charges. Whatever we think of Demosthenes’ guilt in this respect, he must certainly have been there when it happened. This means that the escape can fairly confidently be put some time—and, clearly, not at once—after Demosthenes’ return from Olympia: Harpalus must have stayed in Athens from about the middle of July to about the middle of August.

This makes the earliest probable date for the publication of the Areopagus’ list mid-February 323 and the earliest date for the beginning of the trials early March. I feel that they should not be put much later. Unfortunately this is difficult to prove. There appears to be no terminus post quem non in our evidence, short of the end of the archon-year, by which time Philocles had been reinstated as cosseme so as to be honoured by Leontis (see the inscription cited above). But it looks as though Demosthenes’ exile was fairly prolonged (whether or not we accept the authenticity of the Letters); and Demades had time to return and resume public speaking before the first rumour of Alexander’s death arrived. Also, it is a little difficult to see Harpalus in Athens for months on end, without further action by the Macedonians to press for his extradition. But none of this is conclusive. Though it seems to me easiest to believe that he escaped late in August or early in September, after a stay in Athens of not more than two months, and though we can fairly safely assert (in the present state of the evidence) that he did not escape before about mid-August, it does not seem possible to prove that he did not stay until (even) early November. I hope that closer investigation, or new evidence, will be able to narrow this interval down.

University of Durham|University of Oregon.

E. Badian.
CATTLE EGRETS AND BUSTARDS IN GREEK ART

(PLATES I-V)

I. Cattle Egret φυγαδής

There is a bird perched on the neck of a bull on a Late Bronze Age krater from Enkomi in the British Museum (Plate I 1). It has long legs and a long neck, and it is much larger than any of the crow tribe, so often seen on cattle. Its long pointed bill is fixed on a point in the bull's neck probably removing a tick or something of the sort. The operation is painful and the bull tosses his head. On the other side of the vase the bird has lost his footing but still keeps the grip of his bill on the neck of the bull (Plate I 2). That dagger-like bill is longer than the one on the other side of the vase. We must therefore suppose that the bill in the earlier scene has been inserted into the bull's neck to a considerable depth. No wonder the bull is plunging about to dislodge the operator.

A bird with long neck, long legs, and long beak can only be a marsh bird, and as it is hunting for insects on the neck of a bull, it can only be a Cattle Egret (Plate I 4), though its body bears some resemblance to the bodies of birds which are probably meant for geese or swans; its beak is more formidable. Presumably this insect-hunting bird is not a deity revealing him or herself; but perhaps Cypriots are more secular than Mycenaeans.

I find that V. Karageorghis has assembled this vase and others that I am about to quote, and related the action of the birds on them to those of magpies, though he sees that these birds are not magpies. The publication of Birds of Cyprus confirms my identification by stating that Cattle Egrets can still be seen in parties of ten or more near Larnaka. Enkomi may once have been on an estuary, and this vase gives us scenes from the water meadows. It is true that these birds are all too heavy even for Cattle Egrets, but the same fault is to be found in the swans mentioned above, and we shall find others. The trouble is partly caused by the method of drawing an outline round all the feathers of a fluffy bird. I expect the Cypriots liked their birds fat.

Karageorghis has reversed my order of events, and states that my falling bird is flying towards the bull: it is not flying, its wings are closed, but it may be jumping on. He also figures a companion krater which may well serve as a sequel: on one side the bird is falling on its head, on the other it has disappeared.

1 BM C416. CVA i pl. 10. 7.
2 The cattle egret is called the Tikkie Bird in Africa: it is more usual for birds to explore the backs of beasts.

See the photographs of a flock, and a bird in Spain in Plate I 3, 4. I am indebted to Mr E. Hoskins for permission to use these photographs, and for that in Plate III 2. For other photographs and permission to use them I have to thank the authorities of the British Museum, the Ashmolean Museum, the Pitt-Rivers Museum, the Cyprus Museum, the Agora and the German Institute in Athens. The drawings in Plates II 6, IV 6 are from Birds in Cyprus, by kind permission of Mr and Mrs Bannerman and the London Zoological Society; that in Plate IV 5 from A Field Guide to the Birds of Britain and Europe (R. Peterson and others). I have to thank Prof. Ashmole and Mr Philip Ashmole for reading this paper.

3 E.g. C412, CVA London i pl. 10. 10. Note the short legs, the dark necks, and short beaks.
4 Cf. C372, CVA London i pl. 9. 4. See also Plate IV 1.
5 See M. P. Nilsson, Geschichte der Griechischen Religion 291; T. B. L. Webster, From Mycenae to Homer 42.
6 AJA lx 145, pl. 56, figs. 3 and 4.
7 D. A. and W. M. Bannerman, Birds of Cyprus 241.
8 Sir George Hill's suggestion (History of Cyprus i 12): Oiniodai built near the mouth of the Acheloos is now one to two miles inland.
9 Some Cypriot birds do, however, fly with their wings folded: Plate III 5, 6. I shall make much use of Karageorghis' articles.
10 AJA lx pl. 56, figs. 1, 2, the Pheidias krater no. 42.
Note the nice fluffy extended tail that the bird turns sideways to display to us: perhaps it serves as a parachute. All the tails are too long. Note also the well-marked toes and plus-fours.

On another krater of the same shape, this time from Klaudia near Larnaka, a bull with three diamonds in the air round its head, is approaching a sleeping bird on the ground (Plate I 5). The bird is like the Cattle Egret, except that its tail is folded, perhaps because it is on the ground, and its beak is a little bent. On the other side of the vase (Plate I 6), the bird has awakened, stretched its long neck upwards and appears to be making a pass at one of the diamonds just beyond its friend’s horn. The encounter of bull and bird may be less hostile than Stubbings supposed, in fact it almost looks as if the bull has come to the bird for protection from horse-flies. A diamond does not make a good fly, but these ‘filling ornaments’ do accompany other animals liable to similar attack. On a companion krater the bird has gone to sleep again and the bull passes on.

A similar bird to these Cattle Egrets can be found under stags on another Cypriot krater. The birds are called swans in the British Museum Catalogue, but that is impossible, and a stag each with his attendant goose would not be much better. G. Mountfort tells us that there is an alliance between deer and Cattle Egret and evidently the Cypriots knew of it. The birds are turning their pliant heron’s necks to search for insects on the ground, which have been attracted by the beasts or disturbed by their arrival; this is a common occupation of Cattle Egrets. They might be meant for another kind of heron such as the Squacco or the Little Egret, which also frequent cattle, but the birds with the stags are so like the bird actually on the animal, that it is fair to suppose that the Cattle Egrets are intended. Mrs Immerwahr adds three more of these birds by themselves on an oinochoe from Enkomi (Plate II 1). A fragment with a Cattle Egret, undoubtedly by the same hand as the oinochoe in the British Museum, and one with similar stags, were found by Schliemann at Mycenae. The ornithological evidence rather favours a Cypriot origin for the style, but it is not of course decisive. Schliemann’s drawing of this bird carries conviction, but some of Furumark’s drawings are less satisfactory.

It is possible that a deep bowl presents a pair of Cattle Egret in flight. They have bushy tails, long legs and long bills. This is the way the birds would come in to land (Plate 3).

It is here claimed that all these Cypriot Bronze Age vases show close observation of bird-life in spite of faults of presentation noted above. It is a bird of which we in England can know little at first hand, so it has been hard for us to identify it. All these vases surely give us scenes taken straight from country life. The Cattle Egret is a striking and beautiful bird and deserves to be commemorated (Plate 3, 4).

I have neither leisure nor opportunity to follow the presentation of marsh birds in Cyprus far into the archaic period, though I am convinced that it would repay study. There is a series of squat, round-bottomed oinochoi, obviously made to be hung on pegs and used as dippers. We encountered the shape in Ithaca in the fabric confusingly called Argive Monochrome. The workmen christened them Papades. In Cyprus these vases

---

11 BM C 402, CVA i pl. 10; 4; reverse, Immerwahr, AJA lx pl. 52.
12 F. A. Stubbings, BSA xlvi 170 Group I. 1. I agree with Mrs Immerwahr that the bird and bull vases cannot be separated, but probably animal and fly vases have to be included too. BM C 403, 408; Enkomi, T 18, 6; T 18, 46; Sjöquist, Problems, fig. 21.
13 Cyprus Museum, A1544. Photo kindly sent me by Mr Karageorghis.
14 BM C 409, CVA i pl. 9; 10; good detail, AJA lx pl. 54, fig. 14.
15 Portrait of a Wilderness 99.
often show long-legged birds flying or coming in to land, shouting loudly and obviously enjoying life. I show one in the Ashmolean (Plate II 3). The bird may be a Stilt. Common-sense demands that some of the vases found in tombs in Cyprus were used in life before burial. It seems unlikely that this cheerful bird was especially painted for a sad occasion, or has any part in the cult of the dead.

Professor Myres mentioned a scene of combat between a man and a bull on a Cypriot oinochoe in the Pitt-Rivers Museum, Oxford (Plate II 4, 5). The interesting thing for us is that a bird seems to be rising from the bull's back: it is a big bird and it has a long wing, long legs and a long beak. I take it that it is again our Cattle Egret reappearing in Cyprus in the seventh century. The style of the oinochoe is the so-called Bichrome IV. This bird is shaded rather than patterned, and its neck is thicker and nearer to the real bird's neck. Note that parts of our Late Bronze Age Cypriot Cattle Egrets are also shaded.

A coin-maker working at Syracuse in the late fifth century signed his name as Φρυγίλας or Φρυ. In Thuria, coins of that century are signed φ and φρυ, also φ, with a bird under a bull (Plate II 7). The bird's vertical wings, its legs and its neck are too long for a finch, the kind of bird which it is generally supposed to be, but it cannot be doubted that a bird of some sort is intended and this bird was called Φρυγίλας.

Aristophanes suggests that the word Φρυγίλας should be derived from φροξ, and manages to accuse a rival, Spintharos, who has a name rather like σπηγός, σπηλεα (or Chaffinch), of cowardice in the by-going. Compare the passage where Peithetairos asks Iris if she thinks she is trying to scare a Lydian or a Phrygian. Incidentally Philemon, a Phrygian who was turned into an oak-tree, is a suitable ancestor for a bird with phryg- in his name. Aristophanes is drawing a parallel between migrant birds and foreigners. From Aristophanes then we have a bird who is a little foreign slave.

Rogers, rejecting Aristophanes, openly says that he translates Φρυγίλας as finch because of a fancied analogy with fringillus which Martial uses of a member of the dawn chorus. There is also fringola, the modern Italian for Chaffinch. Then there is the English surname Finch used by Dickens. It is all too good to be true: Φρυγίλας still does not equal fring-

According to the philologists, a similar root to frig- appears in the name of several small birds, in several languages. In Latin it must mean the 'Cheeper' which is quite a good name for a finch, and birds often take their names from the noise they make. The metathesis theory seems to require that the classical Greeks took the name blindly from Latin or Russian, and then turned the vowels round. The root Φρυγί- is as old as the Iliad and the diminutive -ilos -illos occurs in personal names and in names of birds. Aristophanes definitely says that Phrygilos is a Phrygian and a foreigner. The joke would lose most of its point if Phrygilos was just a resident, native finch. Later (Birds 873) when the bird-gods are being arranged, the foreign goddess, Kybele, the Great Mother, has a foreign bird, the

---

21 Oxford 1911-1945. See also a heron, Plate II 2 (BM C831).
22 Pitt-Rivers Museum, no. 2803, 715 blue. See Essays in Aegean Archaeology presented to Sir Arthur Evans, 72 and pl. 14. I cannot agree that a trefoil lip is in itself zoomorphic.
23 BM Cat. Sicily 168.
24 Lloyd SNG ii 405; see Evans Num. Chron. 1912, 36 ff. I owe all these references to Dr C. Kraay. The φρυ is alternative to the bird, and should have the same meaning.
25 Birds 763. See also Φροξ as the name of a slave (Wasps 453) coupled with Midas.
26 Birds 1244. This itself is a parody of Phereas in the Alkestis, Eur. Alc. 675.
27 This suggestion assumes an ancient authority for Ovid's story Met. viii 630 ff. Late inscriptions CIG 2811, 2812, mention games in honour of Philemon at Aphrodias.
28 Martial, ix 54, 7, fringillorum querelas, mentioned along with sparrows and starlings.
29 A. Walde (Hoffmann), Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch 543. I owe this and the following reference to Mr J. Chadwick.
30 Buck and Petersen, Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives. For bird names, ending in -ίς cf. τροχίς, φρυγίς, κλάκις. Metathesis between the first two is not difficult and Aristotle has been guilty. Let us follow the sounder Aristophanes:
Plover, Wren, Thrush.
Great Sparrow, i.e. the Ostrich: so it is appropriate that the foreign god, Sabazios, mentioned here for the first time, should have a migrant, rather exotic bird, not the homely finch.

Let us now take a good look at the actual bird and bull on the coin. A finch and a bull are not good companions on a coin from a practical point of view. It would be almost impossible to draw a recognisable finch to scale. We can see clearly in Seltman’s enlargement, which I reproduce, Plate II 7, that the bird is indeed too large for a finch; it also has long legs, a long neck, and it is alighting or taking off with long, straight, vertical wings. A charging bull on the coin of a colony founded by Athens is clearly the Marathon bull, and he has brought his marsh bird with him, from the marsh where the famous charge was made. The habit of writing Greek names in Latin obscures the fact that the bull himself is a pun θούριος. He is charging, not butting as the Catalogue says. The pun is noticed by Head: such scholars were not deceived by their own nomenclature; but it is a pitfall for students who still have to consult the Catalogue of 1873. H. T. Wade-Gery maintains that Thucydides consistently wrote the name of the town as Θουρία. The foundation happened in his lifetime and he or his namesake may have been concerned in it. Diodorus (xii 10. 6) writes the name as θουρίαν, from whom Head may have taken his Thurium; later Strabo has Θουρία and the Latin form was Thurii. M. N. Tod, however,revives the controversy: the crux lies in the following passage (Thuc. vi 61): ‘He [Alkibiades] who had his own ship, and his co-accused, sailed from Sicily in company with the Salaminia as if for Athens (ἐς Ἀθηνὰς): and when they were εν Θουρίαις, they no longer kept company but departed from their ship.’ If, as Tod states, our town is inland, it would have been a question of returning to their ship: εν Θουρίαις must mean ‘in Thourian waters’. This passage also destroys another argument against Θουρία being the capital: ships are said to sail to Athens, so they can be said to sail to or from Thouria, even though it is inland. It is more likely that envoys should conduct successful negotiations in the capital of a city state, not in the province. The name to which Thucydides gave prominence must be the name of the town.

It is more difficult to be sure of the species of marsh-bird. Its tail is rather long for a Cattle Egret. If it were meant for a Little Egret, it should have a crest, but on this scale such a detail might easily be omitted, and Little Egrets are reported from Greek lands and from South Italy. On the other hand, it would be hard to be sure that the Greeks did not know the habits of such a wanderer as the Cattle Egret. The bird is now busily engaged in colonising the continent of North America. If the Greeks knew of its habit of valeting cattle, the Cattle Egret would be particularly suitable for the office of βοῦκολος δῶλος, the Little Phrygian, the little foreign slave.

The closest parallel to this pun on Phrygillos is to be found on an earlier coin from this same township before it changed its name. A coin of Sybaris shows a small song-bird with rounded wings flying away from Poseidon with his trident. Dr. Kraay suggested to me

31 Cattle Egrets are about five times the size of finches and so more suitable companions for bulls. Professor Ashmole points out to me, however, that many symbols on coins are not to scale. The Greeks rarely represented tiny birds.
32 C. Seltman, Masterpieces of Greek Coinage 69. I do not follow Seltman in believing that ϕ always means ϕυγείλος, op. cit. 70.
33 Earlier bulls on coins of Sybaris are quietly turning their heads, not of course to bite their backs as some would have it. (BM Cat. 286 no. 31.) Head HN has ‘head reverted’.
34 Historia Numorum 85.
35 JHS 217.
36 Ibid., 210.
that this commemorates the help given to Sybaris by her two foundations Poseidonia and Laos. The bird will be λαίος the Blue Stone-thrush, a dark blue and very vocal thrush, who sits on stones and sings.

Our coin-maker did a certain amount of travelling, Syracuse, Thouria and perhaps Athens too, for they say his style is Attic. Outspread but less vertical wings are found in the seal of Eros, attached to a creeping Eros, who must find them unhelpful.

For the style of the bird, compare the vertical wings of a crested bird, under the arm of a sceptred terra-cotta goddess, found at Locri. This is the way the birds alight. There is modern evidence for the presence of Cattle Egrets near Athens. One was shot at Phaleron in 1899. I have not found recent evidence of the bird in Sicily or South Italy, but that is not to say that it was not there in the fifth century B.C. and, in any case, Phrygillos was probably an Athenian.

II. Bustard ὀτίς, τέτραξ

Mr Karageorghis illustrates a krater found in a Mycenaean tomb at Enkomi, showing what he calls a monstrous bird, flying behind a chariot (PLATE III 1). It is large but then Great Bustards do put on weight and it is like a Great Bustard (PLATES III 2, IV 5). I learn from Dr Bourne that these birds are still to be seen in Cyprus in migration, and they may very likely have bred there when there was more forest and more rain. Two persons out for a drive in a rocky landscape such as the plain of Cyprus, see a Great Bustard. It is just another country scene, like the long-haired man picking karob pods from a karob tree. The Bustard is flying after his friend the horse, Bustards are said to like horses. The stripes on the bird’s body are not unlike the real markings. The legs look too short, but they were evidently supposed to be carried bent when flying and one wing is extended.

Even if our Bustard were part of a myth, it is not reasonable to suggest that a krater from Ras Shamra presenting a bird of a quite different species continues the story, with, so it is said, a floating swan taken captive. It does not appear to be very well confined either, for who could tie a swan by the head—to water?

If, as has been suggested, Enkomi was on an estuary in ancient times, swans may have floated past. Bronze Age potteries required running water, and that may be one reason why swans have so often been painted. Neither bird can be an Ostrich. It would in any case have been easier for Cypriots to have seen Bustards than Ostriches. Our artist has painted our bird in the air, and Bustards are strong on the wing, whereas Ostriches are permanently earthbound. The lady is plainly excited by the appearance of the bird, but it should not be assumed that she failed to recognise the local game-bird, and fears it. Most likely she is happily anticipating a glorious and unexpected supper.

Both the Little and the Houbara Bustard are also recorded from Cyprus on migration.

42 Perhaps a Little Egret: R. A. Higgins, BM Terracottas i no. 1209, pl. 165.
43 O. Reiser, Materialen zu einem Ornis Balcanica iii 431.
44 V. Karageorghis, AJA lxii 384, pl. 98. 1; Tomb 17 no. 1.
45 Ibid., pl. 101. 2. To Karageorghis this is Herakles picking apples in the garden of the Herakles. Dr Bourne suggested that the karob was probably native to Cyprus and this vase supports him.
46 Ibid., pl. 101. 2. To Karageorghis this is Herakles picking apples in the garden of the Herakles. Dr Bourne suggested that the karob was probably native to Cyprus and this vase supports him.
47 The swan has obviously been dabbling in weeds, as swans do, and one has stuck to his head: cf. the lozenge-shaped flower near his wings and see similar flowers on BM C411, CVA i p. 9. 3: cf. also a wiggly line by a swan’s bill, BM C372, Murray, Excavations in Cyprus, 48 fig. 73, from Enkomi; CVA i pl. 9. 4.
48 Ceour-de-Lion is said to have introduced swans from Cyprus to Britain, which probably means that they were commoner then than now: both Whooper and Mute Swans still visit Cyprus in winter and both species are probably represented on Bronze Age vases.
The extra large size of these two birds need not mean that they are mythical birds. In the 'Zeus vase' 49 (Plate III 3-5) the bow and the scales are too small, and the octopus are too large; yet no one has so far suggested an octopus myth.

Karageorghis has seen that the two sides of Cypriot vases are sometimes connected, and only he has given consideration to the two birds50 on the reverse. He suggests that they are Zeus' eagles, but they are more like our Great Bustard. Schaeffer51 has figured them but he has cut their scene in two. They are flying one after the other above a karob grove. Their legs are correctly outstretched behind their heavy bodies, and their long necks outstretched before them: only they have forgotten to open their wings. The position of legs and necks suits Great Bustards and not eagles. They are flying towards a giant octopus which cuts them off from the humans and there is another giant octopus beyond. Could these water creatures represent Enkomi's two streams,52 and their tributaries, and have they been made big because they are geographical locations? The birds are flying towards the archer waiting and looking for the evening flight;53 the scales are ready too, and the customers are approaching. Supper again: but this is the largest European game-bird. One bird is much larger than the other: perhaps they are mother and chick, or they may be a pair.54

On the first Cypriot vases which we examined, it was claimed that episodes on different sides of the same vases were connected, and that there may have been a sequence of episode on a pair of vases. Here it is suggested that both sides of the krater form one continuous scene, as it clearly does on the krater from Enkomi55 with silhouette birds among cattle, and on other vases also. Sir John Beazley's rule for interpreting Greek vases holds here too: one must examine everything on a vase.56

For other chariots confronted with a river, reference may be made to two chariot vases in New York.57 Mrs Immerwahr interprets the dividing motives as 'veined rocks', but pairs of horses with their noses hard up against solid walls of rock reaching to heaven, are in an uncomfortable, and indeed a dangerous situation. I would rather think of them as about to cross streams. One stream58 is in the middle of the vase like our octopus.

Another krater on which large water creatures may be taken to represent water was also found at Enkomi.59 Two chariots are proceeding along the sea-shore, spirals representing waves curl near their hooves: behind and no doubt meant to be over the sea beyond each chariot, is a round-nosed cetacean, like the two I saw and heard when they were past Perseus and the pursuing sisters, to feed on the corpse of the Gorgon under the other: 'Ο Προτοτατικός Αμφορέας της Ελευθένας pls. 1-4. 10.

57 AJA lix 385 n. 31.
58 Enkomi-Alasia 121.
59 The Motor Map shows two main streams. Schaeffer speaks of 'numerous streams of the Pediados', Missions en Chypre 83.
60 Houbara Bustards are recorded as coming regularly to water in Arabia. Great Bustards may have been done so at Enkomi. Chapman says that Great Bustards are killed at the water-holes.
61 Mr P. Ashmole tells me that the male is much larger than the female.
62 Mr Mylonas' Gorgon amphora is an instance of a bird linking one end of a scene to the other: a white-tailed eagle is flying from under one handle
63 Sjöquist, Problems of the Late Cypriot Bronze Age, fig. 21. 1, Enkomi Tomb 18.
64 Swedish Cyprus Expedition, Enkomi Tomb 11. 33, pl. 121; Sjöquist, Problems of the Cyprus Bronze Age fig. 25. The creature has a dorsal fin on one of Sjöquist's drawings but S. has suppressed a fine row of teeth. Furumark (op. cit.) fig. 48, no. 20. 7) has given us the teeth, but he has substituted a griffin curl for a front flipper. If it had a smaller eye it would be a creditable grampus, and who would risk taking a close-up of a grampus? Why does the excavator find this creature is 'half-bird'?
proceeding along the Channel of Ithaca. A good deal of the creatures came out of the water with each sighing breath. It is possible that we should include the fish in front of a bull, on a krater from Klaudia in the British Museum, among water creatures with a topographical meaning. Behind the bull under the handle is one of the longer long-billed marsh birds on the land: both sides of the vase are similar.

Karageorghis suggests that the long-robed man on the Zeus vase (plate III 3) is not holding scales but standing beside an altar, so the subject of birds and altars on two other Cypriot kraters in the British Museum must be considered. The first (plate IV 1) shows two outsize birds, obviously swans because of their necks: they are nuzzling two tiny replicas of themselves. Now the only little birds that swans do not savage are their own cygnets: I have seen them grab ducks and drown ducklings. I have also seen both swans on their nests with day-old cygnets. The picture should be regarded from above and not sideways. It will then appear that the plaited object in the middle is part of the nest and no altar. Birds keep their young in nests and not on altars. The painter has had difficulty with the edge of the nest on both sides of the vase: on one it stops short of the parents, on the other it bisects the cygnets, but his purpose is clear.

The other alleged altar on a Cypriot Late Bronze Age krater carries even less conviction. The reverse of the krater has never been published: from it we see that the offset object between the birds goes up to the ceiling of the picture, so it cannot be an altar, for it has ornamental corners and no top (plate IV 2). If it is meant for a real object and is not just a dividing motive, it might be a paved road with curb stones. It certainly divides the displaying birds, which seem to have necks like horses. I can only suggest that the outline of the neck has been drawn outside the display feathers on the necks of Houbara Bustards or perhaps of Squacco Herons or, beak slightly upturned, of Bitterns: the beak is like a small Bittern's. I prefer not to guess at the species of the other pair who have lost their beaks.

Reference is also made to birds near an altar on fragments of a later vase (plate IV 3). On it flowers and a palm-tree are growing out of a pot: flowers never grow out of an altar. Two Turtle Doves are landing on the flowers.

On an oinochoe with an angled neck, a Great Bustard is running up to a bull's protome: another protome is behind the bird (plate IV 4). There is evidently some connexion between these birds and bulls' protomes, but the explanation escapes me. Xenophon notes that Great Bustards run.

Great Bustards may have been painted at Mycenae and possibly at other sites on the mainland, but the drawings made from them are old and I have not seen the sherds, so I do not quote from them here. The birds were probably to be found in the plain of Argos. The birds on those vases were not drawn by our Cypriot artists.

We can recognise a pair of Great Bustards on another krater from Enkomi. This bird has a remarkable display, of which more later, and here it is in progress. This krater also belongs to the Bronze Age. It would be interesting to hear from the epiphanists what god chooses this particular bird for self-revelation.

---

60 Catalogue C365, CVA i pl. 7, 12.
61 A tracing was kindly sent me by Mr Higgins.
62 Catalogue pl. 2, C332; CVA i pl. 9, 12, from Maroni.
63 Catalogue, C400, CVA i pl. 9, 8: wrongly drawn in Furumark, op. cit., fig. 39. 19. This author has also produced unjustified restorations of birds in his nos. 14 and 16 in this figure.
64 Mountfort records that two Great Bustards were run over when fighting on a road: Wilderness, pl. 3b.
65 BM C858–9.
66 Catalogue C577, from Enkomi.
67 Anab. i 5; see below.
68 Furumark (The Mycenaean Pottery, fig. 31. no. 46) seems to have drawn the edge of the sherd as a crest and the edge of a thin beak (from MV pl. 39): better forgotten.
69 BM C390 CVA i pl. 8, 11.
70 Karageorghis revives this old theory for a bird sitting on the back of a ceremonial chair (AJA lxii, pl. 99, fig. 3). He calls it a dove but it is more like
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Birds with heavy bodies reappear in the fabric that E. Gjerstad calls Bichrome IV, which probably means that Great Bustards were still important in Cyprus. What does the author mean by the term 'soul birds' which he seems inclined to apply to these birds? If he means souls of the dead in outsize bodies, it does not appear respectful: were the Cypriots different from the classical Athenians who thought of their dead as gnat-winged and gnat-sized. May we not think of these birds as just Bustards? It is a nice fat bird to put on a fat round-bottomed dipper for a festive occasion.

It is possible that some of the more portly birds on dippers represent Bustards, in the orientalising period in Cyprus, but this is too large a field to be discussed here. Though some of the birds look fantastic, others appear to have a natural origin. I suggest that while Plate II 3 (Oxford 1911, 345) may show a Stilt coming in to land on very long legs poked forward, Oxford 1933, 1678 may be meant to show a sleeping Bustard. I take it that the artist intends flight by attaching inadequate outstretched wings to the standing bird. That is how the wings look in the sky, and without field-glasses he does not know what happens to the legs in flight.

Up to the time of Alexander, only the comic poets Epicharmos and Aristophanes use the term τετραγόν for a bird: indeed it has a comic sound, a 'four-times Bird', an admirable description of the Great Bustard, with a side-glance at the stately gait of the rulers of Thessaly. Euripides mentions τετραγόν in the Alcestis (1154), set in Thessaly. The bird was common in Thessaly in the nineteenth century; the rich cornfields suited it, as did those near the Phokian Kephissos in the time of Pausanias and in the Boiotian plains in the time of Leake.

The Great Bustard can weigh 35 lb., it has whiskers, it twists its long legs and elevates its tail in display: Mountfort says it turns its wings inside out. The other two species may do so too, but the Little Bustard (Plate IV 5) is shy and difficult to watch: he has an ornamental neck. The Houbara Bustard has two long tresses, on either side of his neck (Plate IV 6). The three species have fairly long necks and legs: they have heavy bodies and short beaks.

Alkman, the seventh-century Spartan poet, knew the bird (οὐτις). Epicharmos of Syracuse introduced τετραγόν into Hebe's marriage feast, and caused confusion by calling them στροματολόγοι; hence Alexander Myndios and Liddell and Scott have concluded that the Tetrax must be small, one of those little birds that descend on cornfields in clouds: not so, size is not denoted by diet. The Great Bustard must collect more seeds than anyone else, for he nests in cornfields for that very purpose. Further confusion follows: Athenaios says he has identified the bird in Myisia and Paeonia and then gives the description of Aristophanes the Grammariian: 'The bird was bigger than the biggest cock'. Thompson, for both size and habitat, translates the things hanging down on either side of its ears, like a cock's κάλλια, as wattles and arrives at a Guinea fowl. Besides a duck. Not a good place for a duck one would think, but see what a Boiotian goddess supports on her wrist (Plate V 2). I suppose this bird on the chair is not a Little Bustard?

71 Swedish Cyprus Expedition iv 65, pl. 33. 1b, 34.
72 Ibid., 65.
73 On Attic white-ground lekythoi, especially made for the grave. See JHS xxv 74, 75. Death spirits in partly bird-like form do carry off souls, and real birds may have been thought to assist in the process, but there is no evidence for this function on these dippers.
74 Ath. 398 C: in a list of birds for the table, at Hebe's wedding feast.
75 Birds 882: in a list of heroic birds.
76 The Great Bustard used to nest in Thessaly. Makatsch, 425.
77 Paus. x 34. 1.
78 M. Leake, Travels in Northern Greece ii 419.
79 Wilderness 73.
80 Alkman (Bergk) 146 B. From a scholiast on II. xvii 40.
81 Ath. 398 C. As the reason for the mistake is obvious, it is surely better to forget Alexander of Myndios.
82 Makatsch, 425, says the Little Bustard is common now in the northern Balkans.
83 Glossary, s.v. Τετραγό.
84 Ath. 398 ad fin. καὶ ἄνα τῶν οὐτων ἔκατεροιν ἔτεις κρεμάμενα ὅπερ οἱ ἀλεξάνδροιός τά κάλλια.
being too small, the Guinea fowl’s wattles are on the top of his head. *kállaia* in Aelius (Dionysius) is used of cock’s tail-feathers, and that is the meaning here. The Houbara Bustard is bigger than a cock and it has two black tresses hanging down its neck, like cock’s tail-feathers. The passage goes on to compare Tetrax meat to Ostrich meat. A comparison is often drawn in antiquity of the taste of Otis and Ostrich: both birds are so large.

It is uncertain what Pliny’s first Tetraon is, but his second species, ‘bigger than a vulture, bigger than any bird except the Ostrich’, can only be some kind of bustard. The description does not suit a Capercaillie, as Thompson seems to think. From there Pliny goes on to the Great Bustard, Otis, in Spain, and it need not worry us that Pliny has two Greek names for one bird.

Aristophanes (Birds 882) very properly lists the Tetrax among Heroic Birds. Attic crops are too thin to appeal to Great Bustards. Athenians no doubt knew about them, though some of the fun of the Birds probably lay in the floods of birds that the audience did not know.

It is likely that *kállaia* were at first male embellishments in general: in Aristophanes’ Knights (597) the word refers to both cocks and men. Aristotle enumerates all three beauties in the hen turning into a cock: *kállaia, ouropṣ̣̣i̱γιον, πληκτρα*. Aelian in a similar context summarises these as *kálly*, which should clearly not be emended to *kálλaia*.

Xenophon (Anab. i 5) says that the hungry army near the Euphrates ran down Otides on horseback, but found that they could not run down Ostriches. Plutarch says that Xenophon is right, and adds that many Otides were brought to Alexandria from Libya. Athenaios (390) does not connect Otis and Tetrax, and lists both. Aristotle mentions the Otis several times but not in ways that help us to identify it, except that he knows that it is very large.

I shall hope to show elsewhere that Argive geometric painters were particularly interested in birds: a pelican below a horse appears both at Argos and the Heraion. On a geometric kantharos found in an Argive cemetery, there are two pairs of storks discussing snakes, and a pair of large heavy birds also with a snake. They may very well be Great Bustards, catching a snake in the cornfields of Argos. The probability that these birds are meant for Great Bustards is increased by an orientalising Argive krater. The vase is certainly Argive, and not Boiotian, as hitherto stated, because of the angled squiggles which are the direct descendants of Argive slanting meanders. Not every clumsy vase must be Boiotian. Young goes further and wants to give his Attic pyxis a Boiotian ancestry. We note that one of the birds on the Helbig krater has a slightly thicker neck. Is that accidental or bad drawing? When we come to the excellently painted Protoattic pyxis from the Athenian Agora, Plate V 4, the male’s neck is definitely swollen. Chapman has much to say about how the male grows a swollen orange neck at courting-time and displays it along with his shining white under wings. This pair are eating seeds which the ‘Lazy Bird’ could collect more easily than large snakes. Altogether we have a rather close ornithological study of the habits of the Great Bustard, not, as Young thought, a caricature of ducks.

---

85 Eus. 1278, 50.
86 Pliny NH x 29. Pliny says the Great Bustard is uneatable, its bones smell so bad. Mountfort says they do smell but not too badly.
87 Leak notes that he saw no Bustards in Attica, *Northern Greece* ii 419.
88 HA 631b 10 ιξ. 49.
89 Ael. NA v 5. Hercher’s emendation.
90 Aristotle, *HA* 619b, x 33.
91 BCH lxxvii pl. 29, near foot; Waldstein, *Argive Heraeum* ii pl. 56. 20.
92 BCH lxxvii 259 fig. 50.
93 Antike und byzantinische Kleinkunst, Auktion Helbing 1913, pl. 6, no. 83; Hampe Sagenbilder pl. 18. 4.
94 Hampe, op. cit.; Young *Hesperia*, Suppl. ii 128, on B64.
94a Agora p. 4948; Young, figs. 92, 93.
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One of the largest birds in Greek art is to be seen on an amphora from Thebes95 (PLATE V 1). Hampe says it is a bird of prey attacking a hare running below it, but the bird is flying up and away from the hare; it may have been disturbed by it. The bird’s beak is small and straight. The short beak, the great wing-spread and the shape of body are not unlike the drawing of a Great Bustard flying, in the Guide.96 Two of the same species crouch on the outstretched arms of the goddess on the other side of the amphora (PLATE V 2).

Overweight birds beside horses are common on Boiotian incised fibulae, but they are too badly drawn to be identified. Attic geometric birds are sometimes overfed, but they have all too long beaks for Bustards.

We remember that Allman knew of the Otis (see above). The bodies of Lane’s97 Laconian ‘turkeys’ (PLATE V 5) are so like Hosking’s photo of a tame Great Bustard98 (PLATE III 2) that I am sure that bird is intended. It is to be remembered that the Great Bustard was common in Libya (see p. 52), and was no doubt known in Kyrene, which had close connexions with Sparta. The neck is a little too thin, the legs are right, the beak too thick, and the apron is definitely wrong. It may have been transferred from bitterns or from the crane family, or it may be meant for the Houbara’s tresses or the Great Bustard’s whiskers. Those big game birds will provide a wonderful feast.

The same sort of bird, apronless and less full-bodied, appears on a Laconian cup in Florence.99

It would be nice if we could think that short-beaked, long-legged, long-necked birds beside a horseman on a Laconian cup were Little Bustards.100 Notoriously the Great Bustard is said to be fond of horses and it can still be driven by men on horseback. The birds on the cup have ornamental necks; cf. PLATE II 6.

Leaving Laconia, let us consider R. M. Cook’s ‘long-legged birds’, in the East Greek fabric called Fikellura.101 There is a procession of birds (PLATE V 3), even more like the smaller Bustards than the Laconian birds with the horseman. One of them has a curl on its neck, and two secondary feathers or part of the tail, elevated. He should be a male Houbara in display. The vase was found at Tel Defennah in the country where the bird earned its Arabic name.

There is a Little Bustard standing below two Scottish bluebells on a Fikellura amphora in the British Museum.102 The bird is on the slim side. These campanaulae do grow in profusion round springs. I wonder if all these fine game-birds, and the partridges103 too on vases of this fabric, are just the sort of thing one might like to meet on the way to the spring, particularly on a festive occasion?

The influence of this bird in Fikellura can be traced on into Klazomenian. On a sherd from a kotyle in Marburg104 there may be two bustards displaying.

95 Hampe, op. cit., 21, no. V. 1, pls. 17, 18, Athens NM 5893. Leake notes ‘immense numbers of Bustards in the plains of Boiotia’, op. cit., 419. See above, n. 78. Also AFA lxiv pl. 1. 2 with Leake’s ‘Wild Turkeys’ at Patras.
96 Peterson, Mountfort and Hollom, A Field Guide to Birds of Britain and the Mediterranean. PLATE IV 5.
97 BSA xxxiv 146, 187, pls. 43, 44 on the hydra BM B 58. Cf. Fairbanks Boston Catalogue pl. 61, 55, said by Lane not to be Laconian: also Lane, fig. 27. Manner of the Hunt Painter.
98 Wilderness, pl. 3.
99 Shefton BSA xlxi pl. 55, Hunt Painter no. 13; Florence 3879.
100 Cup in British Museum, B 1. Lane, op. cit., pl. 45b. Shefton, Manner of Arkesilas Painter 21. Any Bustard on a horse’s neck would be out of place.
101 R. M. Cook, BSA xxxiv 64, pl. 4c, C 1 (amphora in the British Museum, B 117), CVA xiii pls. 2, 7. Note that Athenaios mentions a Tetrax in Mysia in Asia Minor. See above, p. 51. Some of the Protocorinthian harlequin cocks have a borrowed curl. (MA xii pl. 42. 2; PV pl. 9. 4). This may be borrowed from contemporary griffins, or they may have adopted it from the Houbara Bustard.
102 BM 67. 5–6. 45, CVA xiii pl. 7; 2; Boehlau, Aus Etruschen und Islanischen Nekropolen 55 no. 4. fig. 24, from Kameiros. R. M. Cook tells us that the beak should be open (BSA xxxiv 20, L 4).
103 Ibid., 64.
104 R. M. Cook, BSA xlvi 152 fig. 8. It is tempting to compare these birds with the birds in a belated geometric style on a plate found at Vroulia (see next note).
Rhodian pottery is rather puzzling. The commonest orientalising Rhodian birds are definitely swans, ducks or geese, with carefully flat, webbed feet. On three vases we have definite toes, very large bodies, longish legs, longish necks, and rather short beaks. It is possible that Great Bustards are intended. (a) on the plate in the British Museum where two birds are discussing a small snake, and for once the eye of the victim is visible. Bustards are not noted as snake-killers, but they like insects and doubtless they would not refuse a snake if it came within range. (b) The bird on a plate in Copenhagen is similar, perhaps by the same hand. (c) The bird on an oinochoe in London differs from the first three in having too many toes and spurs for good measure. Schiering seems to suggest that it is a goose.

There is a kotyle in Boston which represents boys with spears riding on large birds; the scene has always been taken for a comic chorus riding on Ostriches. This is the one and only possible archaic Greek presentation of this bird. It does not show the white floating plumes, the necks are thin and carried very upright and the legs are thin too. The general impression of the birds is more like Great Bustards than Ostriches. I like to think that a squad of ephobes guarding the frontier met a flock of Great Bustards from Boiotia and mounted them. The story is fantastic anyway, and though the Athenians may have heard about Ostriches, it would have been easier for them to draw Bustards.

With this kotyle should be connected another showing a monster being shot at by a lady on a lion, by the Theseus painter. Miss Haspels's description of it as an 'egg-shaped griffin' is unsatisfactory. It wears a donkey's head as a mask even if it is breathing fire; that is all part of the fun. The body is most like that of a Great Bustard, the rest Guinea Fowl.

There is a careful picture of a large bird all by himself on a pyxis lid in Adria. Longish legs, long body, rather long neck and a curl hanging from the eye; different colour of wing and body. All this suits the Houbara. He has in fact a longer curl, but the artist may have felt that nature has made it too long to be believed.

Attic vase-painters made such life-like studies of the birds around them that I find it hard to believe that one of them has drawn so poor a partridge, a bird they must all have seen often: too long legs, too long a body, no fat neck and no horseshoe, no body-marking, only an eye-mark out of place. I would rather think that the artist has made a swift sketch of a little-known migrant, the Houbara Bustard, Chlamydotis undulata. The wing marking does, however, show some resemblance to that of the partridge in Providence.

In this study I have seldom been able to record the specific peculiarities of Bustards, no moustaches, and tresses or jazz necks, only rather doubtfully. It must be remembered, however, that these are difficult to see without modern aids. I have depended on the
general characteristics which can be seen at a distance, such as great bulk, long legs and short beaks.

An obvious conventionality in the approach of bird painters, especially in the Bronze Age, has deceived many commentators into recording decorative patterns, while they ignore the shape and behaviour of birds painted in Greek art. In reality the painters are often so much more skilled in bird-watching than their commentators, that this skill has been entirely unobserved.

Oxford.

Sylvia Benton.
South-western Caria terminates in an unequal pair of prongs. The longer one, commencing at the narrow isthmus of Bencik, is the Datça (Stadia) Peninsula, which in ancient times constituted the territory of Cnidus. The shorter one (or at least its tip), which ends at the Loryma headland, is Daraçya, the Byzantine Trachia. Pachymers in the thirteenth century spoke of the two peninsulas together under the compound name Σταδιωτραχία. The name Trachia may in fact be ancient; for when Strabo speaks of Λόρυμα, παράλληλα τραχεία (xiv 652) it is possible that the last word should be regarded as a proper name. The Daraçya (or Loryma) Peninsula in general corresponds to the Carian Χερσονήσος mentioned in ancient literary sources and inscriptions. But the latter was probably more extensive. Herodotus (i 174) speaks of the Bybassian Chersonese, to which the Cnidian Peninsula is attached at the five-stade isthmus (Bencik). The Carian Chersonese, which figures as a syntely in the Athenian tribute lists, evidently included the Bybassians (see below, p. 62); so it may be assumed that Herodotus' Bybassian Chersonese is identical with the Carian Chersonese, and that this Chersonese extended as far north as the modern Rena Bay at the head of the Gulf of Syme, where the bay which Mela (i 84) calls sinus Bubaesius is almost certainly to be located. On the other hand, the Chersonesian

---

1 See especially Bean–Cook, BSA xlvii 171 ff., 202 f.
2 So on the modern Turkish map ('Dorakia' on Philippson's map); Darahiyah in Piri-Re'is (A.D. 1521).
4 Bean–Cook, BSA xlvii 202; Bean in Fraser–Bean, Rhodian Peraea 63 ff., with full discussion. I take this opportunity of acknowledging my indebtedness both to the book here cited and to Bean's valuable criticism of the first draft of the present article.
syntely in the tribute lists did not include Cedreae; and afterwards, in the administrative system of the Rhodian Peraea as we know it, Phycus remained distinct from the Chersonese. If Cedreae and Phycus are regarded as lying outside the limits of the Chersonese, it may fairly be said that the inhabited region of the Chersonese must have terminated on the north around Erkis (near the head of Rena Bay), beyond which the rough, barren terrain is totally devoid of habitation for a distance of several hours’ walking.6

In the Athenian tribute lists the Chersonesians of Caria form a syntely, which normally pays its tribute of three talents (or a little less) in a single block sum. This organisation is unique in the Carian panel of the quota lists, where normally each community—including even the smallest—pays under its own name. The obvious assumption from this is that a neighbouring Greek state had previously welded the Chersonese into an administrative unit, that is to say, that the Chersonese had become a possession or dependency of a Greek state (like the Samian and Chian Peraeas). Since in later times the Chersonese belonged to the Rhodians and Livy speaks of the Peraea as being vetustae eorum dicionis (xxxiii 33, 6), it has naturally been assumed that the Chersonese was Rhodian in early times also, and therefore that the Rhodian cities had a mainland perea before the days of the Athenian empire.

The assumption that the Chersonese in early times belonged to a Greek state is not disputed in this article. What is disputed is the universal belief that that state was Rhodian. The arguments that have been advanced in support of this belief have recently been reviewed by Fraser.6 He rightly points out that Livy’s phrase is too imprecise to be of any value; and he shows that only one of the arguments that have been advanced constitutes a precise contention, and that this argument (that the assignation of mainland townships as demes to the old Rhodian cities is not likely to have occurred after the synoecism of Rhodes in 408 B.C.) does not stand examination. Nevertheless, he believes that the Rhodians possessed a mainland perea before the time of the synoecism, and he supports the belief by a different argument. In Hellenistic times a system of kòtinoi prevailed in Rhodes and its possessions outside the island. These kòtinoi are commonly thought to be territorial divisions of the population, existing before the synoecism and surviving for religious purposes after the introduction of the deme-system. Outside the island they are epigraphically attested in Hellenistic times at Potidaion in Carpathus, in Chalcé (to the extent at least that, in a late fourth- or early third-century decree of Camirus relating to kòtinoi, the people of Chalcé were given the option of being registered in the list of kòtinoi7), and in Syme (which, though not a Rhodian deme, seems to have had at least two kòtinoi—
one with the name of Epibomo (?)—on the evidence of an inscription found there).8 On the Carian mainland, kòtinoi are attested by surviving Hellenistic or Roman inscriptions in the incorporated Rhodian Peraea at Thysanous (kòtina of Strapiatai),9 Tymnus (where the term used is simply ‘the kòtinoi’),10 and perhaps at Phoenix (tò koivòn tòs fòtovas).11 The inscription relating to the Camiran kòtinoi speaks of tòs kòtovas tòs èn tòi vàs và kai tòs èn tāi ánthelw, so that, unless (as was at one time supposed) the kòtinoi are a peculiarly Camiran institution,12 it is to be supposed that between them the three old cities of Rhodes

5 Cf. Bean—Cook, BSA lii 60 f.
6 Rhod. Peraea 95 ff.
7 IG xii 1, no. 694 (SIG 339), Ann. xxvii—xxix 237 f. (= Tit. Camir. no. 109).
8 IG xii 3, no. 6; for a revision of the traces of the obscure first name see Carraelli, Studi Class. e Orientali (Univ. Pisa) vii 66.
9 AE 1911, 61. This interesting name has unfortunately been neglected by scholars who have concerned themselves with the kòtinoi.
11 SGDI 4264.
12 This possibility cannot be absolutely excluded. It is noteworthy that Tlos (to which Phoenix is thought to have belonged, Rhod. Peraea 58) and Tymnus are the two known Camiran demes of the Peraea; but it is generally supposed that the demes of Carpathus were all Lindian (ibid., 144: the archaic coins which have in the past been attributed to Potidaion in Carpathus are too problematical to be discussed here.
had quite a number of kteinai in the mainland Peraea. Now, assuming that these kteinai represent a Rhodian territorial arrangement older than the synoecism, the places outside Rhodes in which kteinai occur must have been in the possession of the Rhodian cities prior to 408 B.C.; and it is on this argument that Fraser bases his belief that the Rhodian cities acquired a pereia in early times.

The problems of the derivation and significance of the Rhodian word kteinai cannot be discussed here. If we leave aside as too controversial the conjectural identification of the word in Linear B texts, the known kteinai are too few and too obscure to permit any firm conclusions to be drawn; and while the kteinai evidently had geographical position, their names and distribution do not seem entirely to fit with the simple theory of territorial divisions forming a system which was later superseded by that of the demes. It is therefore only by individual consideration of the places where the existence of kteinai is attested that Fraser’s argument can be put to trial.

The status of Carpathus is peculiarly difficult to judge. The evidence is well presented by Fraser. Inferring from the existence of a kteinai there in Hellenistic times that Potidaion was in the possession of one of the Rhodian cities before 408 B.C., he inclines to the view that the entire island must in early times have been incorporated in one of the Rhodian cities. But there is no actual evidence to support this belief; and at least one community of Carpathus, to judge by the perplexing Athenian decree found in the island, was independent of Rhodes in the early fourth century B.C. Further, Carpathus is spoken of as υγρος τριπόλις by Ps.-Scylax (99); this does not positively prove its political independence, but in the light of the normal practice in the periplus it seems strongly to suggest it (contrast υγρος Ποδιων Μεγίστη in 100). Finally, when nearer islands do not appear to have become Rhodian until Hellenistic times, it is inherently improbable that Carpathus would have become a Rhodian possession in early times.

Chalcis lies very much nearer to Rhodes than Carpathus does, and one might expect that it would have been the first island to become a Rhodian deme. In Hellenistic times it appears as a Rhodian island attached to Camirus. But there is no evidence that it was Rhodian at an earlier date; and it is now certain that in the middle of the fourth century B.C. it was still an independent state. Chalcis, like the communities of Carpathus, is shown in the Athenian tribute lists of the fifth century as paying tribute independently to Athens. This of course does not prove that it was not a Rhodian possession; for the Athenian policy was to detach dependencies from the allied cities, to the extent at least of exacting tribute from them separately. But if Chalcis had in fact been a Rhodian possession and detached for purposes of tribute from the Rhodian city to which it belonged, it is hardly to be expected that it would still have been maintaining its independence two generations and more after the collapse of Athenian hegemony.

but the argument does not seem cogent; see now Cahn, Num. Chron. 1957, 11 ff.). Thyssassian is of uncertain attachment; Syme perhaps had no regular attachment (see below, p. 59). Since the present article was drafted, Carratelli has reaffirmed the view that the kteinai were exclusively Camiran, and accepting the equation with the Linear B word for which the value ko-to-na is given in the Ventris-Chadwick decipherment, has attempted to see in the kteinai evidence of traditionalism at Camirus (Stud. Class. e Or, vi 66 ff.). I cannot judge this view. But in any case it does not affect the question of the antiquity of the extra-insular kteinai since a traditional institution of this sort could have been transferred at any time to the Camiran possessions, whether before or after the synoecism.

13 Rhod. Peraea 144 ff.; cf. also Carratelli, loc. cit.
14 IG xii i, no. 977 (SIG3 no. 129; Tod, GHI ii no. 110), perhaps of 390–387 rather than 394/390 B.C. See below, p. 68. Though a Lindian appears to be mentioned as willing to transport the cypress, there is no suggestion in the decree of Lindian domination of Carpathus (or of any part of it).
15 On the evidence for Chalcis see Fraser, Rhod. Peraea 144 ff.
16 The evidence for this is the stone from Old Cnidus bearing the grant of reciprocal rights between the Cnidian and the people of Chalcis, BSA xlvii 187; clarified by Klaftenbach, Festschrift Weickert 94 ff. (cf. BSA lii 83).
Syme is a more interesting case, and in some ways a clearer one. It did not enter the Athenian league until 434/433 B.C., when it appears in the lists under the διώται rubric—proposed as a member of the league by private persons, whether Symeian or Athenian. Though predominantly barren, the island is of a fair size and according to Pliny (NH v 133) graciously affords nine harbours; it was traditionally the seat of Nireus, who ruled part of the Cnidian territory and brought three ships to Troy. Its soil has yielded a carved grave stele of late archaic date; and when it entered the league in 434/433 B.C. Syme was assessed at the not inconsiderable sum (by Carian standards) of 1,800 drachmae. It is therefore not possible that Cimon, who assembled his armada in Cnidus roadstead facing Syme before he sailed to the Eurymedon, can have overlooked Syme on account of its insignificance or inaccessibility; and it is a certain inference that before 434/433 B.C. Syme was incorporated in a neighbouring state. In Hellenistic times its status in the Rhodian administration was peculiar. It does not appear ever to have been a Rhodian deme, though it had koinai; and the inhabitants were entitled to pass decrees under the style το κοινόν τών ἐν Σύμη κατοικεύτων, as though, irrespective of citizenship, the fact of residing in Syme made them members of the koinon. Decrees are not dated (as they are on Rhodian incorporated territory) by a single eponym, but with a double dating by the damiorgos and the Rhodian priest of Helios. In the Rhodian administrative system, to judge by the titles of Rhodian officers in the Peraea, Syme was not attached to the Chersonese until late Hellenistic times. Yet it was not a deme. The question must therefore be faced whether until that time Syme was part of the Peraea at all, whether in fact it was fully Rhodian. The double dating (like that at Minoa in Amorgos, where the priest of Rhodos appears alongside the (Samian?) demiourgos, would accord with a protectorate or condominium of some sort on the island; and if we must look for a Greek city other than the Rhodian, in which to vest the ownership of Syme before the second century B.C., only Cnidus can come into consideration. It is perhaps worth remark that the legendary connexion of Syme is not so much with Rhodes as with the Cnidia; and Diodorus' narrative of the Dorian settlement of Syme reads like a Rhodian antiquarian's justification of Rhodian intervention in the island: Nausos, a companion of (the Cnidian) Hippotas, ἐρημοῦ οὐδαμον instance, at Brykous in Carpathus (IG xii 1, nos. 994–995), ὁ δάμος ὁ Βρικούσιος καὶ τούς κατοικεῦτες ἐν Βρικούσι πάντες, with the difference that Syme was not a Rhodian deme and therefore, in so far as it was under Rhodian jurisdiction, had no δάμος. The phrase τοῦ κ. at Brykous, strengthened as it is by πάντες, can hardly have been intended to exclude all Rhodian citizens who were not demesmen of Brykous—this, in the context, would be ridiculous; and my examination of the term τοῦ κατοικεῦτας at Lindos and in the Rhodian possessions generally has not convinced me that there is ever any intention of excluding Rhodian citizens of other demes or old cities who are resident in the deme (or old city) in question.

17 ATL i 455.
18 II. ii 671; cf. Diod. v 53, 2.
20 See Fraser, Rhod. Peraea 139 ff. for the evidence.
21 IG xii 3, nos. 1269–70. It is evident that the phrase τοῦ κατοικεῦτας (with its corollary τοῦ πατεροκατοικεῦτας) has its normal Greek meaning here and includes Rhodians resident in Syme (see Fraser in Rhod. Peraea 140, n. 4); and if we are to accept the universal view of modern scholars that on Rhodian territory the phrase has a more restricted meaning and denotes a class of privileged non-Rhodians only, the usage on Syme appears to differ from that observed in other Rhodian possessions; in which case we might infer that the political standing of Rhodians on Syme was a peculiar one. I believe that the position of Rhodians on Syme was in fact peculiar and that the use of the term ἀρχηγός in no. 1270 is a proof of this—the use of the word ἀρχηγός (distinguished from πάροικος) in the Pothion decree, IG xii 1, no. 1093, is not comparable because there it is not used in place of a demotic but refers to Rhodians encountered during service in the armed forces or fleet. But I am reluctant to base an argument on the use of the term τοῦ κατοικεῦτας. The designation seems to me comparable to that, for
It is assumed by Fraser that, being attached to the Chersonese, Syme must have been incorporated in the mainland deme of Casara, which evidently included Loryma and was thus the nearest Rhodian deme to Syme. It seems, however, at first sight unlikely that an island as large as Syme would have been incorporated in a deme like Casara; and this could hardly have happened unless Syme had been annexed to the Chersonese—that is to say, unless there already existed a Rhodian administrative arrangement of the Chersonese (and, in particular, of the Loryma Peninsula) at the time when Syme was annexed. If therefore the koinai of Syme represented territorial divisions under Rhodian rule before the synoecism in 408 B.C., it would follow that the end of the Loryma Peninsula must have been Rhodian before this. But Thucydides’ account of Athenian naval operations off the Carian coast in 412/411 B.C. seems to disprove this. After an unlucky reverse off Syme the Athenians sail with the entire Samos fleet to recover the gear they had left on the island; they confront the Spartan fleet at Cnidus, and when the Spartans decline battle they pick up their gear and cross to Loryma, which they assault, before returning to Samos (viii 42–3, 4). At this time, by Thucydides’ account, Rhodes was still in the Athenian alliance, though Cnidus was not; and if Loryma had been an old possession of the Rhodians, the Athenians would hardly have gone out of their way, at such a juncture, to provoke the Rhodians by attacking it. If, on the other hand, Loryma was a Cnidian dependency, the Athenian action can be interpreted as an act of retaliation, like the ravaging of the Cnidian territory some weeks earlier (viii 35, 4). If Loryma, then, was not Rhodian, it is hardly possible that Syme was attached to a Rhodian deme before the synoecism; and the argument that the presence of koinai indicates Rhodian possession before that date falls to the ground.

There is thus no valid evidence that the Rhodian cities possessed an organised peraea including the Chersonese before the synoecism in 408 B.C., and there are grounds for believing that they did not. The distribution of extra-insular demes among the three old cities follows no geographical principle, and can hardly reflect the process of individual aggrandisement of the old cities in the days of their independence; it seems rather to be an artificial allotment, which could only have been created for administrative purposes after the synoecism. Further, an inscription of Lindos, recording subscriptions raised on behalf of the temple of Athena and dated towards 325 B.C., names numerous subscribers from Physcus, but is asserted to have contained no others from outside the island. Now, Amos in the Chersonese seems under Rhodian rule to have also been a Lindian deme, and it was evidently a place of some consequence throughout; it is curious that no Amian should appear in this Lindian subscription list if Amos was a Lindian deme at the time. This piece of evidence, if it can be relied upon, would accord with the view that before the death of Alexander the Great the deme system of the Peraea was not yet formed.

25 Rhod. Peraea 140. For the Camiran (not Lindian) attachment of Casara see now Carratelli, op. cit., 72 f. The damiorgos in the inscriptions of Syme could, of course, alternatively, be Camiran, and not the Cnidian.
26 As Fraser expressly remarks, op. cit., 82.
27 Inscr. Lindos, no. 51; cf. Rhod. Peraea 79.
28 It paid 2,000 drachmae to the Athenians in the year 428/427 B.C., when for an unknown reason some communities of the Chersonese paid separately (ATL i 450).
29 It is not clear to me whether Ps.-Seylax’s mention of Rhodian ἐδώρα in 98b (= 99) should be accepted as evidence for Rhodian possession of territory on the mainland at the date (c. mid-fourth century B.C.) generally assigned to the composition of this periplos. The passage reads (going south) ἀκρωτήριον ἱπών Τρούσιον, Κνίδος πόλις Ἑλληνις
As against this, the links between the Chersonese and Cnidus in early times were evidently considerable. Pausanias records a dedication at Olympia by Chersonesians of Cnidus (ἐν Κνίδῳ, but ἀπὸ Κνίδου in Aelian) out of the spoils taken from their enemies (v 24, 7). His explanation of these Chersonesians as the inhabitants of the outer quarter of the city of Cnidus (at Tekir) is palpably false—both on general grounds and because the dedication should antedate the new foundation at Tekir; and there can be little doubt that the Chersonese in question is the Carian one. This assumption gains support from the series of late archaic coins bearing the Cnidian lion’s head on the obverse, and a reverse type of an ox head with legend ΕΠ. The Cnidian lion-type, according to Cahn, owed its inspiration to Lindos. But the standard on which the Chersonesian coins were minted is the Aeginetan, which was the standard in use at Cnidus at this time (but not used at Lindos and Ialyssos). Further, the form of the letter chi on the coins is the cross; this corresponds to Cnidian usage, but not to Rhodian, where the normal epichoric form of chi is χ. It seems certain, then, that these coins must be of Cnidian and not Rhodian production. Again, a lion-type similar to the Cnidian appears in the reliefs of a stele-base discovered at Loryma near the tip of the Chersonese. It seems clear that there was a special connexion between Cnidus and this Chersonese. Now there can be no reasonable doubt that the Chersonesians who appear organised as a single unit in the Carian panel of the Athenian tribute lists (above, p. 57) are the same as those who used the silver coins and made the dedication at Olympia. And if we examine the tribute lists to see whether the Chersonesians are associated with Cnidus or Rhodes, the answer is immediately clear. In the lists of the first assessment period and at the beginning of the second period the Cnidians, Chersonesians and Pyrmians are entered together as a group, so that Nesselhauf, who made an investigation of such phenomena in the lists, commented on these three communities as paying together.

A small, yet not irrelevant, testimony is that of Isocrates; when c. 380 B.C. he envisaged the possibility of a rising of the Greeks in Asia against the Persians, he declared the Asiatic coast to be settled by Greeks from Sinope to Cnidus (Paneg. 162). If the Chersonese was regarded as Cnidian (or, at least, was not dependent on any other Greek state than Cnidus), Isocrates’ words will fit naturally, since Greek occupation and Cnidian dominion will have

καὶ χώρα ἡ Ῥωδίων καὶ ἐν τῇ ἴπτερῳ Κάδνος; Καρυκιά λόγος καὶ λίμνη κλειστός, κτλ. This would mean ‘Cape Triopion, Cnidus with [i.e. from which we may turn aside to mention?] the land of the Rhodians and [i.e. returning to the mainland] on the coast Caunus with a closed harbour’. But Ps.-Scylax always makes it clear when he is turning aside to the islands or returning to the continent, and in fact he turns aside to speak of Rhodes and its adjacent islands a few words later. Scholars who are familiar with his usage therefore emend the καὶ after Ῥωδίων to ἡ, and so read χώρα ἡ Ῥωδίων ἡ ἐν τῇ ἴπτερῳ, after which Caunus follows without a conjunction. This is a great improvement, since Caunus now becomes the next entry in a coastal sequence and asyndeton is therefore appropriate. But a new difficulty is thus created. The καὶ after the word Ἐλληνικός no longer serves to relate Rhodes to the coastal sequence, and instead it subordinates the χώρα of the Rhodians to Cnidus. If this χώρα lay in the interior behind Cnidus, or, alternatively, were subject to Cnidus, the καὶ here might be justified; but as things are it seems to be out of place. The difficulties here are similar to those in the same

author’s description of the Samian Peraea (97d = 98), where the fourth-century text has certainly been altered or supplemented at a later date (cf. the false καὶ ἐν τῇ ἴπτερῳ Μαγνησία, where Ps.-Scylax would have written καὶ ἐν μεσογείῳ); and it may be that the mention of a Rhodian χώρα here is another alteration or interpolation in the fourth-century text by a Hellenistic scholar who did not closely observe the author’s usage.

Since there is no unambiguous testimony to Rhodian territory on the mainland before Alexander’s conquests in Asia it is useless to speculate on the extent of such territory unless we may assume (as Bean and I suggested in BSA lli 83) that the chain of Orontobates’ forts is to be regarded as a frontier line facing Rhodian territory.

30 BMC Caria, xlvi 80. For these coins and the Olympia dedication cf. BSA xlvi 204, with n. 10.
31 Charites 23 ff.
32 Cahn, _op. cit._, 26, says that Cnidus went over to the Aeginetan standard c. 590 B.C.
33 _AJA_ 1914, 285 ff., pls. 3-4; Aziz (Ogan), _Guide du musée de Smyrne_ (1933) 37.
34 Klio Beih. xxx (1933) 21 n. 1.
been coterminous: but if Phycus and the Chersonese were Rhodian, it would be strange that Isocrates (who was prepared to ignore, in the interest of his cause, a large stretch of barbarian coast west of Sinope) omitted to mention the not inconsiderable peninsula beyond Cnidus which was in the hands of Greeks.

In effect, while no single argument is in itself decisive, the combined weight of the literary, archaeological, numismatic and epigraphical testimonies loads the scales heavily against Rhodian, and in favour of Cnidian possession of the Carian Chersonese in early Greek times. So long as the site of classical Cnidus was believed by scholars to be at the tip of the Cnidian Peninsula (at Tekir), the city of the Cnidian seemed to face westward and to be remote from the Carian Chersonese; but now that it is recognised as having lain in the sheltered waters of Datça Bay opposite Syme,35 it becomes clear that the Cnidian were better placed than the Rhodians for enterprises in Syme and the Chersonese; and it is not surprising that the legendary associations of Syme and the Chersonese are with Cnidus rather than with the island or cities of Rhodes.36

Cnidian home territory extended to the narrow isthmus at Bencik, where it joined on to the Carian mainland;37 beyond this, according to Herodotus (i 174), lay the Bybassian Chersonese. As we have seen above (p. 56), the Bybassians, who constituted a deme of the Rhodian Peraea, must have been situated around the head of Rena Bay in the innermost corner of the Gulf of Syme. They do not appear in the tribute lists of the Athenian empire and it is therefore to be supposed that they were included in the Chersonesian santly. Thus the Chersonese and the Cnidia seem to have been contiguous; and if the assumption can now be made that before the fourth century the Chersonese was Cnidian, the whole of the Gulf of Syme will have been under Cnidian control. There is, however, one objection to this, which must first be removed: this is the established belief that the vicinity of Rena Bay was occupied by a community which is named independently of the Chersonese in the tribute lists and certainly did not belong to the Cnidian Chersonese. If the argument that follows is developed at excessive length, it is because the old-established view so admirably illustrates the dangers of identifications by similarity of name.

The modern village of Hisarönü lies on the east side of the Gulf of Rena. There is good land at the head of the gulf, with evident traces of ancient settlement38 and a deme-site on two hills above the beach a little distance to the south-west; and there are relics of a notable sanctuary on the mountain Arin Dağ an hour's walk south-east of Hisarönü. Hisarönü is the official name of the village here at the present day; it has replaced the previous forms of the name, which have been rendered in a great variety of transcriptions by travellers over the last century and a half and may for the moment be summarised as 'Arine', 'Erine' or 'Rena' (see below, p. 65). Now, on or near the south-western seaboard of Caria a community (or more than one community) with a similar name appears in ancient inscriptions. In the Carian panel of the Athenian tribute lists there occurs a people styled Ἐπαὼν, who pay until the end of the third assessment period (444/443 B.C.) a tribute dropping from two-thirds to one-sixth of a talent; after this they do not appear again in the lists as paying tribute, though they were rated at a talent in the great assessment of 425 B.C. (A 9).39 Secondly, a similarly named Rhodian deme, formerly believed to be Lindian but now recognised as Ialyssian,40 is attested by the demotic Ἐπαὼν in several inscriptions of the island (see below). Hiller many years ago connected this deme with the

33 BSA xlvii 173 ff., 202 ff.
34 E.g. Nireus (above, p. 59); RE s.v. 'Triopas' col. 171.
35 See Bean-Cook, BSA xlvii 185, 202.
36 See Philipppson, Reisen v 77; Maiuri, Ann. iv-v 405.
37 For this record see ATL i 272 f.
38 Cf. Rhod. Peraea 80 f.
site of Rena;\textsuperscript{41} and this identification has won general acceptance. L. Robert, for instance, expressly remarks on it as an example not of similarity of name, but of actual identity.\textsuperscript{42}

There is another instance of a body of people of this name in West Caria in the late fourth century. In the terms of capitulation of Theangela to Eupolemos (c. 315 B.C.) the clause is introduced \textit{εὐερεῖος δὲ ὅσως καὶ Ὡρηναῖος}: the passage is mutilated, but it seems likely that these people had taken part in the defence of the city.\textsuperscript{43} Rostovtzeff, who first treated of the whole inscription, advanced the view that this body of people was a Rhodian contingent sent from the deme at Rena to support the cause of Rhodes' ally Antigonus.\textsuperscript{44} But in his commentary on the inscription Robert rebutted this suggestion and preferred to regard these people as coming from a small place in the vicinity of Theangela itself. Rostovtzeff's view has been taken up again by the editors of \textit{ATL} (i 485); but Robert's objection, that he could see no reason why Rhodes should have sent a detachment from this one point of the Peraea, still appears valid; and it is accepted by Bean, who reinforces it with the cogent argument that outside Rhodian territory such a contingent should have been styled \textit{'Πόλις}.\textsuperscript{45} There is of course another possibility, which is mentioned without enthusiasm by Bean—that the \textit{Ἐρυναῖος} of Theangela did indeed come from Erine at the head of the Gulf of Syme, but that at the time of the siege of Theangela they were not yet incorporated in the Rhodian state and so were acting on their own initiative. This counters both Robert's and Bean's own objections. But it is nevertheless unconvincing. Theangela lies in the vicinity of Halicarnassus, and is no nearer by sea to Erine-Hisaronû than it is to the city of Rhodes, so that it would be most surprising that a single contingent should have come to the aid of Theangela from a place so far away and so insignificant as this Erine. This seems to rule out the location of the \textit{Ἐρυναῖος} of the Theangela treaty at the head of the Gulf of Syme. Of course, if Erine were on the other side of the Bybassian isthmus and so on the Ceramic Gulf, the difficulty of the troop movement would be greatly alleviated. And in fact, with this end in view, the editors of \textit{ATL} propose to switch the position of Erine from the Symeanean Gulf to the Ceramic, allocating Hisaronû to the Rhodian deme of the Hygasseis instead.\textsuperscript{46} This certainly gives an unobjectionable arrangement, but it removes the pillar on which the whole structure is supported; for, if Hisaronû is Hygassus, and not Erine, the one argument for placing Erine in this region of the Peraea vanishes. All the speculations on this subject depend on the assumption of the survival of the name Erine at Hisaronû.

In this very confused issue it seems an inevitable conclusion that the \textit{Ἐρυναῖος} who came to the assistance of Theangela cannot have come from Hisaronû; no doubt, as Robert said, they were nearer neighbours of Theangela. But are the \textit{Ερυνεῖς} of the tribute lists any happier at Hisaronû? They do not seem to have paid tribute for long, and within this short span the amount of their tribute is not maintained. Their record suggests an inland community not accessible to Athenian ships. Further, if they were situated at Hisaronû dividing the Cnidians from the Chersonesians, we should expect them to be named alongside their neighbours in the lists; but they are not. It seems altogether more probable that, as Bean has in fact suggested,\textsuperscript{47} these \textit{Ερυνεῖς} are identical with the \textit{Ἐρυναῖος} of the Theangela treaty and situated in the vicinity of Theangela; in list 2 they stand next in order to Amyndaia, which was a satellite of Syangela (the predecessor of Theangela). In fact the connexion of the \textit{Ερυνεῖς} with Hisaronû has nothing whatever to commend it.

\textsuperscript{41} See the references given in \textit{RE} Suppl. v col. 751 f.
\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Etudes anatoliennes} 495.
\textsuperscript{43} Robert, \textit{Coll. Frockner} no. 52.
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{REA} 1931, 12 ff.
\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Rhod. Peraea} 68.
\textsuperscript{46} \textit{Loc. cit.} This, as their text shows, is an ingenious inversion of a proposal of Hiller's to place Hygassus north-west of Hisaronû, with the two demes straddling Rena Bay. But since the deme of the Bybassians must be placed at Rena Bay, the presence of both Hygassus and Erine there would be intolerable; three demes there is altogether too many.
\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Rhod. Peraea} 68.
There remains Hiller's equation of Arine-Hisaronü with the Rhodian deme of 'Eφωαίς, which has won general acceptance. This is regarded as having some supporting evidence. Hygassus is known as a deme of the Peraea; and an epitaph of two Hygassians, found at Bayur in the south of the peninsula, perhaps offers some indication of its approximate position—though the site at Bayur itself is now identified as Syrna by a decree found there by Bean in 1948.\textsuperscript{48} Now, the Rhodian inscription IG xii i, no. 197 is an epitaph of an 'Eφωαίς, who was married to a man of Hygassus; and this circumstance suggested to Hiller that the two demes might have lain close to one another in the Peraea; that being so, Hisaronü was a perfectly suitable situation for Erine, since Hygassus must have been somewhere in this region. That, so far as I know, is the sole documentary evidence for placing the deme of the 'Eφωαίς in this region, and the sole evidence for placing this deme in the Peraea. Against it may be remarked that the epitaph was not found in the Peraea, but on the island near Koskinou, a few kilometres south of the city of Rhodes; another epitaph of an 'Eφωαίς (ibid., no. 198) also comes from near Koskinou, and the third known epitaph of a person of this deme from a suburb of the city (ibid., no. 196). An 'Eφωαίς appears in the Ialyssian panel of a fragmentary list (from the votive deposit on Mt. Atabyrium) which contains island and Peraean demotics of the three old cities.\textsuperscript{49} IG xii 1, no. 732, found at the Ialyssian sanctuary of Apollo Erethimios, names an 'Eφωαίς as priest of the cult. And at Lindos a family of 'Eφωαίς was honoured in imperial times with statues whose dedication recalls the services of individual members as gymnasiarchs and as eponymous priest of Helios in Rhodes; one of the members of this Erinaean family is also identified with the Rhodian dedicator of an altar discovered at Pergamon.\textsuperscript{50} As against this series of documents of city-bred Erinaeis in Rhodes, no example of this demotic seems to have come to light outside the island. While such limited evidence does not permit a final decision, it is certainly favourable to a location of the deme in the north of the island on the territory of Ialyssos; and it must appear dubious whether Erine-Hisaronü can be the situation of the Rhodian Erinaeis.

It thus appears that Hisaronü is not a suitable situation for any known ancient settlement bearing the name of Erine, and the question therefore arises whether the name Erine here is really an ancient name. The assumption that the name is ancient involves the supposition that it has survived in unbroken continuity since antiquity. This is of course possible. But there appears to be no mention of the name in any intermediate source, and this is surprising. To take an example: the ancient Keramos in the Ceramic Gulf is cited more than once as a bishopric and named by Constantine Porphyrogennetos; it is probably the Zermi of Idrisi; it is marked as Ceramo on Italian sea-charts, and noted as Kereme by Piri Re'is (a. 1521) and Gereme by Hacci Khalifa and Evliya Çelebi in the seventeenth century;\textsuperscript{51} Gell noted the name as Jereme in 1812; and though the place is now officially called Ören, the old name Gereme still persists. In this case the recurrence of the name in the sources proves that Gereme is in direct descent from Keramos. This example shows something of the range of the available testimonia; and from this and numerous other examples drawn from the west coast of Asia Minor a presumption is created that where the name of a settlement has survived from antiquity to the present day some mention of the name will be found in intermediate sources of Byzantine or mediaeval times. This does not entirely apply to the islands of the East Aegean, about which our information is scantier; and there may be examples of survival without intermediate mention in names of isolated dwellings or minor natural features on the mainland coasts. But there is no certain—or

\textsuperscript{48} Rhod. Peraea 28 f.; for Hygassus ibid. 67.
\textsuperscript{49} Clara Rhodos ii 238 nos. 150-1; Hiller, GGA 1933, 17 (non vidi); cf. Rhod. Peraea 80 f.
\textsuperscript{50} Lindos ii no. 465, and p. 847. To the docu-
ments mentioned above may be added a dedication of an Erinaeus, Ann. xxx-xxxii 265 no. 13.
\textsuperscript{51} For the testimonia see Tomaschek, Zur hist. Topographie 39; Wittek, Das Fürstentum Mentesche 167, 170, 172.
even probable—example of such survival of name in regularly inhabited centres on this coast. The modern name Rena or Arine here cannot in itself be considered to prove that the ancient name of the place was Erine; the identification must rather be regarded with misgiving.

The name of the village, together with the bay and the mountain, has been rendered in a variety of forms by travellers in the last hundred and fifty years. Most recently Bean found that the name ‘Erine’ was recalled by the muhtar of Hisarönü as being the former name of the village. In 1921 Maiuri had the name of the bay as ‘Erinç’, the mountain as ‘Arin Dagh’. Earlier in the century the brothers Khaviaras, whose home was in Syme, spoke of the bay and the place as (i) Péva. Philippsen gives ‘Erine’ bay, ‘Assarini’ (the village), ‘Raena Tsai’ for the lower course of the Erküş Çay. In the later nineteenth century Hula and Szanto cited ‘Erine (Assarine)’, and Benndorf ‘Arine oder Assarine’, Spratt, who made the Admiralty survey here in 1838 and returned to Rena Bay in 1860, gives various forms: ‘Arinç’, ‘Arinç Bay (Gulf of Renas)’, ‘Arin Dagh’, the ‘plain of Arena’, likewise ‘Assararena’ for the village and for the bay; and ‘Assarench’ occurs also. Finally, in 1812 Gell noted the name ‘Rena’, and, written above it, ‘Yarena’, in an itinerary (from Cnidus to Marmaris and beyond) about which he was making inquiries at Cnidus. The identification of Gell’s Rena as Hisarönü is certain, both because of the position and of the travelling times given; and it is worth remarking at this point that the double form of the name noted by him would best fit with a saint’s name, corrected by the addition of (A)ya (=’Ayâ). From Spratt it appears that ‘Assar’ here is a prefix (Turkish ‘Asar’ = ‘ruins’), and the nineteenth-century forms of the proper name seem therefore to be ‘Arine’, ‘Areni’, ‘Rena’. The variation in the last two vowels is of no moment; it is common in Greek names, and especially so where Greek names have passed through Turkish lips. But the persistent repetition of the initial A is more interesting; again, it would fit better with the prefix of a saint’s name.

A similar or identical name, Rina, occurs in adjacent Greek islands. The secluded harbour of Vathy in Kalymnos is called Rina; and there is a cove of the same name inside Partheni Bay in Leros. Reises gives no hint of the origin of the name at Vathy. But Ross on his map of Kalymnos marked a church of ‘Ay. Efíva’ at the harbour of Vathy and discussed the name, which interested him on account of the survival of the Doric form; so there can be no doubt that at Vathy the name Rina represents H. Eirene. At Partheni Bay also there is a chapel of H. Eirene, though about a kilometre away from the cove now marked as Rina. It is difficult to believe that the name Rina in these two islands does not represent H. Eirene; and in any case no scholar would care to insist that there was an ancient Erine at each one of the places of this name. Rena Bay at the head of the Gulf of

52 Cf. Bean’s and my remarks on the corresponding problem of the Carian Callipolis, BSA lii 84. Two identifications comparable with that of Erine are Hiller’s placing of the Rhodian deme of Loxidea at Loxa or Losa (Losta) Bay and D. Khaviaras’ equation of Bosporanoi with Bozburen (both in the Carian Chersonese); these are now both rejected with good reason (Rhod. Peraea 61, 81 n. 5).

53 Rhod. Peraea 67; note also ‘Eren Dağ’ for the mountain, as on the modern Turkish map.

54 Ann. iv–v 405; it is not stated whether the name was orally received or not.

55 AE 1911, 67 ff.

56 Bericht über eine Reise in Karien 31.

57 Über eine Reise im Orient (1892) 6.


59 In a field note-book in the British School at Athens (cf. BSA xxviii 115 ff.).

60 Eviya Çelebi (a.d. 1670) in his MS. itinerary cites (in Arabic script) a name Râbiya (vel sim.) somewhere in this part of south-west Caria. Wittek, Das Fürstentum Mentesche 170, seeks to relate this name to Erine Bay and Raena Çay; if this is right, the name is evidently corruptly rendered; but the geographical position of this place in Eviya seems very vague.

61 Reises gives it as (i) ‘Pina in his Περγαμός τῆς νότου Καλύμνου (1913) 32; cf. BSA lii 127 ff.

62 Burchner, Die Insel Leros index (p. 47); ‘Porto Rina’ is marked on the east side of Partheni Bay on the Italian administration’s map of Leros.

63 Reisen ii 114, map at end.
Syme is just such another sheltered anchorage as would receive a chapel of the saint of peaceful havens; and on this bit of coast in the interior of the Gulf of Syme Greek saints' names are peculiarly common. If there were any good reason to expect the ancient name Erine here, the theory of a survival of an ancient name would still merit consideration. Since there is none, the identification of the name here with Ἶη, Ἐρίη must be regarded as altogether more probable. And with that the last shred of evidence for an Erine in the Rhodian Peraea vanishes. The Gulf of Syme will then have been wholly Cnidian.

This is not the place for a discussion of the early history of Rhodes. But if it was to the Cnidians, and not to the Rhodians, that the hellenisation of Syme and the Chersonese was due, and if the Rhodian cities had no possessions outside their island before the fourth century, our estimate of Rhodian enterprise before the synoecism in 408 B.C. must necessarily be affected. It is in fact curious—to judge by the literary sources—how little part the Rhodian cities seem to have played in the expansion of Greece. Their island occupied a key position on the Levant trade route; and archaeology has shown that in early times it lay open to importations and artistic impulses. Yet the colonising activity of the Rhodians as a whole was slight; before the fourth century they produced surprisingly few poets, thinkers or famous Greeks, and made no impact on Greek history. Compared with Samos and Chios, the island of Rhodes was unimportant. It was the synoecism of the three cities that set Rhodes on the way to becoming a power and a dominant commercial city, and it was in Hellenistic times that Rhodes built up a dominant sea-power. In classical times, prior to the synoecism, the Rhodians seem to have lacked initiative or any great incentive to overseas activity and cultural advancement. Possessing a rich territory in their island, they were content to live a rustic life, dwelling in scattered habitations on the land and farming the broad acres in stolid, self-centred probity. To them, as to most other Dorians, it was the era following the collapse of the Athenian empire that brought the realisation of the meaning of the Greek city, together with the quickening of temper and the material benefits that accompany promotion to the ways of civilised life.

II. Cnidus and the ΣΥΝ Coinage

The late archaic Chersonesian coins mentioned above (p. 61) seem to have constituted an extra-territorial Cnidian coinage. A second Cnidian issue which has been attributed to another state is the early fourth-century Cnidian hemidrachm assigned, with a question mark, to Lydæ in Lycia. The ground for the attribution is the legend ἸΛΥ on the obverse; but it is difficult to understand why the Cnidians should have minted coins with their own types for Lydæ, and the explanation of the legend as the opening letters of a Cnidian magistrate's name seems simple and sufficient. The removal of Cnidus and establishment of the democracy after Alexander the Great's successes in western Asia Minor would provide a most suitable occasion for the appearance of the word Δασκαλιστα on bronze coins of Cnidus—serving thus as a daily reminder to the citizens; but here (as also at Telos, on whose coinage the same legend occurs) it is not clear that the message can be as old as 330 B.C.

63 The maps show the following names here: H. Kamariani, an islet Mikale, Cape Apostoli, Badalena (= Panteleémon) Bay, the islet H. Varvara, Saranta (the Holy Forty), and I believe there is a Foneremi (= Phaneromene).
64 Head, ΗΝ 622, there entered as Carian!
65 Cf. Imhoof-Blumer's remarks on the early Cnidian coin with legend A, which had been attri-
66 Buted to Halicarnassus or Acanthus, and on other East Greek issues with initials and monograms (Kleinasische Münzen i 65).
67 See BSA xlvii 210 ff., with further remarks BSA lii 85 ff. This dating is of course conjectural.
68 Cf. Bean-Cook, BSA lii 116 (with reference to L. Robert, Rev. Phil. ix 46).
The Aphrodite, whose head appears on the Cnidian coinage, seems to have become Euploia (i.e. with a small prow in the field) about the beginning of the fourth century B.C. To judge by Cnidian political sentiment at this time, the new emblem of the prow may have been prompted by naval ventures under Spartan leadership in the 390s. The Cnidians were a sturdy people. The rocky, knife-edge landscape of their peninsula must have inured them to a hardy life; and conditions were probably little different in the Chersonese, or in Lipara where the Cnidian colonists lived by piracy and communal working of the land in the adjacent islets. In the late fifth and early fourth centuries the Cnidians were obdurate in the cause of the Lacedaemonians, whose apoikoi they claimed to be. Cnidus was the Spartan naval base in 412/411 B.C., and the bond must have been strengthened after the expulsion of Tissaphernes' garrison (Thuc. viii 109). Again, the Spartan fleet was based on Cnidus before the battle in 394 B.C., and Cnidus must have continued to serve as the Spartans' fortress after their defeat when Conon and Pharnabazus were liberating the Greek cities of the East Aegean. Fifty of the eighty-five ships in the Spartan fleet had been lost in the battle; but the crews had escaped, except for 500 sailors captured (Diod. xiv 83), and the Spartan force garrisoning Cnidus (including the East Aegean allies) must have numbered between 15,000 and 20,000 men. There is no mention of Conon and Pharnabazus attacking this hornets' nest, and it is scarcely conceivable that they should have done so.

In 391/390 Cnidus again appears as the Spartans' principal naval base.67a Besides having the weather gauge of Rhodes, Cnidus was evidently the Spartans' firmest ally in the south-east Aegean. After the disaster in Ionia, when the expeditionary corps under Thibron was shattered by the Persian governor Strouses, the Spartan survivors and reserve troops escaped (according to Xenophon) to the allied cities,68 and (by Diodorus' account) got safely through to the fortress of Knidion.69 Modern scholars have unhesitatingly assumed that these represent two contradictory accounts and have regarded Knidion as the name of Thibron's base at Ephesus. But Diodorus (loc. cit.) had already explicitly named Ionda and Mt. Kornisos as Thibron's camps at Ephesus, and there is no ground for identifying Knidion with these; whatever the significance of the termination may be, the name suggests a connexion with Cnidus, and the narrative in the two historians can be harmonised on the assumption that the Spartan survivors took refuge in the neighbouring cities and thence made their way to the Spartan base at Cnidus.

A Spartan force as large as that present in Cnidus in 394 B.C. must have required a camp or fortress of considerable size. In our account of the Cnidian Peninsula in BSA xlvii Bean and I did not discuss the problem of the Spartan base because we wished as far as possible to avoid speculations of this sort while we were seeking to establish the position of classical Cnidus itself. But now that the position of Cnidus is accepted, the problem merits consideration. The fortification at Dalacak, which we believe to be the citadel of Old Cnidus, has a perimeter whose construction (in part at least) dates within a generation or so of 400 B.C. (op. cit., 173 f.); and the great outer circuit of the city, if Bean and I were right in assuming that a circuit wall surrounded the Burgaz plateau (op. cit., 176), seems to have been an unusually extensive one for a classical city. But the citadel at Dalacak cannot have been newly constituted in the late fifth or early fourth centuries since the surface pottery provides plentiful evidence of archaic occupation. It is clear from Thucydides (viii 35) that in 412 B.C., when the Athenians just failed to take Cnidus by storm, the

67a See especially Xen., Hell. iv 8, 22, 24.
68 Hell. iv 8, 19: ἔσαυ δὲ καὶ οἱ ἑσάθησαν αὐτῶν εἰς τὰς φυλὰς πόλεως.
69 xiv 99: ὀλίγην ό δ' εἰς τὸ Κνίδιον φρούριον διεσάθησαν. The contrast of the compound verb διεσάθησαν here with the simple form in Xenophon could fit with the assumption of a remoter destination in Diodorus' account. It is also worth notice that Diodorus does not write εἰς φρούριον τι ορ τὸ καλουμένον Κ.; although Knidion has not been mentioned, the name of the fort is given in such a way as to imply that Diodorus expected his readers to know what it was, and in the circumstances only the obvious association of the name with Cnidus could serve as a clue.
survivors from the Spartan half-squadron at Triopion entered the city and helped to man the defences. But a force of some thousands of men, such as we find at Cnidus later, would probably have been better billeted in a camp outside the city; and the remains on Maltepe three or four kilometres to the west—with a look-out post on the summit, a massive rough-piled wall blocking the approach from the seaward side, and traces of occupation of an appropriate date (op. cit., 176 f.)—might accord with such a fortress.

It has been suggested—indeed it seems to be commonly held—that after the victory of Conon and Pharmabazos in 394 B.C. Cnidus abandoned the Spartan cause. Evidence for this is found in the Athenian decree for Carpathus (above, p. 58), which is currently dated between 394 and 390 and which names the (Cni)diants, along with the Coans and Rhodians, as being liable to be called upon for assistance. If the date assigned to this decree is correct and the inscription read aright, the defection of the Cnidian is set almost beyond dispute. But it seems surprising that the Athenians should have adopted so imperialistic an attitude towards the cities of the south-east Aegean before Thrasybulus’ mission, and—after due allowance is made for theories about the temple for which the cypress was destined—there still appears to be no very cogent reason for dating the decree before 390. Even without considering the circumstances of Cnidus at the time we could with equal propriety assume that the Carpathus decree dates to the time when Thrasybulus’ fleet was attempting to regain the initiative for Athens in these waters. As regards the status of Cnidus, there is no direct evidence for or against the assumption that the Spartans withdrew completely from their base there after their defeat in 394 B.C. They do not seem to have contemplated, and certainly did not execute, a complete evacuation of their garrisons in the eastern Aegean at this time; and Cnidus had evidently been a favoured stronghold of theirs. But in any case they could not have begun to withdraw their forces from Cnidus until Conon and Pharmabazos had passed northward out of Carian waters, and the evacuation of the thousands of immobilised seamen would have required time and organisation. Thus the Cnidian, even if they had been so inclined, could not have abandoned the Spartan cause at the time when the other cities did so in the excitement of Conon and Pharmabazos’ victory; and since Conon and Pharmabazos did not return to Caria, there seems no likely occasion for a reversal of political sentiment at Cnidus. This is admittedly no more than a contention; but it gains support by implication from Xenophon’s and Diodorus’ accounts of the Spartan dealings with the cities here in 391/390 (below, p. 70): in Samos the Spartans are said to have begun by winning over the island to their side, and in Rhodes they arrived in support of an oligarchic party which had risen in revolution; but their reception at Cnidus passes without comment, and Cnidus seems to have been their regular base in the ensuing operations.

There is, then, no suggestion that between 394 and 390 democracy gained the upper hand in Cnidus, and on balance it seems more likely that during these years Cnidus remained faithful to its Spartan connexion. Byzantium also seems, on the available evidence, to have remained faithful to the Spartans until Thrasybulus restored the democracy there; and Thrasybulus’ mission can hardly be dated before 390 B.C. Now Byzantium, like Cnidus, joined in the minting of the ΣYN coins, which record an alliance that has never been satisfactorily explained. Many scholars have held that these coins are to be dated immediately after the Battle of Cnidus in 394 and that they testify to an alliance between the

---

71 Assuming the date before 390 to be right, Foucart’s reading of [Avβ]dως (and not [Ktβ]dως) would require reconsideration as being not necessarily the worse of two evils; the note in SIG3 no. 129, which purports to give ancient literary authority for the statement that Cnidus came over to Conon after the battle, is beyond atonement.

72 See most recently Cawkwell’s valuable article in Num. Chron. 1956, 69 ff., where the evidence is carefully assembled, though the conclusion drawn from it seems to me to be wrong.

73 Xen. Hell. iv 8, 30; Diod. xiv 94 fin.
vicissitudes of that battle and the minting states—in fact an anti-Spartan alliance. Byzantium has of course long been recognized as presenting a difficulty here: some scholars have contended that the minting of _ΖΥΝ_ coins cannot have been quite at an end at the time of Thrasylalus' visit to Byzantium, since otherwise Byzantium could not have joined in the alliance; and others prefer to assume that, unknown to us, Byzantium may have joined Conon and Pharnabazos in 394 and subsequently returned to the Spartan allegiance prior to Thrasylalus' visit. Neither of these alternatives is attractive or inherently probable; and Cnidian political sentiment, as we have seen, constitutes an additional obstacle to the theory of an anti-Spartan alliance coinage. If it is agreed that the civic dies used for the reverses of the _ΖΥΝ_ coins cannot be reconciled with a date as late as the Boeotian maritime activity of the middle sixties, and that the objections to the minting of such coins by cities of the Asiatic coast immediately after the King's Peace are indeed insuperable, it would seem worthwhile to explore the remaining possibility that the coins represent an alliance which was formed at some time in the years between the Battle of Cnidus and the King's Peace but was not directed against Sparta: in the political circumstances of the time this would almost inevitably mean that the alliance was pro-Spartan.

The Crotoniates seem to have been inspired by the symbolism of the obverse type of the _ΖΥΝ_ coins (the infant Heracles strangling the serpents); for the same subject, with a similar treatment, appears on an issue of their own coins which is attributed to the time when they were leading the Italiot resistance to Dionysius I's attack upon Rhegium. This was in 390/389; and since the _ΖΥΝ_ coinage was evidently short-lived, 391/390 would be an optimum date for the _ΖΥΝ_ alliance. The design of Heracles strangling the serpents, symbolic of a struggle against oppression or despotism, would be a suitable one for Dorian Sparta, whose most honourable role in the nineties was that of champion of the Asiatic Greeks against Persian domination. The device on the obverse of the _ΖΥΝ_ coins is of course a well-known Theban one; and though the Spartans, having no coinage of their own, could not contribute a Spartan coin-type, it may be objected that they would hardly have used a well-known Boeotian emblem if they were at war with Thebes at the time. The question therefore arises, what were the relations between Sparta and Thebes at this time? Now, in the period around 391 B.C. the position seems to have been that the Thebans, whose need was great, had agreed to terms of peace with the Spartans, and Andocides and three colleagues had negotiated a treaty between Athens and Sparta; but the Athenian assembly rejected the treaty it had sought for; Andocides and his colleagues went into exile rather than stand trial, and the policy of naval activity under Thrasylalus prevailed. Thus, even if there was no effective cessation of hostilities between Athens and Sparta, it is quite possible that in 391 (assuming that to be the year of Thibron's departure for Asia) the Spartans may have considered that a treaty of alliance existed between themselves and the Thebans.

The dating of events in the Aegean area around 391/390 is hopelessly confused. Diodorus (xiv 94 sqq.) seems to place the dispatch of Thrasylalus in 392 (!), the Spartan naval mission in 391, and Thibron's mission and death in 390. Xenophon, on the other hand, 73 If, with Diodorus (xiv 94 sqq.), we date Thrasylalus' mission before the Spartan expedition across the Aegean, the supposed anti-Spartan league could still have been functioning; but I am not aware that any modern scholar is prepared to accept this sequence of events. Otherwise, with Ephesus, Samos and Cnidus on the Spartan side and Rhodes in revolution, the alliance must have been defunct when Byzantium joined it.

74 For a statement of these views see Cawkwell, _op. cit._, 69 ff.

75 For these theories see Cawkwell, _op. cit._, 70 ff.

76 I cannot discuss Accame's theory of an 'alleanza monetale a scopo di commercio', which I know only from the reference to it in Cawkwell, _op. cit._, 70.

77 Head, _HN²_ 97.

78 Andoc., _De Pace_ 20; the scholiion on Ar., _Eel._ 193 (περὶ δὲ τοῦ συμμαχικοῦ Φιλόχρους ἱστορεῖ ὅτι πρὸ δύο ἔτην ἐγένετο συμμαχία Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Βοιωτῶν) raises major problems that cannot be discussed here.
without assigning any definite years, relates these three events in the reverse order (*Hell. iv 8, 17 sqq.*). Now, Xenophon comes to his eastern Aegean narrative here from an account of Persian political manoeuvres, and the replacement of Tiribazos by Stroules leads naturally to the story of Thibron’s mission to Asia—an inglorious episode which Xenophon dismisses in summary fashion; the chronological position of this event in his narrative would thus naturally be applicable to Thibron’s arrival in Asia. Diodorus, on the other hand, is concerned with the result of Thibron’s unlucky venture and the Athenian naval operations that followed it, and his dating may be expected to fit with the Spartan debacle. So if, to all appearance, the two historians differ by a year in their dating of Thibron’s activity, the solution may be that Thibron’s expedition covered two seasons, and that he sailed for Asia in 391 B.C. and met his end (as Diodorus indicates) in 390 B.C.*79 If it was in the same season that Thibron crossed to Ephesus and the first Spartan naval contingent was dispatched to Ionia, the two missions are not likely to have been unconnected with one another; and if, as is likely, Diodorus was right in making the original Spartan naval contingent cross the Aegean to Samos first and win over the island to the Spartan cause,*80 the prime object should surely have been to secure the terminal for Thibron’s communications across the Aegean. For that is the significance of control of Samos.*81 By these operations Ephesus and Samos were secured in the Spartan alliance;*82 and after this (if we follow Diodorus’ narrative) the naval contingent sailed to Rhodes, where the Laconising party had recently gained the upper hand, and then set to work to acquire allies and to recruit ships and sailors in Cnides, Rhodes and Samos. The year 391 would thus be the ideal moment for the inauguration of a Spartan alliance coinage.

One of the difficulties of the anti-Spartan explanation of the §YN coinage is the distribution of the mints. Five of the mining cities (Rhodes, Cnides, Iasus, Samos, Ephesus) are in the south-east Aegean; the remaining members (Byzantium, Cyzicus, and perhaps Lampsacus) are in the Propontid region. Northern Ionia and the Aeolis with Mitylene seem to have had no part in this alliance. Yet it was the Ionic cities—and not least Erythrai and Chios—that enthusiastically welcomed Conon; and Chios, at least, was second to none of the eastern Aegean cities in importance and in its turnover of silver. On the anti-Spartan theory this peculiar distribution remains unexplained. But if the §YN coins represent a Spartan alliance, the distribution of the mints immediately appears significant. The sphere in which the Spartan land and sea forces were active in 391/390 extended from Rhodes in the south to Ephesus and Samos in the north. Their allies named in the literary sources are (as we have seen) Ephesus, Samos, Cnides and the party that had seized power in Rhodes. This gives us four of the five cities of the §YN alliance in the south-east Aegean.

---

*79 This is Judieich’s supposition (*Kleinasiatische Studien* 87).

*80 Though not mentioned by Xenophon, this conveniently explains how it came about that Teleutias was later able to pick up ships at Samos (*Hell. iv 8, 23*).

*81 It can be shown by innumerable instances that naval strategy in the Aegean in antiquity and even Byzantine times has centred upon control of Samos as the key to the all-weather Aegean crossing; the Spartans could not have failed to learn this lesson in the Peloponnesian War, and the Athenians (in my view) remembered it in 365 B.C. when Epaminondas was known to be building a war fleet.

*82 Since Diodorus speaks of the Spartan army as quartered at Ionda and Mt. Kornisos in the vicinity of Ephesus, Judeich (*op. cit.,* 86 n. 3) argued that Xenophon was wrong in making Thibron use Ephesus as his base (*Hell. iv 8, 17*), and assumed that Ephesus continued in the anti-Spartan alliance. But this view rests solely on inference from the §YN coins. It is surely most unlikely that under the circumstances the democratic party in Ephesus, which does not seem ever to have been very powerful, could have enforced a policy of intransigence in face of Thibron’s liberating army, especially when Ionic auxiliaries had been enrolled in it; and, equally, Thibron would hardly have continued to occupy a camp close to a city which remained hostile and provided no market for his army. His previous experience in Ionia in 400/399 B.C., when he allowed his troops to plunder the Greeks of the coast, would sufficiently account for his preference for camping outside the city in 391 B.C.; and in any case accommodation for an army of this size would have been hard to come by in a city.
The fifth, Iasus, was of less importance, but it was the one city of the coast which could provide sea-communication for land operations south of the Maeander valley, such as were projected in the campaign of 397 B.C. on this coast; in contrast to Iasus, the neighbouring Halicarnassus, which was among the faithful allies of Athens in the late stages of the Peloponnesian War and among those who at once joined Thrasybulus in 390 or 389, seems to have had no part in the ΣΥΝ coinage. Miletus also is notably absent from both the Spartan alliance and the ΣΥΝ coinage.

The other important region of Spartan control at this time was the Propontis, with key points at Abydos and, as we have seen, Byzantium; and this, as far as Byzantium, is the other region of the ΣΥΝ coinage. There is not the same correspondence in detail here—of Lamia we know nothing at this time, of Cyzicus only that shortly before the Battle of Cunius she was in a position to protect the friends of Sparta against Pharmabazos, and ΣΥΝ coins were apparently not struck at Abydos, where Thibron's old rival, Deystilidas, had for some years been established as harmost. But the general geographical coincidence is again striking.

Why should the Spartans, who did not themselves use coined money, have instigated the issue of this unusual coinage? Two reasons may be suggested. The first is the convenience of army and navy paymasters: Thibron had an army of 8,000 men and collected recruits in Asia, and the naval auxiliaries must have amounted to some thousands of men. Indiscriminate looting by his troops during his first mission to Asia had contributed to Thibron's disgrace and banishment, and it would have been natural for him on the present occasion to organise an efficient system of payment for supplies and services. The second reason involves the character of Thibron himself. He was a poor commander; but he seems to have been a grandee, accustomed to living in style and making big gestures (witness his previous refunding of Magnesia at Leucophyris). Agesilaus, in plainer and more effective fashion, had shown that a Spartan corps could not only protect the Greek cities from Persian encroachment but break the power of both the western satraps. Now, in 391 B.C., with Tissaphernes' Carian stronghold removed, with Thibron's expeditionary corps commanding the Cayster and Maeander valleys and the Spartan fleet patrolling their shores, the cities of the coast from Ephesos to Cunius could at last feel themselves secure and could wholeheartedly support the allied offensive. This, then, was the occasion, and Thibron the personality, which could prompt the issue of an alliance coinage dedicated to liberation from Persian oppression.

The theory here advanced is, so far as I know, a novel one, and hardly likely to win immediate acceptance. Like all theories about the ΣΥΝ coinage, it depends to some extent on judicious manipulation of the literary evidence. But the objections seem not to be so fatal as those that beset other theories; and there are even positive arguments in favour of this theory—both the synchronism with the Crotonian issues and the remarkable coincidence in the distribution of the ΣΥΝ mints on the one hand and the known supporters of the Spartan cause in 391/390 on the other. Further, anyone who reads Diodorus' narrative of these years will, I think, feel that the explanation here advanced fits not only with the detailed account of events, but with the atmosphere of the time; it is surely not for nothing that Diodorus speaks of the Spartans in the east Aegean as deliberately setting to work to acquire allies for their cause (above, p. 70). This was to be a crusade. Finally,

83 Xen. Hell. iii 2, 12.
84 Thuc. viii 42, 4; Athenian decree of 410/409 B.C. praising the Halicarnassians, IG ii3 no. 142. Judeich characterised Iasus as 'athenerfreundlich' (op. cit., 79 f.), but the city of Iasus is not to be confused with the rebel Amorgos, who was a political figure of much greater consequence. (I cannot judge how far, if at all, the Athenian decree IG ii3 no. 3 supports Judeich's view.)
85 Lys. Ergol. (xxviii).
86 Xen. Hell. iii 4, 10.
87 For the relationship between coinage and payment of troops see R. M. Cook, Historia vii (1958) 261.
the view put forward here takes account of geographical considerations, and of human factors such as the persistence of sentimental ties or the inherent tendency of people to behave reasonably; in issues like the present one, where the documentary evidence is insufficient and stringent proof is not often possible, factors of this sort are of paramount importance in historical reconstruction; so too is negative evidence—why, for instance, were ΣΥΝ coins not minted in Chios?

After Thibron's debacle there was no further prospect for Spartan arms in Asia; and when Antalcidas gained a bargaining point the King's Peace inevitably ensued. If the view here propounded is correct, the ΣΥΝ coinage serves as a memorial of the vanity of Spartan ambitions in Asia and an indication of what might have been achieved if Agesilaus, and not Thibron, had been sent out for the second time. On this view the ΣΥΝ coinage could well be called a Θιβρόνειον νόμισμα. Some scholars have in the past assumed, from Photius' mention of a Θιβρόνειον νόμισμα called after Thibron who struck it, and from Pollux's inclusion (iii 86) of the word θιβρόνειον (in some MSS.) among the epithets he applies to false currency, that Thibron the Spartan commander in Asia must have struck coins. And, as far as Photius' notice goes, the ΣΥΝ coinage could perfectly well be the Θιβρόνειον νόμισμα. But if the word in Pollux is correctly understood, the identification ceases to be satisfactory. Even if it was popularly known as Thibron's coinage—and there is no evidence that it was—the ΣΥΝ coinage bears the guarantee of a number of highly respected Greek mints. Thibron's reputation stands low; but on the present evidence there is no justification for burdening it yet further with the charge of currency swindling. The researches of Newell and L. Robert have now established beyond question the existence of two coins, each with a different obverse type, struck by the other Thibron—the mercenary leader who attempted to make himself despots in Cyrene after Alexander's death.88 It is true that these two coins of the later Thibron are undisguisedly bronze issues; but his need of money was great, and his financial expectations were consistently thwarted,89 so that it could well be that the coins that he struck did not all purport to be of the same base metal of which the surviving specimens are composed.

University of Bristol.

88 On this question see Robert's excellent article, *Hellenica* x 167–71. Newell and Robert both prefer the attribution of the Θιβρόνειον νόμισμα to the later Thibron. 89 Diod. xviii 19–21.
THE CAPUTI HYDRIA
(PLATES VI—VII)

Since its publication in 1876, the scene on the shoulder of this vase has been interpreted as showing the activities of a vase-painters’ workshop. The original drawing had been reproduced several times, but its inaccuracies were so numerous that the photographs were long overdue in spite of Beazley’s useful notes on it in Potter and Painter.

The scene shows Athena and two Nikai crowning the artists for their skill. In the centre, Athena (Plate VII 1), spear in hand, approaches with a wreath to crown the youth who is engaged in decorating a huge kantharos; before him waits a similar vessel with an oinochoe standing inside it. To the left, a boy who is decorating a volute-krater looks round in surprise at the Nike as she places a wreath about his head (Plate VI 2). To the right of Athena another boy decorates a calyx-krater and does not notice the Nike who is about to crown him also. To the extreme right, a young girl on a dais begins the decoration of another volute-krater (Plate VII 2).

This note is an attempt to show that the scene does not depict vase-painters at work, but rather the decorators of metal vessels.

First, in general terms, there are several difficulties in accepting the vase-painter interpretation. Some of these were pointed out by Beazley in Potter and Painter where he felt one could possibly explain as an element of fantasy some of the stranger aspects of the scene. But if possible one prefers to avoid imputations of fantasy and to seek a reasonable explanation wherever one can. The metal-like elaboration of the vessels could perhaps be accounted for in this way, but is it a likely explanation? Would a vase-painter when dealing with his own subject deliberately draw things which he knew would never actually appear—for instance the elaboration round the outside of the handles of the volute-krater, when pottery examples, particularly at this date, confine the elaboration to the inside where it would not so easily be broken off? In this position at the bottom of the handle, one normally finds snakes on bronze vessels and at a similar angle, for instance on the Vix krater or on the bronze handle in the British Museum. We also find this elaboration on the other vessels, the oinochoe and the kantharoi, to say nothing of their size which is huge by pottery standards. Again, if the kantharos the young artist is holding is of clay, it is surely a dangerous position in which to hold it, even if it is leather-hard. He would be taking more care if it were made of clay. The same applies to the calyx-krater.

Beazley (op. cit.) discusses the workshop in which the Leningrad Painter was active: ‘The vast majority of their vases are commonplace column-kraters, pelikai, hydriae. Of the grander shapes, there are only three calyx-kraters from the Mannerist workshop; and one volute-krater—by the Leningrad Painter, as it happens. There is one oinochoe (by Myson); there are no kantharoi. It would be too much to say that the painter had never

1 The vase was formerly in the Caputi Collection at Ruvo (no. 278); it passed into the collection of the Marchese De Luca Resta in Rome, then to Scarleitti (Rome), and is now in the Tornó Collection in Milan. It is by the Leningrad painter, ARV 376, 61. Annali 1876, pl. D-E, whence F.R. ii 307, Richter Craft, 71, ML 28, 110, and Cloché, Classes, pl. 21, 1. A photograph of the scene appears in the History of Technology ii, pl. 16, and Richter, Greek Art, 307. It is described and discussed in Potter and Painter 11 ff. (= Proceedings of the British Academy xxx (1944) 93 ff.). I am greatly indebted to Professors C. M. Robertson, A. D. Trendall, and T. B. L. Webster for their helpful criticism and suggestions.

2 As Beazley noted, the line that in the drawing runs from the foot of the kantharos to the lap of the artist does not appear in the original. In the drawing the artist’s brush is not clearly distinguished, and the handle supports are missing from the kantharos on the floor.

3 Joffroy, Le Trésor de Vix, pl. 7 and pl. 23. 1.
handled such vases as he here depicts: but this is certainly not an average day in the Mannerist workshop. Although this obviously does not rule out the possibility that these vases may be pottery, it is far from safe to assume that they are.

However, let us now consider drawings of vessels which are clearly of metal. The most common scenes which show vases in use are those with figures using oinochoe and phiale, be it the departure of a warrior, or, what is more useful for our purpose, the scenes of gods. I think it is fairly safe to assume that if the gods are imagined as using anything, they use metal vessels; and so, if we have pictures of deities using vessels which look like metal, it is probable that they are metal. The kotyle by Makron in the British Museum provides a good starting point: both oinochoe and phiale are clearly metal. The oinochoe is very close to one type of contemporary pottery shape, but there are certain differences. The handle ends in a sort of lump which presumably signifies decoration. In pottery the handle is invariably smoothed into the body in Shape I examples of the red-figure period. The mouth, when compared with the vases on Munich CV II pl. 92, can be seen to fall in the centre, not rise, and the mouth is more shallow, curved, and spreading— that is, compared with contemporary pieces. Again the neck is often somewhat thinner in the pictures we have of metal vessels. By way of decoration, the metal oinochoe is often ribbed or reeded, whereas the Shape I pottery oinochoe is not found so decorated at this period. We have another picture of what looks like a ribbed bronze oinochoe on British Museum D 14, where Athena is about to fill Heracles’ kantharos. Unhappily the top of the picture is missing. On Munich 2304 (CV iv pl. 180, 1) Iris holds an oinochoe and offers a phiale to Zeus and Hera. The phiale is of elaborately worked metal. The oinochoe has a V-shaped ‘cut’ in the top of the mouth and a very thin handle. Munich 2305 (CV iv pl. 175, 1) shows the departure of a warrior. The phiale looks like hammered metal. The oinochoe has an elaborate foot and a distinctive bottom to the handle. The mouth is of a different type. Other examples of what are probably intended to be bronze oinochoai are on the Douris psyker in the British Museum (Lane, pl. 77); on two vases by the Berlin Painter, his name vase (Berlin 2160, JHS xxxii pl. 15, Berliner Maler pls. 1–5) and on the stamnos in Castell Ashby (29, Berliner Maler pl. 27, 1; BSR xi pl. 8); and on the kylix in the Lewis Collection in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (JHS xli (1921) pl. 15), hanging on the wall, there is an oinochoe with a good example of the elaborate finish which was given to the handle of the metal oinochoe, with a thin neck which has a sharp join with the shoulder, and with a mouth which could not be anything else but metal. The one on the other side (ibid., pl. 16) is probably intended to be the same.

If we now return to the Capiti hydria, we can see that the oinochoae has precisely these characteristics. Its mouth is elaborately curved, and it is so shallow at the back that its join with the handle would be quite impracticable if it were made of clay. Again we have the same elaboration at the bottom of the handle that we saw in the other bronze examples and which is never found in red-figure pottery of this shape and not even in Shape III until

---

4 We now have another (Shape III) oinochoe by Myson: Athens, Agora P 25965, another common-pot vessel. (Hesperia xxvii (1958) 158, pl. 45d.)
5 Cf. Euripides, Troades, 820 ff. where Ganymede serves Zeus with golden oinochoai. For an illustrated discussion of gods using oinochoe and phiale see Simon, Opornde Götter.
6 E 149; ARV 591, 3; CV pl. 28, 2; Lane, pl. 69 B.
7 For reeded Shape I oinochoai dated about 400 B.C. or a little later, see Ferrara T 814, Aurigemma, p. 126. 2 p. 119; Rhodes 13091, Clara Rhodos iv 252; and London 64, 10–7, 1658.
8 ARV 737; Murray WAV pl. 21b.
9 The oinochoae on the Berlin amphora is of an earlier type than those on the Castle Ashby stamnos. It is the fuller rounder style of the archaic period with a deeper ‘cut’ in the centre of the mouth. The handle is, if anything, more fancy. The other two are later in style and closer to the shape of vase decorated by the Berlin Painter, though not the same. The oinochoae on BSR xi pl. 8, 1 has a wash in dilute glaze, whereas the one on pl. 8, 4 has not; otherwise they are very like each other. Compared with the oinochoae on our hydria we see the same narrowness in the neck, and the same shallow spreading lip, both at the front and the back.
the time of the Meidias Painter and his followers (where there are relief faces, etc.); add to this the sharply accentuated angle of the shoulder and the ‘reeding’ of the body, the vase could hardly be considered anything other than metal.

If, then, this is a metal oinochoe, it is likely that the other vessels are also of metal—a metal oinochoe is hardly likely to be found standing in a terracotta kantharos. Again on the kantharoi we find the elaboration of the handle, and the kantharos on the floor also seems to have a ribbed foot, which is rare in pottery examples.\textsuperscript{16}

One difficulty is the fact that the very shapes which the painter has chosen to show us are regularly imitated by potters (in fact it is difficult to find a metal example of the calyx-krater).\textsuperscript{11} On the other hand, it seems to me that the painter has made his intention clear in emphasising the size of the vessels and the elaboration with which they have been made—and the bottom of the handle does seem to have played an important part in the decoration. Another minor point which may be worth noticing is that not one of the pieces has a figure scene; all show palmettes and spirals if anything.

Finally one must consider the main reason for thinking of this scene as showing vase-painters at work. The artists have small bowls at their sides—‘paint-pots’, and from the photograph it is fairly clear that they are using brushes. If these are metal vessels, what are they doing? It has been suggested that they may be applying an adhesive base for gold leaf, or an amalgam of gold and quicksilver, which has to be painted on when adding gold ornament to other metals;\textsuperscript{12} and it is perhaps worth remembering in this connexion that Beazley saw the handles and the palmette decoration on the calyx-krater to be yellow.

If these arguments are sound, it does seem possible, then, that we have an all too rare illustration of metal-workers at their craft.\textsuperscript{13}

University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

\textsuperscript{10} The kantharos on the Amasis amphora (Lane, pl. 42) perhaps gives some idea of the decoration which will result from the boy’s work.

\textsuperscript{11} Indeed the calyx-krater is probably the potters’ invention.


\textsuperscript{13} This note was written before the appearance of Mr Noble’s article ‘The Technique of Attic Vase-Painting’, \textit{AJA} 64, 1960, 307–18. He illustrates this vase on pl. 84 as showing vase-painters at work. Even if my argument is sound, it will not invalidate his general thesis.
LAND TENURE IN ATTICA AND SOLEN'S SEISACHTHEIA

A great advance in this subject was made by A. J. V. Fine, who studied the extant ἐοροι and some of the literary evidence, but the general tendency in recent writing about Solon has been to dwell on the views of other scholars rather than to assess the ancient evidence. In seeking to redress the balance in this paper, I acknowledge my debt to the authors of the books and articles which I have used and cited. Our chief task is to discover the conditions under which various forms of property and especially landed property were held in seventh-century Athens; for this is essential, if we are to shed any light on Draco's laws of debt and Solon's Seisachtheia.

Many explanations of Solon's work have been based on the axioms that land in Attica had passed into the possession of individuals long before the time of Solon and was therefore available in his time for mortgage, seizure and sale. This axiom was expressed thus by Swoboda: 'one thing is quite certain, that private ownership is of high antiquity among the Greeks and the persistence of clan- or family-ownership till Solon's day appears absolutely excluded'; and Glotz drew the logical deduction that during the seventh century land in Attica was changing hands more and more from day to day. The purpose of this paper is to show that this axiom is incorrect in respect of one kind of land and that a new explanation may be advanced. It is divided into five parts: the organisation of society in early Attica, the tenure of property, the Seisachtheia, fourth-century explanations of Solon's reform, and a summary of conclusions.

I. THE ORGANISATION OF SOCIETY IN EARLY ATTICA

That part of the Athenaión Politieía which described the organisation of Attica in full is lost, but the fragments from the beginning and the summary at 41.2 reveal Aristotle's belief that in the time of Ion all Athenians were included in four racial tribes (41.2 πρώτη μὲν γάρ ἐγένετο μετάσχεις τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἰωνος καὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτῶν συνοικησάντων· τότε γὰρ πρώτων εἰς τὰς τέταρτας συνενεμήθησαν φυλάς; cf. 21.2 συνένεμε μαίας αἰς δέκα φυλαὶ ἀντὶ τῶν τετάρτων· Ἱαγ. 5 πάλαι τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων πλῆθος . . . φυλαὶ τοῦτον ἤσαν δ', . . . φυλαὶ δὲ αὐτῶν συνενεμήθησαν δ' . . . and from Schol., Plat. Aisch. 371 D Ἀραστότηλος φησι τὸ δὲλλο πλῆθους διηρήσσον Ἀθηναίως . . . φυλαὶ αὐτῶν εἶναι τέσσαρας). His picture of the entire free population taking part in the system of tribes and their constituent groups, the phratries or brotherhoods, agrees with Homer's picture of the Achaeans before Troy, both in assembly and on parade (Iliad ii 50 f. and 441 f.). For the whole πλῆθος (or in Ionic πληθὺς), including Thersites, came to the assembly, and Nestor advised Agamemnon to muster them by tribes and phratries (ii 362–3):

Κριν' ἄνδρας κατὰ φύλα, κατὰ φρήτρας, Ἀγάμεμνον, ὦς φρήτρη φρήτρηφιν ἀργήτῃ, φύλα δὲ φύλως.¹

¹ A. J. V. Fine, 'Horoí' in Hesperia Suppl. 9 (1951) 167 f. I am grateful for criticisms and suggestions made by members of the Hellenic Society, the Oxford and Cambridge Philological Societies, and the Bristol, Manchester and Southampton branches of the Classical Association, at whose meetings the ideas contained in this paper were aired.

² In 'Beiträge zur griechischen Rechtsgeschichte', Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung 26 (1905) 241, 'Eine ist ganz gewiss, dass das Privateigentum bei den Griechen von hohen alter ist und der Fortbestand von Geschlechts- oder Familien-eigentum bis auf Solon als ganz ausgeschlossen erscheint.' Cf. CAH iv (1926) 34, 'the stage when a peasant's land was the common property of the clan and could not be pledged had passed in Attica before the time of Solon'.

³ Histoire Grecque i (1938) 407.

⁴ Cf. Moeris s.v. γενεαὶ and Harpocratin συν.; γενεαὶ: διηρήσσον γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν πολίτων. The same point is inherent in Iliad 9. 63 ἄφρητος ἰθήμορος ἀνέστη ἐστὶν ἐκένοις ὅλων ἔριται ἐπαρχίοιν.
The descendants of these original Athenians preserved their racial organisation. They maintained the worship of Apollo Patroos in the festival of the Apotouria, which was celebrated by phratries (Ath. Pol. fr. 1 τῶν δὲ Ἀργόλων κοινῶς πατρῶν τιμῶσιν Ἀθηναῖοι ἀπὸ ἴωνος), and candidates for office down to the fourth century and later had to answer the question εἰ ἔστιν αὐτῷ Ἀργόλων Πατρῶς καὶ Ζεὺς Ἕρεικες (Ath. Pol. 55.3). Athenians of pure racial descent prided themselves on their equality and liberty, and they had no tradition of a submerged group of inferiors, serfs or plebeians within their own ranks.

The only distinction among Athenians of pure racial descent was one of religious activity. Certain priestly offices were reserved to members of particular families. The texts which deal with this matter are rather obscure and must be considered in detail. Ath. Pol. fr. 5 (from Lex. Patm. p. 152 on γεννηται) gives the division of the early state into tribes and phratries and then continues as follows: τούτων (φατριῶν) δὲ ἐκάστη (φατρία) συνειτήκει ἐκ τράκοντα γενών, καὶ γένος ἐκαστον ἀνδρας εἰς τράκοντα τοὺς εἰς τὰ γένη τεταγμένους οὕτως γεννηταὶ ἐκαλοῦντο, ἀν εἰς ἱεροῦν ἐκάστους προσήκοιαυ ἐκερηρύγαυ, οἷον Εὔμολπιδα καὶ Κίρυκας καὶ Ἐτεοβουτάδα, ὡς ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων πολετείᾳ Ἀριστοτέλης κτλ. It is likely that the words from καὶ γένος ἐκαλοῦντο are an aside and that ὁν resmes τράκοντα δὲ γενών and the plural ἐκάστους refers to τράκοντα γενών, just as at the beginning τούτων stood for φατριῶν and ἐκάστη for ἐκάστη φατρία. The sense then is that 'each phratrie was composed of (a group of) thirty gene, and the priesthoods of each (group of) thirty gene were allotted as appropriate to each (group of) thirty gene, as for instance Eumolpides, Kerukes and Eteoboutadae'. Thus members of the priestly families were allocated by lot to the phratry unit of thirty gene in order to hold the priesthhoods appropriate to that group, although the particular family might not belong to the phratry unit which it served.

There is a passage in Harpocratian which is similar to Ath. Pol. fr. 5. Jacoby FGrH 328F 35b quotes it as part of the context of a fragment from Philochorus; but it is probably not itself drawn from Philochorus. Rather it is a shorter version or variant of Ath. Pol. fr. 5 and is ultimately derived from the Athenaion Politieia. Harpocratian s.v. γεννηται describes the division of the state into tribes and phratries and continued: πάλιν δὲ τῶν φατριῶν ἐκάστη διήρητο εἰς γένη ν' εἰς ὅν αἱ ἱεροῦν αἱ ἐκάστους προσήκοιαυ ἐκερηρύγαυ. There is no doubt in this passage that the antecedent of ὁν is the (group of) thirty gene. When we compare this passage with Ath. Pol. fr. 5 it is clear that we should bracket ἐς in Harpocratian.\(^6\)

These priestly families provided officials not only for phratries and tribes but also for state ritual.\(^7\) They came therefore to be known collectively as ἐπιφατριῶν. The earliest reference to them as a group says that ἐπιφατριῶν were excluded from sitting on a court which was composed of members of the Areopagus Council: FGrH 324F 4 and 328F 20β ὁστερον δὲ πλειώνοι γέγονεν ἡ ἐς Ἀρείου πάγου βουλῆ, τούτωσιν ἡ ἐς ἀνδρῶν περιφανεστέρων πεντήκοντα καὶ ἐνός, πλήν ἐς ἐπιφατρίων ὃς ἐδέχεν, καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ βιω σώφρον διαφερόντων. These two fragments which come from numbered books of the Althides of Androton and ὁκρόνετο; where every free man is assumed to have a phratry just as he has a household hearth. The inclusion of the entire free population in the Athenian system is emphasised by H. T. Wade-Gery in CQ 25 (1931) 3 and by C. Hignett, A History of the Athenian Constitution (1952) 48, whereas H. Francotte, La Politique grecque (1907) 10 and F. Jacoby, Aththis (1949), 318, hold that the organisation was limited to members of the 'aristocracy'.

\(^6\) The meaning of this aside is doubtful. I take it to be that the thirty senior members of a genos were 'those prescribed for the gene' or 'those assigned to the gene' for purposes of representation; and that they were called gemetai proper, as appears also from Ath. Pol. fr. 5 (from Schol. Plat. Axioph. 371 D) τούτωσι δὴ τοῖς εἰς τὰ γένη τεταγμένων γενηται. The thirty men were known as a τρικάλος (cf. Pollux vii 111 γένη τράκοντα ἐκατέρτων τοιούτων ἰ ἐκείνη τρικάλους) and the same term was later used of the thirty men who represented a deme for religious purposes (IG ii 1214,18). It was also used at Sparta (Hdt. i 65, 5).

\(^7\) Lysias vi 10; Ath. Pol. 39. 2; 57. 1; Photius, Eteoboutadae.
Philochorus refer probably to the period just before Solon. The same collective name for the priestly families occurs in Pollux viii 111 φιλοβασιλεῖς · ἕξ εὐπατριῶν δὲ ἄντες μᾶλλον τῶν ἱερῶν ἑπεμελοῦντο, and we learn from inscriptions that there was at Delphi an ἐξηγητής ἕξευπατριῶν (IG iii 267 and 1335). It is clear from Androtion and Philochorus that the ἕυπατριῶι came from relatively few of the leading families; for when they were excluded there was evidently no shortage of Areopagite judges to try some cases involving bloodshed.9

Like so many Greek words, εὐπατρία had a general as well as a specialised meaning. The general meaning, 'persons of good descent', was used in the drinking song of the last quarter of the sixth century, which is cited in Ath. Pol. 19.3: 

αιαὶ Δεισυβάλλων προδουσταίρον,
οίοις ἄνδρας ἀπώλεσας, μάχεσθαι
ἀγάθους τε καὶ εὐπατρίδας,
οἱ τῶν ἔδειξαν ὀνομα πατέρων ἔσαν.

For 'the men good in war and of good descent who showed then of what fathers they were born' were not just the sons of priestly families. The term is also found in Ath. Pol. 13.2 describing the political group which supplied half the number of archons in 580 B.C. (πέντε μὲν εὐπατριῶι). As the members of this group must have been very numerous, the term was probably used, as we shall see later, in contrast to οἱ τῷ γένει μὴς καθαροί in Ath. Pol. 13.5. In fact εὐπατρία was used in the sixth century much as γνώριμον, ἐπιφανεστέροι and έπιγενεῖς were used later. Just to complete the picture it should be added that there was a single genos known as the Eupatridae (Isocrates 16.25 πρὸς μὲν ἄνδρών ἢν Εὐπατριῶι - - πρὸς γυναικῶι τοῖς Ἀλκεμενιδῶι; cf. Jacoby, Atthis 263, for other references).

---

8 So Jacoby, FGH iii B 1 p. 114 middle and p. 321.
9 This passage disproves Wade-Gery’s theory in CQ 25, 8 and 77 that 'the Archons were always Eupatrids' and 'the Areopagus and the Eupatrid Order are two aspects of the same Peerage: Prates and Patricii'. The εὐπατρία among the Areopagites were excluded from a court dealing with bloodshed probably because they were themselves involved in the purifying ceremonies of blood-guilt (this is more probably so if we accept the emendation εὐπατριῶι for θευτριῶι in Athenaeus 410a). It appears too from Schol. Soph. OC 489 that the εὐπατρία played no part in the sacrifice to the Eumenides. See A. W. Perssou, Die Exegeten und Delphi 15 ff. on the Eupatridae as priests.

A radically different account of the origin and organisation of the Eupatridae is given in Plu. Theseus 24-5 and 32. There the narrative is romantic and anachronistic. Theseus is portrayed as visiting the inhabitants of Attica κατὰ δήμων καὶ γένη and persuading them with promises of δημοκρατία and ισομορία to form one state, giving to the new state a new name 'Athens', founding the Panathenaeic and Metoecic Festivals, consulting Delphi, and inviting 'all peoples' to join his new state, which was then flooded by an indiscriminate influx (ἐπὶ πλῆθους ἐπιγενθέντος ἀνρήτου). It was from this indiscriminate mass that Theseus separated out three classes, Eupatridae and Geomoroi and Demiourgoi (25.2), and put them as it were on an equality, because the first earned respect for their religious functions, the second for their services and the third for their numbers. This narrative is not derived from the Athenian Politeia, which took the history of the Athenian state from the time of Ion (frs. 1 and 2, and 41.2), knew of only two classes, Geomoroi (not Geomoroi) and Demiourgoi, in the early state down to the time of Cleisthenes (fr. 5), gave importance to 'demes' only in the reform by Cleisthenes (21.4-5), regarded Solon as the first source of δημοκρατία (41.2), and spoke of the constitution of Theseus as μικρὸν παρεγκλίνουσα τῆς βασιλείας (ibid.). Plutarch himself reveals the fact that he was using a different source, because at 25.3, when he had finished his narrative, he quoted or rather misquoted Aristotle as saying of Theseus πρῶτος ἀπεκλάνε πρὸς τῶν δήμων; perhaps he hoped thereby to heal the breach between his source and Aristotle. Again in chapter 32 there is a rhetorical and anachronistic picture of Menestheus as the first demagogue misleading the people, and it is alleged that he excited the men of influence who considered that Theseus had stripped each of τῶν κατὰ δήμων εὐπατριῶ to their offices (these 'Eupatrids of the deme' being clearly not Theseus' own newly created Eupatrids). I take it then that Plutarch's account of the Eupatrids rests on a late and worthless source. However, H. T. Wade-Gery in CQ 25 (1931) 4 ff. and 78 ff., claims that much of Plu. Theseus 25 is taken from the Ath. Pol., accepts 'the founding of the Order of Nobility, the Eupatrids', and supposes that the Areopagus Council consisted only of Eupatrids chosen by an 'Order of Eupatrids' to be Archons and then Areopagites.
The racial organisation which we have described was carefully maintained by the Athenians. Even when Cleisthenes introduced ten tribes for political purposes, the original four tribes and the twelve trittyes into which they divided were preserved for religious functions,10 and the constituent ‘phratries, gene and priesthoods’ were left intact (Ath. Pol. 21.6).11 Each tribe contained from the beginning four phratries, and each phratry was composed of gene which I shall call clans. A clan consisted of related families, and a family—called an οἶκος or οἶκα—extended to the degree of first cousins and their sons.12 Thus any individual Athenian who was of pure racial descent from the time of Ion belonged to groups of οἰκεῖοι, γεννήται, φράτορες and φιλέται. All these groups were bound together by religious practices,13 and tribe, phratry and clan elected their officials and passed regulations for their members even in classical times.

A society thus organised on a principle of racial kinship faces a difficult problem when it wishes to incorporate refugees by naturalisation. Attic tradition mentioned two main occasions of incorporation before the time of Solon: one under Theseus after the unification of Attica (Plu. Thes. 25.1 ἐτη δὲ μᾶλλον ἀυξήσας τὴν πόλιν βουλόμενος κτλ.) and the other prior to the Ionian migration (Thuc. i 2.6). We are given some insight into the methods of incorporation by the fragments of Philochorus.14 When Harpocratus is commenting on the words γεννήται οἱ τοῦ αὐτοῦ γένους κοινωνοῦστε, he explains that the γεννήται or συγγενεῖς were not simply those who were γεννήται by blood and from the same origin but those originally allocated to the so-called clans (ἄλλοι οἱ ἔξι ἄρχησι εἰς τὰ καλουμένα γένη κατανεμηθέντες). And Philochorus says in his fourth book that those they now call γεννήται were formerly called ὁμογάλκαι. Under this procedure, then, aliens by blood were adopted into the γένη and became members of a γένος, being called at first ὁμογάλκαι but subsequently γεννήται. For a time there were two types of gennetai: γεννήται by descent and γεννήται ὁμογάλκαι by adoption. This point is made clear by Pollux viii 111 καὶ οἱ μετέχοντες τοῦ γένους (sc. ἐκαλείτο from the verb ἐκαλείτο of the preceding sentence) γεννηται καὶ ὁμογάλκαι, γενεῖ μὲν οἱ προσήκοντες, ἐκ δὲ τῆς συνόδου οὐτω προσαγορεύμενοι. Here the μὲν and δὲ clauses can only refer to the ὁμογάλκαι.15

The rare word ὁμογάλκαι is usually translated ‘persons suckled with the same milk’ and taken to mean brothers and half brothers of the same mother or even foster brothers, but this translation does not fit the case of adults introduced into a clan. Moreover, it stresses the matrilineal principle in kinship, whereas the patrilineal principle was dominant at Athens.16 The true meaning of this word is probably revealed by Aristotle in the Politics 1252b 18 where he is tracing the development of the οἰκία, household, and of the village as an ἀποκοιμεῖ τοίς, an offshoot or outgrowth of the household; the members of this outgrowth, he adds, are called by some ὁμογάλκαι. Aristotle’s argument here is that the γένος μετέχοντες καὶ ἀνωθεν ἀπ’ ἄρχης σχότας καταλέγονται.17

10 The existence of any trittyes before the time of Cleisthenes was denied by some scholars despite the literary evidence, but their survival into the fifth century has been demonstrated by an inscription (see J. H. Oliver in Hesperia 4 (1935) 5 ff.).
11 In this passage gene certainly means groups of kindred; it therefore has this meaning earlier in the chapter in the phrase τῶν ἑξετάζει τὰ γένη βουλομένοις and not that of ‘classes’ as suggested by F. R. Wüst in Historia 6 (1957).
12 Phratry, clan and family are seen in action for instance in D.57.67, οἰκεῖοι τις εἶναι μαρτυροῦσιν αὐτῷ; πάνι γε, πρῶτον μὲν γε τέταρτες ἄνευοι, εἰτ’ ἄνευαδος, εἰθ’ οἱ τὰς ἄνευας λαβότες αὐτό, εἰτ’ φράτερες, εἰτ’ Ἀπόλλωνος Πατρίων καὶ Δίως Ἐρείκης γεγένηται, εἰθ’ οἱ ηὗρα ταῦτα.
13 For instance Hesychius s.v. γεγένηται: οἱ τοῦ αὐτοῦ
14 The occasion for these fragments may have been a commentary on Pericles’ law of the citizenship, as Boeckh and others have suggested.
15 Jacoby, FGrH iii B 1 321 f. and M. Miller in JHS 73 (1953), 47, seem to regard γεγένηται as synonymous terms; but it is not possible to say that γεγένηται belonged to their γένος by race but by association. Suida also indicates that aliens were legally inserted into the gene and so into the phratries at some time: s.v. γεγένηται and γεγένηται: οἱ οἱ ἓκ γένους καὶ ἀρ’ αἵματος προσήκοντες ἀλλ’ οἱ ἓκ τῶν γêνων τῶν συνενεγμένων εἰς τὰς φρατριάς . . . νῦν τιν ἔρθον κοινωνίαν.
16 See [D.] 44.62 and Isaeus 11.11 τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἶναι τὴν ἀγκhon τῶν ἀνεφίκιοι πρὸς πατρός μέχρι ἀνεφίκιον παῖδον ὁμολογεῖται παρὰ πάσην.
household and the village had to include within their members certain ancillaries who were not related by blood, such as women and slaves, and these imported members of the enlarged household were called ὀμοσπόντοι by Charondas of Catana, ὄμοκαστοι by Epimenides of Crete, and ὀμογαλάκτες (evidently at Athens), that is to say 'sharers of the meal', 'the feeding dish' and 'the milk'.

In fact the new members were affiliated by sharing in the sacred rites of the primitive household or village, that is in the communal meal. Such a rite survived into classical times: the festival of the Apotouria began with a communal meal, the δοσπία for the phratry brothers.

A second method of incorporating aliens was at the level not of the household and clan but of the phratry. We are informed of this by Suidas s.v. ὀργεώνει, περὶ δὲ τῶν ὀργεώνων γέγραφε καὶ Φιλόχροος τόσο δὲ φράττοσας ἐπάνυγκες δέχεσθαι καὶ τῶν ὀργεώνων καὶ τῶν ὀμογαλάκτας οἷς γεννήτως καλοῦμεν (FGH 328F 35a). 'The phratry brothers had to admit both the ὀργεώνει and the ὀμογαλάκτες whom we call γεννήται. The ὀργεώνει were members of a religious association or guild. They were defined in the words of Solon as 'those who had guilds in honour of some heroes or gods' (FGH 341F 1, Seleucus quoting from the Axios of Solon ὀργεωνάς φησι καλείσθαι τῶν συνόδων ἔχοντας περὶ τινα ἰρων ἢ θεοῦ) and one of their corporate activities was the holding of sacrifice and communal meals.'

17 ἐν οἷς κόμη ἀποκινήτης οἰκίας εἶναι οἷς καλοῦντω τινῶν ὀμογαλάκτας [παῖδας τε καὶ παῖδων παιδας]. The dependence of οἷς on ἀποκινήτης οἰκίας is like that of οἷς in the earlier sentence at 1252b 13 ἢ κοινοὶ οἶκος ἐστιν ὀἷς Χαρὸνα καὶ μὲν κατε ὀμοσπόντος Εἰμινεῖς δὲ ὁ Κρής ὀμοκάστος. The words παιδας τε καὶ παιδων παιδας are correctly bracketed by Susemihl as a gloss, because they conflict with Aristotle's argument; they are, however, retained by Jacoby, FGrH iii B i 323. The word ὀμογαλάκτες was peculiar to Attica (Pollux vi 156). Longus (4.9) used it much later to describe the relationship between a slave messenger and his master, in the sense not that they were foster brothers but that the slave was a household slave of the master. No doubt the word could be used also of brothers by the same mother as a variant for ὀμομηρίτου (Pollux iii 23); this usage may have originated at a matrilineal stage in the dim beginnings of tribal development as M. Miller, loc. cit., suggests. Further references are given by Jacoby FGrH iii B ii 230.

18 See Schol. Ar. Ach. 146 φράττορος φώς συνελθές εὐχοῦνται. A festival at Athens was called γαλαζία from the milk drunk in honour of the Mother of the Gods (Hesychius s.n., and Bekker Anecd. 229.25). An adopted son carried on the sacra of the household after the death of his adoptor.

19 This fragment is discussed by Jacoby in his note and by C. Hignett, A History of the Athenian Constitution (1922), 396.

20 The word σύνοδος was used by Solon in a general meaning (3.22 ἐν συνοδοῖς τοῖς ἀδικοῦσι δίλειοι). Unless one accepts the word ὀργεώνει in the Linear B tablets Er 312.7 and Un 718.11 which are deciphered as wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo by Professor Palmer and W. E. Brown in Historia 5 (1956), 399, the earliest mention of the word in literature is in the Hymn to Apollo 369. The sacrificial meals of the ὀργεώνει are known from inscriptions and lexicographers (e.g. Pollux viii 107); they had been regulated by legislators at Athens (of whom Solon was probably one; cf. Gaius Digest quoted below) according to Athenaus ν 185 c: τὸν ὃν δὲ ἄθροισαν προωνυτῆς οἱ νομισθάτη τὰ τε φυλετικά δείπνα καὶ τὰ δημοτικά προεύτατα, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν δήσων καὶ τὰ φρατρικά καὶ πάλιν 'τὰ ὀργεωνικὰ λεγόμενα. The lexicographers derive the word ὀργεώνει from the Mystery cults, and this derivation may well be correct, if the ὀργεώνει were naturalised aliens bringing such religious beliefs with them and not participating in the local family worship.

It should be noted that W. S. Ferguson in Harvard Theological Review 37 (1944), 64 has seen an equally early reference to ὀργεώνει in the excerpt from Solon's code which is cited in Gaius Digest 47.22.4. Unfortunately I find his view unacceptable, because it rests on his own emendation which is palaeographically without justification. The text gives examples of associations: ἐν τοῖς δήσων ἢ φράττορος ἢ ἰερόν ὀργεών μηνται (BS, but F reads ἢ ναιεται for μηνται) ἢ ὀμοκάστος ἢ ὀμοσπόντος ἢ θισσαῖος ἢ ἐπὶ κλάδων οἱ ἰεροῖς ἢ ἐπὶ ἐμπορίαν. The reading of F ἢ ναιεται is not acceptable because 'sailors' would be included in the last group, but the words ἢ ναιεται have seven letters like μηνται and differ only in the three initial letters. Yet Ferguson reads ἢ ἰεροῖν ὀργεώνεις ἢ γεννήται; he changes three words, adds an ἢ, substitutes 23 letters for 19 letters and generally treats the manuscript quite freely. However, ἰεραὶ ... σεβαὶ and ἰερὰ are as early as Solon (in Hymn to Demeter 476–81), the phrase ἰεραὶ ὀργεώνικα is like ὀργεώνικα and σεβαί ὀργεώνικα in Aristophanes (Ran. 384; Thesmoph. 948), and μηνται may have been analogous in early Greek to ἐξηγηται, so that the meaning may well be 'instructors of sacred rites' (cf. Plu. Theseus 25, 2 ὀδόν καὶ ἰερῶν ἐξηγηταῖς) and the reference be to an association of initiates. For μηνται Mommsen more cautiously suggested θύται and Garducci συνθήται, being five and eight letters instead of seven; if μηνται is to be rejected, I suggest μυσταὶ and note Photius: μῦστης, ὁ τὰ μυστήρια ἐπιστάμενος ἢ διδάσκων.
Thus by the time of Solon there were two methods of incorporation, the first of individuals into the genos system as γεννηται ὁμογόνακες and the second of individuals united in a group as ὀργεόνες into the phratry system. In each case admission to the phratry was necessary for an individual to become a citizen of the Athenian state.

As soon as aliens were accepted at phratry level as ὀργεόνες, there was no case for adopting them into a clan or household. From then onwards there were two types of Athenian citizens: gennetæ belonging to gene, whether their ancestors had been gennetæ or gennetæ homogalaktes, and ὀργεόνες who were naturalised aliens or descendants of such, being grouped separately in guilds. We can see the two separate channels to the citizenship at work in fourth-century Athens when adopted persons were registered with one group or the other: for instance in Isaeus 7.13 καὶ εἰς τοὺς γεννητας καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀριστοροσ ἐνεγερσα and 2.16 τῆς μὲν ποιήσεως ὑμᾶς τοὺς φράτορας καὶ τοὺς ὀργεωνα καὶ τοὺς δημοτας παρέξουσαι μάρτυρας. Thus each phratry came to contain gennetæ and ὀργεόνες;21 the former were acknowledged to be of long-standing racial descent, and the latter were not of pure racial descent—οἱ τῶν γενει μὴ καθαροί, as Ath. Pol. 13.5 calls them.

The system of incorporating aliens into the clans was probably very old. It may have begun with the expansion of trade, for instance, in Late Mycenaean times. At any rate when Harpocratereion wrote οἱ εἷς ἀρχῖς εἰς τὰ καλύμενα γένη κατακεχμάθεντες he was probably using the phrase εἷς ἀρχῖς in the same way as Ath. Pol. fr. 1 Ἀθηναῖοι τὸ μὲν εἷς ἀρχῖς ἐγκρύνοντο βασιλεῖα καὶ ἰδίωτην μὲν ἐστὶν ἐγκέντρωσις τῶν εἷς ἀρχῖς Ἰουνικος καὶ τῶν μετὰ ἁμαρτωλάντων.22 We may therefore conclude that this system was in use when Theseus unified Attica and incorporated aliens (Plu. Thes. 25). The organisation of aliens as ὀργεόνες is likely to have been introduced when the number of refugees was so large that the Athenian clans were reluctant to absorb them. Such an occasion arose between the Dorian invasion and the Ionian migration, when refugees came from the rest of Greece to Attica, were made citizens (πολέμαν γενόμενοι) and increased the population of the state still further (Thuc. i 2.6). If our supposition is correct, Athenian citizens in the seventh century were gennetæ or ὀργεόνες and we may expect to find some traces of the fact in the ancient evidence.

A passage from a law of Draco has survived in the form of a copy inscribed on stone in the Attic year 409/408 (Tod, GHI 87). The law enjoins that a man guilty of unpunished homicide may be pardoned only on a unanimous vote by the victim’s father, brothers, sons, or, failing them, by the victim’s male relatives up to the degree of first cousin. Up to this point the members of the ὀικεῖοι, the ὀικεῖοι, are involved. But failing them, the law proceeds, οἱ φράτερες decide. It is the same in the matter of prosecution (l. 23): we jump from first cousins to phrateres. The omission of the gennetæ in each case is remarkable; there is perhaps only one explanation, namely that the law was making provision for ὀργεόνες, who had relatives and phratry-representatives but no gennetæ. The law yields another point of interest. When the phrateres have to act, the fifty-one Ephetae have to choose ten phrateres ἀριστινδην, that is by the aristocratic principle of birth (l. 20). Such a principle has sense in a state comprised of gennetæ and ὀργεόνες; for within the phratry the former alone are eligible ἀριστινδην. When we turn to later sources for the seventh century, we learn that the three hundred jurors before whom the persons accused of sacrilege during the conspiracy of Cylon were to be tried were chosen ἀριστινδην and took the oath ἀριστινδην (Plu. Solon 12.3 and Ath. Pol. 1.1). Then Pollux viii 125 records the fact that Draco established the fifty-one Ephetae (or judges of appeal) ἀριστινδην ἀριστινδην. It seems then that the ὀργεόνες were excluded from acting as

21 Pollux iii 52 ἐκαλοῦντο δὲ οὗτοι καὶ ὁμογόνακες καὶ ὀργεόνες, the οὗτοι referring to members of the phratries. 22 The same limit appears in Pollux viii 118 φῶν εἴξην ἐπεξεύρεται μέχρις ἀνεψιών and in [D.] 47-72.
jurors in a state court, or as judges of appeal, or as phratry representatives in a case of homicide.  

The use of ἀριστίνδην in the law of Draco implies that another principle was current, namely that of πλούτινδην, under which genetae and orgeones fared alike, for instance in being assessed for taxes payable to the naucari or in being registered for military service as ἵππεις or χειφούται, hoplite warfare being well established in the seventh century. Our secondary source, the Athenaios Politeia in one of its finest chapters (3.1 and 3.6), tells us that the nine archons were chosen in the seventh century ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλούτινδην. This is of course a double qualification, which Aristotle expresses in the Politics more emphatically as ὁ μόνον ἀριστίνδην ἀλλὰ καὶ πλούτινδην (1273a 23 and 1293b 10). Philochorus mentions twice the same double qualification for members of the Areopagus Council, who were recruited from the ex-archons (Ath. Pol. 3.6) and had to fulfil the same qualifications as the archons: οἱ παρ᾽ Ἀθηναίοις πρωτεύοντες ἐν τῇ γένει καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ βίῳ χρηστῷ, and FGrH 324F 4 and 328F 20b (quoted on p. 77 above) περιφανεστέρων . . . καὶ πλούτῳ καὶ βίῳ σώφρονι διαφερόντων. When Solon wrote poem 5.3

οἱ δ᾽ εἶχον δύναμιν καὶ χρήσιμον ἱσαν ἄγνοι,  
καὶ τοῖς ἐφρασάμην μηδὲν ἄκεικες ἔχειν,

he may have meant the archons and Areopagites who had the double qualification of 'influence' by phratry and tribe and 'wealth' which earned respect. Solon did nothing unseemly to them; for he left the election to the archonship unchanged, if we accept the evidence of Aristotle, Politics 1273b 41 f. rather than that of Ath. Pol. 8.1.

We can now say with some confidence that the orgeones of the seventh century had an inferior status vis-à-vis the genetae in law and in politics. One of the claims which Solon made bears on this point. For in poem 24. 18 f.

θεσμῶς δ᾽ ὁμοίως τῷ κακῷ τῷ κάγαθῳ  
ἐπιθέαν εἰς ἐκαστὸν ἀρμόδιος δίκην  
ἐγραφα.

'I passed laws which were alike (not for "good and bad" but) for "high born and low born" and accorded straight justice to each case'. As this poem was written after the Seisachtheia, 25 his words indicate that the previous laws of debt had differentiated between the 'high born' and the 'low born', 26 that is between genetae and orgeones.

23 I do not see any other explanation of the choice of 300 jurors ἀριστίνδην. If it is suggested that the choice was made among the Athenians of pure descent (there being no orgeones) then one would have needed a special de Brett to assess their claims—a thing of which there is no inkling in the ancient tradition.

24 C. Müller, FHG fr. 38 of Philochorus; Jacoby does not include this fragment. In registering his 'profound distrust' of the phrase ἀριστίνδην καὶ πλούτινδην in Ath. Pol. 3(CQ 25, 77) H. T. Wadegery does not refer to these other passages. Isocrates 7.37 says that in the time of οἱ πρώτοι μοι one of membership of the Areopagus was restricted to τοῖς καλὸις γεγονόις καὶ πολλῷ ἀρετῇ καὶ σοφοφοῦσιν ἐνδεχετούντος, which emphasises birth but omits wealth.

25 Ath. Pol. 12 πάλιν δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀποκοπῆς τῶν χρεῶν καὶ τῶν δολεροῦ τού πρῶτος, ἐλευθεροθέντων δὲ διὰ τὴν σεισάκτθείαν. See my article on the Seisachtheia and Nomothesia of Solon in JHS 60 (1940) 78. P. von der Mühll in Klio 35 (1942) 99, rejects the setting which Ath. Pol. gives for the poem, and seems to suppose that the words θεσμῶς ἐγραφα must refer to Solon's second commission and reform of the constitution; but his rejection is arbitrary and unjustfied.

26 In this section I have not discussed the figures in Ath. Pol. fr. 5, because they are not integral to my argument, but it may be desirable to comment on them as many scholars reject the numbers and therefore doubt the validity of the context in which they occur. The figures for the social units of early Attica are given thus: 12 tribes, 12 phratries, 360 gene and 10,000 men representatives of the gene, these numbers being compared respectively with the seasons of the year, the months, the days of a year of thirty-day months, and nothing. Scorn may be misplaced; for in early times the natural system and the social system were regarded as matters of religion in which number mattered, and even later a scepstic might mock an account of Cleisthenes'
II. The Tenure of Property in Attica

It was a commonplace of Greek settlements in the migratory period and in the colonising period, which overlapped with Solon’s lifetime, that the original settlers divided the good arable land into lots or κλήροι which remained in the possession of the family from generation to generation. A family might acquire further land later, but it was dishonest and in many states illegal for the family to part with its original κλήροι. Aristotle expressed the matter succinctly, for instance in Politics 1310a 11: ἦν δὲ τὸ γε ἀρχαῖον ἐν πολλαῖς πόλεις νενομοθετημένοι μηδὲ πωλεῖν ἥξεσαι τοὺς πρῶτους κλήρους.

The circumstances of such a division were different in the mainland states and in the colonies. The former were settled by migrating tribes in which the organisation by kinship into phratry, clan and family already existed, so that the plot of family land, ἡ ὀικεία γῆ, was a piece in a mosaic of land allotted to the phratries and clans; but the colonies were settled initially by individuals who created their own families and social units later and then perpetuated the institutions of their mother country. The inalienability of family land was thus more firmly rooted in the mainland states than in the colonies. Even so we find that in the colony Leucas, founded c. 625, a law enforcing the inalienability of ‘the old estates’ was operating at a time after Solon’s archonship and in a society which cherished political candidature by a system of property qualifications: ἐτε δὲ (sc. νόμος ἑστὶ) τοὺς πολιαίους κλήρους διασφάλειν, τοῦτο δὲ λυθὲν καὶ περὶ Λευκάδα δημοκρίκην ἐποίησε διὰ τὴν πολιτείαν αὐτῶν, οὐ γὰρ ἦν συνεβαίνει ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων τιμημάτων εἰς τὰς ἀρχὰς βαδίσεων (Aristotle, Politics 1266b 21). It is therefore a priori probable that in seventh-century Attica, an area less developed economically than Corinth, the mother state of Leucas, the original estates of the Athenian settlers were inalienable from the families. As we have seen, the racial system was still deeply entrenched in Attica, and it is probable that the higher privileges of the genetae in law and politics rested upon inalienable possession of the good arable land. The sense of group responsibility which renders family land inalienable was so strong that all members of the Alcmenid house were banished and the bones of the dead members were exhumed, when Megacles and his followers were found guilty of sacrilege towards the supporters of Cylon (Ath. Pol. i 1 and Plu. Solon 12). We know that in other states the famous lawgivers of the seventh century were concerned to maintain the tenure of original estates, and Aristotle’s general remark about the inalienability of such estates is system for Attica or Plato’s system for his state in the Laws. The only numbers in fact which are in serious doubt are the 360 gene and the 10,800 men; the latter is reasonable for the prosperous period of the Late Mycenaean age, and even so it constitutes only about a third of the fifth-century population.

27 Odyssey vi 10 καὶ ἐδόσασα ἀρχαιὰς. Finley, Historia 6 (1957) 154, points out that ὄντεκασι is used regularly for division of, e.g., spoils among individuals; but this is incidental to the more frequent occasions of division in the epic and does not preclude division among families for instance.

28 The difference is overlooked by those who deduce that the original lots at Syracuse were alienable from the state of the Aethiops (Athen. 167d = Archilocus fr. 145). When Aethiops sold the κλήρον δὲ ἐν Συρακούσαις λαχών ἐμελεῖν ἔτειν, he was on the journey out with Archias, the actual founder; he sold his prospective claim to an estate and not an estate already vested in himself and his descendants. It is hardly possible to explain the position of Gamoroi at Syracuse and the Geomoroi at Samos with their land and houses (τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν καὶ οἰκίας. Thuc. viii 21), except on the usual view that their original estates had in fact not been alienated from the original settlement until the fifth century.

29 The earliest ‘democracy’ of which we know in a Corinthian colony was at Ambracia on the fall of the younger Periander as tyrant, c. 580 (Arist. Pol. 1304a 31). For a similar law about inalienable estates at Corecyra Nigra in the fourth century, see Ditt. Syll. 141.

30 W. J. Woodhouse, Solon the Liberator (1938) 74 f., and N. Lewis, AJP 62 (1941) 148 have argued that family estates in Attica were inalienable before Solon’s time; but they do so mainly on analogy with other states or on inference from Solon’s reforms.

31 Phieron of Corinth, ὤν νομοθέτης τῶν ἀρχαιῶν, in Arist. Pol. 1263b 12; Philolaus of Corinth acting at Thebes, ibid., 1274b 5; Zaleucus may have been responsible for the law at Epizephyrian Locri, ibid., 1266b 20; and the concern of Charondas and Ephimenides of Crete (who came to Athens in Solon’s time) with the family organisation may have been in the same context, ibid., 1252b 14.
qualified by the phrase τῷ γε ἄρχαιον which generally covers the period down to Pisistratus inclusive.\textsuperscript{32}

Thucydides ii 14–16 tells us more about the actual tenure of land in Attica than any other author. In 431 B.C. the Athenians had to abandon their homes in the countryside. They were reluctant to do so. ‘For most of them had always been accustomed to reside in the country. This had been more so with the Athenians than with other peoples from very early times’ (να τὸ ἀιὸ εἰσβῆναι τῶν πολλῶν ἐν τοῖς ἄρχαιοι διατάσσαται ... ξυνεβεβηκει δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ πανὸ ἄρχαιον ἔτερων μᾶλλον Ἀθηναίων τοῦτο).\textsuperscript{33} Thucydides then explains the ‘very early times’. Under Cecrops and the early kings Attica was inhabited in separate communities (κατὰ πόλεις), and then Theseus made all the people into one community (κατὰ πάντας), ‘He compelled them to use Athens as their centre, but each group of them cultivated their own lands as hitherto’ (καὶ νεμομένων τὰ ἀυτῶν ἐκάστως ἀπερ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ ἡμάγκασε μιὰ πόλει τάση χρῆσαται; cf. i 2.2. νεμόμενοι τε τὰ ἀυτῶν ἐκαστοί ὅσον ἀποζήν). ‘The fact is’, he continues in ii 16.1, ‘that the Athenians had long lived independently in the countryside, and then when they were formed into one community the great majority of them continued the custom and were born in the country and had their households there both in ancient times and in later times down to this war (ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαῖοι ... γενόμενοι τε καὶ οἰκίσαντες). This made them reluctant to move with all their household (πανικεσθα), particularly as they had but lately resumed their establishments after the Persian Wars. They were grieved and distressed at leaving the homes and the shrines which had been theirs throughout, inherited as they were from the constitution of ancient days’ (οἰκεῖα τῇ καταλείποντες καὶ ἵππα ἐν διά παντὸς ἂν ἀυτῶν ἐκ τῆς κατὰ τὸ ἄρχαιον ποιεταὶ πατρία; cf. i 38.1 for διὰ παντὸς).\textsuperscript{34}

No statement could be clearer. In 431 B.C. the bulk of the Athenian citizens were living on the very estates with land, house and shrine which their families had held continuously since before the time even of Theseus. These estates had not been alienated in practice during countless generations; and the evidence of continuous occupation lay not only in the tradition of each family but also in the records of the family shrines (ἱερά) and family tombs (ἱερία). The text of Thucydides makes it apparent that in 431 B.C. there was nothing anachronistic in the question which was asked of a citizen at the official scrutiny: ἐὰν ἦσαν αὐτῶν Ἀπόλλων Πατρώος καὶ Ζεὺς Ἐρκεῖος καὶ ποῦ ταύτα τὰ ἱερὰ ἦσαν, ἑταὶ ἱερία ἐὰν ἦσαν καὶ ποῦ ταύτα (Ath. Pol. 53.3; cf. D. 57.67 ἐπὶ οἷς ἱερία ταύτα).\textsuperscript{35}

The retention of land in family ownership over so many centuries is likely to have been based on a law which was valid in the state and in the clans. Indeed Plutarch (Solon 21.3) reports the existence of just such a law in the time before Solon’s legislation: ἐν τῷ γενεί τοῦ τετελευκότος ἐδεί τὰ χρήματα καὶ τῶν οἰκῶν καταμένειν; and when it was illegal to alienate family property by will, it was probably illegal to do so by sale or confiscation.

There are some interesting examples of this conservative practice in the sixth century. In 546 B.C. when Pisistratus was victorious at Pallene, he sent his sons on horseback to make a proclamation, ‘bidding the Athenians be confident and return each to their own property’ (ἐν τῷ γενεί τοῦ τετελευκότος ἐδεί τὰ χρήματα καὶ τῶν οἰκῶν καταμένειν; and when it was illegal to alienate family property by will, it was probably illegal to do so by sale or confiscation.

\textsuperscript{32} This was pointed out by T. J. Dunbabin, The Western Greeks (1948) 57 n. 4.

\textsuperscript{33} For the emphasis marked by the hiatus αἰεὶ εἰσβῆναι, see my article in CQ ii (1932) 129. Gomme’s comment on ἐτέρων μᾶλλον ‘not more than agricultural and socially and economically backward states, but than those of similar development to Athens, Corinth, Argos, Chalcis, Miletus and many others’ shows that he missed Thucydides’ point which is concerned with very early times and not with sixth- or seventh-century developments (A. W. Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, ii (1956) 48). The comparison is with other mainland states during the migratory period and later, such as Sparta, Boeotia, Thessaly, etc.; we shall see later that Athens was more conservative in the matter of adoptions than Sparta and Gortyn (see L. Gernet, ‘La création du testament’ in Revue des Études Grecques 33 (1920) 154 n. 3, 160 n. 3 and 163).

\textsuperscript{34} Thucydides’ phrase ἦ κατὰ τὸ ἄρχαιον ποιεταὶ looks back to the earlier mention of the settlement made by Theseus and to the use of ἄρχαιος throughout chapter 15.

\textsuperscript{35} The family tombs were placed on family land; cf. [D.] 43.79 πολὺς τόπος περιβεβλημένος ὅσπερ οἱ ἄρχαιοι ἐνήμιζον.
LAND TENURE IN ATHENS AND SOLON'S SEISACHTHEIA

(θαρσόειν τε κελεύοντες καὶ ἀπειναὶ ἐκαστὸν ἐπὶ τὰ ἐώστοι, Hdt. i 63.2). He was as good as his word. No one, at least no ancient author, ascribed to Pisistratus any redistribution of land or even any sale of his enemies' property. He banished some opponents, including the Alcmeonids, ἐκ τῆς οἰκήνης 'from their family land'; but it is notable that the Alcmeonids in exile, as previously in the time of Solon, remained as wealthy as ever, and that Cleisthenes, a leading member of the Alcmeonids, was eponymous archon in 525/524, certainly not in the role of a dispossessed landlord recently recalled from exile. More striking still is the case of Cimon the Booby whom Pisistratus exiled. Cimon won the four-horse chariot race at Olympia twice during his exile, and on the second occasion he tactfully ascribed the victory to Pisistratus, who thereupon recalled him. Cimon 'returned to his own property under an amnesty' (κατηγοθέτηκεν ἐπὶ τὰ ἐώστοι ὑπάτουνθον, Hdt. vi 103.3). There is no indication that the winner of those expensive races was impoverished by his exile or that he returned to find his estates in Attica owned by friends of Pisistratus. Indeed Cimon's son, Miltiades, was eponymous archon in 524/523, which is probably the very year of Cimon's return from exile.37 It is clear that banishment from Attica in the sixth century was compatible with the retention of property in Attica and the drawing of revenue from it. Ostracism offers a parallel. It was a form of exile38 in which the banished man drew revenue from his property for the ten years of his absence (κατηγοθήκες τὰ ἐωτόα, Philochor. in FGrH 328F 30). Nor did general upheavals, such as the evacuation of Attica for a year or so in the Persian War, effect any change of property in the countryside; for Thucydides reports that on their return the Athenians resumed their establishments (ἀνελήφθησαν τὰς κατασκευασίς ii 16.1).

It might be supposed that family property would pass out of the possession of the family or of the larger unit of kinship, the genos, when the head of a family (οἶκος or οἶκεια) left no male heir.39 Up to the time of Solon, as we have seen from Plutarch, Solon 21.3, 'the property and the house had to remain ἐν τῷ γένει τοῦ πεθυμότος'. Solon made a change in the law. He allowed a man with no male heir to adopt a son, who thus became a member of the γένους and carried on the οἶκος.40 If there was an heiress, the father could adopt a man as his son to marry the heiress and beget an heir; if there was no male issue of the union, the property passed from the οἶκος to the genos. If the husband of an heiress proved impotent, she could consort with his next-of-kin in order to obtain an heir who would be oίκειον . . . καὶ μείτεχον τοῦ γένους (Plu. Solon 20.3). If a man died intestate without any issue, the property went to the οἰκείοι up to the degree of cousins' sons, and failing them to the next-of-kin in the group of his γενεσία.41 These laws of Solon were still in force in the fourth century. They ensured that property stayed within the οἶκος or, failing that, within the γένους. The principle behind them is well expressed in the speech Against Leochares: τοῖς γένεσιν αἱ κληρονομίαι διοθέσονται in accordance with ἡ κατὰ γένους ἀγχοστεία ([D. 44.63, 67 and 68].

The property with which we are especially concerned is that form of landed property in Attica which had been in family possession since the earliest times, that is to say good arable land in the areas which had been divided up initially into estates (κληρονομεῖ).42 The

37 See CQ 6 (1956) 118 for the date.
38 Schol. Ψάρις 947 εἶδος γὰρ φηγῆ ἐστὶν ὁ ὁπαράκαινος. Similar provision was made for the oligarchs at Eleusis in 403/402 ἐπίτημον δυτά . . . καὶ τὰ ἄνυμνα κορποσύναμον (Ath. Pol. 39.1).
39 This happened at Sparta in the fourth century (Arist. Pol. 1270a 20 f.). Most of the seventh-century lawgivers of whom we know were concerned with this problem; Solon, who called the hearse an ἐπικλήριτις (Pollux iii 33), also passed laws on the subject (Ath. Pol. 9.2), some of which are noted above.
40 Πλ. Σολον. 21.3; other references, e.g. Isaeus 7.13 in Gernet, loc. cit., 149, who concludes that before Solon's reform it was not fully legal even to adopt relations; cf. K. Freeman, The Work and Life of Solon (1926) 115 f.
41 Solon's law is quoted in [D.] 43.51.
42 Later terms of differentiation are πατρία and ἀυτόκτητα, cf. Gernet, 267 f.
ultimate owner of such an estate was the *genos*, and the estate reverted to the *genos* in the absence of an heir or heiress in the family. The occupier and user of the estate was the family, the *oikos* which comprised relatives to the degree of first cousin, which cultivated ἡ οἰκεία γῆ. It was this unit which Solon adopted for the basis of his property qualifications (ἐκ τῆς οἰκείας, *Ath. Pol.* 7.4).43 Neither the head of the family nor the family as a whole had the right of disposal, and that is why family estates in Attica remained inalienable in practice and probably in law down to 431 B.C. at least.44 But there was other land in Attica. While the good arable land was limited to the plains in which οἱ πεδιακοὶ lived, the hill country which forms the bulk of the land surface presumably lay outside the *genos* system of ownership which derived from original allocations. When Aristotle said a law forbade the sale of 'original estates' (*Pol.* 1319a 11), he implied that other property in land could be sold or acquired.45 The famous story of Pisistratus and the worker on Mt. Hymettus affords an example. Pisistratus gave to his poor supporters not arable land at the expense of the Alcmeonids or Philaidus but loans for field work—in this case for developing a plot of marginal land which consisted (in ancient and modern Greek idiom) 'all of stones'—πάντελος πέτρας σκάπτοντα καὶ ἐργαζόμενον (*Ath. Pol.* 16.2).46 Hill land could no doubt be acquired and developed by individual *gennetai* and *orgei* alike; and there was apparently no limit before the time of Solon to individual acquisition of such land, but he passed a law to control it (*Arist. Pol.* 1266b 16 οὐν καὶ Σόλων ἐνομοθέτησεν καὶ παρ᾽ ἀλλοις ἐστὶ νόμος ὃς κωλύει κτάσεις γῆν ὧν ὁμέναι αὐτῷ διὸ).47

When we consider the occupations of the Athenians in the lifetime of Solon, we are guided by the statement of *Ath. Pol.* fr. 5 that the population was then divided into *georgoi* and *demioroi* (τό τῶν Ἀθηναίων πλῆθος πρὸς Ἡ Κλεοκτῆθεν διοικήσασθαι τὰ περὶ τῆς φυλᾶς, διήρρησε εἰς γεωργοὺς καὶ δημιουργοὺς). The former were evidently the workers of the plainlands, for *georgoi* is a word of distinction in Attica, whereas the term *agroikoi* was applied to those workers on the land who were regarded as less worthy.48 I take it then that the *gennetai* were in fact mainly *georgoi* who tilled the rich plainlands, being called οἱ πεδιακοὶ;49 their land was vested in the family and the *genos*, and it was inalienable. The *orgei*, on the other hand, being immigrants in origin and unable to acquire plainland, must have engaged mainly in the crafts and trades of the time. They were in fact the bulk of the 'workers for the public', the *demioroi*.50 Their property was not bound by any *genos* obligations, and it was therefore alienable.

43 He did presumably relate other forms of wealth (cf. his poem 14) to agricultural produce.

44 When Pericles offered to let his estates be under the control of the state if the Spartans did not ravage them, he was probably referring to the revenues from them rather than the out and out possession of them (Thuc. ii 13.1).

45 The farm of Hesiod's father in *Ascleia* κακή, θέρος ἀργαλεία, οὐδὲ ποι' ἐσθήλη (*Works and Days* 630) was probably on such land, as he was an immigrant; and Laertes was driven to cultivate similar land (*Odyssey* xxiv 205 ff.).

46 There cannot have been much uncultivated land in Attica at this time; for Attica was heavily populated just before the Ionian migration (Thuc. i 2.6), and it had been developed over many centuries. A. French in *CQ* 6 (1956) 13 ff. makes much too much of the development of land since Athens joined in no colonial ventures c. 600 B.C. D. Lottze in *Philologus* 102 (1958) 9 also thinks there was a serious shortage of land.

47 Both εὐπατρίδαι and ἄργουκος were used colloquially in a general sense, the former for instance in *Eur. Alc.* 920 and the latter in *Ar. Clouds* 46 ἐργά τῶν Μεγαλόπων τοῦ Μεγαλόπων ἀδελφνη ἄργουκος ὑπ' αὐτ. There is no space here to discuss the ten archons of 580 B.C. at length: *Ath. Pol.* 13.2 shows that they were the representatives of groups of persons, 5 for *eupatridai*, 3 for *agrioi* and 2 for *demioroi*, which on the basis of the interpretation offered here are the *gennetai* of Athenian racial descent, the cultivators or shepherds of hill lands, and the craftsmen, etc., who formed the bulk of the *orgei*. See further p. 97 below.

48 H. Hommel in *Klio* 33 (1940–1941), 186 has shown, I think, that this is the correct form.

49 It is significant that on the 200 or so ὧν extant 'the only mention of *orgei*... is in three Lemnian texts' (M. I. Finley, *Land and Credit in Ancient Athens* (1952), 98). See the interesting discussion on *demioroi* by K. Murakawa in *Historia* 6 (1957), 385 ff. The word had different associations in different states, just as *georgoi* had for instance in Attica and Crete.
Before we turn to Solon’s reforms, we should note the changes which the Peloponnesian War brought in the tenure of property. In the pseudo-Xenophontine Athenaios Politeia, which was probably written just before the outbreak of the war, the division of the Athenian citizens into the landed genetae and the others was still clearly marked. The terms which the author used to describe each group are significant: on the one hand οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ οἱ πλοῦτιοι, οἱ ὁπλίται καὶ οἱ γενναῖοι καὶ οἱ χρηστοί (1.2), οἱ ὀλιγοὶ καὶ οἱ εὐδαίμονες, οἱ γεωργόντες καὶ οἱ πλοῦτιοι (2.14), η̣ πλοῦτιοι η̣ γενναῖοι η̣ δυνάμειος (2.18); and on the other hand οἱ πέντες καὶ οἱ δήμοι ... οἱ ἔλαιον τὰς ναοὺς ... καὶ οἱ κυβερνήται καὶ οἱ κελευσταὶ καὶ οἱ παντρικόραξοι καὶ οἱ πρωτάτους καὶ οἱ ναυτηρίοι (1.2), οἱ πονηροὶ καὶ πέντες καὶ δημοτικοί, οἱ πέντες καὶ οἱ δημοτικοί (2.18). The well-born georgoi, if we may borrow an earlier word, were contrasted with the inferior people of the demos who were concerned with the affairs of the sea and especially with the Empire. The contrast in their areas of residence is clearly brought out in 2.14 by the statement that the demos, having nothing to be ravaged or fired (i.e. nothing outside the walls of Athens and the Peiraeus), was carefree towards the enemy, whereas οἱ γεωργόντες καὶ οἱ πλοῦτιοι were conciliatory, their property being by implication in the countryside of Attica. The event proved that the fears of the georgoi were fully justified. The owners of land in the plains suffered severely when the Spartans and their allies ravaged Attica and the Boeotians looted in the Decelean War; and at the same time the religious sanctions which governed family life in such matters as ownership of land and burial in family vaults were disrupted by the horrors of plague and war.50 When genetae became impoverished in this way, they must have sought an opportunity to sell or raise money on family lands. The plays of Aristophanes mention movable goods being pawned and seized, but there are only two fragments of Attic comedy of the fifth century which may possibly refer to the mortgaging or sale of an estate.51 The earliest known example of a naturalised citizen being granted land in Attica, technically known as ἐγκτηρικοὶ γῆς, is in the Attic year 424/423.52 The first known case of the state confiscating and selling landed property is in 414/413. A farm of Pisander, the oligarchic leader, was confiscated in 411, and was given to Apollodorus, who sold it to Anticles, who sold it again—all within some fifteen years—which shows how rapidly land once liberated from family ownership changed hands (Lysias 7.4). In the fourth century there is ample evidence that all forms of property, landed and movable, were alienable and that various kinds of mortgage were practised; and the ὅροι, or stones on which the mortgage was registered, have been found in large numbers for the fourth century but not for earlier periods.54 The argumenta ex silentio and the lack of earlier ὅροι are not in themselves at all conclusive, but they lend support to the literary evidence which we have already considered.

Even in the fourth century some land which was owned by familial groups or religious groups remained inalienable. A group called the Eikadeis had two ὅροι erected at different places in Attica with the injunction: ‘no one is to make any loan on the security of this land’ (IG ii2 2631–2632 of the third century);55 this may be a survival of the type of early law mentioned by Aristotle, Politics 1319a 13 τοῦ μὴ δανείζεων εἰς τι μέρος τῆς ὑπαρχοῦσας

50 Thuc. ii 52.4; i 59.1; ii 65.2; vii 19.2; vii 27; Hell. Oxy. 12.4.
51 Cratinus fr. 333 (Kock, CAF i 110) and Pherecrates fr. 58 (ibid., 161). The meanings of στρυμαίας and ἐπώβολος are well discussed by J. V. A. Fine in Hesperia Suppl. 9 (1951), 170 f.
52 An example is given in Tod, GHI 86, for 409 B.C. Land was granted c. 431 B.C. to a cult of Thracians by the Athenian state (see W. S. Ferguson in Harvard Theological Review 37 (1944), 98, and Hesperia Suppl. 8 (1949), 130 f.).
53 W. J. Woodhouse, op. cit., 199, saw this result: ‘family estate before very long became fully commercialised and passed from hand to hand without at any rate any restraint of law’. Unfortunately he dated this revolution to the archonship of Solon and not to the aftermath of the Peloponnesian War.
54 Fine, loc. cit., and Finley, op. cit., agree that not one from a total of some 200 ὅροι can be dated with certainty before the early fourth century.
55 Cf. IG ii2 1289 line 6. The probable explanation is that these lands were inalienable: Finley,
III. THE SEISACHTHEIA

The evidence contained in Solon’s poems is of paramount importance. In the fragmentary poem 3 he describes the disastrous condition of affairs whereby the whole state had fallen into a base loss of freedom (δουλοσύνη) which was awakening civil strife and war from sleep. ‘These evils’, he writes, ‘are rife at home. But many of the poor reach foreign soil, sold and bound with shameful bonds’ (I. 23 ταῦτα μὲν ἐν δήμῳ στρέφεσθαι κακά· τοῖς δὲ πενηχρῶν | ἵκνονται πολλοὶ γαῖαι ἐξ ἀλλοδαπῆν | πραβέντες δεσμοῖς τῇ ἀκεφέλους δεβέτες). As the antithesis of μὲν and δὲ shows, there were two categories of trouble: δουλοσύνη at home, and individuals sold abroad into bondage. Of these the former category was the more important.

The same two categories appear in poem 24, where Solon faced his critics after he had corrected this disastrous condition of affairs (Ath. Pol. 12.4). First he called the best witness in his defence, dark Earth:

αὐτῇ· ἐν δὴ γρόιν ἄριστο, τῇ μέλαινα, τῇ ἐγὼ ποτὲ ὤροις ἀνεύλαιν πολλαχῇ πεπηρύται· πρόσθεν δὲ δουλεύον, νῦν ἔλευθερα.

‘The best witness to this before the bar of time would be the greatest mother of the Olympian gods, dark Earth, from whose breast I took up the marks that once pierced her in many places.’ Earth once enslaved is free today.’ Next he turned to the persons sold abroad:

πολλαὶ δ’ Ἀθῆναι πατρίδ’ ἐς θεοκτίτων ἀνήγαγον πραβέντας, ἄλλοι ἔδικες, ἄλλοι δικαιοῦσας, τοὺς δ’ ἀναγκαίης ὑπό

op. cit., 98, suggests that the Eikadeis may have quarrelled among themselves, but the inscription has at least the appearance of an agreed policy published by that body.

56 The word κλήρος; a lot or allotment, came to mean an inheritance because the allotment was inherited. Lawsuits involving inheritance by metics were introduced by the archon polemarchus (Ath. Pol. 58.3).

57 Solon uses the word in a metaphorical sense here, in 8.4 and in 10.4; he uses δουλὴ for actual slavery in 24.13.

58 The word πεπηρύται is correctly used of a marker (ὁρος) which was fixed in the ground; cf. Thuc. iv 92.4 εἰς ὤρος... παραξενεῖται and Lycurgus ἐς Λεοχατην 73 ὤρος... τίθεντες. Similarly Solon speaks of himself metaphorically as being set up as a ὤρος in no man’s land (25.9 ὃσπερ ἐν μεταυχίῳ ὄροι κατέστη). Here it is certain that the ὀροι were actual markers which recorded an obligation of ‘slavery’ for the land, and their removal liberated the land.
LAND TENURE IN ATHENS AND SOLON'S SEISACHTHEIA

χρειοὺς φυγόντας γλώσσαν οὐκέτα' Ἀττικῆν
ἐντας ὡς ἀν πολλάχια πλανομένους,
τοὺς δ' ἐνθάδ' αὐτοὶ δουλὲν ἀεικέα
ἐχοντας ὡς δεσποτῶν προμεμένους
ἐλευθέρους ἐθήκα.

'And many persons I restored to Athens, their god-built fatherland, who had been sold, some legally, others unjustly, and I set free those fugitives through stress of debt who spoke no more the Attic tongue as they wandered in many lands, and those here at home who were in shameful slavery and feared their master's mood.'

Let us consider the first category of trouble. It was bringing the state to a loss of freedom and causing civil strife and war, and it involved the enslaving of the dark earth of Attica; the marks of the enslavement of the land were the ὤροι which Solon removed in order to free the land from its bondage. This was the major disease in the state, the ἔλκος ἀφυκτον (3.17). Further light is cast on its nature by poem 23 line 19 f., where Solon answered his critics:

οὐδέ μοι τυραννίδος
ἀνδάνει βλα τί μέζεν οὐδέ πιείρας χθονός
πατρίδος κακοίσιν ἐσθλοὺς ἱσομοιριάν ἔχειν.

'It is not my pleasure to accomplish anything by a tyrant's violence nor is it my pleasure that the high born and the low born should have an equal share in the rich soil of my fatherland.' The 'black earth' and the 'rich soil' are the arable land, which, as we have seen, was held by the genetae and could not be alienated by its users, the members of the ὦροι. Solon resisted the cry to divide this land without distinction between genetae and organes. Instead, he freed it from its bondage by removing the ὦροι.

Where land is inalienable and a creditor wants a security, he can in theory take either the produce of the land in part or else the persons of the debtor and his family. In Attica a part of the produce was likely to be more valuable over many years than the persons of the family sold once and for all in the slave-market, because once the family was sold into slavery, the working of the land passed to the related genetae. Words have come down to us from Solon's time which show that some land paid part of its produce to others. Pollux vii 151 comments on the word ἐπίμοροτος · γῆ παρὰ Σάλανη ἢ ἐπὶ μέση γεωργουμένη καὶ μορτή τὸ μέρος τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν γεωργῶν. Hesychius adds on ἐπίμοροτος · στόρμοσ γῆ [7] ἐπιμερστή ... μορτή γὰρ τὸ μέρος ἐκάλειτο. This land was arable (στόρμοσ), technically known as ἐπίμοροτος γῆ in Solon's time, because the georgoi who worked it paid a part of their produce elsewhere. It is unlikely that two sorts of land were in such difficulty as poem 24 and these two references suggest, and we may conclude that the γῆ μέλαινα πρόσθεν δουλεύονσα was the ἐπίμοροτος γῆ of the lexicographers, namely plainland owned by genetae and inalienable but committed to yielding a part of its produce to others.

The people who worked the land on these terms are not mentioned by Solon, except that in poem 23 line 21 the owners of the rich soil were by implication the 'high born', that is on my interpretation the genetae. But the name by which they were known in Solon's time has come down to us as ἐκτήμορος; for the full citation of Hesychius s.v. ἐπίμοροτος runs thus: στόρμοσ γῆ [7] ἐπιπερστή. λέγεται οὖτω καὶ ὀσεπὶ μέρες ἐργαζόμενοι. μορτή γὰρ τὸ μέρος ἐκάλειτο καὶ ἐκτήμοροι οἱ τὸ ἐκτὸν τελοῦντες. Those who worked the

59 The meaning of κακό and ἐσθλοὶ is like that of κακώς and ἄγαθος in 24.18. The meaning may be the same in 1.93 and 4.9 (which is common to Theognis, who uses these words similarly in 183 f.).

60 In other places Solon speaks of γῆ μέλαινα meaning rich land (26.4), γῆ πυροφόρος (1.20 and 14.2), πῖον γαῖα (1.23), γῆ πολυδένδρος (1.47), and in each case the epithet is meaningful.
land on terms of paying one-sixth of the produce were Hektomori, 'Sixth-parters'. The reduction of much land (24.6 πολλαχῇ πεπηγώτας) and many people to this position was evidently the ἐλκώς ἀφύκτων that was bringing the state to a loss of freedom and causing civil strife and war. ταύτα μὲν ἐν δήμῳ στρέφεται κακά (Solon 3.23).

The second category of trouble was a different one, the selling of persons abroad or at home into actual slavery (δουλήν, Solon 24.13) 'justly' and 'unjustly'. These persons were presumably orgoenes and agroikoi outside the organisation of the genos, and there was no question of retaining them as έκτήμοροι on ἐπίμυρος γῆς. The reason for their seizure or flight before seizure was that they were impoverished (Solon 3.23 τῶν δὲ πενηχρῶν . . . πολλοί) and had become bankrupt (Solon 24.10 τοὺς δὲ ἀναγκαίης ὑπὸ χρεῶν φυγόντας).

Two other words from Solon's time are χρεϊκοποίαι and σεισάχθεια of which the meanings are patent: 'debt-cutters' and 'disburdenment'. These words suggest that a burden of debt was responsible for the position of the Hektomori—the more important group—as well as for the enslavement of the others. The 'disburdenment' was accomplished by taking the ὀροὶ off the ἐπίμυρος γῆς, by cancelling the debts of the Hektomori, by buying back slaves from abroad and liberating those enslaved in Attica, and by cancelling their debts. Solon then annulled Draco's laws of debt, which like his other laws were notoriously severe, and substituted new laws of debt which were in a spirit of equality 'for high born and low born' (Solon 24.18). Thereafter gemmatae could not be tied to the family land as bankrupts and required to yield a sixth of the produce to their creditor, and orgoenes and agroikoi could not be enslaved as bankrupts. They were both treated without distinction under Solon's laws of debt, the details of which are not known to us. Solon also set a limit by law to the amount of alienable land which could be acquired (Arist. Pol. 1266b 16); this law was probably designed to protect the agroikoi.

We can now infer the nature of Draco's laws of debt. Under them the gemmatae had a superior status to that of the other Athenians, just as they had in the law of homicide, in election to State courts and in candidature for the nine archonships. If a family, that is an ὀκος, of gemmatae contracted a loan—on which no doubt interest was charged—and a time limit for repayment was set—and if the debt was not discharged, then the creditor was by law entitled to receive until such time as the debt was discharged (virtually in perpetuity) one-sixth of the produce of the family land which was itself inalienable, and the members of the family were tied by law to work the land on these terms. If a family of orgoenes or agroikoi contracted a loan and, having parted with all their property of whatever kind, failed to discharge it, then the creditor was entitled to realise the value of the bankrupts by selling them into slavery or enslaving them himself. These laws had operated for many years before Solon became archon, because some of the fugitives had lost their native 'tongue', or dialect (Solon 24.11). Whatever the amount of the loan may have been, the fate of the bankrupt was probably the same; and in the same way a bankrupt debtor to the state in the fourth century was subject by law to the confiscation of his entire property.

---

61 This is the view of ancient commentators with the exception of Eustathius to Odyssey xix 28; he thinks they paid five-sixths, but even in rich Messenia the Helots paid only a half.
63 These were evidently 'markers' showing that the produce of the land was committed in this way by law. They had the same purpose as those of the fourth century, namely 'to prevent third parties from acting with respect to the property' (M. I. Finley, Land and Credit in Ancient Athens 15, quoting Bekker, Anecdota i 285.12 ἕνεκα τοῦ μηδένα συβάλλειν τοῖς προκατεχόμενοις).
64 Perhaps at a rate fixed by Draco's law; for Solon made the rate of interest free, presumably changing the previous law (Lyssias 10.18 τὸ ἀργύριον στάσιμον εἶναι ἕν' ὀπίσω ἐν βολήται ὁ δεμενος).
65 Including, probably, the sale of daughters and sisters for prostitution which was forbidden by Solon (Plu. Solon 23.2).
66 This is well explained by M. I. Finley, Land and Credit in Ancient Athens 91 and 94 'once he was formally entered as a public debtor, Nicodemus' property was subject to confiscation in toto'.

IV. Fourth-century Explanations of Solon’s Reforms

The explanations which have come down to us seem to have been composed in the fourth century by those writers of Attic history who are called the Athidographers. Earlier explanations presumably existed, but they are not discernible in the writings which survive. Subsequent writers such as Hermippus, who was one of Plutarch’s sources in the Life of Solon,67 probably added little or nothing. The Athidographers wrote mainly after 350 B.C. Therefore their opinions were coloured by the fact that land was alienable at that time and an elaborate system had been evolved of credit, mortgage and ‘sale with redemption’ (πράσις ἐπὶ λύσει). Even so the works of the Athidographers—and for this purpose we may include the Athenaion Politia of Aristotle as one of them—contained several different accounts not only of the effects of debt in Solon’s time but also of the political troubles which brought him into office and of the reform made by him in the currency.68 One cannot maintain that Plutarch’s narrative is good and Aristotle’s bad, because each seems to have used more than one source. We shall take each account separately and give to it the direct meaning which it must have had for a fourth-century reader.

1. Plu. Solon 13.3-5. ‘Then the inequality between rich and poor reaching a peak, the state was in a dangerous condition, and it seemed that rehabilitation and an end to confusion could be achieved only by the establishment of a tyranny (cf. Solon 3.17 f. and 23.6, 9 and 19). ἄπας μὲν γὰρ ὁ δήμος ἦν ὑπόχρεος τῶν πλούσιων. ἦ γὰρ ἐγέρθησαν ἐκεῖνοι ἔκτα τῶν γνωμομένων τελοῦντες, ἐκτίμησαν προσωρινοὶ καὶ θῆται, ἥρα λαμβάνετε ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἁγώνωμεν τοῖς δανείσοντας ἦσαν, οἱ μὲν αὐτοῦ δουλεύοντες, οἱ δ’ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξηντ προασκόμενοι. πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ παῖδας ἱδίους ἱγαμαίζοντα πωλεῖν (οὐδές γὰρ νόμος ἐκάλω) καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐθέει διὰ τὴν χαλεπότητα τῶν δανειῶν. All the commons were in a state of debt to the rich. Either they were working the land, paying to the rich one-sixth of the produce and being called Hectomoroi and Thetes,69 or they were seizable by their creditors as they were incurring loans on the security of their persons—some being enslaved here and some being sold to foreign soil (cf. Solon 24.13 τοὺς δ’ ἐνδῆδ’ αὐτοῦ δουλοὺς ἀσκέων ἐχοντας, where αὐτοῦ is so much more natural than αὐτοῦ in Plutarch, and Solon 3.25 γαίαν ἐσοδομην προασκόμενοι). Many were compelled even to sell their own children (no law forbade it) and flee from the city because of the harshness of their creditors’ (cf. Solon 24.11-14 φεύγοντας... ἱδίς δεσποτῶν προασκομένους).

This account was based on a close reading of the poems of Solon, especially of poems 3 and 24. It is probable that the first of the two groups (ἡ...ἡ, either...or, being exclusive)—namely the Hectomoroi working the land—was intended to explain the opening part of Solon’s poem 24, that is of the γῆ μελανά πρόοθεν...δουλεύοντας, and the second corresponded with the individual slaves in the next part of the poem, this group being the only one to borrow on the security of their persons (ἡχρέα λαμβάνετε ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασιν). Similarly

67 This has been accepted by writers from R. Prinz, De Solonis Plutarchi fontibus (1867), and H. Bergmann, Quaestiones Solonae (1875), down to P. von der Mühl in Klio 35 (1942) 89.
68 The different accounts which appear both within Plutarch’s life and in the Ath. Pol. are clearly derived from different sources (see P. von der Mühl, loc. cit., 96, for example). Thus a faction between three parties—Diacrioi, Paraloi and Pedeis—is given in Plu. Solon 13.2 before Solon’s first commission, in Plu. Solon 29.1 after Solon’s departure, and in Ath. Pol. 13.4 in connexion with the rise of Pisistratus; on the other hand a faction between two parties—rich and poor—is given in Plu. Solon 13.3 and Ath. Pol. 2 and 5 just before Solon’s first commission.
69 As regards the reform of the currency, Ath. Pol. 10 gives an account which is different from the account of Androtion as recorded in Plu. Solon 15.3; and there were doubtless other versions of which Plutarch was aware when he wrote τινὺς ἐγραφαὶ ὅν ἔτυμ Ἀνδροτίων.
the next sentence in Plutarch (13.6) is based on Solon poem 23.21 (ἰσομορία χθονὸς and Plutarch’s τὴν γῆν ἀναδάσασθαι).

In chapter 13 the relevant passages of Solon’s poems are not quoted. On the other hand they are quoted where a different account is given at chapter 15. If Plutarch had been citing direct from the poetry of Solon, he would naturally have cited these poems in chapter 13. We may conclude therefore that Plutarch found these quotations in the source he was using at chapter 15, but not in a different source which he had employed for chapter 13.

Thus in Plutarch, Solon 13.3–5 we have a clear statement of the problem with which Solon had to deal. It was formulated by an unknown writer who was steeped in the poems of Solon and did not import any ideas from fourth-century practices. Its merits are therefore considerable.

2. Plu. Solon 15.5. After reporting a theory held by some, including Androtion, that Solon did not cancel debts in his Seisachtheia but simply reduced the value of the interest due on them by reforming the currency, Plutarch proceeds as follows:

οἱ δὲ πλεῖστοι πάντων ὡμοίοι φαινέται τῶν συμβολαίων ἀναρρέουσις γενέται τὴν σεισάκθειν καὶ τούτους συνάδειν71 μᾶλλον τὰ ποιήματα. σεμνότερα γὰρ ὁ Σόλων ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι τῆς θetreποκείμενης72 γῆς

ὅρους ἀνείλε πολλακά πεπηγότας·
προσθέν δὲ δουλεύσασα, νῦν ἑλευθέρα,
καὶ τῶν ἄγωγίμων πρὸς ἀγγύριον γεγονότων πολλῶν τοὺς μὲν ἀνήγαγεν ἀπὸ ἕξης

γιλώσαν οὐκέτι Ἀττικὴν
ἐντάς ὅσ ἐν πολλακὴν πλανομένους
τοὺς δὲ ἐνθάδε αὐτοῦ δουλὴν ἀεικέα
ἐχοντας

ἐλευθέρους φησὶν ποιήσασθαι.

'The great majority say that the Seisachtheia was a cancellation generally of all contracts and that with this view the poems are more consistent. For Solon prides himself in these poems that from the mortgaged land ‘he took up the markers that once pierced her in many places, and earth once enslaved is free today’, and of those citizens who had become liable to seizure for their debts he brought some back from abroad ‘who spoke no more the Attic tongue as they wandered in many lands and those here at home who were in shameful slavery’, he says he liberated.

The meaning of this passage is as follows. In accordance with the practice of the fourth century the land was under mortgage (ὑποθήκη) as security for a loan, and it was

70 There are, however, some who have made difficulties for themselves. For example, A. French in CQ 6 (1956), 17 writes thus: ‘Plutarch, in an ambiguous passage, declares that ‘either they tilled the lands (of the rich) or took loans on personal security and were subject to seizure by their creditors’. I take this to mean . . . that the impoverished masses were either in a state of servitude . . . or, if they accumulated further debts (my italics), they became mere chattels’. But the Greek text says nothing of ‘the lands (of the rich)’ and does not make χρῆα λαμβάνοντες ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασι either anterior in time to ἕξην or conditional or cumulative. W. J. Woodhouse, op. cit., 57, implies that there were not two but three groups in Plutarch’s text: ‘either they tilled their lands . . . or they borrowed on the security of their persons, or were sold abroad’. D. Lotze in Philologus 102 (1958), 2 thinks that υπόχρεως may mean abhängig, ‘dependent on’; but the context shows this is not so, for the explanatory γὰρ leads us to χρήα λαμβάνοντες and then to τῶν δομεστῶν.

71 K. Ziegler in the Teubner edition of 1957 reads σοφὸς, which is Bryan’s unnecessary and misleading emendation of the MS. σοφός.

72 K. Ziegler reads υποκείμενης in preference to προσποκείμενης. The Seitenstettensis codex has the former with the letters προ deleted, and three interrelated manuscripts have the latter. The choice of reading does not affect my argument.
marked with the ὄροι which were then customary; and in addition there were citizens sold abroad or held at home in slavery. The relation between land and citizens is not clear and there is no mention of the Hectemoroi. But the term ὑποθήκη is clear; it assumed that the land was alienable. And the same assumption underlies the story, told later in this chapter and in Ath. Pol. 6.2, that some friends of Solon, aware of his intentions, bought up large estates (μεγάλα χώρας) with borrowed money.

3. Ath. Pol. 2. μετά δὲ ταύτα συνεβή στασιάζει τοις τε γυναῖκις καὶ τὸ πλήθος πολῶν χρόνον [τὸν δήμον]. ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡ πολιτεία τοῖς τὲ ἀλλοις ὀλγαρική πάση, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐξόλωσαν οἱ πένητες τοῖς πλουσίοις καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ ἐκαλούντο πειλάται καὶ ἐκτήμοροι κατὰ ταύτην γὰρ τὴν μεθώσων ἠρμαύνοντο τῶν πλουσίων τοῖς ἄγροις (ἡ δὲ πάσα γιὰ δὲ ὀλγάζων ἦν), καὶ εἰ μὴ τὰς μισθώσεις ἀποδιδόντες ἀγώνισμοι καὶ αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ παῖδες ἐγίγνοντο καὶ οἱ δανεισμοὶ πᾶσα ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασι ἦσαν μέχρι Σόλωνος. οὗτος δὲ πρῶτος ἐγένετο τοῦ δήμου προστάτης. ‘Then it happened that there was for a long time strife between the notables and the masses. For the constitution was in all respects oligarchical and in particular the poor were slaves to the rich—they, their children and their wives—and they were called Pelatai and Hectemoroi; for it was in accordance with this rent that they were working the fields of the rich (all the land was in the hands of a few), and they and their children were becoming seizable if they did not pay the rents; and loans in every case were on the security of the person until the time of Solon. He was the first champion of the people.’ The Greek is indeed compehensive, but there is no doubt that we should bridge the gaps in the exposition as follows: a few wealthy Athenians owned all the land, let it out at a rent of one-sixth of the produce to poor persons called sixth-parters, arrested any of these persons who failed to pay the rents and held them and their families in bondage. Three questions remain, to which the Athenaic Politeia provides no answer: how had all the land fallen into the hands of a few Athenians? Why did they all demand the same rent? What connexion was there between a tenant failing to pay his rent and a bankrupt debtor whose ‘loan was on the security of the person’?

Scholars have given various answers to these questions. The answer which would have occurred to a late fourth-century reader was one based on a fourth-century practice, that which we call ‘sale with a redemption clause’ (πράσιν ἀπὸ λύσεις). Under this practice a man sold his land for its cash value; the purchaser let him work the land and keep the produce but made him pay a rent over a specified period of years; the seller was entitled to buy his land back within that specified period, but if he did not do so the purchaser entered into full possession of the land. In fact the word μισθώσως in the Athenian Politeia is technically correct for this practice, and there can therefore be little doubt that the author used the term ὄροι to record a μισθώσεως of Isaiah 6:36.

75 The best definition of ὄροι in a case of ὑποθήκη is given by Harpocrates: ὄρον τὸν ἀπάντη τὰς ἐκκενεμένας οἰκίας καὶ χωρίων γραμματα δηλοῦντα ὅτι ὑπόκειται δανεισμῷ.

76 Cf. J. V. A. Fine, Hasperia Suppl. 9 (1951), 177 ‘the fully developed mortgage contract, according to which the creditor on non-payment of the debt due can ... become owner of the real property which had served as a security, cannot exist unless real estate is alienable’.

77 See note 69 above.

78 For the meaning of δὲ ὀλγάζων here and in 4-5 see Ath. Pol. 29.1 fin. ἐὰν δὲ ὀλγάζων ποιήσωσι τὴν πολιτείαν, and Arist. Politeia 136b17 της πολιτείας δὲ ὀλγάζων ὀδῆς. Control rather than possession may be emphasised, but ownership is implicit in their ability to charge rents for landed property.

79 Cf. Ath. Pol. 47.4 τὰς μισθώσεις τῶν τεμένων καὶ Ἰσοκ. Ἀρεώτ. 32 τοῖς μέν γεωργίας ἐπὶ μετρίας μισθώσεως παραδοῦντες. For the use of ὄροι to record a μισθώσεως cf. Isaiah 6:36.

78 This question is put too by D. Lotze in Philologus 102 (1938), 10 in the form: 'was soll man mit ihnen (ὅροι) und der γιὰ πρὸσβεβο δουλεύωνοι νῦν ἐλεύθερα anfange, wenn nur die Person verpfändet und das Land gar nicht direkt betroffen wurde’.

79 The best example of the practice, which is recorded on many extant ὄροι, is in Demosthenes’ speech Against Pantaenetus A. E., where the contract of πράσιν ἀπὸ λύσεις contains a rent and a time limit: ἡ τὰς μισθώσεις ἡ γεωργίας καὶ λύσεις ... ἐν τῷ μηδὲ χρόνῳ. The system is admirably described by Sir F. E. Adcock in Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society 188 (1946), 20. The sale was of course a legal one; the purchase money was not regarded as a loan on the security of the land (this process was known as ὑποθήκη), and the rent was an actual rent, not interest (τόκος) on a loan.
of the Athenaios Politia had this very practice in mind. He supposed then that a few wealthy Athenians had bought up all the land; some tenants were still keeping the redemption clause open, some had presumably let the period for redemption run out and lost their land outright, and some were actually failing to pay the rent. He identified the traditional Hektemoroi with the payers of such a rent fixed at one-sixth of the produce; and he assumed that those who failed to pay their rent were liable to be seized or sold, themselves and their families, into slavery.

This explanation cannot be regarded as satisfactory. A Harpalus and a Cleomenes and a few others in the fourth century may have had the capital resources with which to buy up all the land in Attica, but it is unthinkable that any clique in the seventh century had capital resources of this order. A peasant who had the cash value of his land in his pocket and at the same time the use of that land would certainly not have fallen short of rendering one-sixth of the produce when the penalty for failure was enslavement for himself and his family; he would surely have rendered the one-sixth, and then, if he could not live on the five-sixths, he would have bought food with the cash in hand or even have sold some of his children to save the others. Indeed, so long as a man was a Hektemoros holding the capital value of his land and drawing five-sixths of the produce, he was not at all badly off and certainly not as desperately oppressed as the poor were depicted as being in the poems of Solon.

Now that we have reviewed the three explanations which were formulated in the fourth century, it is apparent that only the first of them (in Plutarch, Solon, 13.4) fits the evidence which is afforded to us by Solon’s poems and by archaic words of Solon’s time. Little comment is needed, if we bear in mind the background of the seventh and sixth centuries which we have already sketched. ‘The indebted commons’, δ ἄραι ἐνδύσεις, were not persons still paying interest on loans but defaulting bankrupts. Their fate depended on their status: those whose land was inalienable paid a sixth of the produce in perpetuity to the defrauded creditor and were themselves tied by law to the land; those whose property was personal and had already gone were realised—themselves and their families—by the defrauded creditor for what they were worth on the slave market. The second explanation, that of ἐνδυσίης (Plutarch, Solon, 15.5), deals with persons still paying interest on loans (the mortgaged property being marked with a ἄραι) and not with bankrupts; it has no room for Hektemoroi and does not mention them. Thus it only meets a few of the problems and those not satisfactorily. The third explanation, based on πρόσσεις ἐκτι λαές (in Athenaios Politia, 2.2), deals apparently with persons who had received the capital value of their land and were keeping five-sixths of the produce, and it is the most improbable of all three explanations.84

80 As land already forfeited would have no ἄραι on it (so W. J. Woodhouse, op. cit., 100), Solon must have referred in poem 24.6 to the first group only.

81 Indeed the modern fashion is to defer the introduction of coined money into Athens until the early sixth century; even if it is dated to the seventh century, as I believe, it is very unlikely that large accumulations of capital were available.

82 We do not know the ratio between land value and land produce, but if the ratio was similar to that used in fixing rent in the speech against Pantaenetus, it was some 12 per cent, and therefore one-sixth of the produce was 2 per cent of the land value. It is incredible that a peasant who held the full land value in cash and worked the land itself could not find this 2 per cent. As K. von Fritz has pointed out in AJP 61 (1940), 55 the rent must be one-sixth and not five-sixths of the produce, because no man in his senses could call five-sixths of the produce a rent. It was, as he says in AJP 64 (1943), 41, a ‘seemingly reasonable rent’. Pisistratus levied a tax of one-tenth of the produce from those he supported (Ath. Pol. 16.5), and the Spartans took one-half from the Helots who were working arable land (Tyrtæus 5.3).

83 Cf. W. J. Woodhouse, op. cit., 88 on ἐνδυσίης: ‘a security for loan which did not come into the creditor’s possession unless and until the debtor defaulted’.

84 It is of course difficult for anyone who accepts the statement in Ath. Pol. 2.2 and 4.5, that, ‘the land was in the hands of a few’, to explain how this ceased to be so, unless Solon carried out a redistribution of land, which is the one thing we know he did not do (Solon 23.21). Already in Solon’s property class
Lastly, we may test these three explanations against the touchstone of what Solon did. He removed the ὅρος. Under the first explanation this means that he freed the land from the obligation which tied its owners to the land in perpetuity as payers of one-sixth of the produce to the defrauded creditor. This was indeed an achievement worthy of the place given to it in poem 24. But under the system of ἐνορθίης the removal of a ὅρος meant only that the land was no longer the security for the loan. What happened next? Did the owner of the land keep the land and in addition the money loaned to him? We are not told. Similarly under the system of πράσινος ἐπὶ λόσει the removal of a ὅρος presumably meant the cancellation of the rent and of the redemption clause, so that the seller of his land may have got away with the purchase money and continued to squat on the land. In neither case do we see any trace of elementary justice or of relief from oppression which could justify Solon in proclaiming the removal of the ὅροι as the chief part of his service to Athens.

We are told, though not by Solon himself, that Solon also cancelled all debts. Under the first explanation the bankrupts were not only freed from being tied to the land or redeemed by Solon from slavery but they were also liberated from the unpaid debts which had brought them into bankruptcy. Under the system of ἐνορθίης those who had raised loans evidently kept the loaned money with no obligation of repayment. Under the system of πράσινος ἐπὶ λόσει there was no debt in any case, and the cancellation of debts therefore did not apply. By this test too we should accept the first explanation and discard the other two explanations as anachronistic inventions by fourth-century writers.

V. SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

In the seventh century B.C. Attica was still bound by the religious and social traditions which had grown up during the Mycenaean period and made her in truth ‘the oldest land of Ionia’. The citizens of the Athenian state were organised in those familial units—tribes, phratries and gene—which claimed descent from the Greek-speaking settlers who had accompanied Ion and peopled Attica. The intervening centuries had brought some accretions, because Attica had welcomed refugees from many parts of Greece. At first these refugees had been adopted into the gene under the name of homagalakes; for they had shared in the sacred meals of the genetae. Later the distinction between genetae proper and genetae homagalakes disappeared; for a new method was devised for absorbing the waves of refugees who entered the Athenian state during the Dorian invasion and its aftermath. These refugees were marshalled in groups with a common worship, and the groups were then adopted into the phratries. The members of the groups were called oreones; they

qualifications we see that Attica was full of smallholders (for the limits for Pentakosiomedimeni, Hippis and Zeugitai mean holdings of perhaps 62, 38 and 25 acres respectively); at the end of the Peloponnesian War the number of citizens who did not possess land was only 5,000 (Hypothesis of Dionysius Hal. to Lysias’ speech 34), and the requirement that a general should possess land in Attica was in force in 324 B.C. (Dinarchus 1.71).

In his lively and original book W. J. Woodhouse believed that he could combine a system of inalienable land (e.g., p. 81) with the practice of πράσινος ἐπὶ λόσει (e.g., p. 97, ‘the hypothesis here advanced is that this form of contract came into use before the time of Solon’). But, as N. Lewis remarked in AJP 72 (1941), 144 f. and 181 f., if land is inalienable, it cannot be sold, and, if the tenant-occupier is sold into slavery, the land reverts to the next of kin and not to the supposed purchaser. Sir F. E. Adecock saw clearly that the land must have been alienable if πράσινος ἐπὶ λόσει was being practised (CAH iv 34), but the fact remains that land was not being alienated from Athenian families until late in the fifth century.

85 Solon 4.2 ‘Iaonia’ is probably an archaizing name for Greece rather than a term for the various Ionic-speaking states.

86 Ath. Pol. frs. 1 and 5 and 41.2 init.

87 Jacoby, FGrH 328 (Philochorus) F35b, Harpocrates s.v. γενεταί ’ο τοῦ αὐτοῦ γένους κοινοκόκτες; Pollux viii 111.

88 Thuc. i 2.6.
worshipped a patron hero or god and shared in a sacred meal,\textsuperscript{90} just as the *gennetae* worshipped their family or local hero or god and partook of communal feasts. From 1000 B.C. or so onwards the members of the tribes and the phratries were either *gennetae*, belonging to the ancient familial units, or *orgeones*, naturalised citizens of relatively recent adoption.

The familial element was dominant in the seventh century. A few families only were believed to stand particularly close to the gods, and they provided the priests for the tribes and phratries and for the state in certain departments, for instance in dealing with Delphi. These priestly families were called the *Eupatridae* in a religious context.\textsuperscript{91} They may have been influential in secular matters too, but they certainly had no monopoly of office, for instance in the Areopagus Council.\textsuperscript{92} For in everything except religion the *gennetae* recognised no degrees of nobility. They were all well born—*ἐδύνεσθε* and *ἀγαθοὶ*—and in comparison with the *orgeones* they were all *Eupatridae*.

The *gennetae* enjoyed a higher status than the *orgeones* in politics and law. The archonship was open only to those who had the double qualification of good birth and much wealth (*ἀριστίτην καὶ πλουτίτην*), and the requirement of good birth ruled out the *orgeones*.\textsuperscript{93} The trial of the Alcmeonids and their followers who were charged with sacrilege after the conspiracy of Cylon c. 632 B.C. was entrusted to three hundred jurors chosen *ἀριστίτην*, that is from the *gennetae*.\textsuperscript{94} The judges of appeal, the Ephetae, who were set up c. 621 B.C., were also chosen *ἀριστίτην*.\textsuperscript{95} Under Draco’s law of homicide a man who had no living male relative up to the degree of first cousin was represented by ten phratry-brothers chosen *ἀριστίτην*; thus even if the man was himself an *orgeon*, he could not be represented by an orgeonic member of the phratry. The discrimination between *gennetae* and *orgeones*, between those who were *ἀγαθοὶ* and *κακοὶ* by birth, was a factor in the situation which Solon encountered and remedied. After the *Seisachtheia* he claimed that his own laws were enacted in a spirit of equality for the well born and the base born (*θεμοῦ δ’ ὁμοίως τῷ κακῷ τῷ καλάθῳ ... ἔγραψα*, 24.18–20). As Draco’s laws of debt had precipitated the crisis, it follows that Draco’s laws were unequal for the *gennetae* and the *orgeones*.

There was also a distinction between the *gennetae* and the *orgeones* in regard to the tenure of one kind of land. Solon (23.20) refused to divide ‘the rich land’ equally between the well born and the base born, although one party (presumably the landless) demanded it, and therefore ‘the rich land’ had been and continued to be in the possession of one or other group predominantly or entirely. The general statements by Aristotle and the analogy of other states in the colonising period\textsuperscript{97} lead us to conjecture that the arable land of Attica had been divided up into estates (*κλήροι*) and allotted to the *gene* many centuries earlier. This conjecture is strikingly confirmed by the statement of Thucydides (ii 16) that most of the Athenian families had maintained their establishments and shrines in the countryside continuously from the earliest times down to the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. In practice, then, the estates owned by the *gene* had not been alienated down to 431 B.C.; in the period before Solon they were inalienable by law, as we know from a passage in Plutarch (Solon 21.3), and they evidently remained so until some date later than the beginning of the Peloponnesian War. On the other hand, the *orgeones* had no share in the rich land, that is in the arable land of the Attic plains. They engaged in the arts and crafts, in

\textsuperscript{90} Jacoby, *FGrH* 328 F 35a; Pollux iii 52; Jacoby, *FGrH* 341 (Seleucus) F 1; Pollux viii 107.

\textsuperscript{91} *Ath. Pol.* fr. 5; Harpocratie quoted in Jacoby, *FGrH* 328 (Philochorus) F 35b; Pollux viii 111; IG iii 267 and 1335; Bekker *Aeneid* 257 has an apt description of the priestly *Eupatridae*: *ἐνεπάρθων ἐκαλυθότοι οἱ αὐτὸ τὸ δότο ὁκοθότες καὶ μετέχοντες βασιλικόν γένος καὶ τῷ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιοῦντες*.

\textsuperscript{92} Jacoby, *FGrH* 324 (Androton) F 4 and 328 (Philochorus) F 20b, especially the words *πλῆκτος ἐξ ἐνεπάρθων*.

\textsuperscript{93} *Ath. Pol.* 3.1 and 3.6; C. Müller, *FGrH* Philochorus fr. 58; Jacoby, *FGrH* 324 F 4 and 328 F 20b; Isocrates 7.37.

\textsuperscript{94} *Ath. Pol.* 1.1; Plu. Solon 12.3.

\textsuperscript{95} Pollux viii 125.

\textsuperscript{96} Tod, *GHI* 87, line 20.

\textsuperscript{97} E.g. Arist. *Politics* 1266b 21.
seafaring and business. In terms of occupation they were called demioúrgoi, whereas the genetai in the plains were called georgoi.\textsuperscript{98} Their property was acquired personally; it was generally movable and alienable. Finally, the hill land of Attica offered a separate, if less attractive, field for development in pasture, timber and arboriculture; and it was worked not by demioúrgoi or georgoi, but by a class of persons who received an occupational name in the period after Solon, the agroikoi, that is the ‘country-dwellers’ or rustics.\textsuperscript{99} Their origin is uncertain; but we may conjecture that the original agroikoi were impoverished younger sons who were squeezed out of the hereditary family estates in the plains or immigrants who failed to establish themselves in the normal occupations of the demioúrgoi. In the troubled times before and after Solon’s archonship their numbers must have grown. No limit was set to the acquisition of this hill land in the period before Solon; but in his Seisachtheia he laid down a limit.\textsuperscript{100}

Draco’s laws of debt, being different for the well born and the base born, are likely to have followed the line of division between corporate and personal ownership; for in cases of debt a creditor cannot gain possession of a bankrupt’s land if that land is corporately held and inalienable, but he can take possession of all personal property and ultimately of the person of the bankrupt, where property is personally owned and alienable. When Solon summarised the situation resulting from Draco’s laws of debt and his own remedy of it by the Seisachtheia, he described two forms of disaster which affected the state: (1) δουλωσιν at home (3.17–23), the ‘dark earth’ being ‘enslaved with δοῦνα fixed in it to mark its servitude’ (24.3–7) and (2) many impoverished persons sold into slavery abroad or kept in slavery in Attica (3.23–5 and 24.8–15). Two clues to the first category have come down to us in the words ἐπιμεροτος and ἐκτησιμορος; for the former was land in Solon’s time which had to yield a part of its produce, and the latter were persons working the land and yielding a sixth part of the produce.\textsuperscript{101} We conclude therefore that this enslaved land was inalienable land in the plains which was vested in a genos but was worked by an oikos of genetai who, as bankrupt debtors, were compelled by law to render a sixth part of the produce to the creditor. For the oikos was the executive unit, as we see not only from Draco’s law on homicide but also from Solon’s fixing of property-qualifications in terms of the produce from ἡ οἰκεία γῆ. On the other hand the second category consisted of persons, whether ὀργεόνες or agroikoi, who had lost their personal property and then gone bankrupt. They were liable by law to be haled off by their creditor and sold together with their families in the slave market.\textsuperscript{102}

Solon put an end to this dreadful situation by removing the δοῦνα, thus setting the land free from its obligation, and by buying back those Athenian citizens who had been sold into slavery. Further, he cancelled all existing debts, so that all men were given a fresh start, and he rescinded the laws of Draco, so that such a situation should never recur. His new laws of debt were framed in a spirit of equality for the well born and the base born (the ἀγαθός and the κακός of poem 24.18–20), and from then onwards all Athenian citizens were treated equally if they became bankrupt.

After 594 B.C. the strife in Attica was not between rich and poor but between three groups.\textsuperscript{103} The first and strongest group was called that of the euripatridae or the ‘plain-men’; its policy was oligarchical, and its members were the owners of the plain-lands, the genetai. The second group was called that of the demiourgoi or the ‘coast-men’; they desired a

\textsuperscript{98} Ath. Pol. fr. 5.
\textsuperscript{99} Ath. Pol. 13.2; Hesych., ἀγριωκός: ὁ ἐν ἀγρῳ δακτυλίως, χρηματός.
\textsuperscript{100} Arist. Politics 1266b 16.
\textsuperscript{101} Pollux vii 151; Hesych. s.v.; Plu. Solon 13.44; Ath. Pol. 2.2.
\textsuperscript{102} Plu. Solon 13.4; Ath. Pol. 2.2; 4.5; 9.1.
\textsuperscript{103} The three groups which appear under different names in Ath. Pol. 13.2–3 and 13.4–5 are certainly the same in personnel; it may be noted that one cause, impoverishment due to the cancellation of loans, is mentioned both in 13.3 and 13.5. The names of the factions occur also in Arist. Politics 1305a 23; Hdt. i 59.3; Plu. Solon 13.2 (antedated) and 29.1.
moderate constitution, such as Solon had established, and they were in general the successful orgeones who lived by commerce and maritime trade. The third group was the radical democratic group of persons called the agroikoi or ‘the hill-men’; they were poor but vigorous workers in the hills, and their numbers were swollen by men who had been impoverished through Solon’s cancellation of loans and by persons ‘who were not of pure racial descent’, that is to say recently admitted orgeones. When Cleisthenes brought the strife between these three groups to an end, he did not disturb the genos system and its social and religious organisation.\textsuperscript{104} Thus the estates of the gennetae in the plains remained inalienable and the gennetae themselves continued to be regarded as a conservative group under such sobriquets as οἱ γνώριμοι, οἱ γενναῖοι, οἱ ἐπιφανεῖς, οἱ χρηστοί, οἱ γεωργοῦντες, until the disasters of the Peloponnesian War and the shocks of the civil war brought about a revolution in Athenian society. Land of all kinds was alienable in the fourth century, and the distinctions between gennetae and orgeones became blurred with the breakdown of the genos system and the growth of individualism.

It was in this fourth century that the local historians turned their attention to Solon’s work. Only one of the three whose ideas have reached us understood the difference between gennetae and orgeones in the seventh and sixth centuries. He has left a clear and precise analysis, which is quoted on p. 83 above. The other two were misled by the conditions of the fourth century and equated the ὁροι of Solon’s poem with the ὁροι which they themselves knew as the records of ‘mortgage’ and of ‘sale with a redemption clause’.\textsuperscript{105} Their views deserve as little credence from us as Androtion’s theory that Solon devalued the currency, the suggestion in the Athenaión Politeia that a few wealthy Athenians made a corner in landed property, and the fanciful story that Solon’s friends brought up wide areas of land with borrowed money in anticipation of the Seisachtheia.

\textit{Clifton College, Bristol.}

105 Plu. Solon 15.6 τῆς θ’ ἑποκειμένης γῆς and \textit{Ath. Pol.} 2.2. Hesychius or his source seems to have identified the \textit{eupatridae} with the \textit{georgoi}, which is the occupational name of the plain-land gennetae; he wrote under ἀγρούσται ἀγροικοί καὶ γένος Ἀθηναίων οἱ ἀντικυκτόλοιτο πρὸς τοὺς εὐπατρίδας, ἢν δὲ τὸ τῶν Γεωργῶν, καὶ τρίτων τὸ τῶν Δημοκράτων. For ἀγρούσται cf. \textit{Odyssey} xxii 85.
THE RETURN OF ORESTES

αφραγίδα πατρός ἐκμαθ' εἶ σαφή λέγω. Sophocles, Electra 1223

In their accounts of the return of Orestes, the three great tragedians show respect for the ancient tradition and the greatness of it by their several interpretations. Each preserves the general tenor of the legend. Electra awaits the return of her brother to avenge her father’s death. The secrecy of his return delays recognition, but once Orestes is made known to his sister the punishment of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus becomes inevitable. Of the differences in action and character in each play, the most significant is the means whereby the recognition of Orestes takes place. This affects not only the mood of each tragedy, but its construction.

The recognition scene placed early in the Choephoroi (224) presents an almost rustic simplicity (lines 228, 231, 232). This matches the lament and slow movement of the invocation by Orestes, Electra and the chorus that follow. The audience are spectators of a simple action from which the drama as simply proceeds. Such simplicity rightly receives an archaic treatment derived from a great religious tradition. The Euripidean version, psychologically more complicated, shows the interplay of personal relationships largely dependent upon memory. This complexity, expressed in the intricate nature of prologue, delays the recognition of Orestes by Electra. Yet in Euripides (Electra 577) the scene still occurs comparatively early—perhaps in deference to tradition, or perhaps that the movement of vengeance can be more fully displayed. In Sophocles (Electra 1224), however, the recognition scene is placed towards the end of the play. So a fuller consideration of character is possible. For it is upon the background of tortured hesitation that a deeper insight into the minds of Orestes and Electra can be given. The desire for vengeance in Orestes is presented as simple, patient and by prophetic advice (32–37) regarded as a natural duty: in Electra it is seen to be complex and introverted. Rendered more acute by tenderness (254, 431 f.) embittered by reported loss (558–610), heightened by resolution (399, 947 f.), submerged in despair (677, 804 f.), it ebbs and flows in varying intensity. Once recognition takes place, the diverse nature of the desires is resolved into a singleness of purpose which gathers an increasing and terrible momentum. It is perhaps for this reason more than for any other, that Sophocles delays the recognition of Orestes by Electra. But since the scene, for which the whole audience has been waiting, is so long delayed, it is given treatment consistent with its unusual position. Perhaps in no other place is the dramatic genius of Sophocles so apparent. A fine sense of economy is shown, which gives the scene grandeur and a profound simplicity; and the manner of recognition, direct and speedy, is seen to be entirely appropriate.

Both Euripides (Electra 88) and Sophocles (Electra 37) use pretence and secrecy to delay recognition and enhance the action, but whereas in Euripides (513–575) there appears to be a slackening of dramatic tension when the scar on Orestes forehead is recognised, the display of a seal in Sophocles increases or heightens it. Euripides may, in his concern for human and poetic values, have felt it necessary to introduce a physical mark as a means of identification and a character old enough to remember the occasion of it (573). Yet if human interest is to be considered and physical attributes are to be used for identification, the finding of a lock of hair offered on the tomb, as in Aeschylus (Choephoroi 229 f.) has more to commend it. The Euripidean concern, moreover, not only entails the introduction of another actor at a time when economy in dramatis personae is dramatically necessary, but also the presence of an intermediary when the relationship between brother

1 Even if there were some indication of the scar on the mask, the size of the theatre would also demand descriptive language or mime.
and sister should be simple. Indeed it would seem that it is just the introduction of another character at this time which shifts the focus of attention, as the addition of another voice slows down the action. If, however, the mounting tension were thought to demand some measure of relief, and a diversion was required to ease a sense of strain in the audience, the diversion or relief should be something which so assists the dramatic action, that the audience move without effort to a deeper understanding of it. The use of the seal at this moment has a stamp of genius, because it is not only a means of identification, but a symbol of the γενός shared by both brother and sister. It also secures a double diversion, since the attention of the audience is momentarily diverted from the actors, and the attention of the actors themselves from each other—only to be followed by a deeper knowledge and relationship in both dramatis personae and spectators.

Classical production of tragedy was in general content with the minimum of stage properties, and the possibility that mime was used to represent objects instead of the objects themselves must not be overlooked. Unlike the seal in the Trachiniae (615) for more ordinary use and simply handed from one character to another, the seal in the Electra of Sophocles is such an essential constituent of dramatic action that its actual use as a stage property could almost be assumed. In a tragedian responsible and famed for many scenic innovations—it is reported that Sophocles himself took part in the ball-playing scene in the Nausicaa—it would have been an inconsistency of the first order to allow an urn for ashes, but no seal for recognition. But should mime have been used in place of a seal, the gesture of showing and of recognition would have been the same as if the seal had been there. By a seal Electra recognised her brother; and if a seal were used, or even imagined, it is pertinent to ask what kind of a seal it was, or thought to be, and what kind of gesture was necessary to show or mime it.

Faced with an unusual incident in the tragedy, the scholiasts and early commentators have offered various explanations for the line 1223 of the Electra, and for the use of the word οφραγίς. Camerarius translates line 1223 Hoc contempta signum annulli, perspice me vera logui, and in commenting on signum annulli writes hic enim est ophragis. Elmsley in his edition of the Scholia on the Electra of Sophocles gives a consensus of opinion that οφραγίς used in line 1223 is the same as δακτύλιον, so also Jebb. Jebb's comment 'and the mere possession of the ring is no proof' suggests that in this instance he regards οφραγίς to be the same as δακτύλιον. This opinion is given in a more detailed form in the abridged edition. The opinions of Musgrave, Dacier and Boissonade that the οφραγίς πατρός is a congenital mark are given; and he adds Cedrenus' mention of το Πελόπτεον το γενοῦς σήματρον τιν ελλις seen by Iphigenia [sic] on Orestes' right shoulder. In each case these scholars were prejudiced by traditional views and current experience. Franklin also suggests some bodily or natural mark, and the remains of the ivory shoulder of Pelops (Pindar, Olym. i 28; Ovid, Metamorph. vi 405) is cited.

---

8 This must be the explanation of the imagery in Electra 4-9, see also A. E. Haigh, Attic Theatre, p. 170.
9 T. A. Buckley, The Tragedies of Sophocles (London, Bohn, 1865) 150 n. 3. See also Jebb, op. cit., 165, on lines 1222 f.
10 At times a thought has occurred to the writer that at some point in this mythological tradition, there has been a grave error. Might the difference between Pindar's reference, ἔλεφαντα θηλούμαν ὄμων κεκακάννου, and Ovid's account indicate that the legend before Pindar had also been distorted, and that his very words give a clue to the original truth, viz. the wearing of an ivory seal round the neck, or on the upper arm? The Cretan seals, Heraklion 1054, 1082, 1109-1112, being parts of ivory tusks, in shape like a human shoulder, but engraved with a device, are also suggestive.
The word σφραγίς occurs rarely in tragedy. So far as is known twice only in Sophocles, twice in Euripides. In Euripides the word is used generally with reference to the seal’s function of security and to the result of its use as a means of safeguarding something, or in attesting the genuineness or the personal origin of a letter. Here, as frequently in English, the word seal is equivalent to sealing. This use of σφραγίς in the Iphigenia in Aulis and in the Fragmenta should be compared with the use of the derivative σφράγισμα in the Hippolytus (862). Here a seal stone set in a ring is indicated by the words σφράγισμα κρυσαλάτου. Sophocles, on the other hand, uses σφραγίς quite simply as a seal, the object by which an impression could be made and whose motif was recognisable as a special and individual mark. Secondary or underlying meanings can be seen in the connexion of σφραγίς with the verb φρύσω. So in Trachiniae it was to be used in itself as a means of personal authenticity, and in the Electra as a means of personal identity. The word δακτύλωσ apparently connected with finger, however, does not seem to occur in Tragedy, although it may be assumed in line 862 of the Hippolytus, for both κρυσαλάτου and σφράγισμα suggest it. It is, however, found in Comedy. Such use may be expected, since tragedy deals with the heroic past, comedy largely with contemporary subjects and manners: for which the fourth-century votive lists of the Parthenon also supply some evidence.

Δακτύλωσ ἀπείρων κρυσαλάτου, δῦνοι Πλάθ[ις Ἀθήνας] ἀνέβεβηκε. (IG ii 1388 39 f.)
[δῦν σφραγίς δυνατον, κρυσαλατου ξυνου τον δακτυλον. (ibid., 45)
[σφραγις κρυσαλατου δακτυλων ξυνου. (ibid., 83-4)
σφραγίδες λιθίναι ϕυλατ.
σφραγίς λιθίνη κρυσαλατον δακτυλων ξυνου.
σφραγίδες λιθίναι κρυσαλατον δακτυλων ξυνους ἐπτα.
ἀνευ δακτυλων περιχρύσων σφραγίδες δύν. (ibid., 1396 21-6)

These entries suggest that the day-to-day use of the older type of seal had declined in favour of a smaller kind held in metal rings, or in gold finger-rings without stones whose bezel was engraved with a device. Σφραγίδες λιθίναι or ϕυλατ were in all probability scaraboids of the older and larger variety (in the last entry). Περιχρύσων σφραγίδες appear to have been seals framed or backed with gold. That they were not set in rings or hooped, is clear. To none of these could δακτυλογυρίς (Plato Alcibiades i 128c) apply, nor the related word in the Law of Solon in Diogenes Laertius, i, Solon 57, δακτυλογυρίς μη ξεινα αφαγίδα φυλάττειν τον παραβέβειο δακτυλον.

It is possible that δακτυλογυρίς in Diogenes is a contemporary word rather than the original used in the Law of Solon. Certainly his use of σφραγίδα, like that of Euripides, suggests a newer range of ideas. This phrase of Diogenes has been translated servare expressum sigillum and by Liddell and Scott in the Didot edition ‘impression of a signet ring.’ Yet whereas from classical times onwards the term signet came to mean a signet to be worn on the finger by means of a ring, the hoop of an ancient signet, primarily a handle, could also be used to attach the seal to the person. This, ancient Egyptian and

11 Sophocles, Electra 1223; Trachiniae 615. The σφράγιον in Philoctetes 403 by reason of the plot and by the apposition of λιθίνη does not seem to be connected with σφραγίς, in spite of an occasional fourth-century assimilation. See also Pliny, Hist. Nat. xxxiii 10.
12 Euripides, Iphigenia in Aulis 155; Nauck, Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta, no. 1132, line 59.
13 Matt. xxvii 66; Rev. v 1, 2 (AV). Also Washburn, Law of Real Property ii 571.
14 Aristophanes, Plato 884, and in a fragment of Antiphones quoted by Athenaeus, iii 96 (123).
15 Böckh, Die Staatsaufzählung der Athenen (Berlin, 1851) ii 252 f.
16 In these items σφραγίς is usually the subject of the sentence, δακτυλον the object. Modern use would reverse this order.
17 As two older examples, in lapis lazuli (Herkleion 838, BM105).
18 s.v. σφραγίς, II.
19 An ivory signet with a ring handle, Herkleion Museum 646 from Koumasa, has a string hole bored twice through the ring handle.
Cretan signets with ring handles suggest. The two extant Late Helladic examples of
engraved finger rings accentuate the ponderous nature of many of the older gold signets
and the large number of contemporary seal-stones. Later varieties of gold signet rings to
be worn on the finger, used in Rhodes in the seventh century and from the sixth century
b.c. in Greece and Etruria, have usually an oblong bezel with rounded ends, lightly
engraved with animals or symbols derived from the Eastern Mediterranean. Both motifs
and shape suggest that this kind of ring was a product of the Phoenician dissemination of
hybrid styles and of the then Egyptian fashion of wearing a scarab on the finger. Later
gold rings with human figures or subjects culled from classical mythology engraved on the
bezel, were not generally used before the fifth century b.c. Perhaps the most important
passage which illustrates a contemporary use of the two kinds of seals occurs in Plato,
Hippias Minor 368b when Socrates observes that ἐίξες περὶ τὸ σώμα ἀπάντα σαυτοῦ ἔργα
ἔχον· πρῶτον μὲν δακτύλων—ἐν τῇ βεβαἱν γὰρ ἦρχον—ὅτι ἐίξες σαυτοῦ ἔχεις ἔργον ὡς ἐπιστάμενος
δακτύλων γλυφέων, καὶ ἄλλων σφραγίδα σῶν ἔγρων. Here Hippias was wearing a δακτύλως and
a σφραγίς at the same time.

Early editions of Liddell and Scott regard σφραγίς and δακτύλως as roughly equiva-

lent. Compare the σφραγίς in Herodotus iii 41, which Rawlinson also translates as a
signet ring; whereas σφραγίς refers to the όμαράγγοδον μὲν λίθον ἔργον δὲ Ἐθεοδωροῦ, with which
the use of σφραγίς in σφραγίδας γλυφοὺν (vii 69) concurs. But it would seem that although
dακτύλως was later used loosely for both ring and seal—because in the latter part of the
fourth century the ring generally held the sealstone, or the σῆμα was engraved on the bezel
of the ring, the word σφραγίς in the first place indicated a piece of stone or other carved
material used as a seal, with the related σῆμα as the essential mark which it displayed or
conferred. The word gives no indication of the manner of its use or how it was attached
to the owner. It is of interest to note that when Herodotus is describing the Persian seal in
1 195, the word σφραγίς is used, and the Persian seal of that time was usually a cylinder or
conoid strung round the neck; but when in ii 38 he is giving an account of Egyptian sacrifi-
cial preparation, he used the word δακτύλως. This is not only appropriate in describing
the way the scarab seal had come in Egypt to be held in a finger-ring—namely by means
of a pin through the string-hole, it also suggests the kind and size of the seal which would
be more convenient to use on written material more fragile than clay. This method,
moreover, not only allowed engraved stones to be conveniently worn, but it allowed the
seal to be turned at will. Indeed, it would seem that in the Republic the turning of the
ring of Gyges may have been the turning of the mounted seal on its pin within the ring,
for Plato mentions that the σφενδόνι is turned.

Nearly all ancient seals were bored in some way so they could be securely tied to their
owner. Even lentoids, whether Minoan or Helladic, are also bored, although the stone

no. 14 and Oxford 1938. 1051 and 1053 have hoops
too small for wear on the finger. Later varieties of
certainties about the Cretan type, e.g. Oxford 1938. 1126 and
large gold signets in Athens, National Museum 2853,
2970, 3134, 3138, 3148, 7372, suggest by the dimen-
sion of the hoop, finger-wear; but, by size and weight,
ceremonial use.

21 Athens, National Museum 2157, of agate; 3374,
of gold, appear to be the first finger-rings engraved with a device for sealing. Two signet rings found in
the Argive Heraeum also appear to be an early use
(Arget Heraeum ii pl. 83).

22 B.M. Catalogue of Finger-Rings, nos. 15, 20, 22,
23, 41.

23 B.M. Catalogue of Scarabs, pl. 1.
not seem to appear on red-figure vases although
cords with talismanic knots are shown on a Euphro-
nios painting in positions where seals were more
anciently worn. A vase-painting of Smikros also
shows men wearing a cord round the wrist. Pfuhl,
Malerei und Zeichnung iii, figs. 394, 388.
25 I am indebted to Mr. P. E. Corbett for drawing
my attention to this reference.
26 In the edition of 1843, p. 1349.
27 See, however, Cary, Herodotus (Bohn, 1861) 188.
28 This also a later use.
29 H. Frankfort, Cylinder Seals 297.
30 The verb relating to the δακτύλως is ἐπενδύων.
THE RETURN OF ORESTES

is thin; in each case through the thickest part between the face and the back of the seal; an operation fraught with some difficulty, but evidently preferred to any interference with the field of the gem. The earlier Island stones from Melos following the Minoan tradition in manufacture were probably worn as were their prototypes, either singly tied to the wrist—as in the cup-bearer fresco at Knossos—or hung round the neck, strung with other beads on a necklace. The former, if the seal was used for sealing and the owner a man, the latter if it were chiefly regarded as a jewel or talisman and owned by a woman.

Certain Greek seals of the fifth century whose shapes are related to both scarab and scaraboid bear a σχήμα—perhaps apotropaic—engraved in intaglio or in the round on the curved back of the seal: and many glandular-shaped stones and amygdaloids of much earlier date are domed or carinated. These, like the later scarabs and scaraboids, cannot be worn with comfort, if the ridges or humps are pressing on some part of the body. This suggests that seals were usually worn with the device turned inwards. Thus worn, the flatter surface of the field lay well on the breast, or on the wrist between the wrist-bones; the engraving was protected from damage; and the device from unlawful eyes. For making an impression or for display, the stone must first be turned. This could only be done with facility in the case of elliptically-shaped gems if the string-hole were bored along the major axis; and in all probability, glandular-shaped stones and amygdaloids were for this very reason so bored, despite the technical difficulties involved.

There is no explicit indication as to how Orestes wore his seal. It would not seem to have been δακτύλιον, a ring with an engraved bezel or small seal-stone set in a finger-ring. Language is specific at this point; nor can metrical demands alone be responsible for the definite choice of word σφραγίς. If, too, the stately acting in tragedy demanded within the range of human movement gestures and distances appropriate to the use of masks, costumes and buskins, the examination of a finger-ring would demand a physical movement and proximity alien to the rest of the setting. The cumbersome folds of tragic costume rule out the possibility that the seal might be hung round the neck, so the older fashion of wearing it tied to the wrist would remain. The showing of a seal thus worn would well fit in with all the other requirements of position, proximity and traditional movement. So it would seem that if a seal were used in tragedy, and particularly in this instance, a fifth-century audience would expect to see it in its more ancient shape, in its more ancient place on the wrist—whether the arm were bare or the Dionysiac sleeve were worn—and worn in the ancient manner, with the device turned inwards. Indeed, unless this were so,
there would have been no place for the exquisite irony of lines 1202–20, for in asking for the urn (1205), Orestes would have extended his hands and revealed the σημά too early. Granted the seal of traditional shape, and granted the customary wear, the recognition of Orestes by Electra depends upon the turn of the seal—perhaps at the very word τῆς (1222); and from that moment of recognition retribution ensues.

V. E. G. KENNA.

Farringdon, Devon.
SENSE AND COMMON-SENSE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY

This paper forms a brief and synoptic study of the use made by Greek thinkers of explanations and causes that lie outside immediate sense-perception; and of the extent to which these unperceived causes outstripped not merely sense but also common-sense, so as to become, simply judged in themselves, unexpected, improbable, or paradoxical. I propose first to examine the main Presocratic philosophers and their predecessors, to discover how far their theories exceeded the range of sense-perception on the one hand and common-sense on the other; then to assess more briefly the reaction of the Sophists, Socrates and Plato, with some consideration of Aristotle and his successors and special attention to the concept of teleology. The aim of this survey, from which much will inevitably be omitted, is to direct from a fresh angle a slender ray of light on the nature of Greek speculative thought—on the character of its dogmatism and the character of its assumed clarity.

If philosophy is the search for causes, then it must soon concern itself with the unseen, with what lies beyond perception. Proximate causes of particular sensed events may be found in other sensed events; but the philosopher's attempt to explain man's experience as a whole requires the inference of causes and relationships outside the immediate range of direct physical experience. In assessing the nature of such inferences it is desirable to evaluate first the degree in which intangible entities and motives are explicitly recognised or at least accepted; secondly, the nature of their connexion with the experience which they attempt to explain; and thirdly, the extent to which the invention or determination of such causes is limited by common-sense—by intuitions of what is possible or acceptable as an appendage of our experience, and what is not. For example, common-sense might not prevent a man from believing that the sun is a large ball of fire, for to say that is simply to assign to it various qualities that we know from experience, qualities which may not coexist in any easily determinable object of our experience but which are not mutually contradictory. On the other hand the belief that the sun is made out of triangles, or is rowed across the sky with oars, may be felt to offend common-sense, because there are no obvious elements of our experience that can be combined without contradiction to form such a picture. The criteria of common-sense may, however, be suppressed in special circumstances: for example in a type of explanation that is professedly symbolical, or if the avoidance of a minor departure from common-sense seems to result in the necessity of accepting another and more important departure. Philosophers normally avoid hypotheses that are gratuitously contrary to common-sense, of that we may be sure. Yet they may be driven from the perceived world into improbable assumptions that are opposed to common-sense either by clinging too tenaciously to what seems to be pure reason or, on the contrary, by abandoning logic altogether and taking refuge in poetry or metaphor. At all events such 'improbable' explanations are an undeniable phenomenon in Greek and many other kinds of thought.

The direction of the earliest Greek rationalistic speculation was strongly affected by preceding quasi-mythological beliefs, so that before approaching the Presocratics we should cast an eye at their pre-philosophical forebears. Now it is of the essence of mythopoetic thought that it soars beyond the seen or perceived world into the region of fantasy; yet Greek myths, as distinct from Märchen or saga, contain less pure improbability, in the sense outlined already, than might be expected or may be generally assumed. Thus in pre-rationalistic Greek cosmography there is comparatively little that in its underlying non-mythical connotation is seriously at odds with the naïve presentation of the senses. Sky,
for example, is a solid bowl, perhaps supported by Atlas, man or mountain. Earth is rooted indefinitely far below, where are the subterranean waters and the abode of the dead. The sun sails back round the river Okeanos in a golden bowl: this is a piece of rather romantic actiology which depends on the much more widespread and important idea that the flat earth is encircled by the river of Okeanos. The experiential basis of this concept is more complex than might at first appear. A surrounding salt-water sea might be inferred from voyages beyond the pillars of Herakles; but the idea of the fresh-water river must have been provoked originally not by Greek experience but by that of the river-cultures of Egypt and to a lesser extent Mesopotamia, where the formation of the world is exemplified each year by the emergence of the dry land above the receding flood-waters. The separation of earth and sky as the first stage in cosmogony is another mythological assumption which at first sight seems contrary to common-sense. But when earth is envisaged, not absurdly, as a mother impregnated by the seed of sky, perhaps in the form of rain, then the complete physical union of the two parents may also seem possible enough; and if a single origin of the world is demanded, whether for simplicity or for still more anthropomorphic reasons, then an amalgam of earth and sky is not unreasonable as the originate unity.

Greek culture- and vegetation-myths also, like those of Prometheus and of Demeter, have an unmistakable substratum of rationality. Some of them are non-Greek in origin, but even these tended to be moulded into typically Greek forms, and what was repellent was usually if not invariably rejected. In spite of the debts to Egypt that I have mentioned, the most characteristic aspects of Egyptian mythopoeia were alien to Greek thought. There is no sign in Greece of the symbolist extravagances that flourished in Egypt, where the sky was indifferently seen as the under-belly of a cow, or as supported by four pillars, or by air, or by a crouching goddess; and where incompatible explanations were blended together with no thought of absurdity, so that across the belly of the sky-cow sails the boat of the sun. If the Babylonians and their neighbours were less surrealistic than this, they were still far more tolerant of factual improbability than were the Greeks. Even the fantasies of Phercydes of Syros in the sixth century B.C., unparalleled as they seem to have been in the rest of early and classical Greek thought, were kept under control. The wedding of Zas and Chthonic and the spreading of the embroidered cloth over the winged oak are based upon a rational view of the world and its parts. Only the fight of Kronos with the snake-monster Ophionese is not readily explicable in terms of the evidence of the senses. Yet this is a version of the Typhoness story as in Hesiod's Theogony; and these fights of gods with giants or monsters are another importation from the Near East—we may compare, for example, Hurrian-Hittite stories of the defeat by the weather-god of the dragon Illuyanksas—and as they stand are not directly related to experience, though they may be used as aitia for phenomena like earthquakes, volcanoes and so on. In origin they were often vegetation-myths representing the struggle of the new powers of spring with the decaying forces of winter. Greece in such cases simply borrowed the myth, attractive and yet improbable as it was, without necessarily emphasising or even recording the original significance. This, though, is the exception, and in general I would contend that mythological fantasy in Greek contexts is surprisingly closely related to a substratum of significant if naive observation and experience.

The earliest philosophers, in reacting against mythopoeic descriptions of the cosmos, naturally achieved a closer relationship with the evidence of the senses. Yet the apparently uncritical dogmatism of the Milesians, together with the bizarre appearance of many of their physical ideas, give the impression that they were not really much concerned with the sense-world, and even less so with what we call 'common-sense'. This is a wrong impression, however, because, given the initial assumption of unitary origin, derived from the genetic tradition of theogony, it is fairly clear that Thales' origiative water and the aer or pneuma of Anaximenes were felt by them to accord with observed natural phenomena
—even though Thales’ choice was probably determined in part by Near Eastern ideas, and Anaximenes’ depended on his naïve view of the world as resembling an animal organism. The first philosophical recourse to an unseen arche completely outside our experience is Anaximander’s apeiron, the Indefinite substance. This concept of an originate substance distinct from any in our world was not, however, an arbitrary one. It seems to have presented itself as the solution to a grave objection to the choice of a present world-constituent like Thales’ water as cosmogonical source: namely, that the warring constituents of our plural and disparate world would never have been able to assert themselves against the limitless mass of a still existing originative material. A more real exception to the rationalistic nature of Anaximander’s cosmology is seen in his anthropomorphic motive for natural change, of injustice followed by retribution. Yet the acceptance of animate motivation for the interplay of physical events, naïve though it may seem, is a dominant characteristic of Greek thought down to and beyond Aristotle, as part of the unconscious heritage of the mythological past. Moreover, this anthropomorphic tendency is not in itself anti-natural, or even directly opposed to common-sense. Originally a reflexion of the incomplete separation of subjective experience and objective stimulus, it was perpetuated as a kind of classical escape-route from a variety of philosophical impasses, and has survived as a not sufficiently disreputable recourse for more recent thinkers.

The only Milesian theory that seems to have far exceeded what is either allowed by the senses or apparently demanded by logic is that attributed to Anaximander of innumerable worlds. Most critics now follow Cornford in thinking that these were successive and not simultaneous. If so, they break the probable rule of retribution for excess, which should ensure the continuity, with certain fluctuations, of our present world. In fact, though, neither successive nor simultaneous plural worlds are motivated by the evidence of experience, nor do they seem to be logically entailed by other arguments based on experience. I have advanced the possibility elsewhere that innumerable worlds were projected upon Anaximander by Theophrastus, who was led by Aristotle’s discussion of infinity to accept that all who posited an infinite universe must, like the Atomists, have believed in worlds coming-to-be and passing away throughout the void. The doxographical evidence is confused, but is compatible with the hypothesis that what was assigned to Anaximander by Theophrastus was precisely the Atomistic type of innumerable worlds. If so, Theophrastus was misled partly by Aristotle, partly by the term apeiron, which for Anaximander almost certainly meant indefinite and not mathematically infinite, and partly by Anaximander’s belief in cycles of the earth’s surface. These cycles, however, were probably inferred from phenomena like the encroachment and recession of the sea and the succession of the seasons with their wet and dry periods. They represent a reasonable inference of unseen events with no tendency toward the improbability of innumerable separate worlds, which, especially if they are successive, are implied by nothing in our experience.

With the Pythagoreans one passes to a different world of thought. They came to believe that the world is somehow made out of numbers. This number-physics, upon which we are regrettably ill-informed, seems to have resulted from an important new observation: that the musical scale is basically numerical. Now music was thought by Pythagoras and his followers to have special powers over the soul; and so the soul and then the whole world were gradually envisaged as being numerical too. This theory may imply an important presupposition which was certainly made at about the same time by Heraclitus: that it is the structure of things, rather than their material, that gives them their real unity. The Pythagorean theory, however, as opposed to that of Heraclitus, imposed upon the unperceived structure of things a form that is startling and in many cases highly improbable. A thunderstorm or a lump of earth, for example, does not seem at all numerical. The details were obscure even to Aristotle, yet on no interpretation is the strangeness of the idea just whimsical or gratuitous or senselessly dogmatic. On the contrary, the whole
theory seems to have been ultimately inferred from a valid discovery about the nature of music. Admittedly it is the immediate consequence of a very unscientific induction—if music, why not all things? Yet the over-bold induction is a favourite luxury of pre-Aristotelian thought. There was also, of course, a mystical and professedly non-rational side to Pythagoras and his school which undoubtedly aided any move beyond mere common-sense.

Another whose interests were not wholly scientific was Xenophanes. Though many of his ideas were inspired by hatred of the dogmatic anthropomorphism of Homeric theology, he also advanced certain physical explanations developed from popular beliefs, such as that men are made of earth and water, or the heavenly bodies of burning clouds. One of his theories, of the periodic drying-up of the sea on the evidence of marine fossils found inland, shows commendable observation and method. Others are rather absurd—for example, eclipses are caused by the sun wandering off into a region of the earth uninhabited by men. Yet in view of Xenophanes’ undoubted acuteness in other respects these are probably to be explained not as gratuitous assumptions of the utterly improbable, as most critics have taken them to be, but as ironical parodies of the excessive dogmatism and naive theourisation of the Milesians. That he would not have departed needlessly from common-sense is suggested by his epistemological caution: ‘Seeming is wrought over all things’, he wrote, and ‘no man knows or ever will know the truth about the gods and what I say about all things’ (both from fr. 34). Here he was giving new and clear expression to an idea popular from at least the time of Homer onwards, that man is fallible and that only gods have complete knowledge. This reserve had been jettisoned, with the Olympian gods themselves, by the Milesian philosophers. Xenophanes’ counter-rejection of Milesian dogmatism is not easy to reconcile with the apparently confident description of his own rather peculiar deity. Yet the concept of one motionless god seems to me to have been determined by taking the very antitheses of the objectionable characteristics of the Olympians. Xenophanes perhaps did not intend to claim complete positive certainty here; but in his negative rejection of the Homeric description there was no reservation. That was presumably because he had proved this point by unanswerable argument, showing the inconsistency and absurdity of the anthropomorphic position: if cattle could draw they would draw their gods as cattle, and so on. Thus I infer that for Xenophanes certainty could after all be achieved about those truths, perhaps in his view only negative ones, which could be demonstrated by logic or reasoning. This is important because it paved the way for Parmenides’ dogmatic confidence in the truth of his own logical conclusions, which from the point of view of common-sense were improbable in the extreme.

Before Parmenides, however, came the important figure of Heraclitus. He was the first Greek philosopher whom we know to have made explicit reference to the unseen as something vital to apprehend. ‘The unapparent connexion is stronger than the apparent one’, he said in fr. 54, referring to the Logos common to all things. This connexion, this Logos, is accessible to all men but is not superficially evident. It is to be inferred as a result of intelligent reflexion on the evidence of the senses. It is the formular or structural constituent of objects, that which provides their essential unity by connecting evident opposites through measured and regulated interaction. This structural unity, which is closely related to a single material, fire, replaces the genetical unity of the Milesians. Heraclitus seems to have been the first to stress as a philosophical principle that the evident, the obvious, incoherent as it may seem on second thoughts, nevertheless leads men to the unseen, unevident truth. It is the soul, using the evidence provided by the senses, that apprehends the unseen Logos. The senses were not rejected by Heraclitus; rather he saw that their message has to be subjected to critical thought before it can lead to the real nature of things: ‘Eyes and ears are bad witnesses for men if men have souls that do not understand their language’ (fr. 107). The Logos is not, in fact, contrary to sensation, it is implicit in it
and explicative of it. Significant perception is probably caused by a physical contact between soul and object, by means of the fiery Logos-element in each. This Logos is hidden, partly because fools are rightly kept from the truth and more importantly because otherwise the opposed or ἀληθορμένον aspect of things, on which their unity also depends, would be endangered. Wise men must ‘expect the unexpected’ (fr. 18). Heraclitus required much more than the negative kind of conviction that we assigned to Xenophanes, and he made certainty of a quasi-logical kind positive by giving it unseen, but not antinatural or in this sense improbable, objects. His dogmatism here is thus less arbitrary than that of the Milesians, since by paying some attention to psychology and epistemology he had outlined a possible relationship between men and an unseen truth that was now explicitly recognised as such.

So far I have not mentioned the famous opinion attributed to Heraclitus from Plato onwards: that everything in this world is in a state of continuous, and therefore often invisible, flux. This plainly involves a supposition which outstrips the evidence of the senses. If Heraclitus really thought this, it would be the second major case—the doubtful innumerable worlds in Anaximander being the first—of an apparently arbitrary transgression of the bounds of common-sense. I do not count Pythagorean number-theory here, since that arose naturally if illegitimately from a genuine observation. Of course the theory of continuous flux, likewise, has a real connexion with sense-evidence; but it goes beyond the senses and in many instances, unlike the Pythagorean theory, directly contradicts them. Why Heraclitus should have accepted this kind of improbability, and how far he really did so, is a problem that calls for a brief digression.

How we are to interpret his categorical statement that the senses are good witnesses provided the soul understands their language? Perpetual flux is not necessarily excluded by this proposition, since the language of the senses might still be able to reveal that a kind of stability, namely the Logos, lies behind the flux. But what of the continuous flux itself: do our senses really tell us, in any language, that all phenomenal objects are constantly changing at every moment of time? The answer is, surely, No. They suggest precisely what was so frequently emphasised by the Greek poets, that all except the gods are ephemeral and that change overtakes everything else in the end. Some natural objects, mountains for example, might seem permanent enough, yet even these can be battered by earthquakes and scoured by water and fire. Yet for periods such things evidently do remain stable and unchanged, and the senses clearly suggest that objects like rocks or tables are not changing at every single moment. But, it may be argued, may not Heraclitus have made a bold induction from sense-objects that undoubtedly do change all the time, to the effect that all things change all the time? After all, he did not scruple to assume that, since pairs of objects are internally connected, all the separate pairs must be externally connected with each other. Yet it may seem doubtful whether in the present case there was any effective motive for the loose induction of literally universal change, and in particular whether the things that do continuously change were of a kind to suggest such an inference. Rivers, probably animal organisms, fire: these are the things that seem to have struck Heraclitus as being in strictly continuous change, while a large part of Nature stands on the other side to testify that although all or most objects eventually change, while some change all the time, there are such things as blocks or pauses in many parts of the cosmic battlefield. What seems to have impressed Heraclitus, though, in the notorious rivers of fr. 12, was the underlying regularity of their flow rather than, or at least as much as, the significant or surprising quality of their constant change itself. Fire is a peculiarly important material, since Heraclitus describes the whole world-order as an ever-living fire. Yet parts of this cosmic fire are continuously being extinguished (fr. 30); parts of it are explicitly described as turning—for a time—into earth (fr. 31). Thus it is wrong to say that for Heraclitus all things individually are made out of fire and are therefore in constant change; it is the world-order as a whole that
is a fire, of which parts are temporarily extinguished but of which the whole manifests the regulated change that is so clearly exemplified in the process of combustion. Neither fire nor rivers, therefore, significant as they undoubtedly were, provide an adequate basis for precisely the kind of illegitimate generalisation required for the assumption of literally universal flux. Nor do the invisible changes later mentioned by Melissus (fr. 8), perhaps with reference to Heraclitus, provide sufficient motive for the assumption of constant and universal changes. The iron ring can be worn away—but by rubbing with the finger. Does this imply that iron is necessarily always being rubbed, and therefore always changing? Or in terms of opposites, the hard becomes the soft and vice versa; but need this transition have been continuous, for Heraclitus, in order to explain their essential unity? No: it may be spasmodic, so long as it is inevitable, just as the τροπαία or turnings of the world-masses of fr. 31, fire, water and earth, which effect their interconnexion and unity, are probably envisaged as occurring discontinuously in different parts of the cosmos. From the modern scientific point of view it is admittedly both natural and more economical to make change not merely ultimately inevitable but strictly continuous; but Heraclitus in his time was thinking of natural changes under the metaphorical guise of War or Strife, a vital stimulant which could seem then to be intermittent in its effects.

Such are some of the internal difficulties in the attribution to Heraclitus of universal and continuous flux. Yet the fact remains that this attribution was made by Plato himself and accepted by all subsequent writers of antiquity. That is a most important fact, perhaps a critical one. If Plato was being accurate here, then Heraclitus must be accepted as having departed radically and from the point of view of logic unnecessarily from the kind of world-picture acceptable to common-sense. Most of his contemporaries would have hotly denied that literally everything in their experience was constantly changing; they would have found the concept of invisible flux repellent. They must have found it more absurd, indeed, than some of the dogmas of the Milesians: things might ultimately be made out of air, although they do not appear to be, since air evidently can assume queer and unexpected forms, and at least the hypothesis has the advantages of explaining an underlying material unity. But literally constant and ubiquitous flux seems unnecessary even for the different kind of unity that Heraclitus was seeking to reveal, and nothing but faulty logic argues, and that but weakly, that everything must be changing all the time as opposed to changing ultimately or some of the time. In fact the difference between these two conceptions, though important in its effect upon the world of common-sense, is largely one of emphasis, which is why I suspect that Plato was able to give a misleading picture. I do not believe that Heraclitus himself was likely to have posited constant and universal physical change, though this idea was one that could easily be derived from his emphasis on the inevitability and regularity of change and one that was so derived at least by the time of Plato’s extremist mentor Cratylus. At all events Heraclitus’ concern with strife, fire, rivers, and change between opposites was enough to suggest him rather than any other Presocratic thinker as the apostle of impermanence and flux.

Against the apostle of impermanence Plato set the apostle of rest. Parmenides initiated a radically new line of thought by which the evidence of the senses must be utterly rejected in favour of a concept of Being which arose solely from the working of the mind on a single premise, ‘It is’. This led to the conclusion that there is only a homogeneous mass of Being, and therefore no differentiation in the real world. The senses, therefore, are utterly mistaken. Now from the standpoint of common-sense this conclusion is completely improbable and indeed utterly nonsensical. The unseen world discovered by Parmenides was as different as it could be from the evident world of our experience. Even more clearly than Heraclitus, Parmenides told the ordinary mortal that the real, philosophical truth made his activities look very foolish—for reasons which he probably would not understand. At the same time we must clearly recognise that the Eleatic conclusion about Being was the direct
result of a logical process of inference—admittedly an incorrect one—and that it was logic alone that led Parmenides to overthrow the world of common-sense. He formulated the choice that the philosopher must make if mind and senses are opposed: he must abandon the comfortable world of the senses and plunge into one that is not only unperceived but also, if necessary, completely improbable.

Apart from the Eleatics themselves, philosophers were utterly dismayed by Parmenides' conclusion and refused to accept it in its entirety. They were consequently forced to make compromises with the senses, compromises which involved highly complicated accounts of the natural world but which avoided, on the whole, the grossly improbable. It was Empedocles who first attempted to preserve some part of the world of appearances while accepting the Eleatic rejection of Not-Being. He detected four root-materials, fire, air, water and earth, which do not come-to-be or perish—and thus they preserve the inviolability of Being—but combine in different proportions, together with the motive substances Love and Strife, to give rise to physical objects. He also envisaged a four-fold cycle of the whole sphere of Being, according to the amount of Love or Strife that was active within it. To understand this unseen order of Nature men must be selective in the use of their senses; they must 'comprehend each thing in the way in which it is clear' (fr. 3, 15). Even so mortal knowledge is limited—though Empedocles, like Parmenides, evaded this irksome restriction by placing himself in a state of divine revelation. Now although Empedocles' account abolished the major improbabilities of Parmenides' Way of Truth, and to a considerable extent reinstated the world of our experience, it nevertheless included a great deal, in the four stages of Love and Strife with the corresponding intermediate cycle of animal evolution, that has the appearance of being purely speculative and arbitrary. This appearance is deceptive, however; for he proposed this cyclical complication for a very good reason, to give the plural world a Parmenidean unity. Having envisaged a stage at which everything except Strife was mixed up in a homogeneous and unified sphere clearly modelled on Parmenides' Being, Empedocles could not make this unity an initial cosmogonical state, since that might seem to involve coming-to-be. He therefore made it a periodic stage in a never-ending cycle. For since there had to be two contrary motive substances there had also to be an opposite condition to the unified stage, one in which Strife was completely in control; and there had to be two transitional periods. To fill the evolutionary periods corresponding with these Empedocles was persuaded to include such things as solitary limbs wandering about disconnected from bodies, and monsters like man-faced oxen-progeny. It is important to see that all these rather quaint ideas, far removed as they were from the world of common-sense, were initially imposed upon Empedocles by the demands of symmetry in working out his cyclical scheme, itself necessitated by his premises of essential unity and no becoming. Doubtless he was encouraged in his evolutionary theories, like Anaximander before him, by a strong interest in the origin of living creatures; but the point I wish to stress is that the major 'improbabilities' of the Empedoclean system were not chosen gratuitously but were the result, as was the case with Parmenides too, of following an initial axiom to its apparently logical conclusions.

It is notable that after Parmenides far more attention is paid to perception and the relation between mind and senses; for the anti-Eleatic reaction was based on the conviction that the perceived world can be valid, provided that it can be satisfactorily related to a single unperceived metaphysical structure. New ideas on perception, stimulated by increasing medical interest in the fifth century B.C., occasionally influenced theories on the nature of external reality; but more frequently theories of perception were themselves tailored to fit prior beliefs about the necessary nature of the world as a whole—a procedure rather typical of the a priori tendencies of Greek thinking. Empedocles, himself a medical man of a kind, was able to support his assumption of the conditional validity of the senses by his theory of pores and effluences. This theory, apparently elaborated from an observation
by Alcmaeon of Croton, appeared to give a solid physical basis to the evidence of the senses while still allowing for error. It is, of course, a special form of the assumption of physical contact between common elements in the psyche and the outside world which is seen in Heraclitus and also in Parmenides’ *Way of Seeming*. Even though the theory may seem at first sight rather improbable, rather repugnant to common-sense, yet like the Pythagorean number-theory it was ultimately based upon valid observation; and unlike that theory it was developed to corroborate the world presented by the senses, or at least some important aspects of it. It must further be remembered that any detailed account of sensation itself necessarily includes much that is far from obvious. Sensation confronts us with the evident by means that are quite un-evident, and all descriptions of it, even modern ones, contain conceptions that are unfamiliar, often improbable, and certainly far removed from the normal sphere of common-sense.

Empedocles’ near-contemporary Anaxagoras likewise tried to circumvent the Eleatic elenchus by a pluralist theory allied with the assumption that apparent coming-to-be is caused by the aggregation of eternally-existing forms of matter. He held that all the natural materials in the universe were to be found in different proportions in every one of the seeds, particles or lumps which combined to make up sensible objects. He was forced to suppose that every component particle, however small, contained a portion of every natural substance, and possessed the apparent character of that substance which had the predominant portion. This theory, even though it had the merit of explaining the mystery of nutrition—how bread, for example, can turn into bone and flesh—must have seemed inherently improbable, as well as intolerably complex, to the common-sense view of interested amateurs. Once again, however, we must recognise that a degree of improbability was inevitably entailed by the attempt to retain the sense-world at all—not in its most naïve aspect, but as giving a ‘sight of the unseen’, an ὄψις τῶν ἄδηλων (*fr. 21a*), and thus providing a basis for something like knowledge.

The Atomism of Leucippus and Democritus was simpler and therefore at first sight more attractive than Anaxagoras’ theory. Yet it followed Pythagoreanism in taking a momentous step away from the phenomenal world of common-sense: for all natural substances were completely abandoned. Sense-perception now had to be accepted as possessing nothing but secondary or derivative truth. It presented no part of the ultimately real, only the practically real. Yet the practical and the theoretical were closely connected; for only the intelligent man, he who knew that the effluxes of atoms from objects were liable to distortion both by the medium through which they passed and by the mind-atoms on which they ultimately impinged, could judge his own behaviour, and the world as a whole, more or less correctly. Thus, as for Heraclitus, a knowledge of the unapparent constitution of things was necessary for reasonable, and indeed for ethical, living. In Atomism, however, although the arrangement and shape of atoms were all-important for the differentiation of objects and the determination of their behaviour, the unity of things was due essentially to their material, as the Milesians had believed, and not to their structure as in Heraclitus and perhaps the Pythagoreans. This material type of unity, though admittedly easier to describe and superficially to comprehend, is ultimately harder to reconcile with the manifold world of experience. Once again, though, the theory depended from a chain of reasoning, one which owed much to that of the Eleatics. It was the apparent cogency of this reasoning that gave Democritus the confidence to proceed beyond the senses and establish, much more clearly than his predecessors, a sharp division between the ‘genuine’ knowledge of the mind operating on perception and the ‘bastard’ knowledge produced by the naïve acceptance of sense-data alone (*fr. 11*).

Meanwhile the Sophists had reacted in their own extreme way to what ordinary men no doubt considered, as the *Clouds* of Aristophanes suggests, as the extravagant absurdities of philosophers. Protagoras’ dictum ‘Man is the measure of all things, of the existence of
the things that are and of the non-existence of the things that are not' seems to me to be mainly directed against the improbabilities of the Eleatic creed: how, that is, can man be certain of a truth that excludes man? The world is anthropocentric and must be explained so as to take account of man and not to deny him; Being and Not-Being must be assessed not by remote intellectual rules but by the more human evidence of the senses. Gorgias too indirectly attacked the theoretical extremism of the physical systems, and he too held that certainty was confined to things within men's immediate reach. These Sophists made the attitude of ordinary men the basis of a scepticism that damaged all metaphysical systems and left the individual as the only valid arbiter. In this they were creating, it may be said, a new kind of improbability; but to them human affairs were all-important, and philosophy and religion were strongly criticised because they were other-worldly, they focused attention on objects that were unseen, indemonstrable, and almost intolerably remote.

An abnormal representative of the Sophistic tradition was Socrates. Like the Sophists he turned from scientific dogmatism to the study of man. He did so not only because of the complexities and inconsistencies of current physical theories, but also because these failed to explain the world in terms of soul or reason, for Socrates the only possible principle of order. His interest in man, therefore, was quite distinct from that of the Sophists, since he thought the important thing to be not practical virtue so much as purity and efficiency of the soul. This was a development of a Pythagorean idea. In metaphysics, too, Socrates made an important contribution, as Aristotle saw, by his realisation that the objects of philosophy must be definitions or common factors and not isolated concrete instances. This had already been felt to some extent by the Presocratic physicists, but they were still prone to infer from one or two conspicuous cases instead of considering the relevant quality of all similar examples. Now when Plato came to promote Socratic definitions into separate metaphysical entities, he was motivated not so much by the confusion of earlier physical theories as by the apprehension that their object, the external world, was notably changeable, particularly according to Cratylus' extreme brand of Heracliteanism, and therefore that definitions immanent in matter were no longer a possible object of unchanging knowledge. And Plato, like Socrates, accepted the existence of unchanging knowledge as axiomatic. Thus the Sophists rejected the complex improbabilities of the physicists by refusing to attempt to explain the physical world at all; Socrates followed suit, but in turning from the practical to the psychic aspect of man, and in correlating coherence with the operation of mind, he perpetrated what seems from one point of view to be the grave new improbability of teleology; and finally Plato was led rather like Parmenides to reject the sensible world as the object of philosophical inquiry in favour of a remote unseen reality quite opposed to anything suggested by common-sense, this time of Form-causes which had no intelligible way of causing anything. Plato's rejection of the sense-world was more moderate than Parmenides', however, since he evidently felt that this world, though not fully real, somehow partook of reality and was a kind of poor relation of the real world of Forms. But while Parmenides' Way of Seeming may suggest that he felt some compunction in abandoning the world of common-sense, Plato accepted its ontological degradation almost without apology, certainly without explicit discussion; for by his time the secondary status of common-sense was more or less taken for granted. He too was supported by logic, in his case primarily the logic of the argument from the existence of unchanging knowledge. Yet it was evidently not only the examination of his logic but also the application of a sturdy scientific common-sense that led Aristotle, not unlike the pluralist successors of Parmenides, to react against the excesses of idealism and restore the phenomenal world to something like its proper place in man's schematisation of his experience.

Now an important advantage of the supposition that the true reality is an unseen one, closely related to but not identical with the sensed world, was that knowledge of this kind
of object, for instance the Logos of Heraclitus or the definitions of Socrates, is not susceptible to an objection that may be aimed at so-called knowledge of phenomena: namely that different men have different experiences of the same physical event, so that their ‘knowledges’ contradict each other. This difficulty was a commonplace of the new comparative ethnology and sociology, and its consequences were drawn in drastic fashion by the Sophists. The theoretical worlds of philosophy, on the other hand, claimed a kind of reality which, once comprehended, could not be doubted and was the same for all. Parmenides equated knowledge with Being itself: you can only validly say or think what is. Unfortunately his Being excluded the sense-world, and so knowledge became completely divorced from sense-evidence and utterly contradicted essential parts of man’s nature. The post-Eleatic pluralists, therefore, were at last compelled to give a detailed account of man’s apprehension of the world, so as to lay a firm foundation for knowledge of the new and more complex type of unseen reality that was designed to replace the abhorrent Eleatic plenum. Parmenides had founded his knowledge on logic, and any rival type had to be at least as strongly based as his. But in fact his conclusions were attacked not in their logic, which was at first broadly accepted, but by recourse to a seemingly more direct type of knowledge founded upon the assumption of physical contact between the psyche and its external environment. There are many difficulties in all this, but none in my view surpasses that of the unquestioning confidence subsequently manifested by Socrates and Plato themselves in the very fact of absolute knowledge. Here Socrates accords not with the Sophists but with the dogmatic physicists, though he did not follow them in giving knowledge the basis of a physical contact between soul-stuff and perceived object. For although he and Plato accepted knowledge as a datum, no full-scale attempt to describe its nature is known before Plato’s Theaetetus, though the problem had been touched on in the Charmides, Euthydemus, Meno and Cratylus. Even in the Theaetetus Plato merely discussed an incomplete set of possibilities, somewhat crudely formulated, with the real intention of illuminating not the nature of knowledge itself so much as that of its objects. We apparently have to accept, then, that Socrates and Plato adopted and maintained a narrowly empirical approach to knowledge, by which it was treated as a self-evident psychological fact. This attitude, which contrasts so oddly with the anti-empiricism of some of the conclusions Plato drew from the premise about knowledge, is akin to the naive assuredness of unphilosophical man and lacks even the degree of self-analysis implied by the sayings of a Heraclitus, ‘I sought—for myself’ and ‘You would not find the soul’s boundaries however far you went; so deep a Logos has it’ (fr. 45 and 101).

Now the knowledge which for Socrates was virtue was primarily knowledge of one’s own soul and its activities. This knowledge did not have to extend far beyond the human moral environment, and Socrates specifically rejected the knowledge aimed at by the Presocratics and with it the kind of ‘improbability’ with which we have been chiefly concerned so far. The fundamental idea of the Socratic doctrine, though this had an appearance of novelty and a genuinely new ethical application, already had a long history. ‘Virtue is knowledge’ is implicit, for example, in its wider aspect, in fr. 16 of Solon: ‘Most difficult is it to apprehend the unapparent measure of judgement, which alone holds the limits of all things’. The idea is more fully developed in Heraclitus, for whom the knowledge required was one of the true plan or structure of all things: ‘The wise is one thing, to be acquainted with true judgement, how all things are steered through all’ (fr. 41). But Socrates, who spurned the intricacies of physics and sought only for professedly simple teleological explanations in terms of mind or soul, limited the knowledge that man must acquire to the narrow confines of human society. For science this restriction was damaging indeed. Yet it did at least have the effect of placing what was judged to be the highest kind of knowledge within the possible reach of the majority of men, and thus making philosophy less exclusive than before. Plato reversed this potentially profitable trend by
making knowledge accessible only to the few—as it had been in the hey-day of the sophos, the divinely-inspired sage or poet, and as it had been for Parmenides and Heraclitus. Plato made knowledge the perquisite of the intellectuals, of the Guardians, for example, in the Republic. In a way this conception revived the valuable idea of Heraclitus that knowledge of self cannot be divorced from knowledge of the principles behind one's total physical environment. Yet whereas in Heraclitus the idea was compatible with a rudimentary scientific attitude, Plato's application of it was ultimately no less anti-scientific, and entailed more questionable assumptions, than the Socratic view of knowledge, since in its extreme form it led to the conclusion that things in this sub-lunar world are no possible object for knowledge or scientific study at all.

Then at last Aristotle re-directed knowledge towards the common-sense world of our experience. He identified its object as Form, as Plato had done, but as Form that is immanent in natural objects and therefore not unnatural or other-worldly. As a scientist he tried to do what Plato had avoided or at least perverted: to show how mind makes contact with natural objects through their specific forms. But his detailed psychological theories were unfortunately so difficult, and apparently so vague at important points, that they left many people, including the Stoics, dissatisfied. They, the Stoics, were in addition temperamentally and logically averse from the transcendent conception of deity in Aristotle as in Plato, and so they returned to Heraclitus' idea of a divine principle or Logos immanent in things. This allowed them to retain the new teleology, yet it seemed to provide a more solid foundation for ethics as well as a better explanation of perception and knowledge. To this extent the early Stoic improved even on Aristotle in returning towards philosophical probability and a real world not utterly repugnant to common-sense. Yet the workings of reason, supported sometimes by irrational traditions, produced fresh affronts to rationalism, such as their acceptance of divination and their belief in cosmic recurrence. Such deviations from the expected were less extreme, however, than those entailed by the truly anti-scientific attitude of the in many ways admirable Epicurus. With his atomic swerve and his principle of indifferent alternative explanations for natural events Epicurus established the physically improbable as preferable to the psychologically insoluble. The swerve made nonsense of the observable physical law that heavy objects fall in a straight line, partly at least with the purpose of reconciling Atomism with the inadequately-investigated phenomenon of free will. Alternative explanations, however attractive they may seem to a modern scientist, further undermined the study of the principles of cause and effect—which had already taken punishment from Plato's propensity for myth—and so once again subordinated physics to ethics in a way which would have warmed the cockles of Socrates' heart.

My survey of the continuing oscillation between the demands of common-sense and the extremities of philosophical theorisation would be incomplete without some further assessment of a concept which more than any other inhibited the potentialities of classical Greek science: I mean the concept of teleology, the idea that the whole world is somehow fulfilling a purpose formed by a superhuman mind. Teleology is a luxuriant offshoot of the anthropomorphic tendency which Greek philosophy inherited from mythology and religion and never completely threw off. In popular religion it was the gods, Zeus above all, who ruled the world by the application of larger-than-life human motives. In Anaximander change was kept within bounds by the sociological metaphor of retribution for excess, and for Heraclitus the motive of natural change was the anthropomorphic stimulus of War or Strife, to which Empedocles, following the tradition of Hesiod's Theogony, added Love. Even Aristotle, when rational induction broke down, fell back again on the metaphor of Eros. After Socrates it was only in Aristotle and his immediate followers, including Theophrastus and the Stoics, that this kind of anthropocentric rationalisation was not strongly detrimental to scientific inquiry. The great logician occasionally indulged in a
masterly illogicality, and according to Aristotle the purpose being fulfilled in the world was one formed by no mind but unconsciously pursued by Nature herself. This allowed Aristotle to proceed with physics. In Socrates and Plato the teleological principle had been applied more damagingly. The causes of events were to be explained by describing not the mechanism by which they occurred but why it was best that they should do so. This summary is necessarily an over-simplification, yet it remains broadly true that Socrates and Plato tended to go straight for ultimate a priori causes like soul or the Form of Good and to ignore the detailed study of most physical events. Concomitant causes could still be studied in the light of exalted metaphysical principles, but we have only to look at the Timaeus to see what the results were likely to be. Aristotle’s scala naturae at least allowed mechanical causation to be studied empirically at the lower levels of the natural progression.

Arising as it did from common anthropomorphic attitudes, teleology was no new discovery by Socrates but had gradually developed among his predecessors and contemporaries. Thus by about 425 B.C. Diogenes of Apollonia could write of his basic substance, air, as follows: ‘Without intelligence it could not be so divided up that it has the measures of all things—of winter and summer, day and night, rains and winds and fair weather. The other things, too, if one wishes to consider them, one would find disposed in the fairest possible way’ (fr. 3). This idea of the measure of natural cycles leads back again to Heraclitus. To him, too, the regularity of the world, underlying the superficially incoherent plurality of experience, had suggested a metric or regulative constituent of things which was described as steering them, perhaps as intelligent. That the world was interpenetrated by a kind of divine life was an assumption certainly made by Thales; and it was against this kind of background that the explicit idea of mind disposing all things gradually developed. Heraclitus exemplifies a transitional stage at which cosmic intelligence simply produces a predetermined regularity, much as in Anaximander the principle of Dike ensured the balance of opposed world-constituents. Dike and Logos are structural laws, from one point of view, determining events as it were from behind, rather than a purpose or end drawing them on from in front. They had a predecessor in the Moira or destiny which even the gods could not contravene. But it was when Anaxagoras called the Logos-type of regulative constituent ‘Mind’ that Socrates became excited, because mind implies cosmic purpose rather than mere regularity-principle. Thus although the seeds of Socratic and Platonic teleology are present in the Presocratic period, there is an essential difference: for the directive constituent in Heraclitus, Anaxagoras and Diogenes is still a physical material, and its results can be studied physically; and that which connects it with consciousness or intelligence is chiefly its regulative power, not the ability to shape higher purposes for men and the world in Plato’s sense. It is for this reason that embryonic, Presocratic teleology is not necessarily anti-scientific, as opposed to Platonic developed teleology which to a large extent is. To put the point in another way: such things as the orderliness of the seasons had suggested to the Greeks the operation of some superhuman power. While this was envisaged as a regulative tendency immanent in certain kinds of matter the scientific study of the external world could proceed, though under handicap. But when the idea of purpose was made explicit, and when, because of the development of the idea of immaterial Being, purpose was finally divorced from matter, then new temptations to despise the demands of sense and common-sense made themselves known to the thinkers of the fourth and later centuries before Christ.

To summarise: Greek thinkers soon discovered that the preconception of unity in the world called for a reality-principle that lay behind phenomena. Yet even in the mythologising period departures from common-sense, from what could be easily explained in terms of elements of experience, had been avoided to a surprising degree. Similarly in philosophical investigations of the underlying unity the evidence of the senses, though subjected to drastic interpretation, was not lightly contradicted. The development of the promising
idea of structural unity was rudely terminated by Parmenides’ logical bombshell, which established a neat and indeed seemingly inescapable piece of theoretical analysis at the expense of the entire world of the senses. Subsequent thinkers fought hard to resuscitate the world that we think we live in, and began to examine the nature of sensation as an aid to demonstrating a new type of unperceived unity. Their theories inevitably became very complex here, and they provoked a humanistic reaction which, by intensifying the anthropomorphising inclination of the Greek mind, led Socrates towards an extreme form of teleology. This, together with the inadequately-investigated assumption of the possibility of stable and unchanging knowledge, led on to the re-establishment of a bizarre though fruitful ontology in the Platonic theory of Forms. Aristotle and the Stoics, however, rejected this kind of abstract improbability, and with certain lapses reconstituted an unseen reality that accorded with and was firmly based on experience. Thus throughout the history of classical Greek thought— with two apparent Presocratic exceptions, one or both of which, as I suggested, may be due to misinterpretation—we find that serious improbabilities from the standpoint of common-sense, itself based upon the acceptance of sensation, were only tolerated when they seemed to be entailed by the self-evident: by what was evident to perception, like the world as a whole, or to reason, like the nature of Being, or to intuition, like the fact of knowledge. And always there was a consequent endeavour to overcome the improbability, to move back to a view of reality compatible with what men directly experience. This common-sense resilience is an important part of what is often mentioned but seldom examined, the clarity of Greek thought.¹

Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

¹ A prototype of this paper was read to the conference of classical societies held in Cambridge in 1958, and subsequently to the Harvard classical society. It has greatly benefited from the comments of Professor W. K. C. Guthrie and Professor Z. Stewart. In expressing my deep gratitude to them I must emphasise that they do not necessarily agree with everything I have written.
DOUBLE REPRESENTATION IN THE STRATEGIA

With the simultaneous recognition by Jameson1 and Westlake2 of the importance of Plutarch, Nikias 15.2 in the tangled problems of election to the strategia, the discussion has entered a new phase,3 and the problems are clarified by Professor Dover's article.4 It is now clear that the formulae which have been thought to indicate 'chairmanship' are not reliable guides, but there remains some force in Jameson's contention that double representation of tribes in the strategia arises rather from electing one general ε διάνυσσα to provide a chairman than from any desire to ensure fairness to candidates in a tribe where the post was monopolised over a long period by one candidate. After Dover's article, cases of double representation are left as our sole material for looking at the problem, and my only aim here is to examine some other years where double representation seems possible. I include some negative results and start with one.

PHORMIO

Despite the weight of the names who have accepted Pandionis as Phormio's tribe, I agree with Hignett and Jameson that the case is not made out. A new point may be offered in the other scale. A new fragment of a manumission-list of circa 320 (Agora I 3183 = Hesperia xxviii (1959), 215, l. 253) names a Καλλίας Καλλιάδου Πιανίνες. Καλλίας Καλλιάδου, strategos in 432/431 or 431/430 or both,5 is of unknown deme. Busolt6 tentatively associated him with PA 7849 Καλλίας Καλλιάδου Αἰξώνεως (Tribe VII), also of the late fourth century, but this would create an unlikely double representation of Tribe VII in years when double representation for Tribe V is already clear, since Proteas of Aixone is attested for both years.7 The new information raises the possibility that he was from Paania (Tribe III). Since he is no nonentity and has always been regarded as the most likely proposer of the Kallias-decree (ATL ii D 1–2) and of the renewals of the treaties with Rheaion and Leontini (GHI 57–8),8 it is not impossible that he was general seven years earlier, and he provides a seven-letter alternative to Phormio as strategos from Pandionis in 439/438 (ATL ii D 18, Hill-Meiggs-Andrewes B 62). If Kallias is from Tribe III, certain consequences will follow: (a) if Kallias is strategos in 433/432, there is either double representation in both Tribe III and Tribe V or Phormio is not from Tribe III or Phormio was not general in this year; (b) if Kallias is strategos in 432/431, there is either double representation in both Tribe III and Tribe V or Phormio is not from Tribe III. This point is not to be overstressed. Kallias and Kalliaides are both common names, naturally associated, but together they raise a presumption for Pandionis which seems strong enough to set against the still rather tenuous evidence (Paus. i 23.10) that Phormio belonged to that tribe. We

---

1 TAPA lxxvi (1955), 63 ff.
2 Hermes lxxxiv (1956), 110 ff.
3 Earlier discussions are lucidly summarised by Hignett, History of the Athenian Constitution, 348 ff. Ehrenberg, Sophocles and Pericles, 77 ff., does not add much to his earlier position (AJP lxvi (1945), 113 ff.). Sealey, Proceedings of the African Classical Association i (1958), 65–8, comes down against Jameson, 'a little reluctantly'.
4 JHS lxxix (1960), 61 ff.
5 For the chronological problem, see Gomme, HCT i 222–4.
6 Philologus 1 (1891), 86 ff.
7 Sealey, op. cit., is the latest scholar to accept such a 'double-double', for 431/430, but his reasoning is not cogent, for it depends both on assigning Phormio to Tribe III and on attributing the campaign of Thuc. ii 58 to 431/430. Few would wish to say that 'double-doubles' are impossible, but the present evidence does not impose them.
8 Against ATL iii 276–277, it seems unlikely that an Athenian decree-prescript can have a live archon, a live grammateus, a live epistates, living ambassadors, and a dead proposer. The original treaty with Leontini was certainly proposed by ——.]27.
must still face the possibility that Phormio is not from Pandionis. The consequences this has for 440/439 and 430/429 need not be developed here.

426/425

All discussions of the strategoi of this year before Sealey⁹ depend on the acceptance of what seems to have become an article of faith,¹⁰ that the battle of Tanagra and all Nikias’ extensive operations of the summer against Melos, in support of Tanagra, and up the Locrian coast (Thuc. iii 91) all fall into the archon-year of 427/426. Remarkable consequences have followed; a board composed of the ‘War-Party’ has been a popular theory, and it has been generally agreed that Nikias missed election in 426/425. The view, however, will not stand. Athenaeus 218b dates the battle of Tanagra to the archontship of Euthydemos, and this certainly means 426/425 (Diodorus xii 58.1 and the Acharnians hypothesis have the same error of name). There seems no reason to doubt this date, which gives far more time for Nikias’ operations against Melos. The strategoi of 427/426 and 426/425 can now be regrouped as follows.¹¹ (References are to Thucydides, if not otherwise stated.)

427/426—Nikias Nikηράτου Κυδανίδης (II) iii 51.1
   Νικόστρατος Δειτρέφους iii 75.1
   Ευριμέδυνος Θουκλέους iii 80.2
   Λάχης Μελιανώπου Αιξονείς (VII) iii 86
   Χαρονίδης Εὐφιλῆς iii 86 (killed iii 90)
   Δημοσθένης ’Αλκισθένους ’Αφιδναίος (IX) iii 91
   Προκλῆς Θεοδώρου iii 91

An unsatisfactory year from the point of view of our knowledge of tribal representation, with only three certainties. Wade-Gery has suggested¹² Σκαμβωνίδης (IV) as a demotic for Nikostratos, of which it can only be said that Nikostratos is a common name, but that there is nothing against it, and Μαρρανώς (III) for Eurymedon, which has a little more attraction, but on which see Gomme, HCT iii 627–8. To Gomme’s doubts, add the possibility that the Μαρρανώς of SEG x 227.38 may be a hellenotamias.

426/425—Nikias Nikηράτου Κυδανίδης (II) iii 91
   Ιππώνικος Καλλίου Αλωπεκῆθεν (X) iii 91
   Ιπποκράτης Αρίφωνος Χολαργεύς (V) SEG x 227.3
   Δημοσθένης ’Αλκισθένους ’Αφιδναίος (IX) iii 97
   Προκλῆς Θεοδώρου iii 98.5
   Λάχης Μελιανώπου Αιξονείς (VII) implied iii 103
   ’Αριστοτέλης Τιμοκράτους Θοραιεύς (X) iii 105.3
   ’Ιεροφών ’Αντιμνήστου iii 105.3

Up to this point, it seems fairly certain that we are dealing with the original board, but there are now a certain number of casualties to be replaced. Prokles is certainly dead (iii 98.5). Even allowing for Gomme’s justifiable doubts (ii 430–1) about the trial of

⁹ Op. cit., 82–7. Sealey and Jones (Athenian Democracy, 126, 159) have accepted the main point made here, but it still seems worth setting my observation out in full.
¹⁰ Beloch, Attische Politik, 302, Griechische Geschichte² ii. 2, 295; West, Classical Philology, xix (1924) 202; Gomme, HCT iii 718.
¹¹ Sealey’s lists should be compared. For 427/426, we are in agreement, except for demotics; his list for 426/425 omits Lamachos, Demostenes and Prokles. I see no good reason to doubt that the two latter were originally elected for 426/425. Sealey disbelieves in by-elections, because they are not attested in the literature, but I think that we are forced to assume them.
¹² CQ xxiv (1930), 34 n. 2 (from Ar. Wasp 81).
Laches, he is certainly replaced in the middle of an archon-year (iii 115.2) and not re-elected in either 425/424 or 424/423, so that a deposition is at least probable. As for Demosthenes, it is difficult to follow Gomme in referring the ἰδωρίας of iv 2.4 to an unlikely failure to secure re-election for 425/424 at a time when he has two or three months to go in office for 426/425, and it still seems easiest to suppose that he was in fact deposed in winter 426/425, re-elected for 425/424, and received his commission of iv 2.4 as strategos-elect.13 For these reasons some of the generals who follow may be regarded as possibly suffice.

Πυθόδωρος Ἰσολάχου
Σοφοκλῆς Σωστρατίδου
Εὐρυμέδων Ῥουκλέους
Σιμωνίδης
Λάμαχος Ξενοφάνους Ὀμῆν

iii 115
iii 115
iii 115
iv 7
Ar. Ach. 593 ff.

With thirteen generals attested for the year, the two depositions we have posited become necessary. Nor do I see how they can be cut down. The only really doubtful case is Lamachos, and this I would stand by. The theories which have been based on the belief that Acharnians 593–619 are last-minute additions are hardly respectable,14 but that does not alter the fact that the belief itself has strong grounds. The most likely interpretation of line 569, even if one does not accept Elmsley’s εἴτε τις ἐτοὶ ταξιριθύς τις ἢ τεχνομάχας ἄνη, which helps the metre enormously, is that Lamachos is a taxarch. The clear inference from lines 1073 ff. is that he is not a general. He is only that in 593–619, and I sympathise with those who find a deeper tone of indignation in these lines. The simplest explanation, without hypothesising winter-elections or early elections, is that Lamachos has been elected strategos at a by-election just before the play was produced, in a poorly attended assembly, at which the voters consisted, more or less, of κόκκινους τρεῖς.

What emerges from this reorganised list of strategoi for 426/425? Firstly, there is no need to deny that Nikias was on the board, and we can now scrap the considerable quantity of work which has been put into developing the consequences of his exclusion. Secondly, now that we have thrown the main weight of Athenian activity in 426 into the second half of the summer, there is no need to attach any special importance to the fact that it was Hippokrates who received the payment of 426/425, Pryt. II 4. With at least five generals very likely out of Athens, he may simply have been the senior (whatever that means) of those who remained. Thirdly, unless Hipponikos was deposed in autumn 426, and there is no reason whatsoever to assume this, there is a prima facie case for saying that the tribe Antiochis was represented on the board of 426/425 by two generals, Hipponikos and Aristoteles.

This may seem surprising, and the case for assuming that they both belong to Antiochis must be examined carefully. As far as Hipponikos is concerned, I think it will be agreed that he has now found his home in Alopeke. The publication of Hesperia v no. 10, line 110 (p. 400) really settled the matter, and a clearing-up operation on the contrary evidence will be found in BSA i (1955), 13–14. But I have since come to realise that there should never have been any doubt at all about the tribal affiliation of this family, since the anecdote in Plut. Aristides 5.6 presupposes that the family came from Antiochis. Aristides is left behind with his tribe to guard the battlefield at Marathon, and one of them, Kallias the didouchos, better known to the nineteen-fifties as the Peacemaker, indulged in lootings. Aristoteles is, I agree, less certain. The points which have been used to fix his tribal affiliation are these: (a) an ἔλεγχος Ὄπσεσίδων was strategos, early in the war, probably in

13 Treu, Historia v 427, treats it as certain that Demosthenes’ command automatically expired in autumn 426. This seems very hard to believe.

14 Müller-Strübing, Aristophanes und die historische Kritik, 498 ff.; Mayor, JHS lix (1939), 57 ff.
431/430\(^1\) (SEG x 226.6); (b) an Aristoteles was hellenotamias for Antiochis in 421/420 (ATL List 54); (c) an Aristoteles, probably the one who had been strategos under the Four Hundred (X. Hell. ii 3.46), occupies a place in the list of the Thirty (X. Hell. ii 3.2), which, if Loope's hypothesis is right, assigns him to Antiochis. These points are in descending order of value, but the first is nearly strong enough by itself. There are a certain number of names in -τέλης in fifth-century Athens and one in -μελης, but only one other general, Epiteles, who died in the 440's (IG ii 943.4). There may be two generals from the Archidamian War, one Θεοκλῆς Θοραείς, the other Ἀριστοτέλης Τιμοκράτους, but it seems unlikely. (So Gomme, HCT ii 417-18.)

If this case of double representation is accepted, it is nearly fatal to any theory which regards the practice as maintained for the purpose of being fair to the second man in a tribe. It leaves open the question of whether the aim was to provide a chairman or to do a man special honour. On either of these views, which of these two is ἐκ ἀπάντων? Let us not be surprised that one of them is, and not Nikias. This is only Nikias' second attested year in the strategia (possibly the third, but I would not like to say precisely where in the campaigning season of 427 the operations of iii 51.1 fall), and, against Plutarch's vague statement (Nikias 2.2) that Nikias was a general with Perikles and carried on many expeditions with him, we must set the silence of our other sources and the certainty that he was not general for Aigeis in 441/440, 439/438, 432/431 or 431/430. Aristoteles can at least be taken back to 431/430 as a general, and Professor Dover rightly reminds me that, although we can say that a fifth-century Athenian was prominent, we are hardly in a position to say that he was not. But on the whole, I incline to favour Hipponikos. Not previously known as strategos, he is nevertheless a person eminently suited in some ways to be first choice for the state's most powerful board. In a time when no one had made out any clear claim to succeed Perikles in his position, there may well have been a certain comfort in electing to high position men who were ἐκ τῶν μεγίστων οἰκίων, πλούσιοι γένει τε πράτοι (Eupolis F 117). If there are qualifications, the head of the Kerykes, the daidouchos (And. i 115) the πλουσιώτατος τῶν Ἑλλήνων (And. i 130; Lys. xix 48; Isocr. xv 31; Nepos Alc. ii 1) possessed them in full measure.

A word should perhaps be added on other possible tribal affiliations in this year. If replacements had to be found for Demosthenes (IX), Laches (VII) and Prokles and these alone, then it seems virtually certain that Lamachos (VI) is a replacement for Prokles and Prokles is also (VI), although there is no prosopographical support for it. Which of the others is suffict and which for Laches and which for Demosthenes, I would not like to say. Admittedly, Pythodoros is Laches' διαδοχός (iii 115) and there is a fifth-century Πυθόδωρος ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ (VII) (IG ii 335-51), but I doubt if this amounts to a demonstration. One identification which must be rejected is that of Gilbert and Busolt, who try to identify Sophokles with the member of the Thirty from Oineis. This will not do, not for Beloch's reasons, but because he is a colleague of Lamachos, this year and the next.

412/411

There is a case for supposing Phrynichos to be the most important member of the board of this year. He sails with the largest expedition, and is named first among its generals (viii 25). In viii 27 he is ὁ τῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγός, and, although he has colleagues, who have to be persuaded and not overruled, he does persuade them (viii 27.5). His troubles come later, when his powers of persuasion deteriorate. If it should turn out that

---

\(^1\) I am sure this is the year. The only obstacle is Wade-Gery's obiter assignment of IG ii 309 to this year (JHS liii (1933), 136), but this will not take much shifting. Wade-Gery has himself long abandoned it.

\(^8\) Philologus 1 (1891), 91.

\(^7\) Beiträge, 291.

\(^8\) Griechische Geschichte iii. 1 577 n. 1.

\(^9\) Griechische Geschichte ii. 2 264.
he was elected ἐξ ἀπάντων, he would be an interesting example of what might happen when the auctoritas of a man in this position was not sufficient to carry his views through, a situation not repeated to our knowledge until 356.

It is possible that he was ἐξ ἀπάντων, and it is perhaps worth while to put out the evidence, although it leads to no definite conclusion. Plut. Alc. 25 gives us his deme, Δειπραδιώτης (IV). The colleague I draw attention to is he who is named Σκηρωνίδης in all modern texts of Thucydides. This is a name of extreme rarity, though there seems to be a Σκηρων at Ephesus, but there is one other instance in Athens, a Σκηρωνίδης who proposes a decree in the 340’s at a meeting of the tribe Leonis (IV) ([Dem.] lviii 18). If the readings are secure in Thuc. viii 25.1, 54.3, and in [Dem.], there would be a very high probability of relationship, and consequently a distinct possibility that both generals came from the same tribe and that Phrynichos was ἐξ ἀπάντων in 412/411.

However, the readings are open to doubt. At viii 25.1 B, which in this book represents a completely distinct tradition, has Κιρωνίδου (a reading which has escaped the Oxford text); at viii 54.3 it has Κιρωνίδην, and is supported by E, F and M from the other family. Skiron is an unlikely patron for an Athenian, and Κιρωνίδης, although rare (I only know IG vii 385 from Oropos), is a perfectly respectable formation. On this evidence, editors of Thucydides viii should probably put Κιρωνίδου and Κιρωνίδην in the text.

In Dem. lviii 17, the sound tradition represented by SFQD is unanimously for Σκηρωνίδης, but A, erratic though it is, must be treated with respect, and it has Κερωνίδης which is a perfectly possible name. φιλέταις Κατώνιδης → φιλέταις Κερωνίδης is a plausible transition for scribes who know their mythology better than their Attic nomenclature. To read Κερωνίδης here would be venturesome, and there are too many Kiros about to make family relationship very likely, even if we had Kironides both in Thucydides and [Demosthenes]. Relationship depends on reading Σκηρωνίδης in both authors, and, were it not for my doubts about mythologically minded scribes, I would say that the readings confirmed one another. As it is, I do not know what to think.

405/404

First, a warning against excessive precision. Constitutional requirements may be waived under the stress of emergency, and neither the total number of generals nor their tribal affiliations may have been considered in the last years. It is possible that, when Xenophon says (Hill. ii 1.16) στρατηγοὺς πρὸς τοὺς ὑπάρχουσι προσέλθοντο he is obscuring the fact that the board as constituted after the Arginsean trial was slightly changed and that the total remained at ten for 405/404, but he does not say so, and the natural conclusion is that some laxity had set in. Nor is this likely to have been the first time. It is doubtful whether there were two vacancies to fill on the board of 414/413, when Menandros and Ethydemos were elected to help Nikias during the winter (Thuc. vii 16.1). They were needed and they were commissioned, and constitutional niceties may equally have been ignored in 405. 24

20 Num. Chron. 1880, 120.
21 Powell's apparatus suggests that P. Oxy. 2100 has Σκηρωνίδης here, but the original editors admitted that the reading was quite uncertain.
22 Isaeus viii is all about a Kiron. The reading K[e]n[œ]v in IG iii 592 has now been discarded by Raubitschek, Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis no. 382, in favour of K[i]n[œ] and there was never any certainty about the restoration in DAA no. 260, but the fifth-century existence of the name is guaranteed by DAA no. 14.
23 See, e.g., Gernet, Plaidyers Civils, i 19–21.

24 On this line of reasoning, it is perhaps by no means certain that there was originally double representation for 407/406. The MSS. of Diodorus xiii 69.3 say that Alcibiades chose Aedematus general himself. Even as amended, Diodorus puts the election of Aedematus after Alcibiades' return. However, Thrasylus appears with Aedematus here, and Xen. i 4.10 clearly makes his election contemporary with that of Alcibiades. Xen. i. 4.21 gives no clear indication of the date of the election of Aedematus.
Jameson\textsuperscript{25} has naturally felt the temptation to revive the possibility that Kleophon was \textit{strategos} in 405/404, which rests on the very flimsy ground of the scholion to \textit{Frogs} 679. Now that Vanderpool\textsuperscript{26} has shown that his father was a general, this certainly becomes more plausible. Jameson, however, proceeds: ‘To the disquieting thought that Kleophon was general must be added the possibility that he was \textit{ex hapanton}, for there would then be double representation from Oineis, with Kleophon and Tydeus. He also considers the possibility that it might have been Tydeus who was \( \varepsilon \acute{a} \pi\alpha\nu\tau\omega \). These possibilities have to be considered, and others will have felt the same temptations. It seems likely, however, that they must be discarded. Firstly, even if Kleophon was a general, Tydeus comes in by the abnormal route of X. \textit{Hell.} ii 1.16, that is, he was probably chosen on the spot because he was needed, and no one in Athens need have contemplated this possibility at the elections in the spring. Kleophon can have been elected in the normal way. Secondly, Lysias xiii 7 ff. seems to indicate that Kleophon was not general. The way to power for the oligarchs was to remove \( \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \delta\acute{e} \mu\omicron \ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \kappa\omicron \ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \ \sigma\tau\rho\alpha\tau\gamma\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \kappa\alpha\lambda \), and these categories seem clearly disjunctive. The first category is represented by Kleophon. His opposition to the oligarchs and removal are described in §§ 7–12, the opposition and removal of the generals and taxiaarchs in §§ 13–42. Kleophon is clearly distinguished from the generals and taxiaarchs, and, if he is a general, \( \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \delta\acute{e} \mu\omicron \ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \ ) \ has no clear point.

\textit{Christ Church, Oxford.}


\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Hesperia} xx (1952), 114 ff.
ATHENS AND EUBOEA

The remarkably well-preserved treaty with Chalcis has long formed a fixed point in Attic epigraphy, since it is confidently associated with Pericles' suppression of the Euboean revolt in 446 B.C.¹ But is this dating and interpretation really certain? From the decree itself we learn that it was modelled on similar arrangements for Eretria, of which fragments in Ionic script survive.² Now Hesychios records a decree, passed ἐπὶ Διφίλου, which regulated the seizure of hostages from the wealthiest Eretrian families. The simplest hypothesis is that both this decree and a parallel one for Chalcis preceded D 16 and 17.³ But this lands us in serious difficulties. If ἐπὶ Διφίλου gives the archon-date we must put the extant decrees in 442/441, which is inconveniently late for the orthodox view. The alternative is to separate Hesychios' decree from D 16 and 17, as Gomme suggested. There would then have been new trouble in Eretria three years after the settlement, which necessitated fresh recourse to hostages.⁴ Now if we once allow that Athens could take such drastic action in peacetime, what guarantee have we that the Chalcis Decree represents the settlement after armed revolt? It also might be an example of arbitrary Athenian intervention in the face of suspected disloyalty. In trying to save orthodoxy we have exposed the weakness of its basis. Another line of defence proves even more damaging. It is fair to suggest that ἐπὶ Διφίλου does not after all give the archon-date. Very few decrees before 421 are dated by the archon either in their prescript or internally.⁵ The normal dating is by the secretary of Council for a particular prytany. Thus in the Brea Decree (IG ii² 45, 15 f.) certain defence arrangements are dated [ἐπὶ - - - - ]το γραμματεύοντος. It is the secretary's name which often appears above the inscribed texts of decrees, sometimes with a heading that parallels Hesychios' Ἐρετριακὸς κατάλογος. Diphilos then may well have been secretary and not archon.⁶ Now we find a Diphilos serving as general in 413/412 and, since secretaries were chosen from men of distinction, what prevents us from identifying him as the secretary of the Eretrian measure? If we do this, however, we can hardly date it earlier than the late 420's.⁷ It is precisely in this period that we hear of Athenian inter-

¹ IG ii² 39+; now most conveniently studied in Athenian Tribute Lists ii D 17 (plate x). See Tod ii³ no. 42 (commentary on date, etc.) and p. 261.
² D 17, 42 f.: IG ii² 17+ (ATL ii D 16). See E. Schweigert, Hesp. vi (1937), 317 ff.
³ s.v. Ἐρετριακὸς κατάλογος: ἐπὶ Διφίλου ψήφισμα ἔγραφη ἐς Ἐρετρίας κατάλεξε ὁμήρους τῶν τῶν πλοίοστατῶν νίκων· τοῦτο οὖν τὸ ψήφισμα ἔχει ἐπιγραφὴν Ἐρετριακὸς κατάλογος. See D 17.47 ff.; τοῖς δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀποκρίνασθαι Χαλκιδέων ὡς τῆς νίκης μὲν Ἀθηναίων δοκεῖ ἐκεῖν κατὰ τὰ ἐφερσιμένα.
⁴ Photos certainly took Diphilos as the archon (s.v. Ἐρετριακὸς κατάλογος: ἐπὶ Διφίλου ἀργοτότος ἐγράφα τὸ ψήφισμα τοῖς ὁμήροις καταλέξει ἐς Ἐρετριακὸν πλοίοστατον. For the dating problem see A. W. Gomme, Commentary on Thucydides i 343 f.; U. von Wilamowitz, Hermes xx 481: E. Ziebarth in IG xii 9.149.
⁵ Archon-dates are found in the Segesta Treaty (IG ii² 19+, 31: [- - - - ]ἐγραφα); the Miletus Decree (IG ii² 22+ = D 11, 63 and 88: ἐπὶ Εὔθοδον ἀργοτότος); the Sigelium Decree (IG ii² 32+ = SEG x 13.5: only Ἄρτο - - - - survives of the name); the Rhesium and Leontini Treaties (IG ii² 51+, 4 and 52+, 8 = Tod nos. 57–8). In the ATL text of the Erythrai Decree (D 10.2) Λ[α]ν[ήρας] ἐγραφεῖ - - - - has been restored in the heading after the epistates, but the editors do not provide cogent grounds for their preference; there seems no good reason for abandoning the old view that the lambda is the first letter of the proposer's name (Tod i no. 29, p. 46). R. Meiggs' arguments (JHS lxiii (1943), 34) were valid only against Highby's text (Klio, Beiheft xxxvi 7).
vention in Euboea. Philochoros recorded an expedition against the island in 424/423 and despite Thucydides' silence we should probably believe him.\(^8\) Hesychios' decree would fit this context admirably. We might well associate with it a fragmentary measure concerning Eretrians and Athenian law-courts, which has been generally dated c. 430.\(^9\) Could D 16 and 17 belong to the same occasion? The Ionic script of D 16 was once thought evidence of fourth-century date because of its letter-forms, so that no really firm argument can be based on it. It is true that Ionic script seems occasionally to have been used at Athens as early as c. 450, but the first firmly dated examples come from the 420's.\(^10\) The witness of D 17 is fortunately more impressive. We shall have to study its ample prosopography, its turns of phrase and the content of its provisions. I think that we shall find that all point strongly to the 420's.

The secretary's name is unluckily missing, though it might not have been decisive.\(^11\) Drakontides, president of the Antiochis Prytany, should be the general of Antiochis in 433/432. He was possibly a fairly recent recruit to the generals' board, since two other men held his tribe's place in 441/440 and 439/438.\(^12\) His career would seem to fall in the period after the Samian revolt. Plutarch links him with attacks on Pericles in 432/431, but the date has legitimately been questioned; the confusion in Plutarch may indeed go even farther.\(^13\) He seems to have become specially prominent c. 424/423, since he receives two mentions in the *Wasp* (157 and 438). In the first passage he appears to be under threat of prosecution. If he was a Councillor in 424/423 this would be most understandable in view of the serious Athenian failures this year and Cleon's notorious toughness towards the errors or misdoings of the Council.\(^14\) It is worth noting that Laches was under specially heavy fire from Cleon according to the *Wasp*. Now Laches was certainly a leading member of the Council in 424/423.\(^15\)

Aschestratos (D 17, 70) is presumably the general of

\(^8\) Scholiast on Aristoph. *Wasp* 716 (716 D): *τὰ παρὶ τὴν Ἑβοβαν δήναμι καὶ αὐτὰ συνεχεῖν ταῖς δωδεκάλαις, πέρων γὰρ ἐπὶ ἄρρην τοῦ 'Ισαρχον ἐστρατεύειν ἐπί αὐτήν, ὡς Φιλόχορος.*

\(^9\) Gomme (op. cit. iii 592) is sceptical about this expedition, but concede that 'some quite small affair' may have been omitted by Thucydides. A. E. Raubitschek, however, accepting Philochoros, linked the expedition with Athens' intrigues in Boeotia and the reorganisation of the Euboian *tēmēni*, to which IG ii 376 testifies; see *Hesp.* xii 28 ff. His attempt to correct Philochoros' date (to 426/425) was firmly rejected by F. Jacoby, who regards the expedition of 424/423 as a certainty; see *FGH* iii b (Suppl.) i 504 and ii 407 (on 328 F 130).


\(^11\) See E. Schweigert, *Hesp.* vii 317 (letter-forms). On the use of Ionic script in Athens see E. Weston, *AJP* lxxi 345 ff.: Meritt, *Hesp.* xiii 215. The Phaselis Treaty is now normally dated c. 450; see Tod i no. 32 and R. J. Hopper, *JHS* lxxiii 41 ff. But H. T. Wade-Gery would put it back to the period 469-462 (Essays in Greek History (1958), 182-6). For Ionic in the 420's see *ATL* ii D 21 (IG ii 55 f. + the Aphytis Decree); *SEG* x 35 (IG ii 71; Kleonymos' proxeny decree, 426/425); *IG* ii 25 (Tod no. 73 and *SEG* x 85: Athena Nike Decree, 424/423. Lines 6-11 are Ionic): the Treaty with Persia in 424/423 (see *ATL* iii 275 ff. and R. Sealey, *Hist.* iii 328. Sealey believes against *ATL* that the whole was in Ionic script, not just the 'new' heading).

\(^12\) See *IG* ii 295, 20 f. and Thuc. i 51.4 (the MSS. have "'Ἀφακίδης ὁ Αἰσιόππος" by error): *RE* v 1663 f. (Swoboda) and Tod. no. 55. For the generals of Antiochis see G. F. Hill, *Sources for Greek History*, (edited by R. Meiggs and A. Andrewes), 401 f. In 441/440 we find Cleitophon of Thora; for 439/438 Andrewes and D. M. Lewis have plausibly suggested Leon (*JHS* lxxviii 179).

\(^13\) *Pericles* 32.3. See H. Swoboda, *Hermes* xxviii 536 and 582 ff.: F. E. Adcock, *CAH* v 477 ff.: Gomme, *op. cit.* ii 184 ff. (all prefer 430). Drakontides could have been general at the time and thus proposed the decree. But even 430 presents difficulties. It is hard to reconcile the decree with the movements of Hagnon, who seems to have moved a rider. Adcock made him author of a later decree, amending the procedure in Pericles' case (p. 478). But this can hardly be read out of Plutarch.

\(^14\) For Cleon as the scourge of generals and Council see *Knights* 335 ff. (with Thuc. iv 27), 3-5) and 369. From *Wasp* 288 ff. and *Peace* 639 ff. we learn that he inspired rigorous inquiries among the allies into collusion with Brasidas; *Wasp* 474 ff. shows that Athenians were also implicated.

\(^15\) *Wasp* 240 ff. and 396-1008 (Κύον Καθήμενος prosecutes the dog Αῖσις Αἰξωνετος): *SEG* x 80
433/432, who was prominent in the Assembly during 424/423, when we find him, as in D 17, adding riders to two decrees in honour of Potamodoros and his son. Eupolis introduced him in a strange passage of his Golden Race (423 B.C.), apparently along with Hippokrates and Laches. Antikles (D 17, 40) is harder to place. He may be either the general of 440/439 (Thuc. i 117, 2) or the man who was sole secretary to the Parthenon Commission from 436 onwards. He could also be another man altogether. Diogenes, who spoke to the Council’s motion, could be the younger brother of Nicias. We first happen to hear of him in 415, when he became involved in the affair of the Mysteries. But he was surely old enough for the Council in 424/423 and his brother was unusually active and successful this year. With Hierokles (D 17, 64 ff.) we reach a character of whom we have definite knowledge. He was one of those χρησμολαγων who, according to Thucydides, enjoyed an astonishing vogue during the Peloponnesian War. It would seem that they were then a somewhat novel phenomenon at Athens. Hierokles prospered so well that he won the privilege of dining in the Prytaneion and could be introduced by Aristophanes in his Peace (1045–1126) as a confirmed champion of the war. He was evidently at the height of his influence in 421. Now Hierokles may have been active as early as 446, but all the relevant information points to the 420’s. Most significant of all perhaps is the remarkably close parallel between his role in Aristophanes and that assigned him by the one clause of D 17. In that he appears also as the expert supervisor of sacrifices or ritual decreed by oracles. With three Councillors he is to conduct the rites for Euboea. In the elaborate scene of the Peace he acts in character from his opening inquiry (1052):

της ἡ θυσία ποιθ᾽ αὐτῆ καὶ τῷ θεῷ;

A little later he asks pointedly whether Trygaion is in order in ignoring the experts (1088):

ποιον γὰρ κατὰ χρήσαν μερὰ θεοῦ;

As he is unceremoniously hustled away, Trygaion’s servant contemptuously addresses him as ὁ θυσίολος. It would clearly be most satisfactory if we could date D 17 firmly in 424/423 when this odd specialist was most active and most famous.

This dating can be supported by some striking verbal echoes in D 17 of decrees passed in the late 420’s. Antikles opens his rider with a phrase for which Thuc. iv 118, 11 provides an extremely close parallel. In D 17, 40 ff. we read: ἀγαθὴ τεῖ τῆ 'Αθηναίων ποιεῖ τὸν ἀριττόν 'Αθηναίος καὶ Χαλκιδεὰς καθάπερ ἔφευγεν ἐφοσφοστο ὁ δέμος ὁ 'Αθηναίων. Laches accepted the Truce terms of 423 in very similar strain: τιμὴν ἀγαθὴ τῇ 'Αθηναίων ποιεῖ τόν ἔκεχεραν καθάπερ ξυγχωρεῖται οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ ξύμαχοι. Hardly less close is the link between D 17, 45 ff. and a clause of the Bottiaean Treaty of c. 422 (Tod no. 68 = IG ii 90–97, 30 ff.). In both passages the speaker moves from the election of five oath-commissioners straight to the vexed subject of hostages. The first is much better

(IG ii 87+: the Halieis Treaty) and Thuc. iv 118, 11 (the Truce Decree). He fought at Delium in the autumn (Plato, Symposium, 221 A). Cleon perhaps tried to make him finally responsible for the Sicilian failure in summer 424; compare Thuc. iv 65, 2–4 with Wars 894 ff.

16 Thuc. i 57, 6: IG ii 70 (SEG x 84), 10 and 40 ff.; J. M. Edmonds, Fragments of Attic Comedy i 410 f. with ns. Hippokrates was general in 426/425 (Thuc. 91, 4).
17 See Tod i 113 (on IG ii 352+).
18 Andoc. i 15; Lys. xviii 4, 9 f. and 21. See RE v 785. For Nicias in 424/423 see Thuc. iv 53 f. (Cythera), and i 119, 2 (Truce); and compare v 16, 1.
19 Thuc. ii 21, 3 and 54; vii 1. See also Knights 997–1007 and Birds 959–991.
20 Peace 1084 (Prytaneion); Lampon enjoyed the same privilege (Schol. Birds 521). Eupolis saluted Hierokles in his Cities as βέλτιστον χρηματίδων ἀνας; for its date see Edmonds, op. cit. 387 ff. (March 422?).
21 Lines 64 ff. Aristophanes calls Hierokles ὁ χρησμολόγος οἰς ὧμοιοι ὡραίοι (Peace 1047; cf. 1125 E). Tod (i 85) suggests ‘perhaps he was rewarded for his prophecies by the grant of an estate there’. Why should he not have been simply one of the cleruchs sent to Hestiaia in 445? The use of the pre-cleruchic name (Theopompus απὸ Strabo x i 445: FGH 115 F 387) in 421 presumably implies an insinuation of alien birth, as the scholiasts recognise.
preserved, revealing a firm Athenian refusal: θιν τομες δε έχον της αιτικά μάλα της άνδρας άνδρας αιτικά μάλα περί δε τον ήμηρον αποκόψαται Χαλκίδευσιν \\

hoi νύ μεν Αθηναίοι δοκεί εάν κατά τα εφοφσαμένα. Let us compare the tantalisingly incomplete Bottiaian clause: τοις δε [νόρκοις] θιν τομες λε[φονται παρά Βοττιαίον ελεύθαι τον \(\delta\)\]\(\mu\) τον \\

περίο τον 'Αθηναίον τοις δε ομέροις χρόνος έχαι - - - -]. 22 In the oath-formula of D 17 (14 ff.) we have a phrase comparable in structure to part of the oath in the Perdikkas Treaty, which should probably still be dated 423/422. The Athenian swears in the first ταύτα δε έπιστεύοναι Χαλκίδευσιν πειθόμενος τοις δε[μα] τοις \(\delta\)\(\eta\) τοις 'Αθηναίοιν; in the second he undertakes ταύτα δε χρειάζεται εμπεσόνο κατά Περίδοκκον - - - - - - - \\

hας χαίετεντιον Αθηναίοιν άδολος ποιοντι Πε[βόικκαν - - -]. 23 Perhaps the most curious correspondence is found in the phrase with which Antikles divides his rider (63 ff.); ταύτα μεν φοβήσασθαι Χαλκίδευσιν υπερθαν τα δε ήπερ τα εκ των χρεισμων υπερ Ευβοιαν θαυμά ός \\

τάχιστα - - - - - - . Hermodoros, who proposed the first decree for Potamodoros in 424/423, similarly divided his speech in Council: ταύτα μεν τους βο[λεν ψοβο[υσαθαί. εάν δε το δεύτερο \\

Ποταμόδορος έχοι δν ζει ε Εύρυτ]αν αυτός αυτος αυτος ι]α προοδον αυτοτ ι]α προς τους βολεν \\

και του δέμου. 24 \\

These parallels should be allowed cumulative weight. Together with the prosopographical evidence they provide good grounds for putting D 17 in the 420’s. Now there is no doubt, quite apart from Philochoros, that Athens was then seriously concerned with the security of Euboea. When Herakleia Trachinia was founded in 426, the Athenians felt certain that the Spartans’ main motive was to use it as a base for intrigue and military operations against Euboea. 25 The failure of their own ambitious attempt on Boeotia in 424 will have increased their sense of danger on this flank. The Athenian army was actually defeated within Attica near Oropos and a large, confident Boeotic force briefly threatened this key to Euboea. For the moment, however, there was no thought of pressing the advantage and luckily for Athens the Boeotians had internal political differences to distract them. 26 Valuable time was thus gained. Philochoros and D 17, I believe, reveal firm Athenian anticipatory action against incipient disloyalty in Chalcis and Eretria, where the malcontents must have been encouraged both by Delium and Brasidas’ successes in Thrace. Into what form of disobedience could they have been tempted, thereby giving Athens a welcome excuse for intervention? Raubitschek has already suggested that there may have been unrest over the increase of tribute in 425/424. 27 Now the scholiasts on Clouds 211 ff. show that this increase was indeed a source of bitter grumbling and could be viewed as another stage in the progressive subjection of Euboea. They mistakenly connect this financial pressure, however, with Pericles’ victory in 446, though that resulted in a lowering of the tribute from ε. 18 to ε. 13 talents. 28 \\

22 For the date of the Bottiaian Treaty see Gomme, op. cit. iii 622 and 623. Tod (i 167) made 33 f. provide for the return of the hostages to the Bottaians. \\

23 For the date of IG ii 71 see Gomme, op. cit. iii 621 ff., against ATL iii 313 ff., n. 61 (c. 436; see \\

Thuc. i 57.2). In lines 33 ff. the weight of the clause falls on the participle (conditional), as in \\

D 17, 15. \\

24 See Meritt, Hesp. x 324 for good comments on the unusual proboleuma of IG ii 70; A. Wilhelm \\

(Sitzber. Akad. Wien 1939, 56 and 71) had argued that the proboleuma ended in line 30, the rest being \\

added by Hermodoros in the Assembly. \\

25 Thuc. iii 92.4 and 93.1. \\

26 See Thuc. iv 91; 96.9 and 97.1; 99. Athens \\

intervened in Boeotia on the invitation of exiles and malcontents from Orchomenos, Thebes and else-

where (Thuc. iv 76). As late as summer 423 Thebes \\

was dealing severely with Thespiae for απάθεοις \\

(Thuc. iv 133.1). Boeotians were possibly behind \\

the Euboean revolt of 446 (Euboean exiles had helped \\

free Boeotia the previous year; Thuc. i 113.2) \\

they encouraged and supported Mytilene in 428/427 \\

(Thuc. iii 2.3 and 5.2); they largely engineered the \\

Euboean revolt of 411 (Thuc. viii 60.1). \\

27 Hesp. xii 33. \\

28 213 D (on oδος, υπο γαρ έμοι παρεταθή και \\

Περικλέους); εις φόρον επιταθή, πλαύσια φόρον \\

παρέχεσθαι . . . Περικλής γαρ αυτήν υπὸ τοῦ \\

Αθηναίων ἐποίησε . . . διὸ παρετάθη τοῖς φόροις καὶ \\

επιπρατήθη . . . παραπτησμένος γαρ Περικλῆς τὴν \\

Εὐβοίαν ἐξετεῖνε τοῖς αυτής φόροις ἐπὶ πολέε. For 446/445 see 

Gomme, op. cit. i 345 and ATL iii 294 ff., where the 

editors argue that the tribute of Eretria was reduced
Euboean tribute until the Quota Lists which the editors of The Athenian Tribute Lists number 25 and 26, but which I have argued elsewhere should again be recognised as Lists 29 and 28, of 426/425 and 427/426 respectively.\(^{29}\) Then suddenly in winter 425 Euboea was required to contribute no less than \(\varepsilon\). 36 talents. The individual tributes of Eretria and Chalcis went up from 3 talents to 15 and 10 respectively.\(^{30}\) They presumably lodged an appeal, as provided in the Reassessment Decree, but without success and in 424 they will have had to pay however reluctantly.\(^{31}\) But in the changed situation of spring 423, I submit, they perhaps paid Athens only such tribute as they considered reasonable. On their refusal to pay the rest on demand the tribute-squadron would have been ordered to proceed against them.\(^{32}\) It was a purely routine operation and Thucydides may have taken no special notice of it, particularly as he was at the time very much involved with his own troubles after the failure to save Amphipolis. Hostages were exacted and oaths of loyalty imposed on both cities. On the question of tribute Athens offered a fair concession. Eretria and Chalcis were given another chance of presenting their case at Athens, but had to promise to accept the tribunal's decision as final. This is surely the meaning of the phrase \(καὶ τῶν φόρων ἡποτελεὶ 'Αθηναίων ἢν ἀν πείλο "Αθηναῖος.\(^{33}\)

A much discussed passage of Antikles' rider may be relevant in this context. It seems to determine that all aliens resident in Chalcis shall be liable for local contributions except for two classes; \((a)\) Athenian metics, and \((b)\) men granted \(άτελεία\) by Athens. The former were probably liable for Athenian \(εἰςφορὰ\) as well as the regular metic-tax;\(^{34}\) the latter were subject only to taxes in their own city. This emerges clearly from the proxeny-decree for Proxenides the Cnidian, as Meritt skillfully reconstructed the text. Its date is of some importance here. Meritt suggested 415 because of the proposer's name, which appears to be Demonstratos. A man of this name moved the decree for the Syracusan expedition.\(^{35}\) The argument is far from cogent and the absence of archon-dating from the stone strongly suggests a date before 421, when this became regular practice. I would therefore put the decree \(ε. 426-421.\(^{36}\) Now lines 24 ff. become most significant and Meritt's conjectures the more plausible: \([-\] - ἄλλον δὲ ἄτελες ἐστο, τὰ] δὲ τέλε τοῖς ἔγγονευσι τελέτο ἥα] δὲ Κνιδ[έος

from 6 to 3, of Chalcis from 5 to 3 talents in the final settlement. The island's total tribute and its distribution can best be studied through the table in Hill, Sources\(^{2}\) 422 f. (based on \(ATL\)).

\(^{29}\) For the \(ATL\) dates see Meritt, Ath. Fin. Doc. 3-25; Doc. Ath. Trib. 98-100; \(ATL\) i 192 f. For my view see Hist. x (1961) pp. 166-8.

\(^{30}\) See \(ATL\) i 271 and 439 (Eretria and Chalcis); 218 f., 257, 261, 263 ff., 387, 415 (other cities).

\(^{31}\) See \(ATL\) ii A 9 (\(IG\) i\(^{2}\) 63+), 12-22: \(ATL\) iii 71 and 75 ff. Antiphon's speeches \(περὶ τῶν Αὐθίων φόρων\) and \(περὶ τῶν Σιμοθρεχίων φόρων\) were presumably delivered during a Reassessment, but not necessarily in 425; see K. J. Dover, CQ xiv 54.

\(^{32}\) Under the terms of \(ATL\) ii D 7 (\(IG\) i\(^{2}\) 66+) and 8 (\(IG\) i\(^{2}\) 65+) demands for payment were promptly lodged with defaulters after the Dionysia (see lines 22-28 and 16-18). For the tribute-ships see Meritt's brilliant demonstration (Studies in Honour of D. M. Robinson ii 298 ff.) that \(IG\) i\(^{2}\) 97 (formerly linked with Melos, 416) is a decree of \(ε. 430\) establishing this specialised task-force. Meritt's new text appears as \(SEG\) xii 25. He has been powerfully backed by W. Eberhardt (Hist. viii 298 ff.) against M. Treu's attempt to restore the \(status quo\) (Hist. iii 58).

\(^{33}\) D 17, 26 f. and 16.11 f. This clause is similarly interpreted in \(ATL\) iii 294 f. (but of 446/445).

\(^{34}\) D 17, 52 ff.: τὸς δὲ χάνος τὸς ἐν Χαλκίδι, ἡπο τὶς εἰςφορὰς μὲ τέλοιον 'Αθηναῖκα καὶ εἰ τοι δέστων ἕμπο τὸ δέμο τῷ 'Αθηναίῳ ἄτελεία, τὸς δὲ ἄλλος τελεῖν ἐς Χαλκίδα καθάπερ οὐκ ἄλλοις Ἀλκοδεῖς. My view of the grammar is substantially that of Hicks and Hill (\(H\)PH 66 f.), Tod (no. 42, p. 86) and \(ATL\) ii 72. There is strong scholarly support for identifying the exempted ἕμπο mainly as Athenian metics (Hicks and Hill; see also the discussion in Tod), but the ἄτελείς surely include non-Athenian metics. The dogmatism of \(ATL\) iii 297 seems unjustified; the editors write of this clause 'No class of non-Athenians could be so described; these must have been the klerouchs'. For them D 17, 52-57 becomes 'the clearest reference to Athenian klerouchs in Chalkis'. For this cleruchy, which has been doubted, see n. 57. Athenian metics were liable for military service in the fifth century (Thuc. ii 13.7 and 31.2); they are found paying \(εἰςφορὰ\) regularly in the fourth (\(RE\) v 2150 and xv 1447 f.).

\(^{35}\) \(IG\) i\(^{2}\) 144 and 155+ \((SEG\) x 108\): Hesp. x 328 ff.: Plutarch Nicias 12.4 and Ael. 18.2.

\(^{36}\) This point emerges clearly from study of all the decrees in \(IG\) i\(^{2}\) and \(SEG\) x which have their precepts preserved. \(IG\) i\(^{2}\) 144 cannot be of 424/423, since Phainippus (not Archikles) was then secretary of the Akamantid prytany (Thuc. iv 118.7).
The Collectors of Tribute were established by a decree of Kleonymos passed in the second prytany of 426/425.37 Proxenides then was being put on equality financially with the Athenians in the Empire, since his tax-liability was confined to his own city; we can show from other proxeny-decrees how Athens' friends were given the privileges of the Athenians themselves.38 The Boeotian exiles were probably given as wide a form of ἀτελεία in 424/423. It would have real practical advantages for them, since Meritt rightly divined, they were granted facilities for settling in cities of their choice within the Empire. Some may well have chosen Euboea. Indeed from the decrees honouring Potamodoros and Eurytion of Orchomenos I would guess that they settled either in Chalcis or Eretria.39 However this may be, the clause in Antikles' rider would seem to safeguard the privileges of aliens protected by Athens, whilst ensuring that all other wealthy residents contributed their due quota in order to enable the city to pay its full assessment in the future.

Archestratos' rider (D 17, 70 ff.) also seems to gain new relevance when considered in the context of the 420's. It must be studied in close association with the terms of the oath proposed for the Athenian Council and Jurors. This too is entirely in place in the Archidamian War, but at least one phrase rings strangely in the orthodox context of 446/445. What are we to make then of the promise (D 17, 4 ff.) ὅτι ἐξελέον Χαλκίδας ἐκ Χαλκίδος οὐδὲ τὸν πόλιν ἀνάστατον πόλην? Certainly the Athenians had just applied this policy to Hestiaia, but Thucydides clearly distinguishes between this city and the rest of Euboea. Plutarch confirms him and adds the reason for the exceptional harshness. Hestiaia was indeed virtually the first city in Greece itself or the Aegean whose population was driven out and dispossessed by fellow-Greeks.40 In the 420's, however, such dispossession was no longer a remote threat. Men could reflect on the warning fate of Aegina, Poteidaia and Plataea, the near escape of Mytilene and the doom hanging over Scione from the moment of its revolt in spring 423. Athens' expulsion of the Delians in 422 for religious offences shows that this punishment was not only incurred for open revolt. Chalcis and Eretria were similarly made uncomfortably aware that disobedience and disloyalty, however tentative, could lead to disaster.41 After its ominous beginning the oath embraces guarantees for individual Chalcidians of fair trial on capital charges before Athenian courts. At this point (lines 6–10) Archestratos' rider becomes relevant. It opens as follows: τὰς δὲ εὐθύνας Χαλκίδου κατὰ ὁφν αὐτῶν ἔναὶ ἐν Χαλκίδι καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖον Ἀθηναίου πλὴν φυγεῖ καὶ βανάστε καὶ ἀτυχία—περὶ δὲ τούτου ἐφευρεν ἔναὶ Ἀθηναῖα ἐς τὸν ἐλαιαν τὸν τὸν θεσμοβετόν κατὰ τὸ φοίνικα τὸ δέμο. The word εὐθύνα is surely used in its normal Attic sense. Chalcis, as Gomme insisted, was being allowed that control over its magistrates which 'is the true mark of autonomy'. It was, however, limited, since serious criminal charges could be dealt with only by the Athenian courts.42 This limitation rested on a decree of the

37 See ATL ii D 7 (IG i2 65+): Meritt, Doc. Ath. Trib. 3–42.
38 See R. Meiggs, CR lxiii 9–12 for a good treatment of the evidence.
39 See Meritt's study of IG i2 68/9+ (SEG x 81) in Hef. xiv 105–15 (especially 113). ἀτελεία does not appear in the extant text, but this is very fragmentary. Potamodoros and Eurytion certainly received ἀτελεία; in the text as restored (IG i2 70+ = SEG x 84.12 f.) it is qualified by ἀλλον καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοις (cf. [ὁρίσματα − − − − − ]). If this is correct it fits in neatly with Meritt's reconstruction of IG i2 144+24 ff. (Proxenides), where the limits are specified. The editors restore ἀρταν [ἐν] ἀλλοτρίων Ἀθηναῖων − − − − − − − − − − in IG i2 70, 14, which implies normal residence elsewhere; IG i2 103 (SEG x 114), 11 f. could be restored

38 See Gomme, CR i 7 ff. and op. cit. i 342 f. with ns. He insists that ἐφευρε̣με̣ς means 'compulsory reference' (to an Athenian court), not 'a right of
Athenian people, which one is tempted to identify with the earlier measure for Chalcis known from D 17, 49.43 But there may be more to it than that. In his speech On the Murder of Herodes Antiphon reveals that no allied city could administer the death penalty without Athens' approval; indeed he would seem to suggest elsewhere in this defence that most capital cases had actually to be taken to Athens for trial.44 Now some other good evidence supports Antiphon, so that it appears probable that a general imperial decree to this effect had been passed by the 420's.45 Such sweeping measures are characteristic of Athens in the Archidamian War. We may instance the Tribute Decree of Kleonimos, the koivà ψφησματα mentioned in the Methone Decrees and the decree regulating the Eleusinian firstfruits.46 When Mende was recovered from Brasidas in summer 423, the city was granted full autonomy in jurisdiction and being thus freed from the ban could deal itself with the ringleaders of the revolt. Chalcis was less highly favoured.47 Yet Archestratos’ rider surely confers some privilege more than the rights common to all subject allies. Now we know that, as the imperial system grew more complex, magistrates in most cities of the Empire might find themselves prosecuted even on non-capital charges. Under the terms of both D 7 and 8 any irregularities committed in connexion with tribute-collection must be tried at Athens; similar sanctions were written into the decree by which the Athenians imposed their currency on the Empire.48 If the trouble in 423 arose from defaulting on payment of tribute Athens showed rare wisdom and generosity in waiving her rights precisely in the financial field.

One final question must be tackled. Raubitschek dated a reorganisation of Athenian τεμένη in Euboea c. 425, associating it closely with the expedition that Philochoros records.49 This fits my reconstruction well. A few years later, perhaps c. 421, we find Alcibiades proposing a grant of land in the island to a certain Lysimachos, whom Plutarch identifies as Aristides’ son.50 Comic references show the people’s greedy, envious attitude to the rich lands across the Euripos, despite which Isocrates could boast that Athens had here resisted appeal; the same point is well made by R. J. Hopper, JHS liii 37. Wade-Gery, however, makes ύποπτος ‘appeal against a judgement’ (however provisional); see Essays in Greek History, 192–5.

42 év κατά τὰ ἐφαρμημένα (of the hosts). Tod equates this with τὸ φαύσιμα of line 76 (no. 42, p. 84).

43 Ch. 47: τὸν δὲ αὐτοῦ καταρχώντας τῶν θανάτων τῷ ἀνδρός ἀπομείναυτα: ἐν οὖν πάλιν ἔξεντο, ἀνεν Αθηναίων οὐδένα θανάτον γεμίομαι... The defendant, a Mytilenean, was being tried at Athens for murder and we learn from ch. 60 f. that Lykinoù could have prosecuted Herodes there on a capital charge. There is no evidence that Herodes was a cleric (pace Gomme, op. cit. i 242) nor is it likely that Lykinoù was an Athenian. The three men were presumably all Lesbian. Gomme apparently came round to this view; see op. cit. i 331 n. 2 (following P. Roussel, Mélanges Glotz 817 ff.).

44 See ‘Xen.’, ‘Aθ. Πολ., i 14–16; Aristoph. Wasps 288 ff.: Peace 639 f.; Birds 1454 ff.; Thuc. i 771; Isoc. iv 113 and xii 63 and 66. See Gomme, op. cit. i 241 ff. and Hopper, op. cit. 36 f. The decree must fall after that for Erythrai, which was allowed capital jurisdiction even in cases of treason to the Confederacy; see ATL ii D 10 (IG ii 10+), 29 ff.

45 D 8 (IG ii 65+): D 3–4 (IG ii 57), 13 ff. and 41 ff.: IG ii 76 (Tod, no. 74). The archon's name is not included in the prescript of the last decree; this recommends Ziehen’s dating (423/422; see Protz/ Ziehen, Leges Graecorum sacrae et titulis collectae ii 25) against attempts to put it after the Peace of Nicias. For full bibliography see SEG x 110 and xii 34.

46 Thuc. iv 130.7. Gomme contrasts the concession with the Chalcis clause as representing a ‘greater degree of autonomy’ (op. cit. i 342 n. 2).

47 See D 7, 31–43: the law-court decides ἄν τι ἄν δοκ[ει αὐτῷ] πολλῆς ἢ ἀποτελεῖα - - - - - - - - - - - - . D 8 apparently made the ἐκλέγεται liable (lines 5 ff.) if a city defaulted; by 43 ff. any offending against the decree are to be tried at Athens, again with the possibility of a purely pecuniary penalty (50 ff.). D 14 § 4 has been plausibly restored to read [δύτω κατὰ τῶν ὁργάνων τῶν τετάρτων περί ἀδικίας διασε Αθήναι]. The context proves that they are local officials.

48 Hesp. xii 32 f. (on IG ii 376+ = SEG x 304). τεμένη are recorded at Chalcis (lines 3, 11 and 22), Eretria (9 and 14), Poseidion? (16 and 26) and Hestiaia (6).

49 See Dem. xx 115 (nothing about Aristides): Plut. Arist. 27.2. Raubitschek discusses the identity of this Alcibiades (loc. cit.), deciding for the famous bearer of the name. Alcibiades will have proposed the decree when chairman of the τακταί in 425 (‘Andocides’ iv 11). But if he ever held this office it must have been in 422/421, since only then was he old enough for membership of the Council; see RE i 1517 ff.
successfully all temptations. He was right in so far as there were no wholesale dispossession apart from Hestiaia. But was there not a cleruchy at Chalcis since 446/445, settled on the wide estates of the exiled Hippobotai? Plutarch is our earliest source for this expulsion and it is curious that Thucydides should have concealed it in the non-committal phrase καὶ τήν μὲν ἄλλην ὁμολογία κατεστήσατο, which suggests that Chalcis was no worse treated than Eretria and any other city. Aelian has a more circumstantial account of a cleruchy at Chalcis, which, since Swoboda weighed the issue, has been customarily identified with Pericles’ settlement. But we must note carefully the remarkable reminiscences of Herodotus in this passage. Particularly revealing is Aelian’s ὅτι δὲ αἱμαλώτους ἔδησαν, since we know that the Chalcidian prisoners in 506 were kept fettered for a time and that their chains were still exhibited on the Acropolis in Herodotus’ day. Aelian is certainly confused. What he says about the τεμένη and the pillars with lease-records probably applies to a much later period. As the editors of The Athenian Tribute Lists argue, these pillars will have recorded only the leases of sacred lands and one must either emend or interpret Aelian’s text accordingly. In view of all this can Aelian be considered a good witness for the Periclean cleruchy? His lease-pillars might well be those from the 420’s of which one survives, as we have seen already (IG ii 376+). Have we any real reason for dating these τεμένη before the settlement of 423, which Philochoros and D 17 jointly evidence? The holdings in Eretria and the Lelantine Plain recorded in the sales-lists of the Hermokopidai might perhaps prove to be leaseshold on these state-domains. There certainly could be τεμένη without any cleruchy, as is proved at Samos and Cos. What then shall we do with Plutarch’s assertion that the Athenians expelled the Hippobotai? The fact may perhaps be accepted without his dating. I would suggest that some Hippobotai at least were exiled as a result of the trials at Athens in 423. It would be from their estates that the τεμένη were formed and there may have been enough land for cleruchs as well. If so it is odd that we hear nothing of them later. Perhaps they acted as absentee landowners, rather like those sent to Mytilene in 427, but this would be a most unsatisfactory system for Euboea. Alternatively the oligarchic estates may have been broken up for the benefit of the Chalcidian δῆμος, as happened in Samos in 412. Whatever may be the truth about the mysterious cleruchy of 506, it was probably quoted in the 420’s to justify Athens’ highhanded behaviour towards Chalcis. The Hippobotai must be content if

51 See Plut. Per. 7.8 (from an unknown comedy): Aristoph. Wasps 715 ff.: Isoc. iv 107–9, especially καθ’ οὐκόμοις πλούσιοι εἰς τοὺς τόπους τοὺς Σκοινοφαγο ὑπὲρ ἐπεμβηθέντων . . . τοιαύτην δὲ χώραν παρελλόμενη ἡ πάντας ἢ ἡμᾶς εὔπροοτέρας ἐποίησεν. Per. 27.4: Thuc. i 114.3.  
52 vi. 1. See Serta Harteliana 28 ff., and E. Ziebarth in IG xii 91, p. 149.  
53 vi. 7. See also Her. v 77 (cf. vi 100 f.) and the epigram which he quotes; two copies survive (Tod, no. 12 and 43; see p. 87). The line δέσποι γνήσιοι σώματος δέσποιναν δίκην may have suggested Aelian’s ἔδησαν καὶ οὕτω ἐναπόδησαν τοῦ κατὰ Χαλκιδῶν δήμου.  
54 ATL iii 296 (emending τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν τὸ ὄντος δολιτοῦ). See also Goette, op. cit. i 344 n. 1 and Arist. Ἐθ. Pol. 47.4 (ἐναπόδησαν δὲ καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῇ μαθαίνει τὸν τεμενον . . .).  
55 Only the Hestiaian τέμενος need be as early as 446/445 (SEG x 304.6). For the Poletai records of 414/413 see SEG xii 12–22, Stele i 90 and vi 151 (Eretria); ii 178 and 312 (Lelantine Plain). Raubitschek identified Panaitios, lessee of the Hestiaian τέμενος, with one of the Hermokopidai (op. cit. 31 and n. 65). Oionios’ holding in the Lelantine Plain could be part of Athena’s τέμενος; which Aelian locates there. For Cos and Samos see Inscriptions of Cos (Paton and Hicks) no. 148; SEG i 375 f., BCH viii 160 and IGA 8. For this point see further Gonne, op. cit. i 347 n. 2.  
56 Plutarch does not say that Athenians were settled, as Gomme well noted (op. cit. i 344 f.), supporting Nesselhauf’s view (Klio, Beihfte xx 132 f.) that the land was leased out to Chalcidian smallholders. For Lesbos see Gomme, op. cit. ii 326–32 and Meritt, AJPh lxix 361–8. For Samos see Thuc. viii 21 and IG ii 101 as restored with commentary by D. M. Lewis in BSA xlix 29 ff. (SEG xiv 9, 4–8). The ATL arguments for a real cleruchy at Chalcis (iii 293 ff.) are ingenious, but inconclusive; for another cleruchy at Eretria they can adduce only Thuc. viii 95.6 (an Athenian τείγωμα in their plain). There seems to be a suggestion of at least partial expulsion of Chalcidians in Thuc. vi 76.2; Her. vii 156 (on Gelon and Sicilian Megara) surely reflects the typically Athenian reasoning on which such a policy rested.
some of them were left on land which had all been forfeited to Athens some eighty years before.\textsuperscript{58}

My proposed redating of D 17 involves awkward epigraphic consequences. These must be squarely faced, if my case seems otherwise sound. The letter-forms of D 17 are transitional, though sigma is always $\epsilon$. We find R and P, $\zeta$ and $\lambda$, N and N used indiscriminately.\textsuperscript{59} If D 17 was inscribed in 424/423 what objective grounds remain for asserting that four-barred sigma had replaced the three-barred form on official documents by 446/445 B.C.\textsuperscript{60} Furthermore should we not think again most carefully about D 7, a decree which used to be put in the 420's, but which is now firmly assigned to the early 440's? One of the main epigraphic arguments was that its letters seemed slightly less developed than those of D 17.\textsuperscript{61} I would urge indeed that it has become vital to date as many fifth-century inscriptions as possible by internal evidence and historical probability. Then we should be able to trace confidently the complex history of the various 'schools' of Attic script. This means radically reversing the normal procedure, but it is arguable that epigraphy has far too long been dominant in the study of fifth-century Athens. The forms of sigma and rho have put many decrees in contexts where they do not really make full sense. This paper is offered as part of the demonstration of that controversial thesis.

\textit{University of Nottingham.}

\textsuperscript{58} For doubts about Herodotus' cleruchy see R. W. Macan, \textit{Herodotus, Bk. io–vi} i 222.
\textsuperscript{59} See \textit{IG} i Suppl. 27 a for a facsimile; Tod i 82: \textit{ATL} ii pl. x. For Ionic H (line 77) compare \textit{IG} ii\textsuperscript{57}, 41 and 52 (D 4; inscribed 424/423).
\textsuperscript{60} For a good statement of the orthodox position see Raubitschek, \textit{AJP} lxxi 477 ff. and \textit{Hesp.} xii 18 n. 1.

\textit{D. M. Lewis was very hesitant, in view of this dogma, in suggesting 443 as the date for the Aegina Decree with three-barred sigma (BSA xlix 22). Within such narrow limits is it confining scholarship.}

\textit{Harold B. Mattingly.}
EMPLEKTON MASONRY AND ‘GREEK STRUCTURA’

Our knowledge of Greek Architecture depends almost entirely on its actual remains. Undoubtedly the Greeks themselves were much concerned with its more theoretical aspects, and in pursuit of this wrote a large number of treatises, descriptive and analytical, which are frequently referred to by our chief authority for ancient architectural theory, Vitruvius. Since, with one exception—and that only in part (Philo Mechanicus, named by Vitruvius vii praef. 14 as an author ‘de machinationibus’)—none of Vitruvius’ Greek sources survives, we experience considerable difficulty in controlling the information he gives us about these aspects of Greek architecture, especially when we try to apply his various theories to the actual remains. First, for all we know, theories and techniques described with some prominence by Vitruvius may not have had a corresponding prominence in the Greek authorities, or actual practice. Secondly, a theory described by Vitruvius as apparently universal may actually have been very limited, either in scope or time. It is in fact true to say that many of Vitruvius’ ideas of Greek architecture apply to the Hellenistic period only. Thus the passage on the spacing of columns (iii 3) must owe much to Hermogenes, two of whose temples are given as examples.

Such possible misconceptions can often be corrected by reference to the remains. But at the same time there is a strong temptation to modify Vitruvius’ account to accord with the more tangible evidence the remains provide. This is frequently done unconsciously, through lack of a proper understanding of all that Vitruvius’ account involves—and misuses of Vitruvius’ terms are often hallowed by repetition from authority to authority. This is particularly true of his account of ‘Greek structura’ walls, where the three terms he uses, isodomum, pseudisodomum and emplekton are usually applied to walls which do not seem fully to agree with his description.

My purpose is to elucidate the true meaning of one of these, emplekton, discuss its proper application, and investigate the question of ‘Greek structura’ walls: that is, walls built of rough stone and mortar, not solid squared masonry (quadratum).

We must begin with Vitruvius himself (ii 8.7; ed. Rose, 1899):

Altera est quam ἐμπλεκτον appellant, qua etiam nostris rustici utuntur. Quorum frontes poliuntur, reliqua ita uti sunt nata cum materia conlocata alternis alligant coagentis. Sed nostris, celeritati studentes, erecta conlocantes frontes servient, et in medio farciunt fractus, separatim cum materia caementis. Ita tres suscutantur in ea structura crustae, duae frontium, et una media farturae. Graeci vero non ita, sed plana conlocantes et longitudines eorum alternis in crassitudinem instruentes, non media farciunt, sed e suis frontibus perpetuum et unam crassitudinem parietum consolidant. Praeterea interponunt singulos crassitudinem perpetua utraque parte frontatos quos διαρόως appellant, qui maxime religando confirmant parietum soliditatem.

The following translation is deliberately non-committal on points of detail:

‘Another type (of structura) is that which they (the Greeks) call ἐμπλεκτον (interwoven) which our country people also use. In their (i.e. the Greeks’) walls the faces are smoothed, while the remainder are left in their natural state, laid with mortar and bound together in alternate joints. But our people, whose object is speed, care only for the faces, placing (the stones) upright; the middle they stuff with separate layers of broken rubble and mortar. So in that wailing three “skins” are raised up, two faces and a middle one of “stuffing”. But

1 I have to thank Dr Plommer for drawing my attention to this problem.
2 One MS. (Sc.) reads faciunt factis, the rest facti faciunt. But cf. una media farturae and non media faciunt, immediately below.
3 MSS. frontatis, emended by Marini. Even if this is not correct, the sense required must be ‘from one face to the other’.
Greek ἐμπλεκτὸν is not like that. They place (the stones) flat, and lay "stretchers" alternately with "headers" extending into the thickness (of the wall), and they do not stuff the middle, but from their faces they make firm a single unbroken thickness of wall. Moreover, they put in single stones running the entire thickness, and facing on either side. These they call διάστοιον. These bind the walls together, and so make them especially strong and solid.

Even if the details are obscure, the general meaning of this passage is fairly clear. Emplekton is essentially a technique involving the use of mortar.⁴ Both Greek and Italian emplekton walls are in three sections, two outer faces and a central core. However, not only are the natures of the two cores different, but while in the Italian walls there is apparently no physical connexion between the three sections, in the Greek walls they are most carefully bonded together.

The two current explanations of Greek emplekton are each based on one and only one of the features described by Vitruvius, and both ignore the question of mortar.

Puchstein⁶ derives the term from the fact that the two faces are 'woven' to the central core (by means of the headers and διάστοιον). Other authorities⁶ emphasise the fact that emplekton is the only Greek wall described by Vitruvius that has a central core: to them, an emplekton wall is any wall with outer faces and a central core.

Puchstein's explanation, the more plausible of the two, fails when we realise that Vitruvius can attach the same term to Italian walls in which the three parts, far from being 'woven' to each other, are kept distinct. If the essential feature of an emplekton wall was that the three parts should be woven together, emplekton is the last word that Vitruvius would use to describe a wall in which the three parts have no connexion with each other at all. Puchstein's explanation automatically means we must suppose Vitruvius to have made a stupid and obvious mistake.

The second explanation also is illogical. Granted that emplekton is the only Greek wall described by Vitruvius that has a central core, there is nevertheless no reason why the term used to describe such a wall should be 'emplekton'; it bears no relevance, that I can see, to this essential criterion.⁷ Nor is there any reason to suppose that other Greek varieties of walls with a central core did not exist simply because Vitruvius does not mention them. So far as the Greeks are concerned he is professedly selective, not comprehensive (vii praef. 14).

Neither of these explanations, then, is satisfactory. If we consider the terms applied by Vitruvius to other types of structura, isodomum, pseudisodomum (both of which terms, whatever their exact meaning, are concerned with the arrangement of the courses), incertum, reticulatum, it seems they could very well refer simply to the surface patterns created by the various arrangements of the stones. This, certainly, is the only thing 'net-like' about reticulatum, and at the same time its most characteristic feature.

On this analogy—and it must be remembered that the Greeks were particularly conscious of the decorative effect of the surface pattern of walling⁸—an emplekton wall is one

---

⁴ Structura in Vitruvius essentially involves the use of mortar: see Boëthius in Ἀράμῳ 133; Jüngst and Thielcher, RM 13 (1936) 164; Scranton Greek Walls 18 n. 19. On the other hand, a non-technical author, Livy, describing the walls of Saguntum (xxi 11) which used mud instead of lime as a binding agent, calls them structurae antiquam genus.

⁵ RE s.v. 'Emplekton'. He is followed by Professor A. W. Lawrence, Greek Architecture 230 (translating ἐμπλεκτὸν as 'entwined'), and anticipated by Dennis, Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria (third edition) 65, 80 (but he takes non media faciunt to mean there was no fill at all).

⁶ e.g. Wrede, AM xlix (1924) 220; J. Pouilloux, La forteresse de Rhamonne 50; R. Martin, BCH lxii/lxii 120; F. Krishen, Milet iii.2 9; and LXX.

⁷ Dennis, op. cit., 80, attributes a similar interpretation to 'the Italians' 'as though it were derived from ἐμπύελλων or ἐμπυλλίσθαι, to fill up'. He rightly rejects this.

⁸ Hence the 'structural' styles of wall painting, and the retention of orthostates in stone walls when all constructional justification for them (as footings for mud-brick walls) had gone.
whose surface pattern gives the effect of woven material. That is, strictly speaking, it is what we know as ‘Flemish bond’, a wall whose courses consist of alternating headers and stretchers, the headers of one course being covered by the stretchers of the next, as in the diagram, FIG. 1.

![Fig. 1](image-url)

In Greek walls that made use of headers and stretchers the headers are generally rather narrow; they look like vertical threads, the stretchers like horizontal ones. The similarity to a woven pattern is striking and obvious, and would, I feel, be immediately apparent to the Greeks. The effect of the pattern is not spoilt by the fact that, to economise, the Greeks often employed two or three stretchers to every header.

Vitruvius in fact takes the name for granted, and does not explain its origin. He is much more concerned with the technique of construction, and with the advantages this has over Roman technique. It is advisable to pay attention to this question of technique before considering the equally important question whether the term emplekton can properly be applied to any wall with a ‘woven’ surface pattern of headers and stretchers, no matter how it was built.

Vitruvius begins his description of Greek structura with isodomum and pseudisodomum (ii 8.5). They are built of coursed rough stone, laid in mortar much as we lay bricks. This he considers more stable than Roman structura, which consists basically of a mixture of unbalanced broken rubble and mortar. The reason for this is that he is suspicious of the lasting qualities of mortar. He expects it to crumble when dry, and therefore naturally prefers the coursed Greek structura walls, which would remain standing even if the mortar dried out, to the unbalanced Roman structura, which would collapse (and quite possibly did, until the quality of Roman mortar improved). To Vitruvius the strength of a wall rests in the coursing of its stonework, not in the mortar.

This remains true of emplekton structura. This is distinguished from the other structura described simply by the fact that it is given a casing of ashlar masonry. Inside there is the same difference between Greek and Roman. Greek with balanced and bonded courses of stone, Roman with an unbalanced ‘mix’ of broken rubble and mortar.

The only similarity between the two is the ashlar facings, but even here the technique differs. In the Roman walls the stones are placed erecta: this is explained by the contrast with the Greeks plana conlocantes and perhaps the plana et librata cubilia of isodomic and pseudisodomic structura. In the Greek walls the stones are greater in width than in height, so they lie flat and balanced. The Roman stones are either equal in width and height, or else the height is greater, so that they do not seem to lie flat but upright, and so less stable.

\(^9\) For an example, see the outer wall of the three-storey stoa at Aegae, Bohn and Schuchhardt, Altertümer von Aegae (JdI Erg. Heft ii) fig. 15. Headers and stretchers are typical of the Hekatomniiid (fourth century B.C.) walls at Labraunda: Jeppesen, Labraunda i 1 (The Propylaia) 14.
This obviously enabled the Romans to build faster, less stonework being required to reach a given height. Further economy could be achieved by not using headers, and it would be natural, from Vitruvius' description, to suppose that the Roman walls dispensed with them. If so, there is some difficulty in explaining why Vitruvius still calls them *emplekton*. One possible explanation is that the headers were replaced by half-stones, which preserved the surface pattern of headers, but did not extend into the fill. Another possibility is that the blocks of these walls were not very long—I am thinking of Hadrian's wall as an example—compared with the blocks of Greek walls, and that the vertical line between the blocks was sufficient to suggest to Vitruvius a comparison with the narrow headers of Greek walls.

More important is the difference between the fills. The Italians stuff the central space—*farcium* does not simply mean fill—by throwing in alternatingly layers of broken rubble and mortar. The Greeks, on the other hand, fill the centre with stones (as opposed to rubble) carefully placed and balanced in position, though set in mortar (*conlocata*, as opposed to *in medio farciunt*), and laid in alternating courses exactly like their isodomic and pseudoisodomic walls. But in addition to this, the carefully constructed fill is bonded to the faces of worked stone by means of the headers of the faces, which extend into it, and the occasional διστροφος which pass right through the entire thickness of the wall.

We can now see exactly what Vitruvius means by a Greek *emplekton* wall. It consists of a solid core of unbroken stones (i.e. not rubble) arranged in courses and set in mortar. This core is bonded to two faces of worked stone by means of headers and through-stones. As a result of the use of headers and stretchers the surface pattern of the faces (the only part of the wall visible when it was complete) resembles that of woven cloth. For this reason the technique acquired its nickname of *emplekton*, 'interwoven', which was also given by Vitruvius to Roman structura walls, which he considered had a similar surface pattern, though built on a different system.

It is frankly impossible to find actual—and convincing—examples of Vitruvius' Greek structura. This is equally true of *isodomum* and *pseudisodomum*, as well as *emplekton*. Hence the use of these terms is modified by modern authorities to agree with the actual archaeological evidence, and so, for example, they are applied, without excuse or justification, to walls that do not use mortar. In deciding whether this can be justified we must at the same time consider what these Greek walls that did use mortar were, and how they came to be described by Vitruvius.

The difficulty caused by the absence of examples of Greek structura is accentuated by the fact that Vitruvius' Roman types of structura, *incertum* and *reticulatum*, are easily recognised in countless examples up and down Italy. It does seem only natural to suppose that examples of Greek structura were equally numerous, and therefore, since there are virtually no Greek walls using mortar, Greek structura, despite Vitruvius, also did not make use of mortar. This makes nonsense of Vitruvius. Scranton (loc. cit.) saw the difficulty. He suggests that Vitruvius is referring to purely contemporary conditions, that is, to Greeks building in the eastern part of the Roman Empire during the second half of the first century B.C., and that walls of this date have not been recognised by archaeologists as Greek work. This is possible, and theoretically Greek structura does sound like a combination of Greek and Roman techniques which one might expect to have taken place about the time of Vitruvius. All the same, it seems to me more than probable that such walls, if they existed, would have been recognised, if only as a useful criterion for distinguishing between the Hellenistic and Roman periods in the Greek world. As I see it, at this period the Eastern Roman Empire either built in its old traditional styles, or else adopted Roman ideas in their entirety. I do not think there is any real evidence for

---

11 Numerous examples in Blake, *Roman Construction in Italy*. 
a period of mingled style, neither one thing nor the other, which is what Scranton’s theory postulates.

I consider that Vitruvius’ notions of Greek structura derive from descriptions in Greek architectural handbooks rather than from his personal knowledge of Greek walls. The reason he describes them in such detail is not necessarily because they were important and widely used by the Greeks, but because he considered that they had marked advantages over Roman structura, which was important, and was widely used. We have already seen what he considered these advantages were—the stability of the Greek wall, even if the mortar crumbled. Vitruvius, we must suppose, started by describing Roman structura, techniques which were evolved by trial and error in Italy itself, and were well known to him. Because he considered them faulty he referred to the Greek handbooks to see if they described a more satisfactory technique, and found isodomum, pseudisodomum, and emplektion. There is, of course, no direct evidence that the handbooks did describe these techniques. But the fact that the names of the types of ‘Greek structura’ are Greek, and the undoubted fact that the handbooks—as we shall see—at least recommended the use of some sort of mortar, makes it all but certain that they included isodomum, pseudisodomum, and emplektion.

However, there is absolutely no reason to suppose, simply because a technique was described in the Greek handbooks, that it was at all widely used by Greek architects. There are two reasons for this. First, it seems clear that there were in Greece marked local traditions of technique, and by and large, the Greeks were reluctant to adopt new ideas, particularly if they originated in areas outside ‘classical’ Greece. Thus, though the use of barrel vaults was thoroughly understood in late fourth-century b.c. Macedonia (the probable date of the earliest Macedonian vaulted tombs) knowledge of the technique did not affect the architecture of mainland Greece at all. Secondly, the handbooks were, it seems, in the habit of copying ideas from earlier authorities, without considering whether they were actually used, or even practical. An example of this is a system of telegraphy, apparently recommended first by Aeneas Tacticus (c. 360 b.c.) in his now lost Παραγωγικόν,12 equally recommended by Philo (c. 200 b.c.) in his Παραγωγικόν,13 and then finally condemned as impractical by Polybius.

For both these reasons, then, the handbooks may well have given greater prominence to a technique than it actually merited, if one considered solely the extent to which it was used in the Greek world. This seems to be true of mortar.

It is difficult to secure any precise information about the Greek use of mortar. The Greeks, of course, made widespread use of stucco (which is basically similar to mortar) for plastering, even at an early date. There is one series of stuccos and mortars, which have been properly analysed, from Corinth, but there the earlier examples were used not as mortar but as plaster—in particular for lining waterworks, cisterns and so forth. This is a highly specialised use. It is remarkable that the composition of this plaster, even in the later examples, differs from the normal Roman composition. It is, however, almost exactly the same as that used to line a wash tank at Laureion.14 Foster suggests that the use of the Greek formula in Roman times is an example of the Romans learning something from the Greeks. Rather it is an interesting example of the persistence in a specialised field of a particularly Greek tradition even into Roman times—and in a Roman colony at that.

Ardailon also describes the construction of the wash-tanks. Where they are not cut in the solid rock they are made ‘de petites dalles de calcaire ou de schiste, reliées par du mortier, et rapelle, par sa disposition tout au moins, celui des edifices privés de Délos’.

12 Quoted by Polybius x 44. See Hunter’s edition of Aeneas, Πολιτουχία, note to 8.4.
13 Philo 90.28 f. All references to Philo are to the edition of Diels and Schramm, Abh. Berl. Akad. phil.-hist. Kl. 1919, which uses the page and line numbers of Thevenot’s edition.
He does not give an analysis or a more detailed description of the mortar used in this construction. At Delos the mortar consists simply of mud; at Laureion it is more likely to be plaster, as used for the lining, and is to be explained by the unusual circumstances. We must in fact be careful to distinguish between this occasional and highly specialised use of plaster or mortar, and the development of a regular mortar technique, which Vitruvius' *emplektos* implies. Apart from this I know no evidence for the Greeks using mortar to cement stones together, at least down to the time of Alexander the Great. If earlier examples do exist they must be regarded as purely local experiments which certainly did not enjoy any widespread vogue.

The earliest real reference to the regular use of mortar for cementing stones occurs in Theophrastus *Peri Lívoun* in a section (64–67) concerned with γύψος:15 χρώνται γάρ πρός τε τά οἰκοδομήματα τόν λίθον περιγένετε κάν τι ἄλλο βούλεωται τοιοῦτο κολλήσαι. . . .

.. Δαυμαστὴ δὲ καὶ εὐροίς ὀφείλεται δὲ γάρ οἱ λίθοι ῥήμασαν ἡ διαφέρονται ἡ γύψος οὐκ ἄνησι, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τὰ μὲν πέπτωκε καὶ υφηγεται, τὰ δὲ ἄνω κρεμάμενα μὲνει συνεχῆς ὑγιές κολλήσαι. Theophrastus attributes the technique particularly to Cyprus and Phoenicia: περὶ μὲν οὖν Κύπρου καὶ Φοινίκην εἰς ταῦτα μάλιστα. It is clear that Theophrastus considers he is describing something out of the ordinary, and not practised in Mainland Greece.

This, I think, would be sufficient to explain the apparent reluctance of the Greeks to adopt this technique: it was something outside their own tradition, like the Macedonian barrel vaults. We still have to explain how the technique of mortar, however varied, found its way from the theoretical writings of Theophrastus into the more practical world of the architectural handbooks.

Undoubtedly the technique was brought to the attention of the Greeks during, or after, Alexander's siege of Tyre. Arrian, *Anabasis* ii 21.4 (whose evidence, coming presumably from the eye-witness accounts of either Aristoboulos or Ptolemy, must, I think, be unimpeachable) describes the walls of Tyre in the following terms: ἵν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰ τείχη . . . λίθους μεγάλους ἐν γύψῳ κεμελίους ἐμμεμπητότα. The strength of these walls was obvious from the resistance they put up to Alexander's siege-engines (contrast this with the ease with which he breached the walls of Halikarnassos, one of the most up-to-date examples of purely Greek fortification technique). In fact Alexander could not breach the walls of Tyre where he first made his assault: κατὰ μὲν δὲ τὸ χῶμα προσογαμένα (οὐκ, οἱ μυχαναί) διὰ σπέρμαν τοῦ τείχους οὐδὲν ἤρων ὁ τι καὶ λόγου ἄξειν. And so he had to attack them 'in that part that faces south and towards Egypt', that is, from the seaward side, where attack was less likely and the walls consequently weaker (perhaps because γύψος was not used there?).

It is only natural to suppose that, once Tyre had fallen, Alexander's military engineers studied carefully the walls which had provided such exceptional resistance to the Macedonian siege-train. Arrian's description must, I think, be regarded as proof of the interest they took in them. It is not in the least surprising that a few years afterwards the Greek fortifications of Dura-Europos were built in (presumably) the Tyrian technique, large stones cemented together with gypsum.16 It is, perhaps, equally significant that this outstanding example of the Greeks using what was essentially a foreign technique should occur more or less in the area where that technique was part of the native tradition, and at a time very shortly after that technique had created a deep impression on military architects and engineers.

---

15 Caley and Richards in their recent edition of the *Peri Lívoun* point out the difficulties of Theophrastus' account, which seems to confuse under the single term γύψος gypsum (plaster of Paris) and quicklime. It seems probable that in Theophrastus' time no distinction was made between the two. I have not therefore attempted to translate the term γύψος where it occurs in a Hellenistic context.

16 Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura-Europos*, 1922–1923 4 f. The use of gypsum, as opposed to quicklime, is of course here certain.
The fame of Tyre and its fortifications must have been sufficient to earn the γύφος technique a 'highly recommended' in the Hellenistic handbooks concerned with the construction of fortifications. Since, to the Greeks and Romans, fortification was very much a part of architecture, it might well have found its way into architectural handbooks in general. It is not surprising to find references to the use of γύφος for fortifications in Philo's Παρασκευαστικά. This work survives only in excerpts, and the passage containing the description of suitable building techniques, if there was one, no longer survives, presumably because the information it contained was obsolete at the time that the excerpts were made. But at least twice in the surviving portions he uses the expression τιθέντες καὶ τῶν λίθων ἐν γύφῳ (80.21, 81.7). I do not find it altogether fanciful to catch an echo of this or some similar phrase in Vitruvius' relicqui ... cum materia conlocata. Compare also 79.1, δὲ ... ὀρύειας μέχρι πετρας ... τιθέναι τῶν θεμελίων ἐν γύφῳ and Vitruvius' version (i 5.1) fundamenta sic sunt facienda uti foci dantur si quae inventi ad solidum et in solido ... et ea impleantur quam solidissima structura. Here at least it seems certain that Vitruvius' structura represents the Greek γύφος technique.

At the same time we need not consider that the technique was used to any large extent, simply because it had found its way into the handbooks. Technically the walls of Heraclea-ad-Latmum, of the early third century B.C. are not influenced by the discoveries made at Tyre. In fact they conform more to the out-moded local tradition typified by the walls of Halikarnassos and other Hekatomnid walls. To the Greeks of Greece and Asia Minor the technique was foreign, and non-traditional, and, if γύφος was interpreted as gypsum, not particularly practical where the climate was not predominantly dry.17

It seems clear that Greek structura walls, using mortar, are to be regarded rather as theoretical in origin. This, I think, is borne out by their character, as Vitruvius describes them. They seem, in fact, to be walls in which the mortar plays a subsidiary, not an essential part, to strengthen, rather than to hold together. As Vitruvius emphasises, they are quite capable of standing even when their mortar has dried out and crumbled; this is, as we have seen, the reason he approves of them. But this very fact suggests in turn that in their original form these walls did not make use of mortar at all, that they are simply dry-stone walls which the theoretical writers of the Hellenistic period thought suitable for adaptation to mortar walls. In this they show a marked contrast to the Roman mortar technique, which seems to be a purely natural development, by a system of trial and error, free from outside influence. A Roman mortar wall would certainly not be stable without its mortar.

This dry-stone origin seems particularly appropriate to emplekton walls. From comparatively early times it was quite a usual practice for the Greeks to build fortification walls with faces of worked—or, at least, carefully fitted—stone, and a central fill of rubble and clay. Thucydides i 93 refers to this technique in terms which imply that it was quite normal in his time.18

Beginning in the fifth century, and developed more particularly in the fourth, we find various attempts to overcome the chief weakness of such walls, that is, the basic instability (once the clay had dried out) of the central fill. This, of course, was made all the more necessary by the fourth-century developments in siege warfare. A good method of achieving this was to bind the faces to the central core in some way or other, either with headers and through-stones, or by constructing short cross walls running from face to face, dividing the interior into a series of 'compartments'. This had the additional advantage of preventing the collapse of large sections of the wall once a breach had been made. Another method was to increase the stability of the core itself by using larger stones, laid in courses, rather

17 Caley and Richards, 215, note on section 65.
18 εὐτός δὲ οὕτε χάλις οὕτε πηλὸς ἤρ; i.e. this was the normal technique, cf. the building of the walls of Cloud-cuckoo city in Aristophanes Birds 839, χάλικας παραφόρει, πηλόν ἄποδος ἄρρυσον.
than rubble thrown in at random. All these features do in fact exist in various dry-stone walls and it seems only natural to relate the system of emplekton, but without mortar, to them. Tólos, in fact, simply replaces (theoretically) the clay used in fifth-century walls.

I think we are justified in considering that the original emplekton walls were dry-stone in construction, and that even though they did not use mortar, they were known as emplekton walls. I have already suggested that the name was given to the system by virtue of its surface pattern. When this is combined with my other suggestion, that Greek mortared walls are theoretical in origin, and not described from actual examples, it follows that the surface pattern could not have been seen on mortar walls, and that the pattern and so the name must have originated with dry-stone walls. It is, after all, difficult to suppose that the name, which could with reason be applied to many actual walls that had a suitable pattern, should have been restricted to walls which, it seems, existed only in the minds of the Hellenistic theoreticians. The same, of course, applies to isodomum and pseudisodomum walls with the proviso that perhaps the exact significance of their surface patterns, whatever these were, eludes us.

Great emphasis is often laid on Vitruvius as a practical architect. It is perhaps necessary to stress that there are two sides to his work, even granted that in writing the De Architectura he had a practical purpose in mind. The two sides are the Roman, which seems to be essentially the result of practical experience and personal knowledge, and the Greek, for which Vitruvius had a very high respect, but which might be regarded largely as deriving not so much from Vitruvius' own personal knowledge of the actual buildings, and building technique, as from the writings of earlier Greek authorities. In the absence of the Greek sources it is virtually impossible to trace the exact extent and character of Vitruvius' debt to his Hellenistic predecessors. The real importance of emplekton masonry perhaps lies not so much in the walls themselves as in the fact that, thanks to one or two chance survivals, we are for once able to consider in a little more detail what this debt really was.

R. A. TOMLINSON.

University of Birmingham.

19 So we have large stones, not rubble, used for the fill of the walls of the fourth-century fort at Phyle in Attica (Wrede, op. cit. in n. 6), while IG ii² 244, the specification for the fortifications at Eetioneia and Mounychia, states categorically that the rubble must be removed from inside the round tower, and replaced by stones greater than a certain minimum size.

20 Some examples:
(i) Headers, stretchers (and through-stones) with rubble fill:
   Assos (Clarke et al., *Investigations at Assos*, 189);
   Magnesia ad Maeandrum (Humann, *Magna
   (ii) 'Compartment' walls with rubble fill:
   Athens, the diateichisma on the Pnyx
   (Hesperia xii 303 sq.);
   Chalkis, Aetolia (Woodhouse, *Aetolica 110*);
   Sounion, the 'Granary' (Wrede, *Attische
   Arch. i 98*).

(iii) Walls with coursed, large stone fill:
   Arch. i 98*).

(iv) Experimental walls:
   Corinth, E. city wall (Parsons, *Corinth iii 2
   Appendix A 282*), fill of unbaked mudbrick; W. long wall (*ibid., 93*), fill of
   packed earth.
THE DANAID TRILOGY OF AESCHYLUS

The Supplices was the first play of a trilogy. It was followed by the Aegyptii and the Danaides, and the satyr-play was the Amyntor. Single plays that formed part of the trilogy were at once tantalising and challenging, and it is natural that scholars should use their ingenuity in the attempt to recover at least the general trend of the lost plays. But their speculations often diverge widely. The most prudent course is doubtless to refrain from speculation altogether. Yet, in the case of the Danaid trilogy, one is haunted by a feeling that the necessary evidence is at our disposal, if only we could use it rightly. In what does the evidence consist?

There are the fragments attributable to the missing plays. With one important exception, these do not amount to much. But fr. 44 N from the Danaides gives us seven famous lines on the universal power of love in nature, and we know that they were spoken by Aphrodite herself. There is the mythographical tradition—Apollodorus and Hyginus; Pausanias; certain scholia. The constant feature—that the Danaids killed their bridegrooms—is known to us already from the Prometheus Vinctus. Apart from this, it is clear that both before and after Aeschylus there were different versions of the story in circulation. We must have independent reasons for saying that any particular late account depends upon him; and it is only Aeschylus himself who can give us these reasons. It is Aeschylus who provides the primary evidence. I am not thinking of the story of Io and her descendants as told in the Prometheus (846 ff.): though this passage corresponds so closely to the Supplices where it covers the same ground—even including the figure of the hawks and doves—that it is not unreasonable to suppose that it summarises those aspects of the Danaid trilogy at least which were relevant to the later play (as I believe it to have been). The primary evidence is provided by the Supplices itself. In the Oresteia we can see how themes introduced in the Agamemnon are carried over into the Choephoroi and, in many cases, find their culmination in the closing scene of the Eumenides. It is a reasonable assumption that Aeschylus used similar methods in the Danaid trilogy and that themes which are developed in the Supplices were taken up and developed further in the succeeding plays. It is also worth bearing in mind that, if any feature in the extant play seems to lack relevance or to receive emphasis disproportionate to its dramatic value there, it may look forward to the missing sequel. These are assumptions; and the biggest assumption that one makes—optimistic and perhaps ill-founded—is that we can begin to understand the artistic methods and modes of thought of Aeschylus. In what follows many questions will be asked and a number of answers suggested, some old, some new. There will be much that is extremely speculative.

One or two things we know for certain. We know that the Danaids were taken as brides by the sons of Aegyptus; that they killed their bridegrooms on the wedding-night; all except Hypermestra, who spared Lynceus. There can be little doubt that this action or some part of it constituted the second play. And one broad line of Aeschylean interpretation seems fairly evident. The victims of violence in the Supplices become violent

1 This article is based upon a lecture delivered to the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies on April 25, 1958. I wish to express my thanks now as I did then to Miss M. L. Cunningham and Mr S. K. Bailey for a number of stimulating criticisms and suggestions.

2 Belief that the trilogy was constituted in this way has been substantially reinforced by P. Oxy. 2256, fr. 3.

3 P. Oxy. 2255, fr. 14, adds nothing to our knowledge.


5 This principle is laid down by F. Stoessl, Die Trilogie des Aischylus, 84.
agents in the sequel, for violence breeds violence, *hubris* breeds *hubris*. Even in the *Supplices*, for all their claims to *sophrosyne*, the Danaids showed a potentiality of violence. There they threatened to kill themselves rather than submit to wedlock: in the outcome they kill their bridegrooms. Thus the themes of βία and ὄφρας, prominent in the *Supplices*, were carried over into the later plays.

But how did this action come about, as it certainly did? The *Supplices* ends with the Danaids under the protection of Argos and its king, who are ready to fight on their behalf. It is commonly—and I think rightly—assumed that the battle which threatened at the end of the play actually took place; that the Argives were defeated, Pelagus was killed, Danaus became king of Argos and negotiated the treacherous wedlock of his daughters. This cannot be proved with certainty, and some scholars have thought that war was averted by diplomacy. Too much weight need not perhaps be attached to the words of the Egyptian herald at 934 ff. which seem to rule out the possibility of a peaceful settlement. But surely it would be something of an anticlimax, if Argos escaped the war which she had so boldly risked in the cause of the suppliants (and an over-simplification of the mind of Zeus, if the innocent did not suffer). More objectively, the economy of the trilogy would be embarrassed by the continued presence of a live Pelagus: better that he should die and that Danaus should become king. That Danaus was at some time or other king of Argos is a solid feature in the tradition. He is not king when the trilogy begins. That a discredited Danaus was promoted to the kingship at the end of the trilogy is hard to believe. It will be shown below that there are considerable advantages to be derived from the hypothesis that he became king in the *Aegyptii*.

To the circumstances which may be supposed to have prevailed in that play and to have led up to the arrangement with the sons of Aegyptus we will return later. It is unlikely that the murder of the bridegrooms, involving the passage of a night, took place in the course of a play. It is more probable that, as the *Supplices* ended at nightfall, so did the *Aegyptii*; and that the opening of the *Danaides* revealed the murder of forty-nine bridegrooms and the sparing of the fiftieth. What happened then? One thing only we know for certain: that Aphrodite appeared and delivered a speech which proclaimed the universal power of sexual love. It is obvious that in this way she commended the action of Hypermestra. It has been assumed—perhaps too readily—that she spoke in Hypermestra's defence and that Hypermestra was on trial.

Fr. 44, from Aphrodite's speech, is the longest and most important of our fragments. It is with this fragment that any serious attempt to recover what is lost should begin. In order to put the whole action in its proper frame, we must look to the end. For this passage must, surely, come near the end of the trilogy. It has a breadth and finality of argument which must settle once and for all whatever it was intended to settle. But does Aphrodite speak as an advocate at a trial? Like Apollo defending Orestes in the *Eumenides*? The analogy is seductive, but leads to difficulties. It is, for example, a one-sided trial in which one party only has divine support: yet no god or gods can have prosecuted

---

8 At 630 ff. the Danaids, while calling down blessings on the people of Argos, return again and again to the name of Ares. Some writers have suggested—and it may well be true—that these references foreshadow the murderous actions of the singers (contr. 749). In any case I feel that the ironical effect is greatly enhanced if the Argives in fact suffer the miseries of war.
9 When Danaus receives a bodyguard in the *Supplices* (985 ff., cf. esp. τίμην γέφρας), this might be regarded as a halfway stage to the kingship. One further point: if Danaus becomes king, his daughters presumably cease to be μέτοχοι (699) in need of a πρόσωπο (491) and become full citizens.
10 Cf. 768-70.
11 ἔρα μὲν ἀγνὸς οὐρανός τρόπαιος χθώνα, ἔρασι δὲ γαῖαν λαμβάνει γάμοι τυχέων.
φιλότιμος δ' αὐτ' εὐνάπτου (?) οὐρανοῖ πεσών ἐκεῖνε γαῖαν ἢ δὲ τίκτετας βροτοῖς
ἀμφόθεν τε βοσκαί καὶ βιοῦν Δῃμῶν
κατανεῖσθαι ὁρᾷ δ' ἐκ νυκτίζων γάμον
τελείος ἔστι ταῦτ' ἐγ' ἐργὸ παραίτησι.
THE DANAID TRilogy OF AESCHYLUis

Hypermestra. Perhaps a better counterpart to Aphrodite can be found in the Eumenides—not Apollo, but Athena. Not Apollo defending Orestes, but Athena persuading the Furies. To the question of a trial I shall return. Nor do I wish to deny that Aphrodite had a function in relation to Hypermestra (she clearly had). But I suggest that she had an even more important function in relation to Hypermestra’s sisters.

What happened to the Danaids (and for that matter to Danaus) at the end of the trilogy? Critics have tended to shrug off this awkward question and concentrate upon the destiny of Hypermestra and Lynceus, who of course lived happily ever after and were the progenitors of the Argive kings. But the question is fundamental and must be faced. Say Hypermestra was vindicated: something must have been done about her sisters. If Aeschylus could not, at Eumenides 778, leave a chorus of angry Furies ‘in the air’, no more could he leave in the air a chorus of Danaids, bloodguilty as well as aggrieved. In point of dramatic structure, they must have had an exodos: whither and to what fate? Say Hypermestra was vindicated: were her sisters found guilty? And, if guilty, were they punished? And, if so, how and where and when? It has been suggested that the trilogy ended with the Danaids condemned to their famous punishment in Hades (and, admittedly, Supplices 230 f. and 416 might look forward to such a conclusion). But that story has not been proved to be as old as Aeschylus. Moreover, it may well be doubted whether an Aeschylean trilogy is likely to have come to a conclusion with the eternal punishment of a chorus. Nor should we forget that these were the wronged women of the Supplices and that they were driven to murder by desperation and by the ill-judged counsels of their father and that their every emotion had been communicated to the audience with the lyric genius of Aeschylus. If not with their punishment, the trilogy can only end in one way: with their reconciliation. With their reconciliation to marriage. It was the function of Aphrodite to reconcile them, as it was the function of Athena to reconcile the Furies; and fr. 44 is then part of the persuasive speech—or one of the persuasive speeches—through which she carried out this function. If this view is correct, the trilogy ends as it began with the attitude of the Danaids to marriage, but with a change of attitude, with a conversion.

This view has been put forward with great cogency by Professor K. von Fritz, to whom I am much indebted at this point. Thanks to his article, I can deal briefly with a complex question which can no longer be avoided. To what were the Danaids opposed? To marriage with cousins qua cousins? To a forced marriage? Or to marriage qua marriage? This question, which has been much debated, turns partly upon passages of disputed reading. The Danaids regard the marriage as forbidden by themis (38), but there is little or nothing in the Supplices which suggests that they (unlike the Athenians) regarded a marriage with cousins as incestuous. Both at the end of the opening anapaests (38-40) and in the words of Danaus (227 f.) the stress is on lack of consent: it is a marriage to which neither the women nor their father have agreed. The sons of Aegyptus, on the other hand, claim the Danaids as their property (39, 918 ff.), but on what right their claim is based—and indeed all the circumstances which led up to the flight and the pursuit—are left obscure in the Supplices and are perhaps unlikely to have been clarified in the sequel. This obscurity 12 It can safely be assumed that the Danaids formed the chorus of this play, whatever may be true of the Aegyptii (see p. 146 below).
15 8-10; 335-9. In the former passage Bambergers aitroyeivē qve8anophq is the most popular and, I think, the correct solution, since it brings out a suitable contrast with 6-7: their flight is spontaneous (aitroyeivē), not enforced; it is flight from men (from husbands), not exile from a city. Cf. von Fritz, op. cit. 123. The difficulties of 335 ff. are too complex for discussion here: there is much to be said for the hypothesis of a lacuna or lacunae (Wilamowitz).
must be deliberate, and it can hardly have any purpose except to concentrate attention upon the violence of the pursuit and the loathing which it engenders. The violence of the Egyptians puts them in the wrong; they are guilty of 

habris, and their victims deserve the pity of the Argives, under the divine sanction of Zeus Hikesios. The distinction between hatred of a forced marriage and hatred of marriage as such cannot be pressed too far, since, in the dramatic situation, force is the only guise under which marriage presents itself to the Danaids, as an act comparable to war or to the preying of bird on bird. But there are passages in which the language of the Danaids suggests a horror of male contact in any form. The Handmaidens sing of Kypris and of marriage in general terms, and it is in terms of the broadest generality that Aphrodite speaks of her own powers. If we want a formula that will cover all the facts, we cannot do better than say that the violent approach of the sons of Aegyptus has warped the feminine instincts of the Danaids and turned them against marriage as such. At the end of the trilogy, then, they must be restored to normality and made freely to accept their destiny of marriage. It is Aphrodite’s function to bring this about with her persuasions.

If the Danaids were converted to the idea of marriage at the end of the trilogy (which seems a reasonable hypothesis), were they actually married or were marriages arranged for them? This is far more speculative. But some arrangement must have been made for their future. There is little point in persuading women to marry, unless they are to be married; and it was in fact one part of the tradition that Danaus married off his homicidal daughters—with some difficulty, according to Pausanias. The story of the foot-race goes back at least to Pindar’s ninth Pythian ode (111 ff.)—the Danaids ranged at the finishing-tape to be chosen in order of attractiveness by the swiftest runners. It seems to lack dignity, and one may prefer to think that Aeschylus did not use it. He need have done no more than indicate that they would be married in due course. But the possibility cannot be ruled out that bridegrooms were actually produced for them upon the stage. This trilogy seems to have run to supplementary choruses. Was there, then, a chorus of bridegrooms (like the Propompoi in the Eumenides)? By our standards this might seem rather ridiculous, but it is not certain that a parade of noble Argives, full of 

aidos towards their brides, would have struck the audience of Aeschylus in that light. The 

exados would then have balanced that of the Aegyptii (see below); and there would have been one other signal advantage. For this would have brought upon the stage for the closing scene representatives of the state of Argos, which had undoubtedly played an important role in the action, and the destinies of which will have been announced towards the end of the trilogy. The political theme is already prominent in the Supplices, and it will be suggested that its importance increased in the later plays.

At this point we must return to the Aegyptii. To attempt to recover its economy in every detail would be unprofitable, but, by careful attention to the Supplices, it may be possible to determine certain situations which it certainly or probably contained.

16 Cf. W. Headlam, CR 14 (1900), 111-12; K. von Fritz, op. cit. 125. The whole 
dike-theme is acutely discussed by D. Kaufmann-Bühler, Begriff und Funktion der Dike in den Tragödien des Aischylos 30-50. 17 Cf. 486 ff., after 478 f.; 639 ff. 18 War: 83, 335, 1064. Birds: esp. 223 ff., 510. 19 Cf. 141 ff. 20 K. von Fritz, op. cit. 262: ‘Die Abneigung gegen einen bestimmten Freier hat nie und nirgendals als Beleidigung der Liebesgöttin gegolten.’ The attribution of these lines to a supplementary chorus of Handmaidens is still denied by some. But why introduce handmaidens at all, unless they had this role to play? And a division of opinion among the Danaids is inappropriate at this stage, before their common action in the sequel. Aphrodite is given due honour first by the Handmaidens, then by Hypermestra, then by all the Danaids?

21 K. von Fritz, op. cit. 262: ‘Die Verletzung ihrer Weiblichkeit durch die Aigyptiosöhne hat die Danaiden mit Abscheu erfüllt gegen jede Ehe und gegen jede Verbindung mit einem Mann.’ 22 3.12-2. 23 Perhaps, as Miss Cunningham suggests, the marriage of Hypermestra and Lynceus alone was solemnised (or about to be solemnised) at the end of the trilogy: perhaps under new rites invoking the protection of Hera (see n. 52).
(1) Reasons have already been given for supposing that a battle took place in which the Argives were defeated and Pelagius was killed. But the outcome must have been such that the state of Argos—and Danaus himself—were not deprived of all liberty of action (and so of dramatic interest). How could this be, if the Argives had been defeated? There is a simple explanation: the defeat was followed by a siege. Let us observe, then, Supplices 955 f.: στείχισεν ειδρυκαί πόλιν | πύργων βαθείας μεγαλήν κεκλημένην. The style of Aeschylus does not in general run to decorative amplifications, and I suggest that this looks forward to the sequel.

(2) That is the situation: Argos defeated and beleaguered. How does it lead to the surrender of the Danaids to their suitors? One thing is certain: the Argive people cannot simply have gone back on their word. The irrevocability of their decision is proclaimed by Pelagius in the strongest terms at Supplices 944 f.: τώρα ἐφήλωσεν τορός | γόμφος διαμπάξ ὦς μένεις ἀραρότως. This unanimous decision not to surrender the Danaids to force (βία) must govern Argive action also in the Aegyptii. But if they are willing, if they are persuaded—that is another matter: (940 f.) ταῦτα δ’ ἐκχύσας μὲν κατ’ εὐνοίαν φρενῶν | ἀγορὰς ἀν, εἰπέρ εὐσεβῆς πίθοι λόγως. This is where Danaus must have played the leading role: a Danaus who now is or becomes king. Whether he was elected king simply in virtue of his descent from Io or whether his election was bound up with an offer to surrender willing daughters to the Egyptians is a matter of mere speculation. His motives too must remain hypothetical: perhaps he distrusted Argive powers of resistance; perhaps he saw a way, a plan, a μηχανή, not only to preserve his daughters’ virginity, but also to retaliate upon his enemies. But the initiative must have come from him. He is in fact characterised in the Supplices as the man who might devise such a plan. It is the only way in which he is characterised—and characterised from the beginning: he is βουδάρχης, πεσσονομῶν—planning his moves, playing his cards (11 ff.). He is the planner, the calculator, the embodiment of worldly wisdom, the man who always knows best. Whatever his motives, whatever the political situation, he has one essential function to perform: he must persuade his daughters. However the earlier part of the play was managed, we can envisage this as the central scene. A scene opening perhaps with utter despair on the part of the Danaids, who have placed their hopes in the gods and in men, who see themselves abandoned by the gods, abandoned by men, abandoned even by their own father. Then comes a stroke of Aeschylean irony. Their father has not failed them after all. He expounds his plan, appealing at once to their hatred of wedlock and to their sense of filial piety; and they comply. ‘Of their own free will you may take them, should pious argument in fact persuade them.’ Those words must have been significant for the future; and they are doubly significant. They look forward to the holy and persuasive words with which Aphrodite converted the Danaids to marriage. But they also look forward to the persuasions of Danaus, necessary to the plot of the Aegyptii. A speech of persuasion indeed, but not εὐσεβῆς.

(3) It was not εὐσεβῆς, because it involved, not merely deeds of murderous violence (which the Egyptians themselves had provoked), but also a breach of hospitality. Zeus

---

24 It is a minor point whether sounds of battle were heard, as in the Septem, before the outcome of the fighting was announced. It is perhaps worth saying that, because the Supplices has no prologue, we cannot therefore assume that both the later plays opened with the parodos.

25 The impression of 11 ff. is reinforced by the first words of Danaus (176 ff., esp. προμήθειας); they are echoed at 969 f. (πρόωνον καὶ βουδάρχην, followed by μήτης). Every reference in the Supplices to his wisdom, forethought and planning must look forward to the disastrous device of the Aegyptii.

26 The filial obedience of the Danaids in the Supplices (204 ff., 968 ff.) prepares for a more dramatic instance in the Aegyptii? K. von Fritz (op. cit. 256 f., 259 n. 1) criticizes A. Elisei (Studi ital. di filologia classica, N.S.6 (1928), 197 ff.), perhaps rightly, for overstressing the submissiveness of the Danaids, but I feel that he himself underestimates the role probably played by Danaus in the sequel. In the absence of the play, however, we cannot know what was the balance between the two factors of their decision.

27 Nor would the Danaids give themselves κατ’ εὐνοίαν φρενῶν (though the Argives were not to know this).
figures in the *Supplices* for the most part in his aspect as Hikesios, the protector of suppliants, but twice (627, 672) as Xenios, the protector of foreigners, of guests. This is appropriate enough, since the Danaids have found *proxenoi* in the Argive king and people: it may have been even more appropriate in the sequel. Indeed I suspect that, just as Zeus Hikesios presides over the *Supplices*, so did Zeus Xenios over the *Aegyptii*. The murder of the Egyptians was a breach of hospitality, since, when peace had been made upon terms, it was not as *polemioi*, but as *xenoi* that they entered the city to claim their brides. They were not only *xenoi* to the city, but they were probably the personal *xenoi* of Danaus. Towards the end of the *Supplices*, the question of the accommodation of the Danaids is raised. It is raised twice (957 ff., 1009 ff.), by the king and by Danaus. There are two sets of choices. The Danaids may share common quarters with other women or have rooms to themselves. It has long been recognised that this may have had a relevance to the sequel, so as to facilitate the action of the Danaids and the independent action of Hypermestra. The other choice too may be significant (and is the one repeated in the speech of Danaus). Will they be the guests of the king or of the city? Now, where the Danaids spend the night which follows the *Supplices* is of no dramatic moment: where they spend the night which follows the *Aegyptii* may be of crucial importance. If they choose—or rather Danaus chooses for them—the royal apartments, and if Danaus becomes king and inherits the royal palace, then the murder of the sons of Aegyptus is the murder of guests under his own roof. ‘Hevy is the wrath of Zeus Hikesios’, said the chorus-leader in the *Supplices* (346). No less heavy is the wrath of Zeus Xenios; and it is this wrath, together with an intolerable pollution, which Danaus will have brought upon himself and upon his daughters. But he will also have brought it upon the city of which he is now king. This surely must be the religious background to the Danaides and must affect whatever action is there taken by the Argive state.

These, then, seem to me the most probable hypotheses about the *Aegyptii*. Argos defeated and besieged; Pelagus dead and Danaus king or becoming king; a voluntary surrender of themselves by the Danaids, on the basis of their father’s murder-plot; a crime prepared against Zeus Xenios. Further speculation on the economy of the play is not, perhaps, very profitable. It has been assumed that, despite the title, the Danaids formed the chorus of this play also. Try as one will, it is very hard to see how the play could have been managed with a main chorus consisting of the sons of Aegyptus, and there is no reason why it should not have been named after a supplementary chorus. This chorus entered, I suspect, late in the play, and only to claim their brides, after negotiations had been completed. No formalities of marriage would be required, since the Egyptians already claim the Danaids as their property; and the cunning of Danaus might well have avoided such formalities. We can only guess at the tone of this scene. Perhaps the bridegrooms entered the house of death with words of ardour, proclaiming the passion which, as they think, is about to be fulfilled. Naturally, we should like to know whether any indication was given that Hypermestra would take a line of her own; whether she was already dis-

---

28 If this is right, it strengthens Miss Cunningham’s case for attributing P. Oxy. 2251 to the *Aegyptii* (*RhM* 96 (1953), 223–31). The attribution is criticised by H. Lloyd-Jones in the *Loeb Aeschylus*, vol. ii (1957), 571 ff.; a rejoinder by Miss Cunningham will appear in *RhM* shortly. I would point out (i) that the attribution is consistent with Snell’s νόθος δόμους, which would be particularly appropriate to the situation I envisage below, and that such an appeal to Zeus Xenios by the chorus in the early part of the play would have a powerful irony in view of their future action; (ii) that ἄρα, ἀρρενάρα are common of deities in the *Supplices* (cf. O. Hiltbrunner, Wieder- holungs- und Motivtechnik bei Aischylus 39) to a degree unparalleled in Aeschylus. For appeals with the imperative or optative of these verbs, mostly to Zeus: 1, 104, 145, 206, 210, 359, 811, 1030, cf. 531.
30 Cf. 970 ff.
31 Cf. M. Pohlz, *Die griechische Tragödie*, 51; A. Lesky, *op. cit.* 70. This trilogy will have been extraordinarily closely knit, if it had unity of chorus as well as approximate unity of time and place.
32 Miss Cunningham’s suggestion.
tinguished from her sisters in this play and Lynceus from his brothers. Here there seems little solid basis for speculation, and I confine myself to a single point. There was one way at least in which Lynceus could have been introduced with plausibility. The entry of the Egyptians must have been prepared by negotiations. It is not inconceivable, therefore, that Lynceus, as negotiator, was a character in the play. If he had a speaking part, it would have given him an opportunity to show a degree of sophrosyne which merited salvation and a persuasiveness in his protestations of desire which awoke himeros in his destined bride.

Why did Hypermestra spare Lynceus? \(\mu\lambda\nu \delta\varepsilon \pi\alpha\dot{i}\delta\omicron\nu\) (so runs PV 865 f.) \(\iota\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\sigma\ \theta\ell\varepsilon\xi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\nu\) | \(\kappa\tau\epsilon\\\nu\iota\varsigma \sigma\upsilon\nu\varepsilon\iota\nu\). Some critics have taken \(\pi\alpha\dot{i}\delta\omicron\nu\) in dependence upon \(\iota\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\sigma\) and believe that she spared her bedfellow out of a desire for children. In the context of the Prometheus it is not perhaps easy to decide between this and the rival interpretation, namely that \(\pi\alpha\dot{i}\delta\omicron\nu\) depends on \(\mu\lambda\nu\) and that Hypermestra was charmed by sexual desire. But, if (as I believe) this passage is related to the themes of the Danaid trilogy, there can be little doubt that the latter interpretation is correct. It is of course relevant that Hypermestra and Lynceus bred the race of Argive kings: the power of Aphrodite is the power of fertility. But the fertility is promoted by desire. \(\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha} \mu\varepsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\nu\rho\omicron\nu\ \omega\omicron\nu\rho\alpha\nu\ \tau\rho\omicron\sigma\alpha\ i\chi\omicron\omicron\nu\a; \) | \(\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha} \delta\varepsilon \gamma\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\ \lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}e\iota\ve\acute{\iota} \gamma\alpha\mu\omicron\nu\ \tau\chi\acute{\omicron}e\iota\nu\) (fr. 44): heaven and earth are filled with mutual love. I cannot separate \(\iota\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\sigma\ \theta\ell\varepsilon\xi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\nu\) in the Prometheus from the terms in which the Handmaidens of the Supplices sang of the attendant train of Kypris: (1039 f.) \(\Pi\omicron\theta\omicron\omicron\as; \chi\tau\omicron; \tau\omicron; \omicron\iota\delta\omicron\nu \\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\nu\ \tau\ell\varepsilon\ell\varepsilon\iota\nu \ \dot{\omicron}\ell\varepsilon\kappa\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\ \Pi\omicron\iota\delta\omicron\iota\nu;\). \(\epsilon\rho\omicron\sigma; \ \pi\omicron\omicron\sigma; \ \iota\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron;\) \(\pi\ell\iota\delta\omicron\nu\) and \(\dot{\omicron}\ell\varepsilon\gamma\ve\omicron;\) these form a cluster of related words, all associated with the power of Kypris or Aphrodite. For that matter it was not the Handmaidens who first raised the theme of the persuasive magic of sexual attraction, but the dry, calculating, puritanical Danaus himself, when he spoke of the passer-by, overcome with desire (\(\iota\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\sigma\ \nu\iota\kappa\omicron\omega\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\)) ‘darting a seductive arrow of the eye \(\dot{\omicron}\mu\mu\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron; \ \dot{\omicron}\ell\varepsilon\kappa\tau\iota\omicron\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}e\gamma\omicron;\nu\) at the tender loneliness of virgins’ (1003–5). The purpose of these lines is not to characterise Danaus (or the Danaids), but to introduce a theme which will immediately be carried further by the Handmaidens and will receive its culmination in the speech of Aphrodite. This, surely, was the force which moved Hypermestra to disobey her father; and it was because sexual desire now presented itself to her, not as a brutal rape, but as a persuasive and enchanting courtship, that she was able to separate herself from her sisters. Aeschylus was renowned as the best of all writers of satyr-plays. The satyr-play which followed the Danaid trilogy was the Amymone, about which we know little, but enough for our purposes. It told how another of the daughters of Danaus was saved from the brutal lust of a satyr by the god Poseidon, whose lover she then became. It can hardly be doubted that Aeschylus had taken up and translated into suitable satiric terms the theme of the contrast between rape and courtship which had already been developed in the trilogy.

What indications may have been given in the Aegyptii to foreshadow the separate action of

---

33 That both Hypermestra and Lynceus had speaking parts and that there was dialogue between them seems unlikely.

34 E. Harrison, Proc. Cambr. Philol. Soc. 160–2 (1935), 8 (oddly misreported by R. D. Murray, op. cit. 60 n. 6), argues that to take \(\pi\alpha\dot{i}\delta\omicron\nu\) with \(\iota\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\sigma\) is more consonant with the tragic poets’ use of \(\pi\alpha\dot{i}z\); but this argument has little force in view of \(\gamma\eta\iota\nu\a; \nu\pi\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\tau\omicron\tau\omicron;\) preceding (853), and I would rather ask whether it is consonant with \(\iota\mu\epsilon\rho\omicron\sigma\ \theta\ell\varepsilon\xi\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\nu\) in a context of wedlock. The interpretation I reject is put in an extreme form, and given a historical setting, by A. Diamantopoulos, ‘The Danaid Tetralogy of Aeschylus’, JHS 77 (1957), 222.

35 It is most unfortunate that 1001 f., with their reference to Kypris, are so corrupt. Still, Kypris is mentioned—and doubtless made responsible for the phenomena that Danaus so deplores.

36 E. A. Wolff, op. cit. 31, on 991–1013: ‘This eloquent plea would surely be superfluous if the Danaids had an inborn antipathy to men, or if they were devotees of Artemis.’ Perhaps, though I should prefer to say that it throws light not on the Danaids as they are, but as first Hypermestra and then her sisters will become—susceptible to the charm of sexual desire.
of Hypermestra we can hardly know. The opening scenes of the Danaides must have revealed that action and its motives. Again, we do not know how it was managed, but it seems likely that the chorus, when they entered, carried, not the olive-branches which they called ἐψεπίστα in the παρόδος of the Supplices (22), but real daggers this time. The defection of Hypermestra will have been disclosed. The situation confronts Danaus—and no less the state of Argos—with a problem. Did it lead to a trial? If so, of whom, and at whose instance? Where, and before what court? There was a trial in the tradition—or rather two trials. According to one account, Hypermestra was brought to trial by Danaus and acquitted by the Argives; according to another, there was a trial of Danaus (not the Danaids) at the instance of Aegyptus, who had come to Argos to avenge his sons. Aegyptus can have played no part in the Aeschylean trilogy. If any action was taken against Danaus and the Danaids, it must have been taken by the polis. But at the outset the initiative would seem to rest with Danaus, who would certainly have been anxious to punish Hypermestra. To him the slaying of the forty-nine Egyptians was the triumphant outcome of his plot, the sparing of the fiftieth a treacherous act of disobedience and, since Lynceus was left alive, a threat to his security. But, if Danaus is concerned, so is the polis—for reasons which have already been suggested. In some way the Argive state must have given a decision upon the issues involved; something in the nature of a trial must have taken place. Did Danaus refer the case of Hypermestra to the sovereign people? Or did he seek to act under his own powers, and did the people intervene? The question is interesting, but perhaps unanswerable. To an even more interesting question some answer can be suggested. The case must have brought king and state into some kind of relationship. What relationship was that?

I have already referred to the principle that, if any feature in the extant play seems to receive emphasis disproportionately to its dramatic value there, it may well be relevant to the lost plays. In the Supplices Pelasgus insists upon the sovereignty of the people; the Danaids are obstinate at first in their refusal to entertain the idea. Since it is important that the city as well as the king should be committed to the protection of the suppliants, we cannot say that the theme lacks relevance. In this play, nevertheless, the dramatic action is unaffected by the constitutional position, since king and people take the same line. For this reason it may be thought that the theme is disproportionately stressed. There is, moreover, a number of passages in the Supplices in which Pelasgus or Danaus expresses apprehension—an apprehension not warranted by the events of this play—about the reactions of the Argive people. (To one of these passages I shall refer in detail below.) I suggest that in these ways the audience is being prepared for a situation later in the trilogy in which a king is repudiated by the people, and that this situation is to be found in the Danaides.

On stage or off stage, Danaus had to put his case to the Argives. The subject of effective speech receives some prominence in the Supplices. Pelasgus knew how to speak persuasively to his citizens (615, 623 f., cf. 523), and he put the right words into the mouth of Danaus (519). But a time would come, when Danaus had to speak without the guidance of Pelasgus. Speak he will have done, full of confidence in his cleverness and in his eloquence (775). What he was made to throw into his argument we do not know. He may have stressed the fact that Argos was now avenged upon a foreign foe who had humiliated her in battle. He may have gone back over the rival claims of himself and the Egyptians. He

---

Footnotes:

37 Danaus may have come to wake his daughters and have made a prologue-speech (see n. 24) of sinister irony. To such a speech fr. 43 might have belonged; equally, or better, it may have come towards the end of the play in connexion with the marriage of the Danaids: cf. von Fritz, op. cit. 134 f., 267. But both text and interpretation are doubtful.
38 Pausanias 2.19,6; 21,1.
39 Σ Eur. Or. 872.
40 Cf. 365 ff., 397 ff.
41 201, 398 ff., 484 f. (on which see p. 149 below).
42 With 775 compare fr. 45.
will have referred to the duty of obedience owed to a parent. But one advantage which Pelasgus possessed he lacked. Pelasgus had been able to persuade the Argives by speaking of the wrath of Zeus Hikesios (616 f.) and of the pollution which threatened the city. Weighing in the balance against Danaus are the wrath of Zeus Xenios and a pollution already incurred. For this, if we are right, is the third and last of three difficult situations with which the state of Argos has had to deal. The second (in the Agamemnon) is conjectural, but about the first we are fully informed in the Supplices. It involved a dilemma: on the one hand the danger of an external war, on the other a religious obligation. A king took his stand upon religion and was supported by the people. In the Danaides, I submit, a king is rejected by the people, rejected on religious grounds, rejected by those of whom the chorus in the Supplices had sung (671 f.) that they worshipped Zeus above all in his capacity as Xenios. Pelasgus had spoken to the people of pollution (619, cf. 473), but his first reference to μακρά in the play had a different context. It was not perhaps for nothing—or for mere antiquarian interest—that Aeschylus made Pelasgus tell the story of Apeis (262 f.), the prophet-healer who had cleansed the land of deadly snakes, which the earth had sent up in wrath, when she was polluted by ancient deeds of blood (παλαιων αιματων μακρα). The services of Apeis were not forgotten by the men of Argos (270), nor presumably the occasion of them. This time it was for the Argive state itself to find the cure. In the words of Pelasgus: το κοιον δει μαινεται πολεις, ξωθε μελεσθω λαος εκπονεως ακη (366 f., cf. 268).

It is of course possible that these proceedings took place—that Danaus spoke and that representatives of the city of Argos reached their decision—in face of the audience. But if so, then the trial in the Eumenides, in so far as it is analogous, may be a misleading analogy. There are dramaturgical difficulties involved; and I am inclined to believe that, as in the Supplices and probably in the Agamemnon, an assembly was held off-stage; that Danaus left, full of confidence, to put his case; and that meanwhile the chorus sang a song of suspense—or perhaps there was a kommos expressing the contrasted emotions of Hypermemstra and her sisters (the former suppli-ant at an altar?). After the ode someone—whether Danaus or Lyceus or a messenger—will have brought news of the decision. At the nature of that decision we can, I suggest, make a good guess.

That decision or those decisions. My basic hypothesis is that, asked to condemn Hypermemstra, the people of Argos instead condemned Danaus and his other daughters. The condemnation of a king might well be prepared by passages to which I have already referred, and particularly by 480 ff., where Pelasgus instructs Danaus in certain precautions: ‘in order that reproaches be not levelled against me, for the people is given to accuse its rulers’. A remark which is inapposite in the context of the Supplices. The apprehensions expressed by Danaus in that play (492 ff., esp. 499; 985 ff.) may seem exaggerated, if not pointless, unless some real danger threatened him in the sequel; and I suspect that he may have been condemned to death, though, for obvious reasons, he can hardly have been executed. We are on firmer ground in speculating about the verdict on the Danaids.

43 It will be observed that an injunction laid by Danaus on his daughters involved them, if I have read the situation aright, in a (highly Aeschylean?) clash between two religious duties: they can honour their father or their guests, but not both. These are two of the three duties to which reference is made in 698–709 (on which see V. L. Ehrenberg, Historia 1 (1950), 352 n. 21 and Kaufmann-Bühler, op. cit. 22).

44 R. D. Murray, op. cit. 81, makes the same point from a rather different angle. I am not concerned to deny that the name of Apeis was also intended to link Argos and Egypt: cf. J. T. Sheppard, CQ 5 (1911), 220–9, R. D. Murray, op. cit. 24 f.

45 The Supplices requires two actors only, and we have no reason to suppose that a third would have been available in the later plays. But it would not have been easy to stage such a trial with only two actors.

46 Miss Cunningham’s suggestion.

47 It is an advantage, if we can dispense with Tucker’s non-dramatic interpretation of these lines: ‘a subtle reproof administered to “Demos”. As to the text, there is much to be said for Headlam’s punctuation after ἐξων κατ’. His death might have entailed the consequence to which he refers at 988. He was spared at the command of Aphrodite?
These women had suffered cruel persecution, which had won the sympathy of the Argives, and they had acted on the instructions of a father: so far they were deserving of mercy. But creatures so grievously polluted could not safely be allowed to remain within the territory of Argos. Let us cast our minds back to the second sentence of the Supplices: φεύγομεν οὖν ἐφ’ αἷματι δημηλασίν ψῆφω τόλμως γνωσθέναι. ‘We are in exile, but not condemned to banishment for bloodshed by vote of a city’ (7–8). Where they stand, the words have a redundant fullness. But is it not Aeschylean that they should foreshadow the condition in which the Danaids actually find themselves towards the end of the trilogy?

The Danaids are in flight again, with both Egypt and Argos barred to them and perhaps without the protection of their father. What can they do, except sing a song of utter and final despair? There was one thing they could do, and perhaps they did it: take refuge at an altar,49 suppliants to the gods again, and repeat their threat of suicide. If so—and I do not suggest that it is more than a possibility—the situation is beyond the scope of human wisdom, and the stage is set for the entrance of Aphrodite. In Euripides she would no doubt have arrived without warning. In Aeschylus her entry is more likely to have been prepared; and in the only comparable Aeschylean theophany Athena appears in answer to prayer. Hypermestra may have prayed to Aphrodite (for it is conceivable that she was still in danger from her sisters); or they in their extremity may have prayed to Artemis and been answered by the appearance of Aphrodite; or in a kommos both goddesses may have been invoked (cf. Supplices 1031 ff.).

Whatever the mechanics of her entry, Aphrodite, as representative of the divine wisdom and the divine will, has more than one task to fulfil. She has to restore the Danaids to normality, to reconcile them to the destiny of marriage. About this something has already been said, and we shall return to it in a moment. One pressing matter must have received attention in this closing scene: the purification of the Danaids from their blood-guilt. According to one tradition, they were purified by Hermes and Athena at the command of Zeus;50 and it certainly seems rather outside the province of Aphrodite, though she might well have announced the will of her father. It must probably remain uncertain how the purification was arranged and how timed in relation to the marriage of the Danaids (if there was such a marriage). Yet purification there must have been, and it must have been ordained by the offended Zeus.

Zeus must have ended the trilogy, as it began with him—began with Zeus Hikesios and continued with Zeus Xenios. Zeus is also teleios, ordaining the end, accomplishing everything τῶν βούλων φέρει φήμ (Supplices 599). But his mind is unfathomable: so at least it appeared to the chorus of Handmaidens (1057 f.). Yet something of the mind of Zeus may have been revealed as the trilogy drew to its close.

Many issues had been raised: issues of religion and politics and society and individual decision, inextricably interwoven (as they always are in Aeschylus). The central thread is that of men, women and marriage. The Danaids reject the violent suit of their cousins and are pursued by them. It is an affair of the family, but the state becomes involved: the city of Argos protects the suppliants. Who can say that the Danaids were wrong to flee from brutal lust, or the Argives wrong to be moved by pity for them and by fear of Zeus Hikesios? Yet marriage is the destined lot of women, and the institution of marriage a necessary part of the structure of society. It was not wrong in the eyes of Aeschylus that

49 Supplices 482, 494, 501 may suggest that altars within the city itself played a part in the sequel—in the Aegyptii perhaps as well as in the Danaides. All three plays may have involved some movement of the Chorus between orchestra and altar.

50 Apollodorus 2.1.4. Hermes would come in well as a link not only between the upper and nether worlds, but between Hellas and Egypt (cf. 220, 920). A silent appearance, as in the Eumenides? This is of course quite speculative, and one could equally argue that Apollo had a role to play: in the light of 214–16 (for he had himself been banished for bloodshed, yet could be described as ἀγως—was his στρογγυλος to extend beyond the context of the Supplices?) and of 262 ff. (he was the father of Apis).
men should champion the cause of women and shed blood for them (476 f.), but it was paradoxical, in a society where men must play the dominant role. It was a paradox which resulted directly from the wrong relation between men and women exemplified by the sons of Aegyptus and the daughters of Danaus. Given this relationship, in which the men pursue the women like birds of prey, nothing can go right. It was not upon this basis that marriage could perform its function in society; and it must have been with a very different picture that Aphrodite turned the hearts of the Danaids. In some way, at the end of the trilogy, Aeschylus must have been concerned to dignify the status of women in marriage in contrast with the ignominious plight of the Danaids in the Supplices, when the Herald seeks to drag them screaming from the altar.

How, precisely, he dealt with marriage as an institution we cannot say. How he dealt with marriage as a relationship between the individual man and the individual woman emerges from the story of Hypermestra, if it has been rightly interpreted, and for that matter (making due allowance for the satyr) from the story of Amymone. In either case a woman who has rejected sexual desire under the mode of βία, of force and violence, comes to accept it under the mode of μετάθεσις, of persuasion and enchantment. She who would not be forced is successfully wooed. If one thing is more certain than any other in the interpretation of the trilogy, it is this. It is something that the Danaids in the Supplices could not envisage, though their handmaidsen, not being themselves the objects of a brutal pursuit, were able to do so. The Danaids could not envisage it, for they were prevented by their fears from understanding the moral of the story of Io.

It was a mysterious story, and much is left in mystery. But we know how it began and how it ended. It began with a lustful Zeus and a jealous Hera; it began in violence and a bestial transformation, and continued in much suffering for Io. But it ended with an act of gentleness, and Epaphus was engendered ἐκ ἐπαφῆς καὶ ἐπιμνημόνως Διός. Most significant of all may be an expression which the Danaids use within a few lines of the close of the Supplices, when they sing in this connexion of the ἐμενή βίος of Zeus. Force has become kindly.

Just as the Erinyes, those agents of violence, became Eumenides. It is perhaps a misconception of the thought of Aeschylus to suppose that we must choose, once and for all, between a violent lustful Zeus and the begetter of Epaphus; between the master of Kratos and Bia and whatever it was that he showed himself to be in the development of the Prometheus trilogy; between the Zeus that works vindictive justice through Erinyes in the Agamemnon and Choephoroi and the Zeus that speaks persuasively through Athena in the closing scene of the Eumenides. In each case both aspects are true of the working of Zeus in human affairs through the process of time. In each case the operation of the divine

---

51 For this theme, cf. also 643 ff., 913, 1068. The right relation of men and men in society was a problem with which Aeschylus was exercised, and not only in this trilogy (cf. JHS 68 (1948), 130 ff.).

52 Cf. D. S. Robertson, ‘The end of the Supplices trilogy of Aeschylus’, CR 38 (1924), 51-3, who suggests that the trilogy ended with the inauguration of the Thesmophoria (cf. Herodotus 2.171) as a festival safeguarding the dignity of women in marriage. This suggestion, accepted broadly by G. Thomson (Aeschylus and Athens 308) and criticised by Vürtheim, op. cit. 74 f., is not without attraction. I should myself have expected that, if the cult of Demeter was to play such a part, there would have been some preparation in the Supplices. It may have been sufficient for the purposes of Aeschylus that marriage was to be under the joint protection of Zeus and Hera: cf. Eum. 213 f. Fr. 383 might belong here.

53 Since my lecture was delivered, there has appeared Mr R. D. Murray’s interesting study of the Io-theme and its related imagery (see n. 4). It may well be that this theme deserves more prominence than I have given it. To discuss this complicated subject adequately would, however, have added greatly to the length of this article, and I have therefore left unchanged the remarks which I made in my lecture.

54 ἐμενή βίος, ἐμενή βίος Valckenaar. If the reading is uncertain, the combination of the notions of force and benevolence is not. A similar combination seems also to be found at 576 ff., also in connexion with the story of Io, but this passage too is unfortunately corrupt.
seems at first to be a matter of force alone; in each case there is a revelation that the divine works also as a persuasive agency. That—and nothing more nor less—is the great religious insight of Aeschylus. Was this a truth that was borne in upon him late in life? The new evidence on the date of the Supplices makes it plausible to suppose that in his last years he wrote three great trilogies which all expressed this same fundamental insight into the divine nature.

King’s College, London.

R. P. Winnington-Ingram.

55 This is certain for the Oresteia, virtually certain for the Danaid trilogy, and, in my view, highly probable for the Prometheia: cf. Gnomon 23 (1951), 420.
A Revised Itinerary of the Route Followed by Cyrus the Younger through Syria, 401 B.C.

The traditional route followed by the Army of Cyrus the Younger as shown in Map I of Vol. VI of the Cambridge Ancient History and in Bury's History of Greece take an almost straight line from the sea at Myriandros to the great bend in the R. Euphrates where it turns to the south-east. Thapsacus, where Cyrus crossed the river, is shown at the bend, approximately where the modern Meskeneh now stands, in the Cambridge Ancient History, while Bury places it farther east at or near the modern Raqqa. Both identify the R. Araxes with the modern Khabour.

As a result of a close examination of parts of Chapters iv and v of the Anabasis, wide reading of the works of ancient and modern travellers in those parts, coupled with some researches in the parasang and a knowledge of the terrain gained during some war-time journeys in that area, I find myself unable to accept these identifications, as they fit neither the length of marches itemised by Xenophon, nor the physical features of the terrain. Both entirely ignore the existence of a considerable river known today as the R. Belekh.

For the purposes of this paper, it is sufficient to say of the parasang, whose origins stretch back through Babylon and Akkad to Sumer, that as used by Xenophon it means an hour's march at the pace of infantry, the distance varying with the nature of the ground, but on reasonably good going, comparable with the 3 m.p.h. of British infantry. A normal day's march was 4 to 5 parasangs or about 12 to 15 miles. When forced marches were deemed necessary, the hours of march or number of parasangs were increased to seven.

Turning to the consideration of the stages of the route in detail the first stage was a four days' march of 20 parasangs from Myriandros to the R. Chalus. Myriandros can be identified as Alexandretta, or in its Turkish form, Iskenderoon. Xenophon mentions no details, but the route inevitably went over the Beylan Pass and what is now the Amiq plain, where there was no reed-fringed lake in Xenophon's time, only the rich and fertile lands and villages forming 'The Girdle of Parysatis'.

The Pass is steep and rugged. To get an army over would take a good two days. The R. Chalus both in distance from the start and in size fits the Afrin River, though I cannot say if the large tame fish exist there any more.

The second stage was a five days' march of 30 parasangs to the Park of the Persian Governor, Belesys, at the source of the R. Dardas. The country eastwards from the R. Chalus/Afrin is for the most part arid and stony downland broken by steep and rough limestone ridges. Although the number of parasangs marched to the R. Dardas seem slightly on the high side for identifying the site of the Park of Belesys with the modern Bab, some 25 miles north-east of Aleppo, yet every other detail fits so well that the identification can be accepted. Today Bab is well watered and full of trees—an oasis in a harsh land—and entirely suitable for a Persian Governor's Park; indeed the only possible place for many miles. It is also the source of the river called Nahr el Dahab, which corresponds to the description of the R. Dardas.

The third stage was a march of three days from the ravaged Park of Belesys to Thapsacus on the Euphrates. By dead reckoning from Bab Thapsacus could be either at modern Meskeneh at the great bend where the Cambridge Ancient History shows it, or at Carcemish, where the modern railway bridge is. It could not be where Bury shows it at Raqqa, as this site is 60 miles or, say, 20 parasangs farther to the south-east.

Meskeneh must equally be rejected as Thapsacus because the river is only about 300 yards broad at the bend, nor are there any traces of a 'great and prosperous city' on either side of the river at that point. In fact Xenophon's statement that the river was 800 yards broad where the army crossed it is an exaggeration for any stretch of the river. At the modern ferry at Qala't Nijm between Meskeneh and Carcemish including side channels, it might measure 500 yards across.

Thapsacus must be identified with Carcemish, because it is the only place where a great and prosperous city could have existed in 401 B.C. Today the railway crosses at this point. It has all through history been an important crossing point, and that is why the Hittites a thousand years before Cyrus built their great fortress there round which a city clustered. By this time the Hittites had long since disappeared, and with them their name for the fortress guarding the crossing. Instead the Semitic 'tisf', graecised into Thapsacus, and meaning a river crossing-place had been substituted for the old Hittite name.

The following extracts epitomise the next two stages of the march from Thapsacus/Carcemish to Corse on the R. Mascar.

(a) 'From here (i.e. Thapsacus/Carcemish) there was a nine days' march of 50 parasangs through Syria until they arrived at the river Araxes. Here were villages full of corn and wine.'

(b) 'From here (i.e. the river Araxes) with the Euphrates on his right, he moved through Arabia. It was five days' march through the desert. . . . Marching through the country (i.e. alongside the Euphrates still) they came to the river Mascar . . . Here was the deserted city Corse. The river Mascar curved right round it.'
Starting with the identification of the river Araxes, it is clear from passage (b) above that the Araxes is an affluent of the Euphrates. It is also clear that the river Mascaras mentioned further on is also an affluent 35 parasangs or some 105 miles farther downstream. The map shows two rivers exactly this distance apart both running into the Euphrates from the north (from west to east) the Belekh and the Khabour. It seems therefore reasonable to identify the Araxes with the Belekh and the Mascaras with the Khabour.

Further proof of the identity is the continued fertility of the area watered by the river, though Islam has banished wine—if indeed Xenophon’s phrase ‘corn and wine’ means anything more than a description of a rich and fertile area comparable to the description of Palestine as ‘a land flowing with milk and honey’.

Accepting then the identification of the Araxes with the Belekh we can now turn to consider where Cyrus marched during the nine days when he and his army covered 50 parasangs or some 150 miles at a fairly high rate of marching between Thapsacus/Carcemish and the Araxes/Belekh.

As the crow flies, from Thapsacus/Carcemish to the junction of the Araxes/Belekh with the Euphrates is only 85 miles. Even if the line of the present railway is followed, where there is water, to Tell Abiad and you then follow the river down to the Euphrates, it is only 110 miles. The distances do not fit. Where did he go?

A reasonable supposition is that during the five-day halt at Thapsacus/Carcemish Cyrus, by secret approaches, tried to win Abrocomes, who was hovering on his left flank, to his side. As Abrocomes hesitated to commit himself (wishing to be on the right side, whichever brother won) Cyrus decided to make a strategic feint to the north, as though he intended to take the northern route via the Tigris valley to Babylon. This he did and when he was satisfied that Abrocomes was no longer a danger, either because he had been outmanoeuvered or because it was considered he was still uncertain which side to back and was still playing a waiting game, Cyrus turned south and marched down to the Araxes/Belekh.

Such a feint would be a very natural military manoeuvre, and would adequately account for the

march tables of Julian the Apostate and in more recent time the meticulously kept records of Miss Gertrude Bell, both of which agree with Xenophon’s times and distances for this section of the march.

Moreover, the description of Circius in the account of Julian’s march as a city almost entirely encircled by the river is practically word for word the description of Corse in Xenophon. There is only one site to which such a description can apply and that is at the confluence of the Khabour with the Euphrates. Miss Bell has exploded the theory that Corse was situated farther downstream on top of the escarpment. It can therefore be taken that Corse is Circius and the Mascaras is the Khabour, and therefore the identification of the Araxes with the Belekh is confirmed.

It may be objected that Araxes in Greek means the Rushing River while the Belekh is a placid stream. The Greeks are most unlikely to have invented an utterly inappropriate name for a river which runs today as it did then past many villages on its fertile banks. It must have had a local name, and therefore Araxes is but a corruption of it.
nine days it took to reach the Araxes/Belekh from Thapsacus/Carcemish.

After three days' rest, Cyrus set off again, this time by forced marches of some seven marching hours a day, keeping the Euphrates on his right, all the way to Corsote/Circesium at the junction of the Mascas/Khabour with the Euphrates.

As for Abrocomas, in the event he arrived two days late for the battle of Cunaxa, and it must remain a matter for speculation whether this tardiness was due to his being bluffed by Cyrus or to his imperfectly clarified loyalties.

Subsequent stages down the Euphrates from Corsote/Circesium present no logistic difficulties and need no comment.

†W. J. Farrell
NOTICES OF BOOKS


For more than twenty years van Groningen has interested himself in the stylistic analysis of early Greek poetry, especially Homer. The work of van Groningen and his fellow countryman W. A. A. van Otterlo seems to have had a somewhat restricted circulation. Although books on Homer often refer to devices like ring composition, it is unusual to find van Otterlo cited by name, and one gets the impression that he is best known at second-hand through Tate's reviews. This deficiency has now been made good by van Groningen's lengthy study of archaic Greek literature. The term is loosely used since the writer considers his material limited not so much by chronology as by the possession of certain common features of style, and therefore includes within his survey sophists, orators and the older part of the Hippocratic corpus. The result is a study which is more extensive than intensive, and specialists, preoccupied with their own difficulties, may well experience a feeling of frustration and disappointment as they turn to the chapters in Book II on individual authors. In his preface van Groningen regrets that the scope of his interests did not always allow him to take advantage of the latest publications. That in itself is perfectly understandable, if the appearance of a book is not to be delayed. There is, however, much more missing from his highly selective bibliography than just the latest publications. Still, as van Groningen is careful to point out, this book does represent a first attempt at such a synthesis of the evidence. We must hope that it will stimulate others to go on and examine its implications in greater detail.

Although shorter, Book I contains much of interest and value (pp. 29-99). In many ways van Groningen is at his best when he draws his examples in these early chapters from Homer and Herodotus. Here he outlines the methods by which works composed during the archaic period could achieve structural unity. He starts by discussing works which do nothing more than group together allied subject-matter. For real unity of design the separate elements need linking together, and then their relative importance must be expressed. This demands the subordination of what is less relevant, whether it be a digression or an episode. A link can be forged by the introduction of a series of words and ideas which repeat themselves from one section to the next, or by the use of connectives. These chevilles de raccord fall into two categories, the simple connective and a more expressive type which may have a retrospective or prospective significance, or, as in the majority of cases, combine both functions. Ring composition, used to facilitate the insertion of a passage which interrupts the flow of the main narrative, belongs to the same general class. A departure from the natural order of events implies a conscious effort at rearrangement so as to indicate priority of importance. The frequent occurrence in archaic literature of a prologue, referring to what follows, means that the author has in mind some plan for the whole. The end is normally abrupt and capable of extension. Van Groningen associates the development of the true epilogue, already anticipated by the Homeric Hymns and choral lyric, with the requirements of tragedy and rhetoric. Finally he shows how repetition contributes to unity of construction.

In Book II van Groningen illustrates the methods by examination of particular literary genres and authors (pp. 103-386). Almost three hundred pages devoted to resumés of contents and structural patterns are easy neither to read nor to review. The field covered, the Homeric Hymns, Hesiod, elegiac and lyric poetry, the Presocratics and others, is vast. While few would deny the merit of much of what van Groningen has to say about points of detail, this tends to be swamped in a mass of information which is either dated or not very profound. It is impossible here to do more than summarise some of his conclusions where structure throws light on the question of authenticity. By the addition of verses 55-6 the author of the Aspis was able to attach his account of the fight between Heracles and Cynnos to the Catalogue story of the hero's birth. The unity of the composite poem, where the description of the actual shield is enclosed in the ring formed by the repetition in verses 140 and 318, is extremely feeble. While rejecting the theory that our text of Theognis is the work of a single poet, von Groningen stresses the uniformity of contents and the repeated use of the personal address. Major interpolations in the Theogny, which von Groningen believes was originally composed for a festival of Hecate, include verses 687-712 and Zeus' battle against Typhoeus. He has nothing to say about the various eastern myths which provide us with parallels to the Theogny. The Hymn to Apollo consists of a separate poem dedicated to the Delian god (1-178) on which the Pythian hymn was grafted (182-546). The hymn thus produced suppressed verses 140-78. The last author discussed is Pindar, eight of whose Epinicians are analysed. Van Groningen claims that the attempts which scholars have made to identify one dominant theme in Pindar have been too rigid.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

Each ode reflects the poet’s creative impulse at the moment it came to be written, and they vary as Pindar’s own feelings vary.

P. WALCOT.


DM. 74.

The present work is intended to fill the gap which exists among histories of Greek literature written in German between the brief survey, such as that by W. Kranz, and the great undertaking of W. Schmid. It is intended to provide a foundation for the student and a starting-point for the scholar in his work and to be for the general reader ‘a rapid, yet adequate, approach to Greek literature’. In eight hundred pages Lesky takes his readers from the beginnings to the early sixth century A.D.—he finds his terminus in 529, that fateful year which saw the closing by Justinian of the Athenian schools and the foundation of Monte Cassino.

The book is a history of Greek literature, and Lesky explicitly disclaims any attempt to write the history of Greek philosophy or science. Christian literature is excluded, and Jewish writings are treated as a marginal development. Through these self-imposed restrictions the author has secured for himself in this ‘manageable volume’ room for a very full treatment of what he considers to be most important in Greek literature. Homer, the archaic poets, classical poetry and prose and Hellenistic poetry and philosophy are discussed with sympathy and an easy authority. Where problems arise, Lesky states the facts, gives his own opinion as well as the opinions of others, but is rarely dogmatic. His judgement inspires confidence. Even when he is dealing with works of minor significance, his account is strikingly free from cursoriness, from a mere listing of names. In general he observes a proper balance in the extent of the treatment which he accords individual authors (but when Sappho receives nine pages, should not Pindar have been given more than eleven?).

The book opens with two brief chapters, one on the παράθυροι of Greek literature and the other on ‘The Beginnings’, with special reference to the introduction of the alphabet and the development of Greek mythology. The third chapter is devoted to the Homeric epic. Although the work of Milman Parry receives considerable attention and the roots of the Iliad are seen to lie in oral poetry, the ‘Fernverbindungen’ are held to indicate that the work was conceived as a written epic. The Odyssey is probably not the work of the author of the Iliad. Although there were earlier treatments of the material of parts of the Odyssey and the narrative contains some real awkwardnesses, there can be no question of a mere stitching together by a compiler.

In the fourth chapter, ‘The Archaic Period’, Lesky succeeds in conveying to the reader an impression of the great vigour and variety of the literature of this age. Especially noteworthy are the many reminders of the extent to which archaic Greek literature may have been affected by Eastern influences. The section devoted to Hesiod is excellent. That on Pindar would have been improved if detailed accounts of some selected poems had been given. Corinna is regarded as a contemporary of Pindar, mainly on the strength of the anecdotes. Lesky rightly refuses to suppose that the fact that Empedocles wrote both Καθαρμός and Περί φύσεως is to be explained in terms of the poet’s intellectual development.

The fifth chapter falls into three parts, ‘The Beginnings and Zenith of “die Klassik”’, ‘The Enlightenment and its Opponents’ and ‘The Fourth Century to Alexander’. As is to be expected of the author of ‘Die griechische Tragödie’, Lesky’s discussion of fifth-century drama is balanced and authoritative. His account of Sophocles may serve as an example of the kind of treatment which a major classical author receives in this book. In a leisurely biographical discussion he treats of the dates of Sophocles’ birth and death, his family, his services to the state, the evidence of the Epidemias of Ion of Chios, his religious activities (the proposal to substitute 'Αμφίων for Αἰκων in the Vina [11] is rejected, but nothing is said of Meineke’s 'Αἰκωνος, which is read by the Oxford and Budé editors), his appearances on the stage during his youth, his victories, his dramatic innovations, his non-dramatic work, the thiasos of the Muses, the litigation of his old age and the legends about his death. A brief paragraph on ancient portraits includes the warning that the Lateran Sophocles has been worked over by Tenerani. Having indicated the fixed points in the chronology of the plays, about which the rest may be arranged ‘with some probability’, Lesky turns to the Ajax. The action of the play is narrated, not baldly, but to the accompaniment of interpretative comments. On 121 ff. he observes that Odyssesus with his insight into the ‘Schattendasein der Sterblichen’ is there shown as an ideal spectator of Sophoclean tragedy. The ‘deception’ speech (646 ff.) is well discussed. It has the dramatic function of enabling Ajax to get away and so to kill himself. Furthermore the emphasis placed on change and compensation as a universal principle indicates his awareness that he has no place in a world of this kind (cf. K. Reinhardt, Sophokles, Frankfurt am Main, 1947, 32 f.). The choral ode which follows (693 ff.) is dealt with as an instance of ταπεινατις tragica. There are some remarks about the technical aspects of the change of scene after 814 and the staging of the suicide. Although the play is a diptych in form, it is shown to possess an inner unity. Finally there is the question of Ajax’ guilt. For Lesky the element of λυπη holds only a marginal position (127 ff., where Athene is speaking in a general way; 762 ff.), and the idea of divine anger is weakened when it lasts only one day and can be averted if Ajax stays in his tent. He holds that the λυπη of Ajax is a theme belonging to epic tradition.
which Sophocles has taken over without according it a central position. The place given it reflects the as yet incomplete casting aside of the influence of Aeschylus, and Lesky sees here a parallel to the stylistic development of Sophocles as described by the poet himself (apud Plut., de professibus in virtute vii 79b). This playing down of the element of hybris in the play is excessive; G. M. Kirkwood's view seems to be better founded: 'In Ajax there is no question but that the hero is culpable. The fact is not stressed in the play, but it is obvious and unmitigated. When a warrior sets out to murder his fellow chieftains, as a protest against what he believes to be an insult to his honour, he is displaying something else besides devotion to arete; in similar circumstances Homer's Achilles, the prototype of the fiercely proud warrior, returns his sword to its sheath' (A Study of Sophoclean Drama, Cornell Studies in Classical Philology xxxi, Ithaca, New York, 1958, 174). And the limitation imposed upon Athene's wrath in no way weakens its reality or our awareness of the hybris which has caused it. Each of the other extant tragedies is discussed in similar detail. There is a brief mention of the Ichneutai, and a little is said about the plots of five other plays. The concluding paragraph discusses the development of Sophocles' style.

The sixth chapter, on Hellenistic literature, is in two parts, 'Athens' and 'The New Centres'. The first consists of discussions of New Comedy, Attic prose and the Hellenistic philosophical systems. In the second a general introduction, which includes some good remarks on the Hellenistic delight in both the enormous and the miniature, is followed inter alia by studies of Callimachus (there is a sympathetic account of the hymns), Theocritus, Apollonius, the Epigram and Judaeo-Hellenistic writing.

In the last chapter, Lesky disposes of the literature of the Empire (31 B.C.-A.D. 529) in fewer than eighty pages. Even here his account does not degenerate into a catalogue, and many will find this chapter a valuable introduction and aid to orientation. Plutarch is the only author to whom a whole section is assigned. Lucian, however, is well discussed. Julian perhaps receives less than his due.

Some points of detail. P. 17, a reference to R. R. Bolgar's list of Greek manuscripts in Italy during the fifteenth century would have been useful (The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries, Cambridge, 1954, 455-505). P. 109, n. 4, cf. also R. P. Winnington-Ingram, Mode in Ancient Greek Music, Cambridge, 1936, and K. Schlesinger, The Greek Autos, London, 1939. P. 145, Lesky remarks that the poems of Stesichorus on subjects belonging to cyclic epic must have been of considerable length, and adds 'es stimmt dazu, dass seine Orestie zwei Bücher umfasste'. But is it not likely that there were at least two separate poems in the Orestie? cf. W. Schmid, i 1, 476. P. 147, for 'Rylands' read 'Rylands'. P. 153, n. 2, cf. also F. M. Cornford, Principia Sapientiae, Cambridge, 1952, 88-106.

P. 171, does the story that Ibycus could have been tyrant of Rhegium necessarily indicate that he came of distinguished family? P. 199, the shamanistic elements in the journey of Parmenides might have been mentioned. P. 203, n. 4, cf. also J. Tate, CR xli (1927) 214 f.; CQ xxiii (1929) 142-54; xxviii (1933) 105-14. P. 749, l. 14 from the bottom, for 'osio' read 'odio'. P. 757, l. 1, for 'Gorgias' read 'Gorgias'.

This is an admirable work. The excellent bibliographies show discrimination, and the discussions of textual history which follow many of the studies of individual authors are especially welcome. The book, written in a pleasant German which is not difficult to read, presents the reader with a scholarly, thoughtful and humane account of Greek literature.

M. J. McGANN.


This monograph, presented to the Lombard Academy by R. Cantarella, is modestly sub-titled 'Nota'; it sets out to give a systematic account of the papyri of the Iliad which were written before 150 B.C., or before the appearance of what Del Cornö calls 'la cosiddetta Vulgata'. After an introductory chapter, on 'Dati preliminari', Del Cornö devotes a chapter each to the following papyri (Collart's numeration, as extended in 1955 by H. J. Mette): 5, 7, 8, 12, 40, 41, 217, 342, 432; an eleventh chapter deals summarily with 59, 266, 269, 317, 410 and with Michaelides 5 (published in 1955). He gives what purport to be full collations of his nine major authorities; and though the result of his work is bound to be negative, as he admits in his 'Conclusione' (p. 143), he need not be inconsolable on that account—as old militarists know, 'negative information is often of the highest value'. Del Cornö's collection and presentation of the facts will be very useful; but so much in these matters depends on the absolute accuracy of the reporter that one is bound to have some misgivings when one finds such well-known names as Van der Valk and Gerhard appearing (the second frequently) as 'Van der Walk' ('Walk') and 'Gehard'; when R. A. Pack's initial is given as 'H' and when 'transmission' appears as an English word (in the title of a well-known book by T. W. Allen). It may be my ignorance, but I am still wondering who the 'Menrad' may be who is quoted with Diels on p. 120 (n. 29); for the absence of any reference to my own paper (MPER 1956, 51-8) I console myself with the reflection that H. Erbe's far more important work also goes unmentioned. At the same time, I cannot help feeling that Del Cornö might have been able to produce rather more positive results than he has done if his mental spectacles were not so deeply tinted with 'Analyse'.

J. A. DAVISON.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


This well-produced pamphlet contains a short preface (explaining that it results from preliminary studies for a dissertation on Mimirnemus), an alphabetical list of passages cited (running from ‘Acro v. Pseudo-Acro’ to ‘Zenobius, Epitoma Paroemiaria III 17’), one hundred testimonia regarding the life and writings of Mimirnemus, arranged chronologically (1-11 Solon to Callimachus; 12-22 Callimachus to Horace; 23-68 Roman Empire; 69-100 Mediaeval), a concordance with Bergk, Diehl and Edmonds for those testimonia which contain quotations from Mimirnemus, and a short appendix of adespota which some have sought to attribute to Mimirnemus. The number of testimonia is increased by the care with which the editor has distinguished between different grades of quotation: thus his No. 1 (Solon fr. 22. 1-4 Diehl) appears again as No. 48 (Diog. Laert. I 60-61), though the text is given only once (under 48). This seems to me a sound way of reporting the facts; and so long as one does not lay too much stress on the precise order in which the various authorities appear, the historical arrangement is also helpful.

The editor tells us in each case the edition from which he has taken his quotations (not always the latest; for example, he quotes Strabo by Kramer's 1844 edition), and adds short but pithy notes (in Latin). The whole is a very valuable piece of work; we shall look forward to the promised dissertation with great interest—and similar treatments of other authors would also be welcome.

J. A. DAVISON.


The purpose of this short work is to defend Hector against those scholars who have held him to be 'debole e vile', or a proud warrior who madly led his city to ruin, and show that he was truly ἄριστος of the Trojans, as Priam calls him (Ο 242 ff.). The Homeric ethic appears most clearly in the famous speech of Glaucus to Sarpedon, Z 145 ff.: men are like the leaves that perish, but (207 ff.) should yet, as Hippolochus told Glaucus to do, ἀλών ἄριστεναι and not disgrace the γένος of their fathers. So Hector, later in Z, must fight in the foremost ranks, despite Andromache's entreaties, ἀρνήμενος πατρὸς τε μέγα κλέες ἔδω ἐμὸν αὐτῷ. Troy is doomed to perish anyway, but Hector will win κλέες if he dies bravely. This κλέες is won by the individual in his own interest (and that of his family); and Quaglia (p. 53) contrasts Polydames, who desires the safety of the whole city, with Hector, who is concerned primarily with his own κλέες. Such κλέες, derived from the display of ἄριστος, is the goal of the Homeric hero, whose aim is 'non tanto la via nut limitata nel tempo quanto il κλέες eterno'. Hector, pre-eminently among the Trojans, lives by this standard: he may well be termed ἄριστος.

That the personal κλέες which is the reward of ἄριστος is more important than immediate victory or the success of one's own group is the core of Quaglia's thesis. But the contrast she has drawn is too simple: the Homeric ἄριστος-standard is linked to the needs of Homeric society. When (X 99 ff.) Hector by his folly has exposed Troy to danger, he says that Polydames will be the first to bring ἐλεγχεῖν on him. Now ἐλεγχεῖν falls to the ἄριστος who in some respect has behaved like a καυκός. Accordingly, Hector has shown himself deficient in ἄριστος by endangering Troy as a whole. Homeric society, in fact, regards as the ἄριστος of its ἄριστος just those qualities which it believes will secure its continued existence: that is to say, courage and the success which, in a shame-culture, cannot be distinguished from the courage needed to win it. It may be wrong about the best means to this end: ultimately there may be a tension between ἄριστος and κλέες, since (as Quaglia points out) one may have κλέες as the gloriously slain defender of a defeated city; yet ἄριστος is closely linked to the needs of society, not merely to the glory of the individual.

I have chosen to review this aspect of Quaglia's work, since her résumé on p. 1 shows that she considers it to be the most important. But even if one disagrees with this part of her thesis, these eighty pages amply repay reading, as an unusually elegant and sensitive evocation of the situation of Hector and of Troy; and a reviewer of works of classical scholarship can only be grateful to an author whose style is a constant pleasure.

ARTHUR W. H. ADKINS.


This brief character study, given its title because νόσων combines the notions of volition and disposition and is the most compendious means of referring to character and action, begins by drawing out the contrast between the volatile dispositions of Odysseus' companions and enemies and his own tenacity and prudence. The hero's tenacity of purpose is elucidated by his successful resistance to the temptations of Ogygia and Phaiakia. His tenacity has thus a moral overtone: it is also loyalty. Two aspects of his prudence are discussed: the familiar πολιτικής who doubts the words of goddesses and lies to friends and enemies alike: and the ideal leader, who despite the assertion of inevitable human deficiencies in Od. 8, 169 ff. combines in his own person all the physical, intellectual and moral excellences.

Bona's insistence that Odysseus is uniquely made
to display a νόος; untouched by the vicissitudes of fortune is a point that deserves to be put in a wider context. It reflects developments both in literature and society. Typically the Illicadian hero is a child of circumstance and lives a paratactic life of emergency and quick decision, and the epic story of such men tends to be episodic. The concept of the immutable νόος assists the more highly organised plot of the Odyssey by supplying both the goal, the return home and the re-establishment of good kingship on Ithaca, and the qualities to achieve it, prudence and loyalty. Now those virtues are not essential to the Illicadian hero, who may be selfish and willful without detracting from his ἄρετή, so that πεπνυμένος and similar words that connote the virtues of co-operation and responsibility are epithets almost exclusively of counsellors, heralds and subordinates. But in the Odyssey these terms invade the heroic classes in the persons of Telemachos, Pistratos and Medon, and would not be incongruous applied to Odysseus himself. For the first time πεπνυμένος has become part of an heroic νόος.

Thus besides its many useful observations Bonas’s essay may be regarded as a signpost for further exploration of Homeric characterisation.

J. B. Hainsworth.

MOULINIER (L.) Quelques hypothèses relatives à la géographie d’Homère dans l’Odyssee.

Professor Moulinier recognises four kinds of evidence for identifying the places mentioned in the Odyssey:

(a) time and direction of journey as stated in the poems;
(b) description of district;
(c) archaeological discoveries;
(d) well attested local legends presumably anterior to knowledge of the Homeric poems in the locality. He believes that Homer (‘the great poet who composed the core of the Odyssey’, living in the ninth century) knew something of Mycenaean commerce (e.g. the reference to Temesa in Od. 1, 184), and that the places referred to are actual places, either seen or heard about by the poet, who modified some of his descriptions to suit poetic exigencies.

Homer’s ‘wind rose’ is examined: Boreas is N to NE, Notos S to SW, Zephyros NW, Euros SE to SSE. The differences in some of his descriptions of the winds result from variations in their nature in various parts of the Mediterranean: Zephyros, for example, is mild and pleasant in Egypt, but elsewhere more like a mistral. Next, the times of Odysseus’ voyages are considered. The speed of early sailing craft varied greatly according to the weather. Perhaps the phrase ‘helped by a god’ indicates the optimum sailing conditions. Unfortunately when we are told that Telemachos sailed from Ithaca to Pylos in one night, the distance may have been approximately 34 or 65 or 96 miles according to which Pylos (in Elis, Triphylia, or Messenia) the poet meant (and assuming that Ithaca is Thikai). It is clear that much remains indeterminate here. But Professor Moulinier handles the evidence with exemplary sobriety. So far even the most sceptical reader is likely to accept his views as reasonably well founded.

When he comes to the actual identification of sites he becomes less cautious. For example he accepts Béard’s extremely far-fetched view that Calypso’s cave was on the coast of North Africa opposite Spain. All Béard could produce to prove this was his discovery of four springs near a cave there. But these springs were not τετραμεναί ἄλλοις ἄλλη (Od. 5, 71: Béard disingenuously mistranslates this in Les Navigations d’Ulisse iii 364), and the place is manifestly not: νίσσον ἐν ἀμφιερη ὑδά τ’ ἀμφιλα ἐστὶ θάλασσας.

Moulinier proposes some new locations: Ithaca is Thikai combined with Cephallonia; Scleria is in North Africa near Cyrene (this certainly makes better sense of the emphasis on Scleria’s remoteness from other civilised countries, and it is, of course, not called an island by Homer). The land of Circe is in the East (as in the Argonautic legend). Odysseus gets there by a fast by-pass, i.e. Oceano’s (the Northern circuit), and goes from there to Hades and back by the Southern circuit. This, though hardly explicit in Homer’s narrative, does remove a major difficulty. (Incidentally it also lends some further plausibility to the view that the description of Laestrygonia contains some dim memories of Scandinavian scenery; but Moulinier places Laestrygonia at Bonifacio.)

W. B. STANFORD.


The first volume of Professor Adrados’ welcome edition of the archaic Greek elegiac and iambic poets was noticed in this journal recently (JHS lxxix [1959] 161), and there is no need to repeat here the general remarks upon Adrados’ work which were there made, since the second volume follows very closely upon the pattern of the first. The authors for whom a text and parallel translation are now provided are Hipponax, Anarius, Xenophanes and Theognis, followed by an appendix of fragments ‘not included in the edition’ (the most important of these is Archilochus 5 [= POxy. 2356 + 10.1-2 Diehl]; the others are single words, paraphrases and allusions). A concordance with Diehl for all writers, with Lasserre-Bonnard for Archilochus, with Bergk for Callimachus, Tyrtaeus, Semonides, Solon, Mimnermus, Hipponax and Xenophanes, and with POxy 2174-5 for Hipponax, is also provided; there is a
list of errata which does not suggest that Adrados has taken due note of Professor Page's comments on the first volume (CR 1958, 225). Sr. Isidoro Millán González-Pardo prepared the concordance and collaborated in the preparation of the appendix.

J. A. Davison.

Murray (R. D., Jr.) The motif of Io in Aeschylus' Suppliant.

Princeton: University Press


In this pleasantly printed little book Mr Murray sets himself to show that 'the web of imagery woven round Io, the ancestress of the Danaids, conveys much of the meaning of the Suppliant', that the story of Io is intended as an 'allegory' explaining with remarkable clarity and completeness the character and motives of the Danaids, and is thereby the ultimate vehicle of the basic ideas expressed in the trilogy'. He acknowledges earlier discussions by J. T. Sheppard, O. Hiltbrunner and others, but thinks none of them has pursued the subject systematically enough.

Apart from the Danaids' invocations of Zeus and Epaphus and other allusions to the Io-story, Murray finds special significance in certain 'key-images' which he derives from it, viz. those of bull and cow, male versus female, touch and seizure, and breath, wind and storm. His argument for the existence of these 'images' (some of which are not images at all) is, however, only partly successful. The bull-cow image resolves itself in his discussion into no more than a series of repetitions of the syllable βοῦ (not all from the root of βόος) and a single comparison of the chorus to a cow frightened by a wolf. The contrast of male and female is certainly an important element in Suppliant (and in many other plays), but it is not clear that it derives anything material from the relation of Zeus to Io. Murray is on firmer ground in thinking that the Egyptians' seizure of the Danaids as μηνια is prefigured by Zeus' 'touching' of Io, for Aeschylus makes the point that Epaphus was ἄλβος μοίον ἐπώμος. But there is little to be said for discovering a relation between the creative ἐπίπονα of Zeus and the textually uncertain ἐπύπτωνα κακά τ' ἄλην of the Exodus, let alone one with every other allusion to wind and storm in the play.

In his general discussion of the significance of the 'Aeschylean Io' Murray accepts the view that the 'primitive' Zeus of P.V. evolved into the wise and just god of Suppliant. He believes that P.V. and Suppliant are about contemporary, are based on identical theological doctrine, and cannot, in the absence of the rest of the two trilogies, be fully interpreted independently of each other. As the Zeus who pursued Io developed into a just and merciful god, so Aeschylus probably 'described Lyceus' pursuit of the Danaids as climaxing in a more gentle, compassionate treatment of Hypermnestra' (p. 62). As Io learned to accept her suitor, so Hypermnestra; and both gave birth to kings. As Io was driven mad, so the Danaids appear to be afflicted by a madness that will not allow them to see life in its proper proportions. No literal gadfly maddens them, but it exists none the less in the person of the Egyptians, who are described as "possessing in their mad intent an inescapable goad" (p. 71). Perhaps not many readers will wish to follow Murray in thinking Aeschylus depicts the Danaids as mad. Nor is it clear that, because they did not want to marry the Egyptians, they can be credited with an unreasonable antipathy to any marriage, still less that, as Murray thinks (ib.), the distinction is immaterial. If it were so, why has each daughter been provided with a βασιλική σφέτη (979)?

It is unfortunate that Murray has overstressed his case, since his general thesis that the Io-theme is of more than casual relevance in the play, and is a source of dramatic irony, is undoubtedly correct.

There is an appendix supporting the late dating of the play, and another proposing a new restoration (ὑπογεγρ. τοὺς φιλάκτημονδ) of the probably irreparable corruption in 1.8. This is unconvincing. But it is refreshing to find a critic with little use for the popular notion that half the Exodus is sung by a bevy of ladies-in-waiting.

A. H. Coxon.

Méautis (G.) L'authenticité et la date du

Prométhée enchâiné d'Eschyle. [Univ. de

Neuchâtel, recueil de travaux, faculté des

lettres, 29.] Neuchâtel: Faculté des lettres.


The author subjects the Promethes Bound to a thorough and subtle analysis, strives to reconstruct the Freeing of Prometheus, and comes to what appears to the reviewer the only sane conclusion, namely, that the two plays were composed by Aeschylus at the end of his life, during a last visit to Sicily (probably Gela), and were performed there. This being so, it is needless to dwell on various points on which I disagree with him, for example his objections (p. 9) to the theory that Prometheus was represented by a large wooden figure. He well characterises the character of the hero, e.g. p. 25, the fond de la nature de Prométhée est la pitié, and rightly appreciates (p. 31) the subtle psychology of Aeschylus. He is strongly of opinion that the drama has an arrière plan resulting from the deep hatred to tyranny engendered by the Sicilians' recent sufferings under despotism and perhaps also by the poet's own recollections of his experiences on his earlier visit at the court of Hieron. He accepts the theory that Zeus was represented as evolving and learning gentleness and mercy with increasing experience of supreme power. His remarks (p. 12) on the use of sound during the performance of the play in this and other tragedies show a proper appreciation of the fact that he is dealing with a work intended to be publicly acted. A small error (pp. 4 and 53) is the placing of Prometheus'
bondage on the Caucasus, where the text of the play makes it fairly clear that it is not.

Altogether, this is an admirable contribution to the vast and growing literature on this play.

H. J. Rose.


This volume takes its place alongside the Jebb-Pearson edition of the fragments of Sophokles as replacing the corresponding part of Nauck,² and raises the obvious question when some stout heart will attempt the like task for Euripides. The editor has gathered up every scrap of information, including papyri so fragmentary that often nothing but three or four unintelligible letters survive, and rightly, since no one knows when some lucky find may supplement these pitiful remains and give us some substantial part of a lost play. The order is, so far as possible, that of the known or reasonably conjectured tetralogies to which those plays belonged of which we can be tolerably certain that we have some remains. After these come the many Fragmente unbekannten Ortes (Nos. 494–769), then a short appendix and copious indices. For the papyri, the editor has made careful collations from the photographs of the Oxyrhynchus finds, while Bruno Snell read the Italian ones and courteously passed on his results; the text is therefore as reliable as can well be expected.

It is the editor’s hope that other scholars will work at restoring the fragments; by way of example, he has himself inserted in the many gaps his own conjectures or those of others, being careful to note, not once only but several times, that these are but tentative suggestions. Hence, for instance, the first long fragments, the more or less intelligible parts of the Θέσου or Ἰσθμισσάτη (Nos. 16–17), contain a large measure of modern additions to the damaged papyrus text. Here and there, on the other hand, I think he has been a little too sparing in his use of supplements and other conjectures; thus in 609, 9 (= 304, 9 Nauck), Heath’s suggestion μικρός τάσον ἀπαλλαγεὶς τάτων might at least have been mentioned in the critical note, as it is in Nauck’s. But perhaps I am prejudiced in favour of this conjecture, a better one than most of its author’s, because I hit independently on it myself. Mette’s critical notes, by the way, are full and good, and are to receive a further supplement in a forthcoming second volume of commentary and translation. Good also are the references, often involving quite long quotations, to the authors preserving those fragments which are not due to papyrus finds. It is to be hoped that the second volume will include a discussion of the authorship of figs. 530 and 535 (the intervening ones are too scanty for extended treatment). They are from a dialogue between Dike and someone who is probably the chorus-leader, and to me they have not the flavour of Aeschylean dialogue, even for a satyr-play, if that is where they belong; the metre is strictly tragical. The only external evidence is the quotation, in the Homeric commentators, of five commonplace words, ὅστε δήμοι; οὔτε ἐτίς ἄνιψ, which might have occurred a dozen times in the tragedies.

These may serve as samples of the kind of minor disagreements which will occur to any informed reader of the book. Given that it is to serve as a basis for further study, they are presumably by no means unwelcome to the author, who is far too good a scholar to claim infallibility. That he is generally right in such positive statements as he makes (and he is cautious in this as in other respects, offering his readers ἀμφιτροποι ὁδὲ ἀμφοτεροὶ) will be obvious to anyone who examines the work with due attention. Henceforth it will be proper to cite the fragments under the rubric ‘such a number Mette’ instead of the now obsolete references to the classical work of Nauck.

H. J. Rose.

Sophocles. Tome ii: Ajax, Oedipe Roi, Electre.


This volume contains the three plays of the Byzantine Selection, and the editors adhere to their view that A must stand beside L and the shadowy φ group in witness to the ancient MS. tradition. I suspect that this will some day become untenable, but as it can hardly be denied that unique and authoritative readings have somehow been incorporated in A, there can be little actual harm in judging it at each point on its merits. But here as elsewhere one must be on the look-out for mechanical editing; it is uncritical to assume, for example, that at O.T. 1279 τ’ simply dropped out after αἰσχρό (better reconstruct around Porson’s αἰσχοκόντα), or that the same fate befell ἀνίψ in L at El. 433 (where, as Nauck saw, the trouble was caused by simplex ordo). Apart from a bad lapse at O.T. 227, where Dindorf’s unattractive τετράδιον is printed in the text without warning, there is little to quarrel with in the austere apparatus, though one would have liked to hear of προαναγωγή (W) at O.T. 685, of ἄξονθ (Lκ? for ἄξονθ) at 1213, of μεγαλοπόρος ἐτι (recess.) at 1401 and above all of τοῦ (Πη—τοῦ) at 378. But when we are told what readings are actually recorded in the scholia, we might also like to hear what others are implied; a note on Iphianassa (El. 158) is all very well, but, unless I am mistaken, the scholia imply a v.l. which was not a proper name but, presumably, a verb. Emendations are always a problem; here, as occasionally elsewhere, we detect a dual practice: a judicious and drastic selection from the corpus of well-known conjectures and a perceptibly more indulgent hearing for some recent French proposals; it would not be easy to justify mention of παρμός; (Aj. 835) in an edition which ignores Οἰδίπους πατίρ (O.T. 943). At Aj. 208
NOTICES OF BOOKS

The translation, if I dare say so, is attractive and often striking; I like particularly ‘écouter les sottises d’un fat’ (Aj. 1161 f.) and ‘ni même que l’on te soupçonner sous ce poil fleuri’ (El. 42); good sense is extracted from El. 128 f. It would be a superhuman feat to construe the texts of those difficult plays and please everyone, and I offer the following as more probable interpretations than those given: Aj. 91: Ajax appears μαστοφόρος, not with dripping sword. 321: ἄφαρξες κτλ. refers to his more seemly deportment on previous occasions, cf. Trach. 1074. 407: a statement, not a wish. 467: μίνον μίνον is a conventional pairing; it does not imply ‘avec chacun d’eux’. 476: ‘adding up to yet taken from death’, perhaps cf. Martial V, XX, 13: ‘nobilis pereunt et imputantur’. 572: not ‘juge’, cf. 1136, but ‘president of the contest’. 895: ‘east’ not ‘south’, cf. 877. 817 ff.: ‘the man who gave it . . . the earth which holds it’. 1234 n.: Teucer had claimed that Ajax was his own master (1099). 1297: Αἴας was to be thrown to the fishes; the lover’s fate would be of no interest. O.T. 16: retain ἰπέρις and distinguish three groups. 44: ‘the experienced profit by consultation’ (CQ xxiii 90). 220 f.: ‘Otherwise I should not look far without a clue’ (v. CQ xi 62 and perhaps cf. El. 329); this, I believe, is the only admissible construe—Oedipus means that, if he had concerned himself with the matter earlier, he would have exhausted every channel of inquiry, and it would have been absurd to begin a new investigation now with nothing to go on. 230 f.: ἐνεστὶς (Vauvilliers) is not wanted but ἄλλος (Purgold) is (CR n.s. x 7). 334 f.: ‘your temper must be of very rock’ (CQ n.s. viii 142). 374: οὐκ εἶναι must be construed as subject of βλέπω, since the MS. tradition is rightly retained in 376. 579: ‘assigning her an equal share in the land’. 674: ‘exceed in want’. 715: ξένοι is worth translating. 756: ‘I fear I have already given too many reasons for wishing to see him’ (CQ xxii 167). 1063: ‘base-born’ not ‘une vilaine’. 1086: the Chorus are infected by Oedipus’ optimism. 1210: δύται (Wunder) is rightly noted—attractive in itself and permitting ὅσπερ ἄλλων γίον (Jeck) in 1218. 1273 f.: ‘in darkness they shall see . . . and in darkness they shall fail to know . . . ’; the negative must not be neglected. 1296: ‘even one who abhors the sight’. 1410 f.: the alternatives should be construed as written. 1520: ‘do you really think so?’ El. 121: why should the Chorus be ‘jeunes filles’? cf. 173. 563: ‘just enough to avert hardship’. 438: ‘where’ not ‘so that’. 466: ‘justice forbids me to contend against you both’. 516: ὡς ἄνωθεν: ‘natürlich’ (Kaibel—more might be made of this fine commentary). 531: no other Greek would sacrifice his own child (Kaibel). 688 f.: ‘in a word, I never heard of such exploits’. 841: ‘though naught but soul’ (Whitman, Sophocles, 280). 891: ‘are you not pleased?’ 961: retain the parallelism of expression. 1008 n.: the allusion is to death by torture. 1080: ‘having drawn a double vengeance upon herself’ (Kaibel). 1151: ‘our father’s cause is lost’.

The short introductions to the plays are of varying merit. That to Ajax is sympathetic, but perhaps a shade too defensive about the prolongation of the play after the hero’s death (on p. 38, ‘ici commence la deuxième partie de la pièce’ is uncalled for). We are surely unjustified in drawing any derogatory inference about the Homeric warrior from the famous smile of the ass (A 558 ff.). Oedipus’ responsibility for his own sufferings is very perceptively treated; but I can make nothing of the alleged insincerity of Electra. The dating questions could hardly be answered to suit everyone. I see no likelihood of an allusion to Euripides’ Orestes in Aj. 1295 ff.; the play may be later than Antigone, but Mazon himself found traces of ‘second style’ in Trachiniae and Ajax only. I agree that Electra is late and I cannot admit that it is ‘undoubtedly’ earlier than Euripides’ version; on this point I have never seen the arguments better presented than by A. S. Owen in Greek Poetry and Life.

On matters metrical I have only to say that I hanker for Pearson’s trimeters at O.T. 665 ff. = 694 ff., that Miss Dale’s colometry (Greek Poetry and Life, p. 197) seems preferable at El. 1068 ff. and that the dubious prosody of El. 853 should perhaps have been noted.


French lovers of the classics are singularly fortunate in the handy yet scholarly texts and eloquent yet accurate renderings with which the Collection Budé is constantly supplying them. I could write at length on the excellences of this new edition, but content myself with offering these criticisms as a tribute to the high standard maintained.

A. D. FITTON BROWN.


These ‘Studies’ consist of two articles, fortunately of easy access to Western scholars since the ﬁrst is written in Latin, the second in German.

I. De Sophoclis Telephia. This postulates a tetralogy consisting of (1) Telephus, on the events in Mycia when Telephus received a spear-wound from Achilles; (2) ᾿Αγαθών Σίλλαυος, in which Telephus comes to Argos and is healed by the spear of Achilles on condition of leading the Greeks to Troy and taking no part in the fighting himself or his family;
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this play is reconstructed on the basis of P. Berol. 9908 (Pearson fr. 142), P. Ryl. 482, and the fragments of the Telephus of Accius; (3) Eurypylus or Mνσοι, of which the scene is laid in Mysia; after Telephus’s death his son Eurypylus is allowed by his mother Astyoche (bribed by Priam) to go to Troy to fight against the Greeks, and is there killed by Neoptolemus wielding the spear of Achilles; (4) Tel. sατ. on the exposure and finding of the baby Telephus (admittedly guesswork). The final note says that just as this was ready for the press the author became aware of BICS Supp. 5, 1957 (Handley-Rea), which showed on the basis of new fragments that P. Berol. 9908, assigned by Wilamowitz on very slender evidence to Soph. Ἀγαθών Σύλλογος, is almost certainly from the Telephus of Euripides. Sr. deeply regrets being unable to deal with the subject in this dissertation, but does not find the identification with Eur. Tel. sατis probatum’. Most scholars, however, have found the case overwhelmingly strong, and since without this fragment there is nothing to connect Ἀγαθών Σύλλογος with Telephus at all, Sr.’s Telephus, which is really determined by its second play, begins to look like Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark; at least there is no criticism which can usefully be made here.

II. Die Szenerie der altattischen Komödie. Much of the argument tends to be divided in an irritating way between the text and lengthy footnotes, but the author shows an essential understanding of Aristophanes’ treatment of his stage, and the kind of jokes he got from it, which is as welcome as it is uncommon. His main thesis, important and irresistible, is ‘Ort der Handlung ist die Theaterbühne’, and any attempt of commentators to give it precise locality in terms of illusionistic stage-settings is fundamentally mistaken. He rightly insists that all Ar.’s plays were produced in the Theatre of Dionysus, ἔτοι Ἀφριῶν being merely a traditional formula. For what concerns the actual shape of the Theaterbühne, however, and many details of production, his assumptions may seem to many dubious if not downright unacceptable. He takes for granted a stage-building with three doors ‘as required for tragedy’ (which tragedy?) and projecting side-wings, and appeals for confirmation to the theatre at Eretria as in all probability modelled on the fifth century Athenian theatre. But archaeologists differ considerably about the date and the interpretation of the Eretrian remains, and the wooden theatre at Corinth (v. Stilwell, Corinth ii 15 ff.), which certainly is late fifth century, had no projecting wings. (For a discussion of these problems, see now T. B. L. Webster, ‘Staging and Scenery in the Ancient Greek Theatre’, Bull. Ryl. 42, 2, 1960). The use to which Sr. puts his side doors is often bizarre; the houses of Euripides in Ach., of Agathon in Them., and the Phrontisterion in Nub. have each to have two doors, one for the Servants and the Pupil to emerge from, and one for the subsequent entry of the ekklyklemata. Why cannot the Servants and Pupil emerge and close the door behind them (surely the normal procedure for any actor in any play who comes out of the door) so that it has then to be opened again for the ekklyklemata? Sr. also makes much use of a central platform (Podium) of some kind in the middle of the orchestra, which he takes to be a survival from the earliest form of Aeschylean stage (in itself a highly debatable subject), while denying any raised area or steps of any kind in front of the skene. Thus the uses of ἀνάβασις and κατάβασις which have so often been the source of controversy in discussions of a ‘raised stage’ are mostly explained with reference to this Podium. But quite apart from the fact that the orchestra is in general the province of the Chorus and their flute-player, not of the actors, why should Philectron, for instance, on his way home from a party (coming up the parados) take his flute-girl up on to a central Podium instead of towards his own house-door?

Exkurs I deals with the vexed question of the meaning of Pl. Symp. 194b, and Exk. II with the scenery of Ar. Pax. I find myself in strong disagreement with the conclusions of both, but there is no space to argue the details here. The article contains a number of incidental felicities of Aristophanean interpretation.

A. M. DāLE.


Gnomologies being out of fashion, two ways have appeared of studying general reflection in the dramatic poets. The passages in reflective language may be, and often have been, lifted from their context, prosed, and reassembled into an essay on the poet’s thought in the setting of his time. Dr Johansen’s method is the antipode of this. Heir to an epoch of closer reading, he does not make it his business to arrange or evaluate these passages ethically or metaphysically, or to estimate their place in the history of ideas. Instead he carries out a careful analytical study of certain patterns of composition.

General reflections serve many purposes. They may be brought in to buttress an argument or as the premise of a prediction or piece of advice. They may arise in a lyric context where ratiocination is of secondary importance. All these cases are here left on one side. The real subject is the universalising which occurs when a statement in plain speech about the actual state of affairs is amplified in significance by being logically connected with another somehow more general or deeper proposition. (1) The two things may simply be paralleled as instances of a superior rule (paratactic comparison), or (2) the deeper proposition may concern a mythological figure who constitutes the acknowledged type of what we see before us. (3) The superior rule may be propounded and then the particular situation presented (with γράφειν as an example which goes to prove it) or (4) the logical starting-point may be the rule itself, employed so that the indi-
vidual case can either (4) be classified by it (descriptive application) or (5) stand out as manifestly in breach of it. Finally (6) the reflection may emerge as a conclusion to what has happened. These provide Dr. Johansen with his formal categories.

He is able to show convincingly that the poet’s mind works recurrently in these patterns and that in detail they undergo a gradual evolution. They mostly have natural roots in older Greek poetry. Paratactic comparison was probably archaic already in Homer, but the παράδειγμα ὅκειον came to full flower in tragedy and even began to influence the development of the other patterns. The poets moreover had their personal proclivities. Sophocles and Euripides felt the archaic note in paratactic comparison and largely dropped it from their later work. Aeschylus and Euripides articulated their reflective sequences by means of pauses, whereas Sophocles in his later life blended general and particular together to smooth out the line of thought. Euripides underwent some interesting changes in the years following 420. Probably owing to the resignation of old age he became less given to violent or universally directed pathos. This was noticed by Schadewaldt, but it now appears that there were concomitant formal changes. Numerous as his conclusions are, his earlier intense interest in reflection appears to wane. Some kinds of descriptive application drop out, the pattern coming to be used rather as a mere introductory formula. Formerly his παράδειγμα appeared at critical moments of the action, now they are relegated to secondary speeches and used more perfunctorily to point moral lessons by the way.

These studies are valuable for a number of reasons. First, as will readily be inferred, they shed light on a number of chronological and biographical problems. More important, by tracking the processes of a poet’s mind they form acute and sensitive pieces of literary criticism. Such close reading will often bring to light structural elements and connections of thought which have escaped the majority of editors. This leads incidentally to improvements of punctuation. In the Oxford text of the Antigone Pearson’s full stop after 391 is shown to interrupt the sequence of thought, and his indentation after 790 to break up a formal unit (707–711) which with the sequel makes a paratactic comparison. The fragments too are sometimes illuminated. Three lines of Euripides’ Phaethon are identified as a paratactic comparison with the vestigial remains of special statements preceding and following.

It cannot, however, be said that the book inspires complete confidence, still less that it is pleasant to read. A few slips and misprints will be forgiven, but there are other elements which put the reader on his guard. Conclusions are sometimes squeezed out of very small statistics, as when the Ajax and Antigone are said to show a ‘comparatively extensive use’ of paratactic comparison (two instances each). The author is also continuously on the defensive in regard to his scheme. ‘When working with these things, it is a sine qua non to realise all the time that the logical notions which we sometimes have to apply to the texts do not always square with the thought and language of the texts themselves.’ It is all honest, but a writer should be the master rather than servant of his tools.

To be read with any degree of comfort a book like this requires many passages of verse to be set out, properly spaced off, in Greek. For some, possibly economic, reason the author gives up the attempt to do this after the first few chapters; from then on, Greek quotations are either cramped or missed, and everything has to be looked up. The English is valiant, but the niceties of our word-order and prepositional usage cause the writer many a trip. He needed the help of an English friend, who might very likely have saved him also from a reference on p. 119 to an obscure Mrs Dale. But his modesty and patience go a long way to atone for these various shortcomings and his thesis takes an honourable place in that work which is so characteristic of our time, ‘the gradual discovery in various fields of research of the subtle interplay and fundamental unity of thought and form’.

CHARLES GARTON.

The Complete Greek Tragedies Translated.

In these two volumes the translation of the Iphigenia in Tauris is distinguished from the others in being the work of a poet, not a Greek scholar, and, as we are told in the introduction, not made from the Greek text but based on a close study of all English versions available. It is not surprising that it should frequently appear to be a paraphrase rather than a translation. Thus in the first seventy lines ἤν χρή σε θέσει (23) is expanded to ‘Summon your daughter now and keep your word’, and ἐκακοίην ξιπεῖ (27) to ‘the blow would have been struck I saw the knife’; whereas lines 33 and 66 and a number of words and phrases are omitted. A more striking example is 855–61, where a fairly close prose translation might run: ‘When without marriage song, O brother, I was brought to a false bed-chamber of Achilles; and at the altar there were tears and lamentation. Alas for the holy water (sprinkled) there’, and Mr Binne gives us:

And do you see what I remember there?
The treachery, the misery, the shame!
After the trickery, the vanishing
Of all my dreams! Not to Achilles’ arms
I went, circled with songs, but, shaken with sobs,
I felt the hot flame from the altar-stone
And the cold water trickled on my head.

However, not all passages are handled with quite this
freedom, and as a rule the general purport is con-
veyed, often with greater power and charm than is
found in more scholarly translations. Greekless
readers may vote this one of the most attractive
versions, but they will never know how much of what
they enjoy is Euripides and how much Mr Binner.
It should be added that there are passages where a
close rendering is combined with a vigour and
simplicity that would be effective on the stage, e.g.

Πολύθη, θανοίμθη, ἀλλ' ὅπος θανοίμθη κάλλισθ· ἐπον μοι, φάσανον σπάσας χερὶ.

If this is death, let’s meet it, Pylades,
Like men! Come on! Together! With our swords!

The other plays must be dealt with briefly. Where
there is no indication of the Greek text used it is not
always easy to check the accuracy of the translation.
On the whole the standard is good, though there are
a few rather odd lapses. In Helen 11, for instance,
Latimore writes ‘his mother’s image’, but the
Greek is όγλησμα not όγλημα, and in 449 ὁ ὀδόπτων
γένος can hardly mean ‘of high degree’. In
the same play some scenes may well be to some extent
parodies of tragic situations, conventions and lan-
guage, and this effect is marred by too colloquial
a tone, as in ‘Quite so, granny, just as you say, and
fair enough’ (441). The Alexandrines which Lat-
imore continues to use for Greek iambics seem to me
a little too slow in movement and less suitable than
the blank verse adopted by most of the translators.
In the Andromache J. F. Nims shows ingenuity in
corriving isometric renderings of elegiacs, anaepaets
and lyric metres. In dialogue his phraseology
sometimes strikes me as misleading in its connota-
tion; e.g. ἄνευδου ‘cuddle up’; ὃς φαίδης ὃν ‘you,
you piddler’; τάς θ' αἰματόων θές ὀσφύδιον ἐρού
‘and hooted over the scarlet clotted goblins’. In the
Ion R. F. Willetts omits altogether lines 24–6, 334–7
and 557, without giving any reason. In 594 he
apparently accepts Scaliger’s emendation, which
makes Ion refer to Xuthus, in his presence, as a
nobody. In the last twenty lines some of the stage
directions supplied and the distribution of speakers
assumed are valid only on an interpretation which
not all would accept, but no doubt each translator is
entitled to present the play as he sees it. On
the whole the versions of the Cyclops, Hecuba and Heracles,
all by W. Arrowsmith, seemed to me the most con-
sistently satisfactory in these volumes.

Many other detailed criticisms could be made,
some of them being of course matters of individual
taste; but there is also much that is admirable, and I
regret that limitations of space preclude quotation
of some fine passages. Where many translators are
concerned, there is bound to be a good deal of varia-
tion in style and some unevenness of quality, but
taken as a whole these verse translations are a serious
attempt to present Euripides in contemporary idiom,
and an attempt that has achieved a good measure of
success.

P. T. STEVENS.

EDMONDS (J. M.) The Fragments of Attic
Comedy after Meineke, Bergk, and Kock,
augmented, newly edited with their contexts,
annotated, and completely translated into
Pp. 682. £7 5s. 6d.

The second volume of Edmonds’ work is planned
in the same way as its predecessor. Containing the
fragments of those poets who may for convenience
be labelled ‘middle-comedy’ writers, it takes us from
Aristophanes’ sons to Timocles; presumably Diphilus
and Philemon are postponed to the next volume.
The fragments of each poet are arranged as far as
possible in the order of Kock, and his numbering is
generally retained. An asterisk is used to indicate
doubtful attributions (though this is nowhere
explicitly stated, to my knowledge).

A modern edition of the fragments of ‘middle
comedy’, to replace Meineke (vol. iii published in
1840) and Kock (vol. ii in 1884), has long been
needed. Unfortunately, the present volume in no
way supersedes Meineke and Kock; though it is not
without individual felicities, it contains so many
inaccuracies and so much evidence of unsound
judgment that no scholar can use it safely without
first verifying text, reference, and interpretation
elsewhere. One deeply regrets the harshness of this
assessment, particularly in view of the editor’s death
while this volume was still in proof (it was seen
through the press by Miss A. K. Clarke with two
helpers, whose diligence is deservedly recognised in
a foreword), but those who seek a worthy memorial
of Edmonds’ scholarship, imagination, and inspiration
must look elsewhere.

It will be an advantage to consider the text, transla-
tion, and interpretation of the fragments separately.
First, the text. This is equipped with a brief
apparatus criticus which is full of pitfalls for the unware.
For instance, the source of most of the fragments
collected here is Athenaeus, whose text (in books
III–XV) has been shown by Maas to derive from a
single, extant archetype: the codex Marci anus (A).
But Edmonds reports manuscript readings of
Athenaeus invariably as ‘ms.’, and indeed he seems
to value the readings of the epitome ms. as highly
as those of A. This would perhaps not mar the
apparatus unduly if all the readings had been reported
accurately, but they are not. The following example
of inaccuracy, by no means unique, is taken from a
fragment (Alexis, 30) where Stobaeus is the source:
v. 1, E. prints ἀκάρτα without comment, but this is
Meineke’s conjecture, all the ms. reading ὀτί
παρά; v. 4, E. prints τοοὐδέτερον, with ‘ms. τοοὐδέτερον’.
No indication is given that this is Edmonds’ own
notions of books

conjecture, based on Hirschig's τουούτον. At v. 6, the apparatus runs 'most (ms.) omit κάρτο'; in fact all the ms. omit κάρτο, which is a medieval conjecture (second hand of A). Similar inaccuracies occur in reporting papyri (e.g. Philiscus, 1 A, especially vv. 1, 8, 11: with inconsistent use of square brackets) and inscriptions (e.g. the testimonia of Anaxandrides, from I.G. 14, 1098). Furthermore, when conjectures are admitted into the text, it is very rare that Edmonds records the name of the original emender. Thus it is often difficult to decide whether new conjectures are the editor's own or not.

The text itself reveals that Edmonds was far too ready to admit new conjectures; yet amongst much that is implausible several palmary emendations deserve notice: Anaxandrides, 15 v. 3 (ἐδειγε' εἰς τονα, ται), Eubulus, 82 v. 2 ('Ἀρενιαν'), Antiphanes, 47 (a difficult fragment with a series of problems brilliantly solved), Epicrates, 10 v. 1 (καλκεια), Alexis' title 'Ἰόμηνορ'; and there are many others deserving of serious consideration by future editors (e.g. Antiphanes, 190 v. 5, 244, 262 v. 1).

Edmonds' translations, in rhymed verse, are often elegant, witty (e.g. Nicostratus, 28), and spirited (e.g. Ephippus, 18A, 19), although the idiom sometimes seems dated. The tyranny of rhyme prevents exact renderings, but Edmonds consistently stays close to the original, and errors such as Alexis, 127 v. 5 (ἀνίσις for ἁρπον), 165 (tr. 'let dark Opora go to hell'), and the title 'Πρόπολος; translated 'Colt', are not numerous. However, the point of Epicrates, 11 (the 'Platonic divisions' fragment) is lost when the whole fragment is turned into an exercise in Scots dialect; the effect of the Doricisms in the original was all the greater for their being scattered at intervals in an Attic text.

Edmonds adds to his text a large number of footnotes. Here one must quarrel severely with the editor. On the analogy, presumably, of such odd-comedy political allegories as Cratinus' Διονυσος-αλεξανδρος and Nemesis, Edmonds interprets whenever he can the mythological titles of fourth-century comedy as similar compositions, in which the mythological heroes are contemporary fables (or places) in semi-disguise. Thus Tereus in Philaeterus' play is tentatively identified as a caricature of Cotys; Odysseus more than once is assumed to be Callistratus in exile; Eubulus' Glaucus and Antiphanes' Caeneus are both Athens; the hungry Heracles in Alexis' Λίνος is conjectured to be the hungry Athenian Demos. Perhaps such political allegories were occasionally written in the fourth century (for a possible example, see Webster, Studies in Later Greek Comedy, 21); but there can be little doubt that the majority of mythological comedies produced in this period were apolitical travesties, in which popular myths (or tragic versions of them) were farcically and vulgarly reinterpreted. Moreover, on the tentative equation of mythical hero and fourth-century personality or city, Edmonds over-confidently constructs arguments for dating the plays concerned; these arguments, of course, fail to the ground immediately that the general 'political allegory' theory is shown to be implausible. The evidence sometimes advanced for dating other types of play is also inclined to be suspect: if Philippus' (or Philippides') Olynthia is dated to 378 solely because Olynthus fell to Sparta in 379, ought not Menander's Olynthia logically to be given the same date? Again, Alexis' Kratia is assigned to the year 306 on the hypothesis that the heroine of the title was identical with the historical Cratesipolis, but no evidence is adduced to support this identification; what evidence there is rather suggests that this play was of a new-comedy type, with the Kratia of the title a persona ficta. These instances accurately reflect Edmonds' consistent interpretation of the 'middle comedy' as a succession of plays on political themes, with many of the characters caricatures of real people. The evidence in support of this theory is so meagre, and the evidence against it so strong, that a great number of Edmonds' footnotes, together with much of his appendix of production dates (pp. 639-50), must be considered valueless.

It is likely that the collection of material for this volume ceased many years before its publication; there seems to be no other explanation for the absence of references to work on Athenaeus and Greek comedy published after Peppinck's edition of the Athenaeus epitome (1937-1939) and the first edition of Page's Literary Papyri: Poetry (1940). Thus no account is taken of Webster's anticipation (op. cit., 66) of Edmonds' identification of the title-figure of Nicostratus' Νερες, or of Desrousseaux's πτηροφως at Philetaerus, 19 (Budé Athenaeus, i 21c), which so nearly resembles Edmonds' own suggestion.

The volume abounds in misprints; of those that I have noted, the following seem to be most awkward to correct: p. 28, opp. cit., 'Gaasp.' for 'Gais(ford)'; p. 74, fr. 52 v. 2, χοῖτο omitted before χαίτε; p. 113, note c, reference should be 'Rudens 478'; p. 134, fr. 111, reference should be to Athenaeus, iii 106a; p. 154, fr. 15 v. 6, ἡ πτεροφως for ἡ πτηροφως; p. 220, fr. 126 vv. 1-2, ἐξελκρικότοιον ἔσων; p. 418, fin., read '102K = 67A'; p. 424, n. i, read 'Moer(is)?'. A printing accident may have accounted for the disappearance from this volume of Alexis', 344 (on p. 520, it is renumbered in a cross-reference as 63a, but it does not appear between 63 and 64); but the omission of the papyrus fragment of Alexis' Εἰσιον (Pap. Oxyrh., xv 1801; Crönert, Literarisch Zentralblatt, lxiii 1922, 425; Weinreich, Sit.-berichte, Vienna, 1942, Abb. 4, 123) is a more culpable oversight.

W. G. Arnott.


It had been known for some years that Professor Dodds was engaged in editing the Gorgias, and he now tells us that he conceived the plan twenty years ago
when he was lecturing on it at the beginning of the war to undergraduates who were soon to be soldiers, and was struck by the relevance of its themes to the problems of our own time. The work was delayed by war-time duties and by other urgent commitments in the immediate post-war years. It has been well worth waiting for, and it will at once take, and will long keep, its place as the standard edition of the dialogue.

Dodd offers no radically new interpretation of the dialogue as a whole, but his industry and learning have been well spent in producing an edition which unifies, consolidates and extends all that has been done for the Gorgias by earlier commentators, and which also brings to bear on the dialogue the results of the work of other scholars who were more generally concerned with Plato or Greek language, literature and philosophy.

The Preface disarms a possible criticism of what seems at first sight a disproportionate amount of space devoted to textual matters. Dodd found that Burnet's apparatus was seriously inadequate, and he has supplied its defects by taking account of the papyri, of the minor manuscripts, and of the indirect tradition, as well as by undertaking a fresh collation of W and F from photographs lent by the Association Guillaume Budé. The evidence for the text is considered at length in the second chapter of the Introduction. Dodd acknowledges that very few of the textual problems he discusses have any important bearing on the understanding of the doctrine of the dialogue, but he rightly pleads that nobody since Stallbaum has offered a reasoned defence of a text of the Gorgias.

Chapter I of the Introduction consists of thoughtful and judicious essays on the dialogue's Subject and Structure, Personages and Period, and Date of Composition, with a final section on 'Plato and Athens'. Recent commentators have rightly hesitated to single out any topic as being the theme of the Gorgias. Dodd goes much further, and convincingly exhibits a 'spiral' pattern in which the two themes of μετορίκη and εὔθυμονία are subtly intertwined. He gives strong reasons for regarding Callicles as a historical personage, and for seeing the Socrates of this dialogue as a mixture of the ironist of the early aporetic dialogues with the metaphysician and prophet of some of the later works. In his discussion of the date of the dialogue, which concludes by placing it at the end of the first group, Dodd incidentally offers much sound sense for the attention of those who still need to be convinced that the Apology is agnostic on the question of human immortality, that the hedonism of the Protagoras is seriously meant, and that the 'Theory of Forms had barely begun to germinate in any work of the first group. To his reasons for placing the Meno after the Gorgias he might have added that the Meno is nearer to the developed Theory of Forms than the earlier work. The Introduction underlines the parallel between the historical background of the dialogue and the problems of the twentieth century which impressed itself on Dodd when he was lecturing in the year 1939-1940.

All these themes, and many others of equal interest, are developed in a commentary which is a rich storehouse of learning and sound judgement on a myriad points of language, logic, style, history and doctrine. There are particularly valuable remarks on the connexion between the Gorgias and the developed account of 'pure rhetoric' in the Phaedrus; on the paradoxical contention that the true use of rhetoric would be to secure punishment for one's wicked friends and to deprive one's enemies of its benefits; on the important passage where Socrates pays tribute to the qualifications of Callicles as a fellow-seeker for the truth; on Plato's estimate of Attic tragedy; on the germ in the Gorgias of the absolutism of the Republic, Politics and Laws; and on the rôle of Callicles as spokesman for an anti-Platon chez Platon.

In such a full and lively exposition of an important dialogue there are inevitably points at which individual scholars will wish to cavil. Dodd does not give convincing grounds for holding that ἁλλάκτις is always a corruption of ἁλλάκτις (p. 213), and he does not do justice to the possibility that τις αὐτῇ ἀττικῇ ἡ τιμία (497b8) means 'it is not on this that you pride yourself'. But these are small matters. There are two points of greater substance which call for critical comment. Dodd has missed opportunities of displaying the extent to which Plato uses in the Gorgias the very rhetorical devices and techniques whose misuse by others he is concerned to criticise. He also fails to grasp the true nature of the Socratic technique of paradoxical utterance, and so is inclined, after the manner of Aristotle, to dismiss paradoxes simply because they are paradoxical. He remarks, for example, that Plato does not always restrict the word βούλεωςθαι to the sense required by the paradox that every man wishes for what is good. But this is not an oversight on Plato's part. It is of the essence of a paradox that it achieves its effects by ad hoc extension or restriction of meaning to which its author is not committed permanently and for all purposes. Solon's paradox does not deprive him of the right to recognise the literal truth that some men are happy even while they are still alive.

There is an interesting appendix on Socrates, Callicles and Nietzsche. The book is supplied with a List of Works Cited, an Index of Testimonia, an Index of Greek Words and Phrases, and a very full General Index. The printing and proof-reading are in general excellent, but there is a trivial error in the word 'personal' at the end of p. 243, and the quotation from Lord Acton on p. 342 has been badly maulled.

All who read this edition will be deeply grateful for the sanity of its judgements, the sureness of its touch, the comprehensiveness of its scope and the pungency of its style. Plato speaks of Attic tragedy 'in terms that a bishop might use in discussing
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dangers of commercial television'. The χαράδρας is crisply portrayed as 'a bird of messy habits and uncertain identity'. Dodds reminds us that 'Plato did not know that he was writing for grammarians'. If he had known that he was writing for editors he would have wished them to have the qualities which Dodds shares with Callixtes—έθνος, παρρησία, ἐυναξίου.

RENFORD BAMBRUGH


Humbert is entirely responsible for C. Mid., Gernet for C. Aristocr. Their contributions can best be considered separately.

C. Mid. Text and apparatus. H. has newly collated both S and Y. For A and F he has used previous collations, but he has checked the reported readings of F (and B) against the Aldine edition, and those of A against Paris 2998 and 2996. He follows S in some forty places where Butcher (usually also Sykutris, less often Goodwin) followed other MSS. or adopted a modern correction (16 line 10, the reading attributed to A in H's note is not that which Butcher and Sykutris report and adopt). In six places, however, where Butcher followed S, H. prefers A. Apart from three deletions (10 την ἐν Διονύσων, 47 παραχρήμα, 86 ἡ τοῦ σκορπομονὸς) he prints only one correction of his own: 165 δ ἄγωντος παϊς; seeming not to see the point of ἀποκ. (SY), which he calls 'assez bizarre'. He adopts at least ten modern corrections without acknowledgement, most of them very slight, but surely Markland (185) should be given credit. He cites few modern corrections in the apparatus, and (rightly) even fewer testimonia, but he gives generally a fuller report than Butcher of the readings of SAYF, being never content with al., cett., or vulg. However, his notes are often confusing and sometimes ambiguous, for although SAYF are the only sigla used, AYF are used in a peculiar way, to represent 'non seulement les manuscrits ainsi désignés, mais en même temps ce qu'atteste chacune des quatre familles: s'il y a divergence reconnue à l'intérieur d'une même famille, la leçon la moins fréquente est mise entre parenthèses'. A couple of examples, taken almost at random, will illustrate the result: 47, 1, ύβρις SYF: ύβρις (ήβρις) A (Butcher: ήβρις codd. uno excepto: ύβρις Schaefer'; Sykutris: ήβρις codd. : ήβρις Paris. 2998); 49, 12, ἰδιος hab. AYF: non hab. S, non hab. (hab.) A (Sykutris: δη όμοιο Μ); 116, 3 δὲ ἐμός SAF: δὲ ἐμός SAF: δὲ ἐμός (ἐμός) Y (Butcher: δὲ ἐμός YO: δὲ ἐμός S vulg'; Sykutris δὲ ἐμός Rh. Gr. IV 459: δὲ ἐμός codd.')

Translation. This seems graceful and lively, but some words and phrases are inadequately rendered: τολμήματα 19; repeated καὶ 20, cf. 28; φίλοι and πατρίδες not rendered 49; ἱμάτα 59, cf. note on p. 182; ἅλασσοντα 66; ἀπάργμον 83; κλητῆρα 87; emphatic πρῶται 161; ἐκκλησίαν 161. There are also a few mistakes: 51 'dresser des autels' is not in the Greek (although Ἀγνώσις may well be right); 79 μυτήρα 'sœur'; 87 'magistrat', referring to a διακονίας. In 87 the words δὲ ... δικείν have been omitted, in 161 the words ἔτερον ... Μεσοί: Notes. These could have been more helpful, especially on history and institutions, even within the space allotted to them. There could at least have been a few references to modern literature. Some of the notes seem unduly trivial (e.g. pp. 26, 43, 51, 64, 65, 74). Some are misleading, e.g. p. 21. on φιλία, p. 22.1 and p. 180, n. on 36.4, on the πρεσβυτήριον and πρωτάρχης, p. 183, n. on 83.5, on the Forty, who handled only τὰς ἄλλας δῖκες, p. 70.1 on symmories—D. is referring to those for εἰσαρχή, p. 185, n. on 110.6, on Εὐβοια—D's dealings with Callias come later. Above all, there is inconsistency about the chronology of the chief events—assigned to 349/348 on pp. 3–4 and p. 42 n. 1, but to (351)/350 on pp. 53 n. 1 and p. 185 n. on 110.6 (cf. the following note). For 'les affaires d'Eubée' (p. 185) it would be appropriate to refer to Parke, JHS 1929, or to Cloché or Glotz-Cohen, rather than to Goodwin.

C. Aristocr. Text and apparatus. In the Introduction G. says nothing about the MSS., but seemingly he too has made, or used, a new collation of Y, at least, for his account of its readings diverges in at least forty places from the reports of Butcher and Sykutris. Otherwise his apparatus differs little from Butcher's. Nor does his text; I noticed only eighteen changes, the majority rejecting S in favour of some modern correction. A few seem unnecessary, e.g. δοντ' > 6, οἴδε for καὶ 131, [καὶ] 150, πολεμήσαντες for πολεμεῖν 152, but most are plausible. He adopts only two corrections of his own: εἶναι for εἶναι 59, φαίνει 89, which seems almost necessary. He defends αἰσθαναίτω τινα (72), referring to Glotz, Solidarité de la famille, p. 102, n. 4.

Translation. I noticed only two doubtful renderings: 65 καὶ μεθύδω καὶ δὲ αὐτοί μαρτυροι ἐσμέν 'ces belles histoires dont nous pouvons nous-mêmes témoigner' (surely a distinction is intended), 94 οἵτι καλὸς ἔχει μι λίθων 'vous n'aivez donc pas le droit de ne pas abroger' (Vince is better: 'it is not right that you should refuse to annul'). Generally the translation seems elegant and vigorous as well as accurate.

Notes. As usual, Gernet handles the juridical questions with admirable lucidity. He also explains many of the historical allusions as adequately as is possible in a few words, but a little more information should have been given on recent happenings in the Hellespont region. There is, for instance, no note on 103 'nos concitoyens résidant en Chersonèse', the note on Sestos (p. 157, n. 2) should refer more precisely to the very recent Athenian reconquest, and it might be mentioned that the treaty which the speaker commends (173) has been identified with IG ii 126. Two small points: on any chronological
scheme Philip's advance to Thermopylae cannot have preceded Pammenes' expedition to Asia (p. 166, n. 1), and Robert's theory that the διόδεκα θεοί were not the Olympians, which 'has found little support and is indeed ridiculous' (Guthrie), should not be presented as fact (p. 191, n. on 66).

Mistypes. I noticed about thirty minor faults in the whole volume. There are also a few more troubling errors: C.Mid. 53 text κρατήρα, note 'κρατήρας τοις'; 67 το belongs before στόμα; 86 text [ι το τοις ακροφυμώνων], note '[τιν τοις θεριφυμώνων] τοις'; 94 note, for '1' read '5-6'; 94.6 note, delete διαίσοπα τὸν ἐλεφόσα; C. Aristoc. 116.2 the critical note is confused; 186.3 'et codd.' needs to be added to the note; 162 a bad muddle in the apparatus, for '12' read '4' and add to this note 'ἐμιν σελ. Weil' (deleting 'δήσεις ἐμιν F?'), and in the text, 162.12, delete ποι.; the note marked 162.6 is evidently also out of place; p. 8, part of n. 1 on p. 7 has crept into the text; p. 155, 'c. Aristoc. 149' would be more appropriate than 'Δέμ. 669,7'; p. 184, for 87.5, 88.10, 90.6 read 86.9, 87.5, 88.10 respectively; the note on 90.6 is missing.

C. RODEWALD.


These volumes maintain the standard set by their two predecessors, in the first of which M. Gernet explained the principles underlying his text and apparatus (see JHS lxvii (1957) 330–1). In these eleven speeches G. adopts some twenty of A's readings, and a few modern conjectures, which neither Blass nor Rennie accepted; otherwise, in his esteem for A, he is often with Blass against Rennie, but he again rejects many needless changes made by Blass. He prints in his text about a dozen emendations of his own, besides suggesting some twenty further corrections or deletions. It is easy to see how most of the slight mistakes and glosses postulated might have crept in; but in accepting Scherling's Σκίφωρ for Σκίφω (lii 3) G. suggests that οἰκών should replace οἰκοτόρων ἃν and deletes καὶ ἐν Σκίφω κατοικούσα (9), and the fact that these further changes almost inevitably follow casts greater doubt on S's correction. The other most notable change is the insertion of οὕτω before πυργίζων (lviii 59).

As in the two previous volumes, the effort to make the apparatus concise renders some of the notes useless without recourse to some other edition: e.g. xlix 7 καί, lii 23 τίν, lix 32 τε: either the line or the context is needed. In three places the translation and the order of the critical note suggest that the reading printed is not that which G. intended to adopt.

The word ἐπιρεσία, which occurs repeatedly in 1 and once in li, is translated as 'rameurs'. For this rendering there are many precedents (e.g. the Loeb translation here, the German commentators on Thucydides and Crawley's and Warner's translations: cf. LSJ 'body of rowers, ship's crew'), but an examination of passages in which the word is used suggests that this cannot be right, as had indeed been recognised long ago (see, for example, Busolt, stk a 572 fl.). Until recently the most decisive passage was Thuc. vi 31, but there is now also the 'decreed of Themistocles' from Trozen (Hesperia xxix (1960) 200, line 26). The word seems normally to denote members of the ship's company other than the rowers (often, as here, called simply ραφάς) and the έπιρεσία: as we might say, the petty officers (cf. Gomme's note on Thuc. i 143). Similarly the ἐπίρεσία (i 31, 51) was probably one of these, rather than simply 'un envoyé' or 'le messager'. I query a few other renderings: lii 21, 'maison' must be a mistake for 'moisson'; liv 19, προ is surely not temporal here but means 'in order to avoid' (LSJ); liv 42, the translation seems to be of Voemel's conjecture, not mentioned, τρομάσατον; liv 30, the translation cannot be right if τά is retained; liv 106, the meaning seems rather to be 'he laid down in the decree, with reference to them, the rule that none . . .', which eliminates the contradiction to which G. refers in his note on 93. In liv 20 the words θεοὶ . . . ἐμοὶ have been left untranslated.

The introductions and footnotes are again particularly good on the juristic side, with plenty, but not a superfluous, of references to the modern literature. They also explain most non-juristic allusions that might puzzle the ordinary student as adequately as limits of space permit. III: p. 33 and n. 2 on the difficult question of the triarch's rôle in recruitment, a reference might be given to some fuller discussion, such as Busolt's (L is evidently a mistake for LI); likewise on proxenia (p. 68), since speech lii is one of our chief literary sources; while on προεκχαίνω (l 8, cf. p. 36) reference might be made to A. H. M. Jones's discussion of this passage (Athenian Democracy 26–8). P. 77, n. 2: it is far from true that but for lii 20 we should hardly be aware that there was trade in the fourth century between Athens and Phocinia. P. 133, p. 139, n. 3: there is much that is obscure about these commercial laws, and it is by no means certain that the reference in lii 10 is to the law quoted xxxiv 37, etc., cf. Hasebroek, Trade and Politics 170 (not an adequate analysis). P. 135, n. 1: the allusion to Paol's theory concerning δίκαιον ἡμῶν requires a reference to the note on xxxiii 23 in vol. I. IV: p. 9, n. 3 (on p. 10): G. mentions Gomme's theory (Essays in Greek History and Literature 75–86), that failure in an appeal against exclusion from the citizen roll did not involve sale into slavery as a penalty, only to reject it. It is a pity that space did not permit him to state his reasons fully, since, so far as I know, the theory has never been discussed by an expert on Greek law. G. refers merely to the speaker's allusions to the consequences of failure; but surely, as Gomme says (79), 'a candid reader, who had not yet been told that
enslavement was the penalty of failure, would certainly not guess it from the speech'. P. 23, n. 2: it is hazardous to assert that the 'law of Aristophon' referred to in this puzzling passage is the law quoted by Athenaeus, which was itself by no means certainly a re-enactment of Pericles' decree (see, for instance, Lipsius, *Attisches Recht*, 414, n. 146). P. 39: I am not convinced that 'il faut suppléer' the law referred to in lviii 10-12 as G. proposes, on the assumption that it too was concerned with the penalties incurred by a prosecutor who failed either to proceed or to receive one-fifth of the votes. It appears rather that this second law simply authorised the use of ἐνδείξις or ἀπαγωγή against any person alleged to have accused an ἐμπυρός falsely, which would of course lead to his appearance in court. In other words, it will have specified a particular application of the shadowy γραφή συναφρικτάς. Admittedly it is hard to see how such a law could be given effect, but Bonner and Smith (*Administration of Justice*, II 71), to whom G. does not here refer, suggest one possibility.

P. 66: the prosecution of Apollodoros raises problems that have never been satisfactorily solved, but the account given by Theomnestos suggests that he was condemned and his proposal quashed not 'pour le fond' but because he was held to be ὅτιμος. Incidentally one is sorry to see it stated categorically once again that in 348 Eubulos 'gérat' the theoret fund.

At the end of the fourth volume there is an index of proper names (113-27) compiled by J. A. de Foucault. There is also an 'Index des termes du droit et des institutions' (128-90), compiled by R. Well, giving also G's translation of each term in its various senses and references to his notes on many of the terms. This index is generously conceived and will be very useful; for instance, under νόμος each law alluded to in these speeches is separately listed, likewise under δίκη and γραφή. In testing each index against the last three speeches, I found only one mistake ('Céphisia, déme' appears also as 'Képhisia', with one reference missing), and a few possible additions to the second index (lvii 17, φύσωνυμα φυλετῶν; *ibid.*, on the transmission of public debts; lvii 30, implicit reference to laws on citizenship (cf. note); lviii 23 n., on γεννητατα as nobility).

There is the usual quota of misprints, mostly in the apparatus and mostly trifling. Only the following might be confusing: III: p. 37, for 361 read 360; Iv 17, it was before αντίθετον that Baiter-Saupe added τῆς; I 53, the second critical note needs correction; II 9, something has dropped out of the first note. IV: lvii 20-1, the presumed lacuna is after Νυκαδύν (20) not Νυκαδύς; lviii 7, add A at the end of the last note.

C. RODEWALD.


The 'giro' is the stylistic device of having a de-pendent infinitive itself govern a second infinitive, which may in turn govern a third, and so on (as in οἶμαι δὲν ὑπάρχει, καλόν εἶναι κολάσια διαφθείρεται). Demosthenes has a great fondness for this idiom (particularly, as Rehdantz and Blass pointed out, employing the formulæ οἶμαι (or οἶμαμι) δὲν and γεμαί δὲν); and Professor Nuño, believing that it is one of the sources (through the accumulation and juxtaposing of verbal ideas) from which his style acquires its energy, set out to investigate it, both in Demosthenes himself and in those other prose-writers with whom it is natural to compare him (Thucydides—especially in the speeches—and the other orators), not merely as a contribution to the 'conocimiento científico' of Demosthenes (Nuño seems to have been a passionate devotee of stylistic analysis), but also as a tool for measuring stylistic relationships. Unfortunately, he died before he could publish his work, which has been seen through the press by Professor Gallo. Gallo has done his work with thoroughness and clarity; and the result does justice to the considerable precision of Nuño's method.

He sets up six categories, according to whether the elements P (redicate) I (infinitive), I (infinitive) occur in that order, or in the order P I 1 I 2 , or 1, 1 I 2 P, and so on. A further distinction occurs according as one element succeeds another directly or is separated from it by intervening matter. Thus within the first category one can have the patterns P 1 I 2 I 3 P, I 1 I 2 I 3 I 4 as variations on the basic P 1 I 2 . Applying the variations to the other categories we get altogether twenty-four possible patterns in which the essential three elements may occur. Nuño has examined all the cases of the idiom occurring in the political speeches of (or attributed to) Demosthenes and in the other authors mentioned, and classified them according to these categories (calling the basic patterns 'Type I', 'Type II', etc., and the variations 'Type Ia', 'Type Ib', etc.). What is perhaps more striking than any novelty in the conclusions reached is the way in which the resultant statistics agree with impressions already formed intuitively. (As Nuño says, this is confirmation that the handling of this idiom is a formative element in the style of authors.) For instance, Dionysius (not Caecilius of Caleacte, as Nuño says on p. 63) remarks that Lysias and Isaeus are so alike that only an expert can tell them apart (Isae. 2). Accordingly, here it turns out that of the twenty-four categories Isaeus uses twelve, Lysias the same twelve plus one other. Moreover, the different categories are employed by both these authors with practically the same relative frequency. This use of about half the available variations by these two corresponds to their middle position (as regards flexibility and variety) between more restricted stylists such as Lycurgus (3 categories) and Antiphon (6) and the freer and more venturesome (Demosthenes, with 19, Thucydides, with 16, Isocrates, with 15).

Another classification, reflecting history and
environment rather than personal idiosyncracy, emerges when Nuño examines the lexicographical usages of the various stylists in connexion with the idiom. It may be compounded with verbs of obligation, of opinion, perception, and so forth. The earliest authors (Antiphon, Andocides, Thucydides, Lysias) form a group apart, distinguishing itself by its preference for ἐρωτᾷ as a verb of obligation, ἐρωτᾷαι (with δοκεῖ and νομίζω close competitors) as a verb of opinion, and ἐρωτᾷ as a general declarative verb. In marked contrast is the late group of Demosthenes, Aeschines and Hyperides, with a decided preference for ἔσται as a verb of obligation, ἔσται (particularly with ἔσται) of opinion, and ἐστὶ as a declarative only when coupled with ἔσται (ἐστὶ εἶθα, for instance, never occurs in this idiom in Demosthenes except in the highly-suspect π. ‘Αλοντάνεσ!’ Evidently speech-usage has changed in this respect during the period separating these groups. Nor is it fanciful to suggest, as does Nuño, that historical factors have contributed to this change (that one said for preference ‘you ought’ to the Athenians of Pericles’ day and ‘you must’ to those of Demosthenes’ seems a not unreasonable proposition. Nor does it seem accidental that the archaising Lycurges harks back to ἐρωτᾷ and ἐρωτᾷ in this idiom. I notice, however, that Lycurges has ἔσται repeatedly as a verb of obligation without a second infinitive, which suggests that the matter is not altogether straightforward.) Two stylists, falling in the period of relative calm which came historically between these groups, reflect the transition between the usages which they represent. Isocrates and Isaeus look backward in their general preference of ἐρωτᾷ to ἔσται and their tolerance of desideratives like βοήθεσθαι (seldom used by the pragmatic Demosthenes in this idiom), but forward in their preference of ὑπάρχει (or ὑπάρχει) βασανος ὑπάρχει (the latter is altogether absent in Isaeus, who has bequeathed his own fondness for ὑπάρχει βασανος to his pupil Demosthenes).

This reviewer is not one of those who believe that literature is on the whole well interpreted in terms of science. Yet enough has perhaps been said to show that these statistics are interesting and suggestive. A general criticism that one is bound to make is that the field chosen is too narrow to yield results leading to firm general conclusions. The treatment of verbs of opinion for instance needs supplementing by a study of the whole practice of the authors concerned in regard to these verbs. No account is taken of hyperbaton, which has obviously been an important factor in determining the word-order in some of the examples quoted. The analysis made in the book of the various types of verbs upon which the idiom can be made to depend (thinking, wishing, perceiving, etc.), and what exactly they convey, seems to this reviewer particularly interesting and profitable for its own sake.

J. H. Kells.


L’s first edition (1954) seems to have evaded JHS and CR; the most useful review in English is by M. Chambers, CP li (1956) 44-5. Its users will be familiar with the general soundness of his apparatus, his retraction of Hude’s preference for C, his textual conservatism, his use of the Leiden Klammer-system, and the forest of numbers which make his pages so ugly and the text so easy to use for finding Bekker line-references while using von Essen’s Index. Here, in the Teubner manner, before we get Vol. II, is a second edition of Vol. I, differing from the first only in having eleven pages of Addenda et Corrigenda, to which reference is mercifully facilitated by the appearance of hollow squares in the already crowded margins of the main text. The most important accretions to the apparatus are the readings of the new eleventh-century Modena fragment Y; covering I 31.2-34.2 and I 50.5-52.2, certainly showing no tendency to transcend the minuscule archetype and much closer to ABFEM than to C, a new Florence papyrus of II 73.1-74.1 to be published by Bartoleti (date not given), with two unimportant new readings, both possibly right, despite L’s doubts of ὄθεν ἔτεμνομ as a possible tense at II 73.1, and the results of Alberti’s patient work on G. None of these is easily accessible, and it is good to have them here. On the general question of the MSS. L. remains totally unshaken by the amount of evidence which has been assembled by Hemmerdinger and Dover to suggest that there are readings in H which transcend the minuscule archetype and prove its independence of B. He tells us that, before a complete collation of H has been published, it is too early to come to a decision. One would, however, have thought that there was enough on pp. 57-8 of Hemmerdinger, Essai sur l’histoire du texte de Thucydide to make anyone wish to withdraw the statement of the first edition in libris recensioribus ante VI qvis quidquid inventum iri puto, quod antique memoriam ab archetypo alienae certum vestigium sit. The outlook seems black, and I see no likelihood of getting an adequate apparatus of Books V-VI for some time, since L. is uninterested in H and Mme de Romilly uses Hemmerdinger’s collations, which take no account of what seems to me a clear difference between the hands involved in correcting H and obscure the facts that the main text of H is very close to B and the important marginalia are in a quite distinctive hand (cf. JHS lxvii (1957) 330). This lack of interest in the recentiores (except G, in which most of us have lost interest) extends to Kleinlogel’s work on J and I, and it must be said that, even with the Addenda, L.’s preface no longer provides a fully adequate treatment of the manuscript tradition.

D. M. Lewis.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


The Loeb Classical Library has made considerable progress since its early days. Not only are the obvious gaps in the range of authors being slowly filled (although many still remain), but also the scope of individual volumes has been widened. Besides the translations we are now offered, in many cases, explanatory footnotes and introductions that make an original contribution to the study of a particular author or work, and sometimes constructive textual criticism is given. In the *Moralia* series an outstanding example is the *de facie* of Professor Cherniss (in vol. xii). The present volume has similar ambitions but is less successful.

For the essays translated here (*de cupiditate divitiarum, de vitioso pudore, de invidia et odio, de se ipsum citra invidiam laudando, de sera numinis vindicta, de fato, de genio Socratis, de exilio, consolatio ad uxorem*) the editors have provided us with a text which 'rests on a collation from photostats of all MSS, known to us'. To that extent the text is independent of other editions, and despite many difficulties it gives a fairly sound working-basis for the translation. One could hardly expect a complete account of the MS. variants within the limits of a Loeb edion, and many are naturally omitted; but at the same time one frequently finds a fuller report than that given by the Teubner apparatus (e.g. 527A p. 284; 542C p. 134; 547E p. 167, where a new reading is offered and variants not reported by the Teubner editor are given; 603C p. 544 and many others). Altogether more than sixty new readings are offered, some of them attempts to fill the lacunae in the later essays in the volume—these, generally speaking, follow the hints of earlier scholars—and most of the others only slight alterations of the MS. Many are unnecessary and some are injudicious or quite unacceptable. E.g. ἀμελής (526C) is inconsistent with what follows about the care bestowed by misers on the 'training' of their sons in 559C (*ad fin.*) τι before πάλις was seen by Reiske to be the result of dittography, but here it is retained although it is meaningless; ἐλικα (564A) is inferior to the ψυκόν of Bernardakis, and the suggested comparison with ἐλικα τεταραγμένη in 592A has less relevance than ψυκά ... ἐφέρποτο in 564B; τὸ is inserted unnecessarily at 565C (p. 284) in an awkward position; at 570C (p. 326; cf. p. 327) Sandbach's κῶς εἰμαιμένη is the best reading, demanded by the sense of the whole of the passage; ἐκατον at 581B is a doubtful use of the reflexive pronoun.

The translation is on the whole competent but unimaginative. Its chief fault is that it follows the Greek too literally and consequently becomes turgid and, in places, unreadable. Examples are: 562B, the last sentence on p. 263; 562E, the sentence beginning 'This we do . . .', on p. 267; 567F, the first sentence on p. 299; 573D—'These matters . . . ' on p. 347, etc. Certain expressions are ill-chosen: 'acold' (in a line of Hippoxas, 523E); nurses are said to 'sowl infants' and to 'do them hurt' (529C); 'until their necks are severed' (554E); 'agefellow' (ἅλκωτάς, 590A); 'when reason has gromped them out' (599G); 'cleansed and prettied up their children' (609E), etc. Some things have been overlooked in translation: e.g. p. 20, l. 2 (where the text, in any case, is difficult); 561F—ὅτι τὰς ἥπιως . . . πόνοι; 584A—διασφαλίστως, etc. The exact force of Greek words is not always appreciated: e.g. ἀρμοιτίως, 525C; τὸ φιλότιμον καὶ τὸ φιλάθλους at 527A are more than 'kindness and friendship'; διεξέλθειν, 567A; μὴ γοῦν, etc., 569B; εἴθε, 585F. At 585F ἐκεῖ, if the text is correct (see p. 436b and p. 437b), must surely be construed, with the rest of the sentence from ἐκεῖ, as part of the ἐννοια of Theanor and the Pythagoreans in Italy and will therefore mean, as befits the context, 'in Thebes'.

The footnotes are evidently intended to cater for a wide reading public. They range from concise and scholarly discussions of technical points to items of simple information (e.g. p. 35b 'Helen had once gone off with Paris'; p. 146 'all deified rulers were gods'). Of Dionysus we are told (p. 561c) that 'Zeus took the unborn child and sewed it in his thigh, and thus Dionysus was born a second time'. The unintinitiated might well ask, 'How?' There is similar ineptitude in the Index (which is by no means inclusive of all proper names appearing in the translation and footnotes).

Some misprints have been noticed—ἐταίρος, 589E; μαρτυρείν ὑπό, 534A; ἄλλας, 591C; ἔρως, 609B. The commencement of 525E is not marked. There are at least two wrong references—on p. 398b, to 585b; p. 607, s.v. Auleus, to p. 319b, for 391b.

Despite these and many other points of dissatisfaction, this is a useful volume.

A. J. GOSSEAGE.


The sixth volume of the Loeb Lucian follows the fifth after an interval of twenty-three years, and maintains the high standard of Professor Harmon's work. The text established by Mr Kilburn makes use of codd. Vaticanus 90 (P) and Parisinus 2957 (V) and incorporates a judicious selection of emendations by himself and others. The volume includes compositions of various types; the *Historia* (a work of much interest and sound doctrine even if Messrs Avenarius and Bonmaird have disposed of its claims to originality), *Hermodotimus, Saturnalia, Prometheus en Verbis, Apologia, Navigium*; and a few short introductory lectures and appeals for patronage.

The translation, entirely in present-day English, seems at its best in versions of the more conversational pieces such as the *Saturnalia* and includes many
NOTICES OF BOOKS

felicitous turns of phrase such as Harm. 3 καὶ ὄλος ἁπάντων ὁ πολυφράστας ἐν παράδειγμα σι γε ἢ and in short in the field of culture you have a block vote that outvotes all', Nov. 15 ἐκπροβάζει 'you are too full of beans' (if indeed this phrase is still current). There are a few inaccuracies: Harm. 71 πάντες ὃς ἔτος ἑκατέρων περὶ ἀνάλογα μέγατον ὁ ἐπιφάνειας is not 'all who study philosophy are, as it were, wrangling . . . ' but 'practically all . . . ' as is regular with ὃς ἔτος ἑκατέρων. ὅπος in Apol. 12 is unlikely to mean 'province' in the technical Roman sense. διὸ ὅ ἐκ πασῶν in Hist. 7 is translated 'two diapasons apart' which seems incongruous: the same phrase, however, in Apol. 12 is rendered 'two octaves apart'. Translations of the Stoic terms τὸ καλὸν (Herm. 36) as 'the beautiful' and καθῆκτα ὁμοῖος (Herm. 82) as 'properties' do not convey the moral implications.

The question of how much to explain in the footnotes of a Loeb translation must be difficult. But a reader who needed to be told who Clotho and Atropus were (Hist. 38) might also be baffled by 'a mountain was in labour' (Hist. 23) on which no help is given. The note on Iberia at Hist. 49 would be better placed at Hist. 29. In the case of quotations references are given to Homer and to the source of 'Hippocletes doesn't care', but there is no comment on the ants of India at Sat. 24 (presumably those of Herodotus III 102 ff.). Finally, 'Lucian's respect for the life of the ordinary man', mentioned in the introduction to the Hermotimus, even if genuine, is not consistent; the ἵδοι of Alexander 227 are also called κόρης μεστοὶ τὴν βία.

B. J. SIMS


Vol. I, fasc. 2 of the new Teubner Aesop, published in 1956 and reviewed by me in JHS lxviii (1958), 137-9, went out of print in less than two years. It has now been reprinted with a few corrections and some addenda supplied by H. Hunger. The text and apparatus had to be reproduced almost exactly as they stood, for reasons of economy, the new editor being restricted to the removal of a few misprints and obvious slips. The result is that another opportunity has been lost: the publishers have still not done anything effective to bring even this one half of Hausrath's edition up to date by taking proper account of Perry's masterly edition of 1952.

What Hunger does claim to have done is to list the following in his addenda: (1) 'omnes connectas novae editionis (i.e. Perry's edition), sive a Perry ipso sive ab aliis factas'—though it is not clear whether this means only conjectures adopted by Perry in his text, or includes also conjectures merely mentioned by him in his apparatus; (2) a number of readings of the more important MSS. hitherto not noted in the Teubner edition; (3) all the passages in which Perry adopts in his text readings hitherto not noted in the Teubner edition.

By supplying some of these omissions, and by drawing the reader's attention to them by means of signs inserted in the margin of the text, Hunger has gone a little way towards improving Hausrath's very faulty apparatus. But it should be noted that, in Category (2) of his addenda, Hunger does not claim to have supplied all the readings of important MSS. that Hausrath omitted, even though their existence may be either explicitly stated or distinctively implied in Perry's apparatus. For example, we are still not told that A, as well as the MSS. mentioned by Hausrath, reads καθηκοποιοῦ in 256.1, and γεφώρου in 250.9; that Cr and A omit καὶ-ἡμίτονοι in 242.5; that A reads ὁ ἀγαθός in 244.4; that A reads πολλοί καὶ τῶν μεγαθῶν πραιτοποιοῦ in 256.8; that C reads αὐτόν ἐφόροντος in 252.2; that in 253.3 C has the same reading as F. In one or two cases the new information supplied by Hunger is wrong: in 263.11 the reading of F and Cas is reported by Perry—obviously correctly—as καὶ ἀκόλογος τὰς κακίας, whereas Hunger gives the meaningless ἐκ τῆς κακίας; and in 250.7 he must have intended to say that Cr—not C—reads θνίας.

As described by Hunger, Categories (2) and (3) of his addenda refer to simple omissions in Hausrath's apparatus. He goes on to speak in his preface, however, of cases in which reports of readings that are included in Hausrath's apparatus are contradicted by Perry's apparatus; and some such cases are included in the addenda, where they are distinguished by the sign (!). Between the conflicting reports of Hausrath and Perry, he says, 'diūdicicare non potui, quique qui codices ipso ndondem inspinsem'. If he had obtained only a few pages of two or three MSS. and had looked at the relevant passages, he would soon have been able to judge. I have not collated the whole of any MS.; but I have inspected photographs of parts of two codices, and Perry has rechecked some readings of others at my request; and I can assure Hunger that where Hausrath and Perry differ Perry is almost invariably right and Hausrath wrong. On what principle Hunger selected a few such cases for inclusion in his addenda, I do not know; but his readers should clearly understand that those he gives are only a small selection. Hausrath's false reports of MS. readings are legion, and the great majority of them stand uncorrected in this reprint and are not anywhere referred to by Hunger. Of the seventeen explicit mis-statements which I pointed out in my previous review, after examining merely some fifteen or twenty of the fables included in this fascicle, only four have now been corrected—which means that the apparatus must still contain a very large number of errors and is only a little less unreliable than it was before. Anyone who wants to know what the MSS. of Recension I read in a given passage will do well to refer to Perry; and, failing Perry, he is much more likely to be correctly informed.
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by Chambry's edition, published thirty-five years ago, than by this new Teubner.

S. A. Handford.


In 1951 Lana published ‘Quintilianus, il “Sublime”, e gli “Esercizi preparatori” di Elio Teone’, in which he suggested that Theon was the author of Ἱππία γραμματίς. The lack of studies on the language and style of Theon, and even of an adequate critical edition, induced him to try to supply these deficiencies himself, in order to support his thesis; and the present volume (to be followed by a critical edition of the text) represents the first-fruits of his toil.

Of his theory on the authorship of Ἱππία γραμμ. this is not the place to speak, except to say that one reviewer at least will need a good deal of convincing that the author of these dry Progymnasmatas could have anything in common with the broad-minded and sensitive author of Ἱππία γραμμ.; but of the value of his work on Theon there can be no dispute. Theon's previous editors cannot be said to have served him well, and if Lana's forthcoming volume conforms to the principles which have guided him in the present one we may well have the first really scholarly edition of the Progymnasmatas.

Of the seven editors of Theon from Angelo Barbato, whose editio princeps appeared in 1520, to Spengel (Rhetores Graeci II, 1854), only Barbato and Walz (1832) knew any MSS. directly; of these two editions, according to Lana, Barbato's is full of errors of all kinds, while that of Walz is based on the hasty collection of one MS. and part of another, and his inaccuracy is such that no statement of his can be accepted unless checked by reference to the MSS. Promise of a more scholarly approach was given by two projected editions; Lederlin (1672-1737) had the Paris MS. collated, but died before completing his task; his materials were available to Walz, who, con la solita superficialità (in Lana's phrase) found no use for them. H. Rabe, who did so much for rhetorical studies in the revised Teubner series of Rhetores Graeci (1892 onwards), besides collecting a good deal of material, also collated a hitherto unknown MS. in the Library of St Mark's in Venice; but he too died, and his materials were destroyed in the last war. The latest editor, Spengel, whose edition is perhaps the most readily available, collated no MSS. himself, but used the edition of Finckh (1834) which in turn was based, not on personal study of the MSS., but on the materials collected by Lederlin. Of the other three editors, the earliest, Camerarius (1541), used only the ed. pr., while Heinsius (1626) used only Camerarius, and Scheffer (1670) used only Heinsius.

Lana deserves our gratitude for calling attention to this unsatisfactory state of affairs, but even more for collating all the available MSS. and showing the relationships between them. He shows that the common assumption (P-W, Schmid-Staehelin) that Walz and Finckh used five MSS. is based on a hasty reading of Walz's introduction, and that in fact only three MSS. are of value to an editor; in Lana's classification these are L (Biblioteca Medicea, Florence), M (Biblioteca Estense, Modena), and P (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris). Two others mentioned by Walz in his introduction (vol. 1, pp. 141 ff.) are shown to be useless to an editor; D (Darmsstadt) for instance contains only a free paraphrase of Theon's chapter on χρήσις, while O (Bodleian) contains only the so-called scholia to Theon. Of the other known MSS. of the Progymnasmatas, E (in the Escorial) is merely a copy of the ed. pr., while Ma (in St Mark's, Venice), which was not known to editors before Rabe, is a copy of P.

Lana's first three chapters contain detailed accounts of the three principal MSS., and in chapter 4 he describes Ma and its relation to P; one would have liked a similar proof of the relation of E to the ed. pr. His next two chapters are on the printed editions, chapter 5 containing an interesting account of the copy of ed. pr. which was owned by the Florentine scholar Pier Vettori. Of the remaining four chapters — on the so-called scholia to Theon, the indirect tradition with special reference to John of Sardis, the relations between the MSS., and the original order of the chapters of the Progymnasmatas — the last is the most interesting; from this it emerges that Theon's treatise, originally a teacher's manual, was at some unknown date remodelled on the lines of similar but more popular treatises (especially that of Aphthonius) to make it more useful to students.

E. W. Bower.


It is a characteristic of later Greek literature that the genres multiply, each with its own conventions and techniques of expression. The bulk of the writings in which these conventions actually developed has perished, but important clues, sometimes consisting of only a few words in an isolated fragment, or else reflected in the works of Latin writers, can be profitably studied by the scholar whose eye is keen enough to spot them. Kassel has performed a useful service in tracing the development of a ‘consolation’ genre, with its own traditions and techniques, from such fragments and later reflections.

In the first part of this work, Kassel examines the contributions of the sophists and the schools of philosophy and rhetoric to the development of such a genre, and finds that their main principle of consolation is necessarily the combating of grief through arguments based on reason. Perhaps the most difficult part of his task here is to maintain a distinction between the actual techniques, commonplaces and verbal expressions employed by the
several schools, especially between Stoics and Cynics, where in any case, as Kassel himself admits, specific doctrines of the individual schools tended to merge in the general treatment of examples by later writers, for example Seneca. In Kassel's discussion of the schools as separate entities one misses a general historical perspective: his thesis might have been given a fuller significance and could have been presented more attractively if it had been related to a wider context, possibly showing parallel developments in other literary genres in the Hellenistic period, such as historiography and biography, with their own theories and standard commonplaces. In this first part, however, it is chiefly the theories of consolation that are studied as such, and literary practice is quoted only to exemplify a limited number of points. The theories are mainly Greek—with certain amplifications in Cicero's Tusculan Disputations: many of the quotations are from the practical consolation found in the works of Seneca, and interesting references are also made even to epi-

graphical texts.

The second part of the work is headed Consolator und Consolans. Materia consolandi. This discusses in some detail two works, the Consolatio ad Apollonium and the well-known letter of Ser. Sulpicius Rufus to Cicero (ad fam. iv. 5), showing, by means of parallel examples, the comparative use of commonplaces, the traditional material of consolation. The parallels are sometimes limited to only a few words, but the tone and the general attitude of mind are often closely similar. Kassel is quick to perceive these similarities (e.g. even in expressions like non putavi futurum, which is not a commonplace in itself but rather a typical psychological reaction to the death of a son or a daughter), and he has done well to note how even the constructions of sentences might be adopted by one author from another (e.g. the conditionals analysed on p. 70). It has been a practice of certain German scholars, possibly under the influence of Pohlenz, to find in the commonplaces in later works echoes of lost Hellenistic writings and sometimes close references or even citate, and to attempt reconstructions of lost works on this basis. Thus, for example, H. Broecker (Animadversiones ad Plutarchi libellum peri evtheias, Bonn, 1954), analysing Plutarch's de Tranquilitate Animi and comparing it in detail with Seneca's work of that title, proceeded to reconstruct in outline a lost work of Panaitios. The present reviewer is now more sceptically disposed than before (cf. JHS lxvi, 1956, 118) to commend this practice, and notes that Kassel himself (p. 25 and note 2), though acknowledging the influence of Panaitios on the de Tranquilitate Animi, refers only to Siefert (Plutarchi Schrift. p. evi, Progr. Schulpforta 1908) and does not even mention the work of Broecker: nor does he follow the attempt of Pohlenz to reconstruct parts of Krantor's peri evtheias from the Consolatio ad Apollonium (pp. 58, 68-9. Cf. p. 90). Kassel is also sensitive to the tone of individual writers and notes the superiority of the genuine Plutarch Consolatio ad

Uxorem and the Sulpicius letter to the Consolatio ad Apollonium in detail—but without going so far as the Teubner editor, who describes this last work as libellus spurius ab homine stulto . . . complatus. Perhaps two works were sufficient to illustrate how theories of consolation and the traditional material influenced the practice, but it might have been useful to add a few more. Here the claims of Statius, for example, would run high. He, after all, regarded himself as lugentum mite solator and was well versed in the techniques and expressions that were nota nimis vati (Silv. v 3, 80 ff.; 5, 38 ff.).

On the whole this work is sound and well-written. Because of its self-imposed limitations, indicated by the title, it will appeal more naturally to specialists than to the general Classical reader. Some references might have been given more fully: e.g. p. 43—the Statius reference (11, 6) is to the Silvae, but the work is not mentioned: p. 84—the two Melankommas orations of Dio Chrysostomus (78 and 79) are numbered after the edition of de Armin (1896), which is not universally followed. In the Teubner edition of Dindorf (1857) they are numbered 29 and 28 respectively. The references to the Consolatio ad Apollonium consistently follow the pagination of the Teubner edition of 1925. Other Plutarch references are given either by the title and chapter of the work or by the Xylander pages of the Moralia.

A. J. Gossage.


Professor Weitzmann's latest book resumes the argument of Illustrations in Roll and Codex (1947, now being revised for a second edition) which he had written to establish the existence of classical book illustrations and to demonstrate the principles that govern their iconographical and formal aspects. This undoubted achievement of speculative scholarship was to be supplemented by another, historical study tracing the origin and characteristic use of illustrations in various branches of literature. But, the material collected having far outgrown this plan, the author now envisages a fully documented work in four separate volumes. The Martin lectures of Oberlin College are meanwhile offered as synopsis in the form of this book, its four main chapters representing 'prolegomena' to a future volume each: I. Scientific and Didactic Treatises; II. Epic Poetry; III. Dramatic Poetry; IV. Literary Prose Texts.

Workers in this and allied fields owe Weitzmann a debt of gratitude especially for the indisputable material gain to be derived from this as from previous books. The scholarly quality of his work is, as always, exemplary. He combines a thorough and extensive knowledge of monuments and literature with constructive imagination and the ability to
present his complicated case and a vast amount of heterogeneous documentation clearly, skillfully and consistently. His system of concise but fully informative annotation merits special mention. (The book provides clear print, satisfactory reproductions and a reliable index.) As there are many references to ‘Roll and Codex’ regarding matters of principles and method, and as the large new work is under way, the present book should be seen in its context between these two. The material presented will, therefore, receive less attention than it merits, the concepts and working principles will be the main concern of this review.

That the Egyptians had inserted pictorial scenes in texts with hieratic script from the tenth century B.C. on is as certain as that Greek mathematical treatises received illustrative diagrams by the fifth century B.C. The same applies (presumably from the fourth century) to materia medica including plants and animals, also to certain technical, astronomical and other instructional books. Professor Weitzmann demonstrates that in some surviving illuminated Byzantine codices, such as the Poliorcetica or Nikander texts, human figures in illustrations are inventions which were added to the classical models by miniaturists of the Macedonian Renaissance. Similar procedures are known from the Joshua Rotulus thanks to one of the author’s earlier investigations. But it seems that, on similar grounds, his analysis of the Agrimensores illustrations is weak: diagrams of town lay-outs should support the text sufficiently, and the walled city-formulae are, more probably, later imaginative additions rather than contemporary copies from relief sculptures or frescoes. The question when, where and why certain books were first illustrated appears still more complicated with regard to pseudo-scientific popular books such as the Aratea which shows constellations as mythological figures. Is its discussion, or that of the Physiologus, Marvels of the East, other didactic poems (Hesiod’s Works and Days), Pseudo-Oppian’s Cynegetica, Virgil’s Georgics, and the like in Chapter I consistent with the rest of its contents, or should these books form a separate one among the literary works? The author postulates Greek rolls as prototypes of all these on the ground that illustrated scenes, once their iconography has been established, can be shown to have wandered, sometimes more or less changed, to different texts. Sirens in the Physiologus, the text reporting their fatal song as known from the Odyssey and the picture looking much like their classical representations in other media are, therefore, presumed to go back to an illustrated Odyssey; ‘Fighting Bulls’ in the Vatican Virgil’s Georgics, the Venus Cynegetica and even in a Mount Sinai Book of Job illustrate a story also found in Aristotle’s Historia Animalium. The mythological Aratea constellations can similarly be connected, though not with Eudoxus of Cnidos himself but with the Alexandrian librarian Eratosthenes of Cyrene, who described Engonasin as a man on his knees, which is said to have caused the illustrator to represent this constellation as the club-swinging Hercules on his knees. We are, therefore, led to assume that the iconographical scheme was first drawn in Eratosthenes’ Alexandria. Cynegetica, again, contains some illustrations strayed from the Alexander romance, and this occurrence is explained as evidence for an origin of the ultimate prototypes similar to that of the Aratea and, indeed, for the whole group which thus links up with literary texts, the concern of the other three chapters.

Methodically, these arguments are joined to a tripartite argument, the key to all else: (1) enormous numbers of consecutive illustrations (narrative cycles) were first inserted in the columns of papyrus rolls in the library scriptoria of Hellenistic Alexandria from the late fourth or early third century B.C. on; (2) these pictorial cycles exercised an almost ubiquitous influence as the ‘storehouse of narrative art’ and were used as models for all imaginable media (terracotta vases, relief sarcophagi, marble plaques, wall paintings, floor mosaics, textiles and metalwork); (3) such works, which had better chances of survival than papyrus, now reflect Greek book illumination in Hellenistic Alexandria first, elsewhere later, and provide the material for reconstructing the history of the ‘lost art’.

This thesis is crucial because only seven illustrated literary papyrus fragments have been found so far (compared with over two thousand in all). They date between the second and fourth centuries a.d., that is after the introduction of the codex, only two being large enough to admit certainty that they are roll fragments (Oxford Heracleia and Paris Romance, unidentified). The earliest surviving MSS. with a greater number of literary illustrations are the Ilias Ambrosiana, the Virgilius ‘Vaticanus’ and the Virgilius ‘Romanus’, all from codices and probably none datable before the fifth century. While not claiming more than an ‘extremely spotty and fragmentary account of ancient book illumination’, Professor Weitzmann extracts very far-reaching and detailed conclusions as to which texts received illustrations in Hellenistic and later Antiquity, the methods of their insertion, and the evolution of their iconographical schemes. What is the value of any amount of collateral material without primary evidence? (I regard post-codex evidence as of diminished value; the astronomical Eudoxus sketches on Paris Papyr. 1, although of the second century B.C. and showing Orion as Osiris and the sun as a scarab, may as well be a document for Greek education of Egyptians, their native habits not entirely eradicated, as for Egyptian influence on Greeks.) Why is there no support whatever from literature for book illumination and a good deal for other media? The earliest known references, from the first century B.C. well into the second A.D., are Roman and speak of portraits in rolls, their multiple publication being Varro’s ‘invention’.

The author’s claim that his interpretation of all
secondary material may serve as something between a probable supposition and primary evidence, depending finally on the facts that narrative cycles are more closely akin to literary narration than any other type of pictorial selection, and that the great flow of continuous cyclic friezes of which the Telephus frieze from Pergamon is probably the earliest, represents a characteristic aspect of Greek Hellenism. Although such a mental climate makes the illustration of books feasible to our way of thinking, it remains open whether this was so to Hellenistic Greeks. Logical or historical necessity cannot be argued under any circumstances. If we knew more about technical and physical practices by which iconographical and compositional schemes were actually transmitted and spread (pattern books and cartoons are problems to the point), we should also be better acquainted with the influence that different media exercised upon each other. But as the author himself thinks that, during his ‘roll period’, book illustrations were not of the highest quality artistically, it seems doubtful in any case that they can have become so fertile a source of imitation so rapidly to artists in other media. Nevertheless he calculates, on the evidence of papyrus fragments, ‘Iliac’ tablets, Megarian bowls, the Tensa Capitolina, Pompeian wall-paintings, the Ilias Ambrosiana cuttings and similar monuments that, for instance, the combined cycle for the Iliad and Odyssey on 48 rolls consisted of 1,440 illustrations. As to the presence of shorter or longer texts from the literary sources on his supporting ‘derive’ monuments, he adduces these as a further reason for assigning their pictorial representations to rolls as the only thinkable original home. But, again, cannot an equally good case be made for texts to have been subsequently joined to pictures just because they were not available in the books? The inscription with Euripides’ name on a Megarian bowl may have no other significance.

While Hellenistic illustrated texts remain, for the present, a matter of surmise, there is nevertheless a very small area of firmer ground in addition to strictly instructional diagrams and scientific and technical matter: author portraits, whether in the form of imitates clypeatae or as full lengths, certainly go back much further than Varro’s Imagines, and there are geographical maps, magical and astrological prescriptions, very near the technical group. Also, the recent discovery of a Greek schoolbook papyrus in Cairo with painted arcades, of the third century B.C., by Carl Nordenfalk (no. 65,445; see ‘The Beginnings of Book Decoration’ in Essays in Honor of Georg Swarzenski, Chicago, 1951) makes this type of decoration probable for the purpose of quick orientation in otherwise cumbersome rolls. The subject-matter is here arranged to a plan of increasing difficulty within the arcaded space. For the rest, book illumination can be proved to have been produced in some quantity for religious and literary texts only after the introduction of the codex. Although Professor Weitzmann states that the importance of the invention of the codex is comparable to that of the printing press, and although he quotes C. H. Roberts’s The Codex (Proc. Brit. Acad., 1954), he has not questioned his own approach to Roman-age books with reference to that work. There is impressive cumulative evidence that the Christians and the codex grew up together, that the second Gospel at least was written as a codex from the beginning, and there are also St Mark’s special connexion with the Egyptian church and the gathering together of their authoritative books by the world religions. As the renewed research into the beginnings of the codex has shed new light on the last days of the roll, our concept of the early art of the codex may also require extending, particularly with regard to the probably competitive interrelation between Christian and pagan art once Christianity had made an impact.

Having tried to show why the hypothetical origin, development and diffusion of ancient book illumination from Hellenistic Alexandria cannot be accepted as proven I welcome Professor Weitzmann’s book, nevertheless, as a valuable contribution to the history of narrative art. The monuments, brought together with great industry and discussed thoroughly, seem to support fairly accurately what is known of contemporary tastes from literary history. Some are successfully identified as picturing scenes from texts now lost in the original. Above all, his close analyses of variants in pictorial cycles of the same literary subject lead to the observation that different iconographical and formal ‘revisions’ within the various categories of literature seem to have circulated simultaneously. This should prove a most promising point of departure for further research into the problem of workshop traditions, adaptation for adequate rendering in diverse media of existing schemes, perhaps of particular local preferences and the migrations of men and works against a more closely defined historical background. While the author’s own account of such ‘revisions’ is necessarily tied to the concept of illustrated rolls as the common prototype, alterations being later introductions, others may be free to work the material for its own sake and thus with more tangible results.

**Manfred H. Bräude.**


We have now reached the stage where some knowledge of Mycenaean Greek is part of the basic equipment of the classical scholar, and the more progressive universities are making provision for its teaching. The need for a handy textbook has induced Professor Galiano to compile a brief introduction to Mycenaean studies for Spanish readers. It consists of a full introductory section on the writing system and grammar; a good bibliography up to 1958; seventeen
NOTICES OF BOOKS

This volume contains only literary texts. 2426-2434 and 2437 have been edited by Lobel, and 2435 and 2436 by Turner. 2426 is from a metrical list of plays by Epicharmus—an early example of its kind (second century A.D.). In 2427 we have more than sixty fragments from two or more plays of Epicharmus. Few pieces are of any size; but when the editor says (p. 2) that 'there is so little continuous text that the literary value of these remnants is small' his estimate seems unduly modest; in several cases his examination not only of text but of fibre patterns has discovered alignments between fragments from which sense or identity can be conjectured with probability. Thus he shows that the pieces combining to make Fr. 1 may be from the Περίτα καὶ Προμάθες mentioned in 2426; and that they probably show three actors simultaneously on the stage. Fr. 27, the largest single continuous fragment, belongs probably to the "Ἡμερα γάμος" or Μοθών. 2428 contains fragments of unidentified Doric comedy. 2429 is a commentary on Epicharmus; the identity of a lemma in the first large fragment with a citation in Athenaeus shows the play there discussed to have been the 'Οδυσσείς αὐτόμολος, and the correspondence of other lemmata with a text in Mith. Pap. Rainer V (= Page GLP 3 7) confirms the already conjectured identification of the latter with that play. The sense of col. ii is in several places complete. The other large fragment, 7, may well concern another play. 2430 comprises 166 fragments in one hand, not all certainly belonging together; those of a size to permit judgment are of choral lyric verse in Doric dialect; the author may be Simonides, if the editor is right in his tentative but attractive identification of a line in fr. 79 (e) with Sim. fr. 39 Diehl (whose differences from it are perhaps not too great to be accounted for by misquotation). 2431 is from an epinician ode; its heading: κελοίτι τοῖς Ἀπατῶν παισὶ suggests Simonides, whose epinicians were arranged by event. The editor's suggestion of a like authorship for 2432 rests partly upon the similarity of the sentiments expressed in ll. 6 seqq. with those of Plato's citations in the Protagoras of a Simonidean poem which is not, however, identical with it. The legend of the label 2433: Σιμώνιδεων οἰκομενή leaves the editor uncertain of the precise content of the book. 2434 is a commentary on lyric verses; the author discussed is perhaps Simonides (see the suggested supplement of fr. 1 (a) 1. 2); but we are disappointed of the sense of the most extensive fragment by the obscurity of the lemmata and some uncertainty about their extent; above all by a word ἀγαπείς of unknown derivation and meaning. Turner's first text, 2435, is a crude and irregular hand assignable to the earlier first century, bears on the recto a report of a speech (punctuated by the applause of its audience) made to the citizens of Alexandria by an unspecified Roman imperator who, as the editor shows, can hardly be other than Germanicus Caesar on the occasion of his visit to Egypt in A.D. 18. The scene in the column preserved on


John Chadwick.

the verso, expressly dated A.D. 12/13, is Rome, where an Alexandrian delegation is heard by Augustus and a consilium of eight, including Tiberius and Drusus. We have only the Alexandrian speakers' opening compliments, but they are evidently preparing to make an important request; the editor suggests that this will have been for a βωλή. He also suggests that the Alexander mentioned in l. 41 may have been the famous Jew of that name called 'the Alabarch', and points out that, if so, we see here an Alexandria 'in which Jew and Greek are not yet at each other's throats'. Whether this is so or not, there seems little doubt that the editor is right in suggesting that here is yet another example of the Alexandrian pamphlet literature known as the Acta Alexandrinorum. The text is so abominably written and spelt, and the surface of the verso so damaged, that the editor is to be congratulated on the success of his heroic task of reading and interpretation. In vs. 42 I read: [κερε] Σέβαστας εἴπαμε. In ib. 51, after a speech which might end with κατενοούσισθαι (l. 50-) we have perhaps the abbreviation et) found for εἴπασε in some later reports of proceedings (e.g. P. Oxy. 2407; P. Ant. 87); there is a similarly abbreviated word in the next line. I suggest for 51 seqq.: et)/[υ]ε[π]/ο[γ] ([Σέβαστος εἴπασεν αὐτῷ]/[ . . . ] εἵ φοιασὺν εἴ ποιασὺν μετὰ δέ/[ταυτε εἰ]) ὕπομενος κοινοῦσαι καὶ τούς τοῖς [εἰ] [ς] [τά] [ς] [οίμα] [τί][παρά] [παρέχεις] [σπονδή]/[ . . . ] [οίσαι] [ . . . ] [οίσαι] (we are here?)] [κερε] Σέβαστας τοσού[ν την και] τοις (οί)

[σ]ο[ι]
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siders to have been the original relation of infinitive to verb, and in the way that ἐφ'μι... is integrated into the structure of the sentence as a whole' (p. 124). Would he regard the separation of ἰν from the infinitive by the governing verb as a relevant parallel? In the course of these and the further remarks on word-order which constitute his final chapter, Moorhouse makes a number of acute and valuable comments on particular passages, e.g. Aristoph. Ran. 866 (p. 114). In Thuc. I, 122, 4 ὥρ γὰρ ἐκ περιμένει ἀβέν,ἐκ ἴρ τῆς πλείστης, ἦ δὲ σκόπος τῆς παραρτήματος, καταργώντας καταργήσεις καταργήσεις he explains περιμένει ἀβεν, ἦ as a parenthesis, the resumption of the negative sentence being marked by the repeated δὲ (p. 108). It seems preferable to take the negative as denying the compatibility of the ideas expressed by the participial phrase and the main sentence, just as it can deny the compatibility of the two parts of a μὲν-δὲ anti-theis (as if we had ὥρ γὰρ ἐκ περιμένει μὲν ἀβέν, ἦ δὲ τῆς... καταργήσεις); the second δὲ may belong, as its position suggests, to πλείστης, which as an adjective of number and a superlative, falls into two categories of words frequently emphasised by δὲ (Denniston, Particles, pp. 205, 207).

These observations do not so fully represent a work so full of argument, comment and quotation, but they may suffice to show that Moorhouse has written a scholarly, thoughtful and, what is more, thought-provoking book.

D. M. JONES.


This is a syntactical sketch of the development of the Greek infinitive, designed to account for its expansion and subsequent decline. It deals with the following topics. First, the earliest uses, showing a complementary or explanatory (explicitant) force; but surely not with ordinary demonstratives, as he suggests on p. 35 (e.g. II. 9. 688 ἐτῶσιν καὶ ὄλθε τῷ εἰκένεσιν, with ἐτῶσιν supposedly expanded by the infinit.). The rise of the accus. and infin., and of the construction after πρὸς, are here also dealt with, while the second chapter also has remarks on the former and on the verbal constructions with ἐπί, etc. After comments on the expression of tense and mood we come to the main part of the work (Chapters 4-7), on ὑπὲρ et the infin., the articular infin., τῶν with infin., and ἴνα and the subjunctive. The principal aim here is to present the picture of a series of parallel constructions with the same sense, using the infinitive (with or without τῶν), ἴνα, ἰνα, οὗος, or ἴνα, from among which ἴνα finally emerged as predominant. He suggests that ἴνα was more used in the popular language and ἰνα more literary. The examples given on pp. 171 ff. show the contexts in which the extension of ἴνα would arise, especially with verbs such as ἀνέθετοv: it would, however, be wise to separate cases of future and of subjunctive after ἰνα, which B. takes indiscriminately.

Two further chapters treat the use of the infinit. in post-classical and Byzantine Greek. Here there is particular interest in the mixture of constructions found both in popular and in literary sources, leading to such superfluity as not only δὲ Ἰνα but even ἰνα δὲ ἴνα to show purpose (p. 217).

Lastly, the development of the subjunctive and infin. in Latin syntax is very briefly compared with that in Greek, but this can do little more than show how different the conditions were in the two languages. Unfortunately there is no index.

It is not easy, even if it is possible, to produce original views about the Greek infin. at this stage. But where B. diverges from accepted views, his position often seems not merely mistaken (and after all in such matters there is room for different opinions), but almost perverse. I quote some examples. Pp. 34 f.: at Od. 14, 41 f. ἄλλοιν ἄλλην ἀνάφερον τὴν ἰνα... ἀντικλά ἱδονήν, the infin. is said to be attached to, or enlarged, the notion of the noun ("porcs-à-manger") rather than the phrase σις... ἵνα; he compares Lat. curare domum aedificandam, but there the situation is quite different (with adjectival gerundive). Pp. 40 f.: the accusative, he says, could be used freely after any verbal or nominal element to show movement or tendency towards, so that there was no essential difference between κελέον ἰνα and, on the other hand, ἵνα ἰνα or πεπρωτα ἰνα (to all of which an infin. could at will be added, thus giving an accus. and infin. construction). The difference is, of course, that the two latter phrases, without the infin., make neither grammar nor sense; the cases of ellipse of infin. after ἵνα do not materially alter that position. Pp. 43 f.: on the infin. with imperative sense he refers several times to Chantraine’s Grammaire homérique as if he were following it, but in fact offers a completely different, and impossible, explanation which seeks to keep the explicitant aspect even here. Thus, such an infin. could be attached to a ‘point de référence’ which assumes such varied forms as another verb, in the imperative or future indicative, or even a pronoun or a vocative noun (so in II. 5. 124 ἡράσαντων ἰνα, Δώμηθεν, ἐπὶ Τρώους μάχασθαι the infin. would, in some strange way, be justified by the presence of the vocative!). B. does indeed add here that the attachment exists ‘pour le sens sinon pour la syntaxe’; but is it not the syntax that he is dealing with? On the articular infinitive (pp. 99 ff.) he is very reluctant to admit the advent of the use of το purely as an article, with no demonstrative (and no connective) sense. This development is probably as old as Alcaman and even Heliod. But B. tries to avoid admitting it even in tragedy. So (p. 102) at Eur. Herod. 476 f. γνωσίϲ γὰρ ἰνα τε καὶ το ἀφορονείϲ καλλιστον, where it would be το by itself which strictly makes the second item corresponding to ἰνα! It is a pity that such views are allowed to detract from what could have been a much more useful work.

A. C. MOORHOUSE.
This book has grown out of the author's own researches in pursuit of a knowledge of Greek, and shows both the advantages and drawbacks to be expected in these circumstances. First, the work has an individual flavour. The material offered is by way of being a personal selection, based upon what has come to the writer's attention and focused his interest as a student of Greek. This makes for liveliness, but also leads to the inclusion of words that may seem unnecessary, e.g. ταλίκα ναός (dialectal), or ποιήτης Protestant minister; and it is surely superfluous to give ἄγγελος, ἄρκονδα, ποιήτης in addition to ἀρχιπρέπον, ἄρκετά, ποιήμα in a book of this size.

A very good feature is the generous sprinkling of common colloquial expressions that are all too often beneath the notice of conventional small dictionaries. Such are ἄντοκα γαργαρός, ἄποδα sharp person, γκέλ bounce (also sex-appeal), ποτζά backsider, ακοητάρχη α lot he cares! On the other hand some of the 'loan-words' hardly merit inclusion, e.g. κακός, γκέλετ-φραίνρ, σουβιά, καρτ-πόστάλ, κύριε. The usual words for postcard are δελτάριο (plain) and κάρτα (picture). Συζύγω is here defined as sex (subject); but in fact it is only a quotation of an Anglo-American colloquial euphemism, and has no place in the Greek vocabulary. Another special feature—and a praiseworthy one—is the relatively large amount of space given to idiom and syntax under various entries like get, do, -ing, self, κάποιο, etc. (This method was applied on a larger scale in H. N. Adair's Nouveau Lexique, a remarkably good French and English dictionary published in England about thirty years ago.)

As a rule words are given in demotic form when this differs from the katharevousa. A few puristic forms occur, and are marked with a K. But this is not quite consistently carried out; and we find, for example, vía βίβλα (K theòρημα). This should read (K theòρημα). In his definitions, Mr Swanson, realising the snags of single-word entries, wisely adds an elucidatory parenthesis where needed. This is usually helpful; but in some cases a single connotation is given in brackets, with no mention of other equally common ones. Thus we read γιός: pure (spiritually), αψεργητίκωσις wise (yes), καρπός fruit (botanical). These seemingly implied limitations could mislead the reader. Few definitions fail to hit the mark. Κόσμος is not a club (for dining) but a place of entertainment or refreshment; ἀριστοφάνης is not extreme (unusual) but violent. But these are small exceptions to a generally high level of aptness and concision. Here and there American usage offers a neat rendering which the British lexicographer may envy, as βούτιμα cookie (for dunking).

To sum up, this is a most useful handbook, which succeeds in being lively as well as accurate. With roughly 4,000 entries in each section, it covers a lot of the ground which a beginner in Greek must traverse, and does so much more informatively than many a larger dictionary.

J. T. Pring.


This work will be as much a landmark in the study of the pre-Socratics as the first edition of Burnet's Early Greek Philosophy in 1892 has proved to be. This work may not altogether supersede Burnet for those whose main business it is to study these philosophers, but it is likely to do so for everyone else; for it consolidates half a century of further scholarship and offers the best available guidance. Kirk and Raven do not profess to vie with Diels-Kranz Fragmente or to offer all the material; but they offer a responsible selection. This is always adequate and in places rather more than adequate in proportion to the rest of the book. Careful translation is made of all Greek cited and textual caves are dealt with as they arise. Kirk has been chiefly responsible for the first six sections—on early cosmogonies, Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Xenophanes and Heraclitus—and also for the Atomists and for Diogenes of Apollonia at the end of the book. Raven has treated the Western schools and Anaxagoras. The book is nevertheless a unity: each author criticised the other's work, and they pay tribute in the preface to comments on the final draft by F. H. Sandbach, to whom they dedicate the work. The bibliography is indeed 'selective', but the indexes are good and the format is excellent. The smaller type used for linguistic discussions and for 'footnotes' (which appear in the text because the foot of the page is reserved for translation) serves to segregate specialist concerns from what most readers will require.

All this ground is much fought over and impersonal interpretation is impossible—Burnet had a very personal approach, one must remember. Here we have two personal approaches to allow for, but we are aided in making such allowance by previous works of each author—Raven's Pythagoreans and Eleatics (1948) and Kirk's Heracleitus, the Cosmic Fragments (1957). The former has been the more subject to revision here; but that is natural, for it appeared earlier. A reviewer is likely to have his own approach to the evidence and in any case can only select a few points from so long and detailed a work.

A first general caution must be given. The authors exclude the Sophists as being 'mainly concerned with epistemology and semantics' and deal with ψεύδη only as part of φόρος.1 No doubt the early

1 The admirable treatment of the Katharmoi in relation to the rest of Empedocles is an exception to this.
cosmologists have more right to the early chapter than the seven wise men of Diogenes Laertius have, but Diels was right nevertheless to treat Protagoras and Prodicus as being pre-Socratic philosophers no less than Zeno. As for γαρ, Kirk's conscience seems to smite him at the end, for he tells us on p. 444 in the course of discussing Diogenes of Apollonia that

There is no doubt that from Alceclus and Empedocles onwards the more easily determinable structure of the human body was used as a clue to that of the whole world. The assumption of a parallelism between the two seems to have been held in some form by Anaximenes, probably as a development of the entirely unscientific tendency to treat the outside world as a person, to animate it and regard it as a living organism.

That is true and important, and one wonders whether a desire to save Anaximenes from being 'entirely unscientific' is latent in the long discussion in KR 163 of what has generally been regarded as the only extant fragment of Anaximenes which makes a complete sentence: 'as our soul, being air, holds and controls us, wind-breath and air enclose the whole order of Nature too', αναξιμανήνιον μεταφέρει αδρον. Here must be 'later', as Kirk says; but περιψηχει implies the meaning of what it replaces: the notions of a system of nature and a viable organism, are near enough together for αδρον to be held responsible for each alike. κόσμος meaning (or at least referring to) τῷ ὁλῷ καὶ ὅν περιψηχει was traditionally ascribed to Pythagoras himself (DK 4 A 21), and must surely be admitted at Heraclitus fr. 30 Diels (KR 220), especially if Vlastos' defence of τὸν κατὰ τὸν ἀνάμνησιν κόσμον τὸν ὀλὸν καὶ τὸν ἀναθηματισμὸν after κόσμος τὸν ὀλὸν is to be rejected as Kirk would wish it to be. Parmenides fr. 4, line 3 must also be considered. Why do Kirk and Raven reject all this evidence at the end of the sixth century for κόσμος = universal order = universe? But the basic point is that the ὁλος which begins the Anaximenes fragment implies comparison and parallelism: it cannot only mean that αδρον controls both man and all things. The microcosm-macrocosm axiom is already enunciated.

A similar question arises over Xenophanes. Kirk gives him real importance, so astonishing for Burnet's surprising disparagements; but he virtually regards him as poet, satirist and theologian rather than philosopher, and 'Ionian' in so far as he was philosophical at all. One does not wish to champion Aristotle's or Theophrastus' view of him as founder of the Eleatics, still less the systematic elaborations of the de M.X.C. But one must look carefully at his One God, and especially at the line αἰὲ θ' ἐν τοῖς πάθοις μὲνοι καὶ κανονίζομενοι οὐδέν. It is indeed anti-Homerian, but is that all? At least one must also consider the passage about the World-God at Plato, Timaeus 32c5-34b9. Primitive elements here reveal what may well be a common basis for ἐνθ' θεός and for ἄνθρωπος as a σήμα. Independent building on a common basis may best express the relation between the poems of Xenophanes and Parmenides.

Kirk's interest in the early cosmogonists is so fruitful that it seems churlish to complain that they figure disproportionately in this book. Yet they certainly do so. The Orphic character of the poems of Diogenes of Apollonia that 'birth from an egg was an archea thought of the universe'—makes a fair and valid distinction. Ηρόη in the Birds has a very cosmogonic theology after all, and, as Kirk himself says, a parody must be a parody of something. The γόνιμος τῆς μορφής and τῶν πρώτων ἐν Αναξιμάνδρῳ is left as a puzzle by KR 123. Cornford may have pointed too eagerly to the ὄνομα and have too rashly called it 'Orphic', but if the egg had a place in any earlier cosmogony, this γόνιμος, which is separable as well as productive, is easier to explain.

One important, though not very explicit, finding of Kirk must be welcomed as likely to earn permanent acceptance. He really draws the inevitable conclusions from Cornford's insight about Anaximander and Hesiod, and his own difficult detailed work on the other early Greek cosmogonies. Thales, he says, probably had direct contacts with Egypt and Babylon (p. 91); but Anaximander and Anaximenes are rather seen by him as pointing back to earlier Greek mythical speculation. Kirk might have sharpened this distinction a little further. We ought in future to beware of classifying 'the Milesians' together except in so far as they all three abandoned myth for natural philosophy.

The treatment of Heraclitus is brilliant, as one would expect. Kirk is firm in his refusal to concede that the 'flux' doctrine is a doctrine of Heraclitus himself. One can only point out that if Cratylus said you cannot step into the same river even once, someone between Cratylus and Heraclitus must have said that you cannot step into it twice. Who would this be? Is it impossible to combine the accepted saying that 'on those who enter the same rivers ever other waters flow' with a saying that you cannot step into the same river twice? The river is the same and is not the same. To believe this is not to attribute Fluxlehre in its later form to Heraclitus. The present reviewer heartily agrees that Fluxlehre is Heraclitean and unity-in-process Heraclitean: he remembers saying this in 1942—or something very similar. But because he believes process so bound up with unity in Heraclitus' thought, he is not convinced that ὁδὸς ἐν ὁδός καὶ ὁδὸς ὁδὸς only means that the road from Lynmouth to Lynton is the same as the road from Lynnton to Lynmouth.

One cannot deal properly with the 'Italian' schools (together with Anaxagoras) as presented by Raven without entering on discussions quite impossible in a review. In the main, Raven has the harder assign-
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ment and the more controversial material. Furthermore, the treatment of Parmenides and of Anaxagoras is rather unduly cramped—so is that of Empedocles in the Physics. Yet all are satisfactorily analysed, and the short chapter on Zeno is to be applauded for giving the basic arguments against plurality rightful precedence over the famous paradoxes challenging motion. The Way of Seeming of Parmenides is for Raven neither anti-Pythagorean nor adapted Pythagoreanism but original: truth is a unity, seeming a plurality of opposites in interplay. We therefore go back to Simplicius’ interpretation of τὸν μίαν ὡς χρεὼν ἑσταὶ (fr. 8 line 54): ‘of which it is not right (to name) one only (without the other)’. Raven fears that this ought to be expressed by τῷ ἐκτὸς, but need it be so if some monism in physical speculation is deliberately referred to? It would then mean ‘of which it is not right to name a single one’ (i.e. as distinct from two of them). If this is a possible interpretation, it would point to the existence of some pre-Parmenidean physical monism—and most people still believe in its existence!

Raven is now less sure than he was about the distinction of historical periods within Pythagoreanism. He begins with the caution that it is ‘hazardously conjectural’, yet he seems to believe that he can provide us with ‘the most that we can hope to achieve’, which is a division into ‘two main periods, the one before Parmenides the other after Zeno’. One does not want to be childish, but what becomes of the period contemporary with these two, the one agreed by all to have been the pupil of the other, and not less than twenty years younger? In fact ‘pre-Parmenidean’ ought to disappear from the heading of Chapter IX and pre-Zenonian ought to be substituted for it: this would begin to make sense of it all. For we have already agreed that the Way of Seeming can no longer be used as evidence for contemporary Pythagorean cosmology. Two more brief ‘Pythagorean’ points may be made, on Chapters IX and XIII. Can we be sure that unit-point atoms are not late imports, to compete with the Atomists (cf. Ekphantos Δκ. 51 A 2)? In the case of the ‘fragments of Philolaus’, we are not limited to straight acceptance or rejection. Their provenance might be real fourth-century Pythagoreanism. Of course in this case they would no longer be pre-Socratic.

I conclude with two grumbles, the first of which is the more serious. Alcmaeon of Croton does not get his deserts. Anyone who consults Wachtl’s edition of his fragments will be convinced of this—but so will anyone, I think, who studies Diels-Kranz. Raven treats the doctrine of the primacy of the brain and the distinction of man from the beasts as only physiology: he does not even mention the view that the seed is a portion of the brain. The testimony about soul and stars being alike in constant motion has little comment, and there is not much concern with man’s being destroyed because he cannot join the beginning to the end. It may not be easy to

link all this up with Ἀσωρία and the duality of all human things; but there is enough evidence of a first-class thinker here to entitle Alcmaeon to fuller treatment. The second grumble concerns the tentative dismissal of Archelaus as of minor importance and no consistency. Was he as ‘dim’ as Burnet thought? Kirk does something to rescue Diogenes of Apollonia from Burnet’s dismissal of him as only an ‘eclectic’, and perhaps we have not appreciated Archelaus—excused to some extent in this by the bad tradition of evidence. His view of zoogony out of the slime is like that of the ‘wombs’ in the earth which Lucretius reports from the Epicureans and they presumably derived from the Atomists accepting Archelaus. It is quite different from Anaximander’s account. Archelaus probably tried to ‘conflate’ Mind and the ‘homeoeomics’ with the continuing ‘philosophy of Anaximenes’. The place he gave to ἀργύρεια may have influenced Athenians like Euripides. He was not worried about Parmenides and Zeno, but deserves more attention none the less.

In general, this book is a work of clear thought, balanced consideration of evidence and historical judgment. Apart from its intrinsic merit, it has already proved its value as a textbook for undergraduates studying ancient philosophy.

J. B. SKEMP.


Dr Loeken’s aim is to establish a new interpretation of Parmenides, Melissus and Gorgias (and by implication of the Eleatic movement and its effects) by the double method of considering what the Greek of our sources might mean, and what the philosophical issues were, and letting the one illuminate the other. His book is for experts only: his thesis, that ‘the fundamental Eleatic tenet was ἡ ἐστίν, where ἐστίν is to be taken in ‘the strict sense’ so that its subject becomes a ‘necessary being’ in (for example) the Augustinian sense of ens necessarium. It will follow of course from this that we have to read the Eleatics as employing or recommending a technical concept of ‘is’ which is not intended to apply to the totality of things, but only to one special entity: for Parmenides, Dr Loeken thinks, this is ‘what we now call the idea of being’ (p. 43), for Melissus ‘an absolute Being’ reached by a proof ‘similar in character to that found later in the so-called ontological argument’ (p. 142). Hence they were not using this technical sense of ἐναι of the physical world at all, and consequently were not regarding it as illusory; whereas Gorgias, by his title as well as his matter, is attacking Melissus and contending that such a sense can have no ontological application at all (pp. 180–6). In Parmenides, to whom most of the book is devoted, Dr Loeken thinks that the unchanging and unitary on is (a) noēin, thinking or
knowing, (b) *noema*, the content of thought, (c) ‘the idea of being’. Thus the tendency of Parmenidean thought ‘might be described most satisfactorily in Platonic terminology, viz. as the doctrine which assumes only one Idea’ (p. 103) and for him ‘the content of *noein* is always and everywhere without exception exclusively the conceptual content “being”’ (p. 44). This interpretation is ingeniously (and I think perversely) argued for from the text; but I confess that I do not properly understand either why Dr Loenen wants it or what he means by it—and since I do not find his arguments here convincing, it is a comfort to discover that Parmenides advanced the kernel of this doctrine in what is now a textual lacuna, conformably reconstituted by Dr Loenen.

His special view about the Parmenidean *on* does not affect the general thesis. This thesis seems to me partly right and partly mistaken; but given the closely argued and painstaking way in which it is presented, useful comment is difficult in anything less than the book’s own length. Dr Loenen uses considerable scholarship in trying to make every detail buttress the whole, and develops his argument *seriatim* in such a way that the smallest point affects what follows and precedes. But this quite proper method (which makes the book difficult to read) means that it is only by taking the detail that one could adequately seek to show where the main conclusion is astray. In brief, I think it goes astray because it is a conclusion. The idea of taking an *ens necessarium* as a preliminary and suggestive clue to the Parmenidean and Eleatic sense of *esti* may well be helpful for some people as an heuristic device—and perhaps especially helpful for Continental philosophers. But certainly it should not be taken as more than this, and as this only with great caution. A dogmatic and general illustration may serve to indicate the difficulties.

It is or should be by now a commonplace that pre-Parmenidean *theoria* is done in a mixed mode which is neither ‘philosophy’ nor ‘science’ nor ‘theology’ but something of all three. What is more, as a physical inquiry it identifies two questions which modern cosmology is able to separate, because of changes (largely Aristotelian) in the background logical theory: namely the question of how *ta onta* (‘the things that are’) come into existence, and of how it is that they have their observed characteristics. This conflation is reflected in the peculiar Milesian concept of *genesis*, in which there is no distinction between the existential and the predicative senses of ‘become’, and consequently in *einaí* also. And because of it, we find the Milesian–Ionian thinkers giving on the whole a single explanation cast in historical terms to these two questions taken as one. (By contrast, modern cosmology deals with the first question historically, and the second non-historically, with techniques and theory drawn from mathematical physics.) But as the concept of *arche* gives way, in Heraclitus and the Pythagoreans, to the non-historical concepts of *logos* and *harmonia*, the question ‘what is the nature of *ta onta*?’ becomes more recognisably metaphysical (as we might say) in tone; and the previous mixed but ostensibly unitary answer tends to split into an account of the changing physical world still in historical terms (‘number’ or the *logos* as physical entities), and an account of *ta onta* given in terms of a timeless or formal analysis (‘number’ or the *logos* as the rationale, almost the ‘real definition’, of things). This has the effect of emphasising *einaí* rather than *genesis* and *gignesthai*. And since both these confute existential and other senses, we get the paradoxes and problems of Eleatic logic.

This, I take it, is the situation Parmenides inherits. The notions of *einaí* and *gignesthai* need clearing up; since it is apparent that in so far as one ignores the historical emphasis in previous theory, all his predecessors have been saying that *ta onta* are what equally they aren’t—*apéiron* or number or what not. And if cups and couches are *onta*, what is one to say of number or a *logos*? His logical recommendations parallel his methodological proposals for distinguishing two types of explanation: one for what is virtually metaphysics, concerned with *onta* (or rather the *on*) where a logic of strict identity and the new technical sense of ‘is’ is to be used, and the other for physical cosmology concerned with *gignomena* for which a joint logic of is-is not, that is virtually a logic of contrariety, is to be used. And these are set forth in the two parts of his poem—which significantly begins with a methodological point: ‘I will tell you what the two conceivable ways are of asking and answering questions’ (*dizein*). The so-called ‘pluralist’ cosmology, it is pretty plain, is putting into practice this Parmenidean recipe. His proposals for metaphysics, on the other hand—as Gorgias reveals and Plato painfully discovers—are quite unavailing and need substantial alteration, which we find in the *Phaedo*, the *Parmenides*, and the *Sophist*. Precisely what the new technical concept of *einaí* contains we can find out both from what Parmenides says of it and from the changes Plato makes in it.

But if this is the situation, I should contend that Dr Loenen cannot adequately deal with it by means of the analytical device of an *ens necessarium* and a contrast between necessary and contingent being—even supposing that these notions were themselves quite perspicuous. The context they presuppose is too narrow and different from that of the fifth century, with this welter of changes and connexions between physics, mathematics, philosophy, and the various developing concepts involved: perfection, becoming, being, soul, to say nothing of incipient logical theory. In the event, he precludes himself from seeing Parmenides, in particular, in proper connexion with earlier theory or with Plato (for whom the device will be an embarrassment); his treatment of the existential-predicative conflation as a ‘paralogism’ from which the Eleatics are to be saved will prevent him in principle from understanding the beginnings of Greek logical theory; and for
methodological problems, his suggestion is unhelpful just because it presupposes distinctions of method between cosmology and metaphysics (and within philosophy of logic and ontology) which the Greeks themselves are only just beginning to see.

All the same, much of what he says will stand. Melissus and Gorgias are doing very much what he makes them do, I think; it is true that there is a technical sense for einoi invented by Parmenides and the focal point for discussion thereafter; it is true that all this has been widely misunderstood (even by Kirk and Raven, whose work Dr Loenen does not mention), and that a reinterpretation on these lines is now overdue. I could wish that he had held his hand, and instead of stating his thesis as an historical truth, had tried it out on the pre-Parmenideans and on Plato. This might have led to changes, and a book which would command more support and gratitude than I for one can quite accord his present work. As it is, one can still be grateful for an approach which will lead to better things, and deliver scholars from our present and labyrinthine misunderstandings. Recommended with caution, as the only attempt of this kind I know of in print: though Anglo-Saxons will not relish the philosophical language of Dr Loenen or his efficient translator.

DENIS GREY.


In content and arrangement this volume is similar to the same editor’s Senofane in this series. Diels-Kranz 284 is ostensibly reprinted with a few additions to the testimonia, an adequate Italian translation and copious footnotes, and prefaced by a long introduction in four chapters. It is a pity that the editors of the series have not seen fit to impose a more rational arrangement of text and exposition. There is no apparatus or index, and divergences from the text of D-K are not always marked, so that the reader is sometimes compelled to search for their justification in the introduction (e.g. at B1, 32). Footnotes are long, diverse, and unsystematic; some, such as those which summarise Diels’ reconstruction of the doxography, are useful where they occur: others, on occasional linguistic points not peculiar to Parmenides, or, as often, merely bibliographical or encyclopaedic, are superfluous and occasionally misleading, as, for instance, the reference to Verdenius on p. 61. Occasionally too (as on p. 118) the line-references to D-K in the footnotes become meaningless.

The distinctive points of Untersteiner’s introductory chapters are these:
1. The essential attribute of Being for Parmenides is not unity but totality. Since the tendency still persists to speak anachronistically of Parmenides’ ‘One Being’ or even ‘One’, the point is worth making. But Untersteiner goes too far in eliminating from the fragments all reference to unity by arbitrarily adopting Ammonius’ variant reading in B3 5–6, and attributing the introduction of ev entirely to Melissus and his successors, against the evidence of Aristotle.
2. ‘La cd. a gnosiolegeta l’ev’. This statement indicates the conclusion of a somewhat portentous attempt to show the close connexion between the mythological prelude, the concept of cd., and the negative ontology which emerges as Parmenides pursues his way, and the polymorphic goddess her tale. In this connexion he interprets B2–7, offering a new (and unconvincing) rendering of B2, which involves finding the subject of otopw (I. 3) in cd. This construction will appear profound to some and trivial to others; what substance it contains seems hardly to justify the number and length of the words devoted to it.
3. The Way leads from cd. (not to be identified with the false ways of B2 and 6) which reveals to us the world sub specie temporis (the real meaning of tais; and vs) to the klytism, grasped by vs (intuition), of Timeless Being: the transition is symbolised by the passage of the Gate in B1, 17 ff., and the duality by the ‘polymorphic’ goddess. This I think is basically on the right lines, though it still leaves unanswered the perhaps unanswerable question of the relative validity of cd.

On the details of Parmenidean physics Untersteiner is a little perfunctory: remarks like ‘P. concepibet l’anima come una manifestazione dell’ energia vitale dell’ ev tradotta nella temporialità di vs e vs’ do not help us very much.

It would be useful, and appropriate to this series of texts, to have a commentary which set out the different possible interpretations of Parmenides’ words and stated the evidence available to enable us to judge between them. Untersteiner has given both more and less than this. His introduction uneasily combines a survey of modern scholarship on the subject (with which he is widely acquainted) with an exposition of his own views. The continual irritation of summaries of the conclusions of different scholars from Zeller to Zafrupolo create obstacles to following the development of the author’s own interpretations, and where one looks for argument to support a point one is too often confronted with an accumulation of conflicting views, the acceptance or rejection of which is not pressed with either cogency or conciseness.

R. MATTHEWS.


This is a highly original book which deserves to be widely read, studied and pondered upon. At times almost brilliant, at times very much open to challenge and at times completely unsatisfying, it none the less successfully opens up fresh topics of great interest. Nominally concerned with the develop-
ment of the concept of moral responsibility from Homer to Aristotle, it adopts an indirect approach, and could not unfairly be described as primarily concerned with the changing content of *arete* during this period. It thus takes up the problem posed by Jaeger in *Paidieia*, Vol. I, and it carries the investigation further by applying more rigorous methods of analysis to the way in which relevant concepts are used in the surviving literature.

Dr Adkins' main thesis is that for Homer words like *agathos* and *arete* denoted the 'competitive' virtues, such as courage and self-assertion, regarded as appropriate to the Homeric hero. According to this concept individual success was all-important, and the means irrelevant as long as success was achieved. The 'co-operative' or 'quiet' virtues were not unknown, and there were terms appropriate to their description but these terms could never compete with the terms appropriate to the 'competitive' virtues in cases of conflict. This situation suited the needs of Homeric society. Despite fundamental social changes the relation between these two sets of terms continued without real change right down to the fifth and even the fourth centuries. Thus an action might be just, *dikaion*, and yet *aischron*, shameful to the doer, in that it involved his failure to succeed as a Homeric hero, and so a failure to achieve *arete*. None the less it became ever more urgent to relate the 'quiet' virtues in some more satisfactory way than this to the terms appropriated by the 'competitive' virtues which remained the highest terms of praise available. This was so because in fifth and fourth century Greek cities it was in fact the 'co-operative' virtues which were more important to society, at least for most of the time. The history of moral thought in Greece is seen as largely the history of this attempt. The practice of justice might be justified under the *agathos*-ethic by arguing that injustice brings retribution either in this world or in the next and so leads to personal failure. It was loss of belief in divine retribution that made possible the sophistic reversion to the Homeric conception, e.g. in Thrasymachus. Plato and Aristotle had the difficult task of showing how justice and the other quiet virtues could be essential to *arete* in its traditional sense. This Dr Adkins believes they were able to do with some success. But they did so by concentrating attention upon the results of the 'quiet' virtues, and so made impossible an adequate theory of moral responsibility, which requires that intention, not results, should be the starting point.

The thesis is supported by abundant analyses of the uses of the terms concerned, and the discussion of particular passages is one of the most interesting features of the book. The theory enables more precise interpretations to be offered for many passages than have previously been possible—only two examples can be mentioned. When in the *Choroi* 493 ff, we are told that Agamemnon died *aigypos* this should be understood to mean that Agamemnon incurred shame in dying a death not appropriate to a Homeric hero, rather than that the deed was shameful to the doer. Secondly a most interesting interpretation is made possible of the Scopas-fragment of Simonides discussed in Plato's *Protagoras* which seems to make a number of things clear which were not clear before.

Yet not everything will secure ready assent. While the account of the dominant ethic in Homer is persuasive, the 'quiet' virtues were there too. Were they in quite such a subordinate and unregarded position as Dr Adkins suggests? While *Moira* is discussed it is not regarded as an exception to the dominant ethic. *Dike* and *Themis* are barely mentioned, and the view that there was already in the Homeric world another ethic, not subordinate to, but rivalling the *agathos*-ethic needs more discussion, cf. for example the first two studies in *R. Mondolfo*, *Problemi del Pensiero antico*, 1935. At any rate after Homer surely the doctrine of *epinomos* became of the first importance, and it is wrong to interpret it simply as a case of the gods applying the *agathos*-ethic themselves. Again Dr Adkins sees that the Greek view of responsibility is related to the Greek world-view just as our view of responsibility is related to our world-view, and this is greatly to his credit. None the less he thinks that the Greek view, and so the views of Plato and Aristotle are somehow inferior to ours. In this he speaks from within our world-view and so is less than true to his own sound principles. But then, every reader will want to argue with Dr Adkins about some fundamental points, and this is no doubt as it should be in a book of this kind.

G. B. Kerferd.

**CLASSSEN (C. J.)**  
*Sprachliche Deutung als Triebkraft platonischen und sokratischen Philosophiers.*  

This work discusses the effect of Plato's unusual sensitivity to the literal meaning of metaphors on both his style and his philosophy. In Part I Classen discusses a number of passages from Plato's later dialogues (which are less likely to show Socratic influence), turning in Part II to an attempt to establish Socrates' own linguistic behaviour from the earlier dialogues, Aristophanes, Xenophon and the lesser Socratics. He examines in detail the development from the habits of ordinary Greek speech of a number of Platonic usages and metaphors, some of great importance for his philosophy. On p. 67 he defends his method: 'Modern philosophers may laugh at such proceedings and call in question the value of such explanations and "proofs". The scholar has to state first that these are the explanations, and indeed the only ones, which Plato gives in his published works; and he has further to establish whence the individual ideas are derived, how they are united in images and in what manner they are used. Then it can be accepted that they reflect the path of Plato's philosophical speculation and the development of his thought.' The nature of the
method can best be shown by a brief résumé of Classen’s Chapter IV. Here he discusses the materials from which the Cave is finally constructed, among which are: (a) the Greek use of sight-metaphors for thought-processes, e.g. 
\[ \text{εἰδὴς, εἰς, εἰδέναι} \]. This encourages the selection of \( \text{εἰδῶς} \) and \( \text{εἴδα} \) from the large number of words available for what Classen terms ‘U’ (the nameless something which is to be named ‘Form’). \( \text{εἰδῶς} \) is regularly coupled with \( \text{ἀποφήμει} \) in the earlier dialogues; (b) the use of \( \text{αἰκός, ἀκοπώδια} \) for intellectual ‘darkness’; (c) the use of \( \text{ἐν/ἀναφέρων, ἀνάγω} \), to mean ‘refer something to a higher principle’; (d) the use of \( \text{τὰ ἄνω} \) first literally of the objects of astronomy, then of \( \text{τὰ ἀλλήλος ἄνω} \), which can only be seen with the eye of the \( \gammaγγ} \). Plato, maintains Classen, was conscious of both the literal and the metaphorical aspect of all these expressions, and as a result was led to construct the Cave, in which the metaphors are pictorially represented.

Both this and Classen’s other discussions are of considerable interest, and, if treated purely as a record of Plato’s (and Socrates’) linguistic development, require no apology. But Classen uses the metaphor ‘Triebkraft’ in his title, and this surely raises questions to which he offers no answer. Is the existence of e.g. visual metaphors for thought-processes in ordinary Greek supposed to have caused Plato to work out the Forms and the Cave as we have them? Or merely tempted him to do so? Does the existence of such metaphors imply that the majority of the Greeks (and Plato himself) were ‘visualisers’, a fact which gave Plato a vocabulary on which he could operate philosophically, and which influenced his philosophy in a manner which he never examined? Classen indeed (p. 60 and cf. p. 178) holds that Plato’s ‘sprachliche Deutung’ leads not only to clarification of language but also to deeper insight, apparently into the truth of e.g. the \( \text{dogma} \) embodied in the Cave. But if Classen is really making this claim for the interpretation and elaboration of metaphors, the ‘modern philosopher’ may legitimately complain. However, anyone who is prepared to ignore such questions will find much of interest in this book.

ARTHUR W. H. ADKINS.


These papers by sixteen contributors bear from different angles upon two problems over which there is yet little agreement: the doctrines of the lost early works of Aristotle, and his early development in relation to Platonism. They have had the advantage of being rewritten in the light of the discussion, and several refer to each other.

Much of the discussion of the fragments concerns the \( \text{Protophylacōs} \) (doctrine, not authenticity). E. de Strycker analyses the logical structure of fr. 5Α(W) and finds agreement with Plato both in general and in detail. Miss S. Mansion, on the other hand, making a distinction (which de Strycker contests) between two strains of argument in \( \text{Protr.} \) as a whole, finds a transition towards the treatises. I. Düring finds in fr. 13 a fundamental departure from Plato’s idealism; while P. Moraux argues that idealism is still present in \( \text{Protr.} \) but gone in \( \text{de Iustitia} \). This conflict is due to the philosophical vagueness of the alleged ‘fragments’. It suggests that Rabinowitz, who has dared to point at this emperor’s new suit, deserves more attention than he gets in the footnotes of these essays. Only P. Wilpert allows that all is not well, and pleads for a reconsideration of the ascriptions of fragments \( \text{incipit sed} \). Meanwhile a solid contribution to the testimonia \( \text{for de Philosophia} \) is provided by R. Walzer, who shows how the
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D. M. BALME.


It is no good trying to pretend, as some scholars do, that Aristotle's Poetics is a work of no importance. It may have come down to us in a garbled version, it may have been wrong-headed in the first place, it may have been badly misinterpreted; and of course we do not need a fourth-century philosopher to tell us what to think about fifth-century tragedy. But the fact remains that theories claiming the Poetics as their authority have been built into the critical tradition of all Western literatures and are not easily dislodged, as allusions to 'the Aristotelian unities' persistently testify. So there is every justification for such a drastic re-surveying of familiar ground as Professor Else, of Michigan University, has undertaken in this book, which is not a commentary in the usual sense but a continuous inquiry into the structure and meaning of the text, taking it paragraph by paragraph but not line by line. It is a bulky volume, and would have been even bulkier if E. had not excluded cc. 16, part of 19, 20–2, and 25 from present consideration, with promise of further studies to follow.

The book is nothing if not controversial, but no amount of impatience with its method or disagreement with its conclusions should be allowed to obscure the fact that E. has performed at least two major services for students of the Poetics. First, he has related the method, language, and substance of this small work to the rest of the Aristotelian corpus with a thoroughness achieved by no one previous commentator; in particular, those who have assumed that Bywater could be counted on to know his Aristotle may be astonished to find how many passages of obvious pertinence that great scholar failed to cite. Secondly, he has probed into the meaning and usage of the key terms in the critical vocabulary without ever allowing himself to be distracted by traditional interpretations or loose English equivalents. For example, he is never tired of insisting that formations in -σις denote a process or activity, that ποιησις means the process of composition and ποιητική the systematised skill controlling this...
process, and that neither word corresponds exactly to the English word ‘poetry’ in any of its uses. Obvious though this may seem, neglect of it has led to much muddled thinking, and it has important corollaries which E. follows up with exemplary persistence.

The section of E.’s book which most strongly challenges attention is that on catharsis. This is based on the following data: (a) παθημάτων, throughout Ar., does duty as gen. pl. for πάθος; (cf. 53b11 and Bonitz s.v.); (b) πάθος, though it can denote an emotion and does so in 53b38, is a key term in the Poetics as a euphemism for an act of violence; (c) the natural meaning of τῶν τοσοῦτων (49b27), following on δ’ ἐλέον καὶ φόβον, is ἱλασμὸν καὶ φοβέρων (cf. 53a38–b1, ἦ ἐλεον ... ἦ φόβον, οίων πράξεων ἡ τραγῳδία μύηςς ἐπόκειται), and it is only by taking παθημάτων to mean ‘emotions’ that we are forced to exclude this interpretation; (d) another key term in the Poetics is μετόρηγον, a cognate of μίσαμα, the pollution attaching to acts of bloodshed, especially within a family, which can, when there are extenuating circumstances such as error due to ignorance, be lifted by a process of ritual or judicial decontamination. E. finds it natural that this should be the catharsis to which Ar. refers, and accordingly translates the codicil of the definition as follows: ‘... carrying to completion, through a course of events involving pity and fear, the purification of those painful or fatal acts which have that quality’. There are difficulties in this interpretation, e.g. that it is the agent who is cleared of μίσαμα by καθαροῖς, not his act, and that πάθος should strictly denote what happens to the victim rather than what the agent does (though this difficulty exists on any view of πάθος in the Poetics). E. seems less aware of these difficulties than of the lesser one of reconciling his hypothesis with Pol. viii. cc. 6 and 7, on which the traditional interpretation rests. His reaction to this difficulty is to shrug his shoulders and say (p. 442) that the consideration of cross-references elsewhere, and of other possible external evidence, must follow the interpretation of the Poetics, not precede it. This is not a happy remark, since much of the value of E.’s book would have been lost if he had consistently followed this principle, and one feels that he need not have thrown up the sponge so readily. There is surely material enough in Rohde’s Psyche and elsewhere to furnish so astute an engineer as E. with a bridge between ἐθνωσισμοῖς, viewed as demonic possession, and a catharsis closely analogous to the one he sees in the Poetics. Several recent studies (E. R. Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational, passages indexed s.vv. miasma and catharsis, PW Supp.-Band VI s.v. καθαροῖς, and now (1960) A. W. H. Adkins, Merit and Responsibility, ch. V, ‘Pollution’) have cleared the way for a fresh approach to the whole catharsis complex, and whatever may be the fate of E.’s hypothesis, his rehandling of the problem makes it certain that the classic controversy can never again be fought over quite the same ground, which is something to be thankful for after more than half a century of static warfare.

Other major topics on which E. has much of value to say are the six μέρη of tragedy, notably ἰδεις and δημος, and the καθῆλος and καθ’ ἐκείνου of c.9 (though here he seems to miss the point of Ar.’s δευτέρων). On ὄραμα it is in line with current views, and carries elucidation a stage further by firmly coupling it with ἀναγνώρισις (the link being ἄγνοια, which gives rise to the one and is dispelled by the other). On περιπέτεια he seems to be headed in the right direction when he defines it (p. 344) as ‘an unexpected yet logical shift in the events of the play’, and later his discussion of c. 18 bears out the view that peripety is the switch-point between δίσεις and λύσεις, the emergence of something which does not square with the delusion based on ἄγνοια and so touches off a chain-reaction leading to ἀναγνώρισις. Yet on p. 354 we find him talking of a peripety following the recognition that has averted a πάθος, as in the I.T., i.e. after the λύσεις is complete, and therefore no part of the complex plot; what he is here talking about is in fact no more than the formal and, by now, expected consummation of a μεταβολή εἰς ἐννέας which has been working itself out ever since it was touched off by the peripety (i.e., in the I.T., by the dictation of the letter). Perhaps E. would have thought better of this notion if he had had occasion to comment on c. 16, where the better sort of recognition are said (54b29) to be those ἐκ περιπετείας, and the one resulting from Iphigenia’s letter is cited (55a18–19) as an example of the best type of all. On the μύηςς of tragedy (c. 5), it is astonishing to find him exhuming Teichmüller’s desperate contention that Ar. is referring to the running-time of plays, as if unaware that as many as five were performed in one day (E. is even reduced to talking about reading-time, as being longer). Paradoxically, when he comes to c. 7 (where Ar. does mention running-time, only to dismiss it as ὁδ τῆς τέχνης), E. gives a thoroughly sensible account of the tragedians’ habit of ignoring ‘empty time’ (e.g. the travelling-time of messengers), a concept which makes the usual interpretation of c. 5 much easier. On the passage supposed to have suggested the ‘unity of place’ (c. 24), he is both acute and helpful, and there is an engaging simplicity about his conclusion that ‘if Ar. had been told of the “unity of place”, he would probably have said that he had no great objection to it, but that it did not matter very much’.

For all E.’s meticulous attention to details of language, there are places where command of Greek syntax or idiom seems to fail him. His discussion of 47b22–3 evidently rests on the assumption that formations in -εος can only be used personally, i.e. that with τοιουτοῦ ποιητῆς προσάγορευον we must supply εἶναι, not ἐστίν. At 48b17 he emends οὐτος ἐκεῖνος to οὗτος ἐκεῖνο in the hope that this will bear a meaning (oddly expressed on p. 125 as ‘this individual is a so-and-so’) for which the natural Greek is οὗτος τοιοῦτος. Objecting to an interpre-
tation of ἕν τῶν λόγων (50b6), he writes (p. 265, n. 157): 'But then one would expect ἕν τῶν μὲν λόγων'; similarly at 54a29 he defends (p. 464) a reading which involves an irrationals placement of μὲν. On p. 317 he interprets ό γὰρ ἀν ἐγένετο (51b18) in a sense which would require γενέσθαι. His re-editing of 55a27–8 goes astray because he evidently thinks that μὴ ὄρθωντα can mean the same as ὄχι ὄρθωντα. This error makes it the less surprising that he has followed those who twist the interpretation of 47b6 ff. by treating ὁδὼ eί τις as if it were καί eί τις.

E. has been influenced by the work of de Montmollin (see JHS lxxv (1955), pp. 170–1), and devotes much space to distinguishing texte primitif from additions ultérieures. In this he does not go quite so far as de M., and indeed reproofs the latter (pp. 261, 541, 631) for some of his excesses. Even so, a second encounter with this parlour game leaves one with the wish that scholars would stop fussing about whether or not Ar. added a clause to his first draft the morning after completing it (E. p. 262), and would rest content with weeding out interpolations which must be from some other hand.

R. G. C. LEVENS.


The starting-point is Aristotle’s remark in Politics I, 1278 b 30 ff.: ἀλλὰ μὲν καὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λεγομένων τρόπων βέβαιω διαλέκτων, καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς λόγοις διορισμέθη παρὰ αὐτῶν πολλάκις. After a sober discussion of all the instances of its use, M. Moraux concludes that by the phrase ‘οἱ ἐξωτερικοὶ λόγοι’ Aristotle means dialectical and rather superficial discussions of a subject, which may or may not form part of his dialogues, and that although Aristotle here stresses that the distinction of types of rule was often made, there is nothing to prevent us supposing that at its first introduction this distinction was elaborated at length in a single work.

The next move is from the content of this same passage of Politics I. Aristotle distinguishes first between the despotic rule of master over slave, and the rule of a father over his family; political rule is a third type, which should, in simple justice, look after the interests of the community, but may improperly look after the ruler’s own interests, as despotic rule does. From this remark M. Moraux infers that the same context in the ἐξωτερικοὶ λόγοι held a comparison of types of domestic rule with types of civic rule, and connected this theme with the concept of justice.

This move enables him to bring in the analysis of types of rule in Politics A I, which has long been recognised as a criticism of Plato, and several comparisons between the polis and the family in Pol. A 12, Eud. Eth. H 9 and 10, and Nik. Eth. Θ 12. In these various contexts we find certain themes constantly linked together—namely, the different types of rule, justice, friendship, the bipartite human soul and the relations between its two parts. And in treating these themes Aristotle refers ‘à plusieurs reprises’ to his exoteric works. This last statement may cause some surprise at first, since apart from the Politics reference from which we started, only NE 1102 a 26 seems to be relevant. M. Moraux increases the number, however, by including three references to λόγοι without any epithet, in EE 1240 a 11 and 23 and 1244 a 20. Since the last of these mentions several competing definitions of friendship, M. Moraux is able to infer several interlocutors in the dialogue; and since the EE has a first-person-plural in connexion with these kinds of friendship, he concludes that Aristotle directed the discussion himself.

The frequent appearance of these themes in each other’s company argues for a single exoteric work in which they were first treated at length. M. Moraux identifies it with the dialogue περὶ δικαιοσύνης from the resemblance of the subject-matter (particularly the parallel study of the city and the human soul) to Plato’s Republic. He is then able to bring the known ‘fragments’ of the dialogue into the picture. M. Moraux omits fr. 88 (Rose)—a passage in which Themistius refers to a pronouncement of Aristotle’s on the right attitude to τιμή, which is not easily explicable as a reference to either of the two Ethics. But the attribution to the dialogue on Justice, though of course by no means sure, is not bad; Plato’s Republic, apparently the model for this dialogue as the Phaedo was for the Eudemus, has plenty to say about this topic, and the giving and accepting of τιμή is a theme that belongs to the context of rule, justice and friendship (see for instance EE 1242 b 20, NE 1159 a 18 ff., 1163 b 4 ff.). If M. Moraux would accept fr. 88 he might find a little support for his thesis (on p. 134) that at the time of this dialogue Aristotle was already a partisan of the μετανάστης, if an unsystematic one.

M. Moraux goes on to consider traces of the dialogue in Cicero’s De Republica (it was one of the objects of Carneades’ attack), Stobaeus, certain Neo-Platonic Plutarch’s De Virtute Morali, and to compare it with the Platonic Aletheia I.

In the fifth chapter we have an analysis of NE 5—a useful contribution to the study of this difficult book. The conclusion is drawn that the distinction between distributive justice and two kinds of corrective justice is a relatively new development; the book may contain reminiscences of Aristotle’s earlier views in the discussions of justice as legality and of political justice, because (broadly speaking) these discussions leave out of account the particular forms of justice which are elsewhere said to be the proper subject-matter of the book. This leads to a very clever reconstruction of a possible course of argument in the dialogue on Justice—from an idea of justice as the whole of virtue to an idea based on the concept of equality.
Of course this book of *AE* has to be used with great delicacy as evidence for the dialogue. The criterion for selecting 'older' portions of the existing text is only that of incongruity, of one sort or another. But why should Aristotle quote inexact material from a well-known earlier dialogue? Why not simply refer to it, as he does elsewhere, if he thought it still correct but superficial, or criticise it explicitly, if he thought it wrong? M. Moraux's use of this evidence, however, is very subtle, and I think it is probably legitimate. He tries to establish what lines of thought may have preceded others in the *Ethics*; but he does not transfer what is said in the 'earlier passages' directly to the dialogues, but only uses them to confirm or suggest the presence of certain themes in the dialogue.

The book ends with comparisons between Plato and the Aristotle of this dialogue, on the subject of justice and the theory of the human soul.

I find this a fine exercise of scholarly imagination. About the contents of Aristotle's dialogue it is possible that M. Moraux is almost wholly wrong; conjecture plays a large part in the book. But the conjecture is always deliberate and plausible; and it does not masquerade as proven truth. The author's claim is justified: 'Il va sans dire que le caractère en partie conjectural de cette reconstruction ne cherche pas à se dissimuler.' M. Moraux's argument is in fact honestly and lucidly presented: it is a most elegant piece of reasoning.

D. J. Furley.


These two books form the second and third volumes of an enterprise which in its complete six volumes stretches from Creation to the present day. Those parts of II and III which have previously appeared in print have been published in journals of politics; and the author (II, 3) clearly intends the work as a whole to be judged as philosophy of history. His purpose is to examine the various types of order expressed in and through human society and, in certain writers and at certain periods, in opposition to human society. In II and III he discusses in this light Pre-Homeric Greece, Homer, The Hellenic Polis, The *Aretai* and The *Polis*, Parmenides, Heraclitus, Tragedy, The Sophists, The Historians, Plato and Aristotle. The chapter headings are familiar enough; but Voegelin's philosophical standpoint ensures that familiarity goes no further. His use of 'society' and 'philosophy' accounts for this. 'Society', II, 2: 'Every society is organised for survival in the world and, at the same time, for partnership in the order of being that has its order in world-transcendent divine being; it has to cope with the problems of its pragmatic existence and, at the same time, it is concerned with the truth of its order'. *Philosophy*, II, 275: 'Philosophy by definition has its centre in the experiences of transcendence.' Accordingly, any author whose work contains elements which may be represented as transcendent or symbolic commands Voegelin's approval, while any author who uses logic against such philosophers is damned. II, 294: 'A peculiar style of thinking develops that permits men who are no philosophers in the existential sense to express their opinions on problems involving the experience of transcendence with the usurped authority of the existential philosopher.' Voegelin's philosophers (from whom, incidentally, do they obtain their credentials?) merely utter inspired epideixis, which no one else may probe with logic, lest he reveal himself as a mere 'sophistic intellectual'. Since Voegelin qua philosopher is presumably a philosopher of this kind, the reviewer can only tiptoe softly away. But when he interprets classical texts the ordinary rules of logic and observation presumably still apply. Here inaccuracies are inaccuracies. I append a few examples: III, 105, 'The *gennain pseudos* (of the *Republic*) is that all men are brothers'. Plato, *Rep.* 414 E, says that the *citizens* of *his* state are to look on one another as brothers. This is quite different; and even this plays a comparatively small part in the *pseudos*, whose primary purpose is to emphasize differences between the three grades of citizens. In III, p. 135, Voegelin maintains that Plato would not have used force to bring one of his ideal states into being, since such action is unworthy of a true philosopher. This on *Rep.* 541 A; but e.g. *Politicus* 293 A6 ff. shows that in Plato's eyes the quality of government depends not on the voluntary acceptance of the governed but on the skill of the governors. (Voegelin's reason for supposing the plan of *Rep.* 541 A not Platonic is that it is put into the mouth of Socrates!) Again, II, 272, Voegelin attempts to equate Protagoras' proposal that a habitual criminal should be executed with Plato's provision in the *Laws* that the atheist with an *eidos* *deixis* should be executed if after five years he did not change his views, though even in Plato's own terminology he could commit no worse than *akousa: biaid, Laws*, 626 ff. So, we are informed, the 'liberal' Protagoras is as authoritarian as the 'fascist' Plato. But though to execute the habitual criminal may be Draconian, to liquidate a well-behaved citizen for 'wrong' beliefs is on a different plane altogether.

On these (and other) not unimportant occasions Voegelin misrepresents his sources in the interests of his overriding thesis; and if the nature of his philosophy is taken into account, the work may fairly be described as tendentious. With this judgement, I suspect, the author would agree, though he would probably prefer the word 'engage'. Voegelin clearly feels himself surrounded, and longs to hit back. So, III, 37: 'The situation (of Socrates and Callicles) is fascinating for those among us who find ourselves in the Platonic position and who recognize in the men with whom we associate today the intellectual pimps
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for power who will connive in our murder tomorrow.' If things are really as bad as that in Louisiana, the rapiers of logic may well seem insufficient to defend the position; but to hurl balls of cotton wool from behind a tangle of metaphysical barbed-wire seems little more likely to be effective.

ARTHUR W. H. ADKINS.


This is an account of the principal divine and heroic legends, intended for those who wish to get some general idea of Greek traditions. Given the name of the author, it goes without saying that it is attractively written. There are abundant quotations from the ancient authorities, all in good French translations, and the illustrations, principally from vase-paintings, avoid the hackneyed, or as Méautis amusingly calls them the 'archiconnus' (p. 23).

The scope is about the same as that of my little work, Gods and Heroes of the Greeks, and a short but sufficient index enables the reader to look up any personage whose name occurs anywhere in the book, thus using it on occasion as a short and handy mythological dictionary. Naturally, neither completeness nor lengthy discussion of any story or of myths in general is aimed at; the author might say with Lucilius, Persium non duo legere, Laelium Decumum solo. At the same time, little or nothing of real importance is omitted, and there are brief but good explanations of the difficulties of mythological study and attempts, by no means frustrate, to appreciate the significance of the ancient tales and what he calls the personality of the gods; the heroes get rather scantier treatment.

It would take too long to enumerate the good things to be found up and down the pages of this book. As examples, the following may serve. P. 10, the matter of mythology is 'fluid' because it is so closely connected with 'la partie affective de notre âme, qui n'aime guère se plier aux définitions'. P. 58, he rightly rejects the views of those who think the Homeric Zeus unjust and cruel, and elsewhere refutes other absurdities. P. 98, he has an attractive parallel between Artemis κελαδεύτης and the Wild Hunt. P. 101, the description of Hermes as a gypsy god is neat, and 103 adds that his 'Homeric' hymn is the oldest detective story in the world. P. 126 rightly warns readers that Hades has nothing devilish about him. Pp. 143–6 parallel the attitude of Aeschylus' Danaids towards marriage with that of Euripides' Hippolytos. P. 241 justly compares Artemis, in the story of the Kalydonian Boar, to the neglected and vengeful fairy of Sleeping Beauty.

That the book is faultless would be too much to say. The interpretation of myths leans somewhat excessively towards finding moral meanings in them; indeed on p. 60 one of the most amiable ancient interpreters, Plutarch (Mor. 23 D) is almost translated in a discussion of the opening verses of the Iliad. There is also rather too little notice either of parallels or of probable non-Greek sources for certain myths. On p. 49, the interpretation of ἔκνεοι in the story of Pandora is interesting, and probably right in refusing to explain it as hope, but when it is translated attentis it surely is untrue to add 'de tous les maux, un seul nous est épargné', for many people make themselves wretched with their own forebodings. On p. 57, I doubt if ἡμέρας means closing the eyes before a dazzling light; is it not rather closing the mouth and so keeping the secret? On p. 72, Don Giovanni in Mozart had loved more than a thousand and three women, that being the number of those who had attracted him in Spain alone. P. 90 mistakenly calls Apollo a solar god. The account of Dionysos, p. 108 ff., over-emphasises his connexion with wine. P. 113, it was not from the ashes of the Titans, but from the vapour of their burning bodies that mankind sprang. P. 123 falls into the old mistake of supposing that Kore's period of absence is the winter. P. 125, Isokrates IV should not be called the Panegyrique d' Athènes. P. 178, there is no sufficient indication that Aiolos in Homer is a god. P. 181, the name of the runner who saw Pan is Philippides and not Phaedippides, which appellation is a comic invention of Aristophanes. P. 183, Selene's amour with Endymion was not her only one, cf. Verg., Georg. iii 391. There are a few misprints, or perhaps slips of the pen: p. 21, for 1938 read 1928; p. 35, line 5 from the end, simple should clearly be triple; p. 107, Phorbas' name is misprinted, and p. 109, before 'dans son Dionysalexandros' supply 'Cratinus'. On p. 215, 1st line, the name of the sow was Phaia, not Phoia; p. 232, line 15, it seems as if Oedipe ought to be Etéocle.

The literature is not always quite up to date; p. 61, n. 1, quotes the first instead of the second edition of Nilsson's Geschichte d. griech. Rel., Vol. I, and p. 41, though it discusses the Giants well, shows no knowledge of Vian's useful monograph on them.

All these, however, are trifles, which a very little revision would put right; the work as a whole is excellent of its kind.

H. J. ROSE.


Professor Fontenrose in this long investigation approaches the Delphic oracle and cult from a new angle. His subject is not the familiar one, treated lately by Parke and Wormell, by Amandry, and by Marie Delcourt, the nature and behaviour of the oracles in historical times, but the myth of the battle that Apollo fought with the serpent Python before he took over the oracle. The book sweeps widely through the myths of combat between gods or heroes and serpents or dragons in Greece and elsewhere, particularly in the Near East, with which the Greeks were always in contact, and where the combat was
usually connected with the creation of the world or with cosmic processes.

As one seasoned addict of comparative mythology I can promise others that they will find here many old friends of their childhood, mustered from such sources as the Enuma Elish, the Contest of Horus and Set, the Vedas, the Eddas, Beowulf and even the Popol Vuh, not to speak of Hittite, Hurrian and Ugaritic figures more recently made known. The author's thesis is that the Delphic myth of Apollo and Python originated from the cosmic battle between the Champion of light, order and life and his Enemy, the monster who represents darkness, chaos and death. He admits that Apollo has not always this beneficent character any more than other gods of mythology, and points out that in some such myths, Greek and other, the antagonists grow curiously alike, as is natural when they represent opposite sides in cyclical processes. In this view of Apollo there is already something of Nietzsche's contrast between Apollo and Dionysus, and it is interesting to see it argued later that Dionysus as occupier of Delphi for the months of Apollo's absence is in origin identical with Python.

No one would deny that the cosmic myth of combat between god and dragon is very widespread and is likely to have originated in the Near East. But it is essential to Fontenrose's thesis to show that the Delphic combat, which on the face of it has nothing to do with creation and the overcoming of watery chaos, grows from this gigantic and ancient root. This is the subject of Chap. XIII on earlier forms of the Delphic myth.

We are reminded that in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo the dragon is called Typhon, like Zeus' monstrous enemy in the Theogony, and also that Apollo, like Marduk (or Beowulf at the beginning of his career), has two monsters to fight, one of them female and mother of the other. The combat between Apollo and the male dragon Typhon has dropped out in our present version of the Hymn except for an allusion, and we have only that with the dragoness Delphyne described. Simonides is the first of known poets to make the male dragon the only opponent and to call him Python, and his version became the usual one in classical mythology. Typhon's character as the cosmic enemy of Zeus and the other Olympians is well known from Hesiodic poetry and from Aeschylus.

Fontenrose argues that the roles of Champion and Enemy were carried by earlier and now nameless gods at Delphi in myths that showed various stages in the adoption of this fundamental myth from Anatolia, Syria and Phoenicia. There were even said to be buried remains or tombs at Delphi not only of Python but, in some traditions, of Dionysus and even of Apollo. Their deaths may reflect the originally cyclical character of the combat, linked with an annual ritual for the renewal of life, as in the case of Marduk and other Near Eastern deities. The oriental gods certainly die or spend long periods as defeated victims of the Enemy before they win, even within the framework of the myth itself. Or in some cases, such as those of Marduk or Horus, it is the son of the original champion who is victorious. Fontenrose feels that from such tales as the imprisonment of Zeus in the Corycian Cave he can infer that, before Zeus became head of the Pantheon and officially invincible, Apollo may have been, at Delphi at any rate, the original Champion's successful son. But in the final and official mythology Apollo has no conflict except with the dragon (or dragoness) and is definitely subordinate to Zeus.

This great mass of evidence is persuasively presented, and each step looks convincing when it is made, but after many steps along some paths the reader often feels that he has gone too far. However, the main thesis seems to me eminently likely in view of the increasing evidence for historical links between Greece and the Near East in Mycenaean and in archaic classical times. Certainly the argument is fully documented, and this alone would make the book a valuable addition to scholarship in ancient mythology.

E. D. PHILLIPS.


These lectures by a well-known authority on ancient religion do not develop a continuous theme. Though the second and third have definite links with one another, the first stands on its own.

The first lecture 'Mars' I found the most illuminating. It is obvious, as Professor Rose says, that 'Mars' is not simply the Latin for 'Ares', but that the god is a much more complex figure than his Greek equivalent, and is little less in stature than Jupiter. To derive all his characteristics from his nature of war-god is absurd, and it is not much better to make him mainly a god of agriculture or of the weather. His rite of the equus october had two uses, to promote the growth of next year's crops and to purify the cattle stalls in spring, and the celebrants avoided the oldest settlements of Rome. The lustratio agri described by Cato had the same purpose. In the swouetaurilia Mars was urged to avert disaster and ruinous weather. The celebrated Arval Hymn is also revealing. Rose mostly accepts the interpretation of Norden (Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern 190-244). Mars is treated as god of the wild and of the world beyond one's own country, over which he has special power. As Lord of the Animals he had once been everything to hunters, but to farmers too he was still no mean deity. This account of Mars among the Romans and elsewhere in ancient Italy I find convincing. I am reminded of the extraordinary Lord of the Wild portrayed by Celtic artists on the celebrated Gundestrup Bowl in the National Museum at Copenhagen. From an origin of this kind it would be natural that a special god of war should develop, a god of eruptions from the outside suffered
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in one's own community or inflicted on others. Mars would also be appropriate to a community largely increased with alien outlaws, such as early Rome was according to tradition.

The next lecture looks for the idea expressed by the Polynesian mana—divine power which may be personal or impersonal—in popular Greek thought. Rose examines the indefinite use of daimon as contrasted with mention of such a personal god as Apollo, and also the meanings of ἄγως and ἄγη and their compounds, as covering favourable or unfavourable, positive or negative aspects of mana. He is inclined to accept the connexion of ἄγως with ἄγως and ἄγη rejected by Liddell-Scott-Jones, and not considered, I see, by Boisaq. Personifications such as Hebe and Themis are also studied in this light.

The third lecture deals with images as carriers of the mana of the god that they represent, as having some consciousness in them of respect paid by some men and not by others. The ancient belief in special affinity between gods and their images, which is not the same as identity, is shown to be rediscovered or reinterpreted by late pseudo-philosophical theory in the form of sympathetic and antipathetic influences between the elements, of which the images are made, and the gods.

There is little here that is new for specialists, but these are general lectures, not technical discussions. They must have been as well worth hearing for the original audience as they are now pleasant to read.

E. D. PHILLIPS.


Aux yeux de la plupart des historiens de la philosophie, Porphyry n'est qu'un élève de Plotin, conscientieux sans doute, mais sans relief. Le disciple aurait simplement édité les œuvres du maître et vulgarisé sa pensée sans rien ajouter d'original. Dans la précieuse reconstitution des grands traits de l'histoire du néoplatonisme que nous a donnée K. Praechter (Richtungen und Schulen im Neuplatonismus, dans Genethliakon Carl Robert, Berlin, 1916), Porphyry apparaît comme peu original et peu systématique: sa figure s'efface au profit de celle de Jamblique. A vrai dire, l'œuvre de Porphyre, en grande partie perdue, n'est connue que d'une manière encore bien imparfaite. J. Bidez avait entrepris d'en rassembler les fragments, mais la mort interrompit son effort (son manuscrit se trouve dans une bibliothèque de Grande-Bretagne). W. Theiler, dans son ouvrage Porphyrios und Augustin (Halle, 1933), a eu le mérite de déceler les différences doctrinales qui peuvent séparer Porphyre de Plotin et de proposer une hypothèse de travail qui permet d'enrichir notre connaissance de la doctrine porphyrienne: si, chez un néoplatonicien postérieur, apparaît un développement doctrinal qui peut se comparer par son contenu, sa forme, son contexte avec un développement analogue d'Augustin, et en même temps n'a pas de correspondant aussi précis chez Plotin, on peut considérer ce développement comme porphyrienn (Theiler, p. 4). Récemment l'article de R. Beutler consacré à Porphyre dans le Pauly-Wissowa (RE 43, col. 175-313), utilisant les travaux des MM. W. Theiler et P. Courcelle (Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore, Paris, 1948) propose une intéressante synthèse des enseignements propres à Porphyre.

Le livre de H. Dörrie, 'Porphyrius' Symmikta Zetemata', fera époque dans l'histoire des recherches porphyriennes. Non seulement cet ouvrage nous restitue en partie un livre perdu de Porphyre, mais il reconstitue avec une extraordinaire précision la doctrine de l'âme que Porphyre y exposait.

De ces 'Recherches variées', ce sont en effet celles qui concernent l'âme qui sont le mieux conservées, grâce au de natura hominis de Némésius, qui les utilise abondamment. Un premier Zetemai destiné à démontrer que l'âme est une substance incorporelle, a laissé sa trace, parallèlement à un écrit moyen-platonicien, dans le c. 2 de Némésius. Un second Zetemai traitait probablement de l'immortalité de l'âme: Némésius semble y faire allusion et saint Augustin l'a peut-être utilisé dans son de immortalitate animae. C'est le troisième Zetemai, sur l'union de l'âme et du corps, qui peut être reconstitué de la manière la plus exacte, grâce à un parallèle entre Némésius, de natura hominis, c. 3, p. 125, 11-137, 3 Matthaei, et Priscien, solut. ad Cäsioam (CAG suppl. I 2), pp. 50-2 Bywater. H. Dörrie nous donne le texte complet et commenté de ce que nous possédons de ce Zetemai grâce à ces deux témoins. Enfin un quatrième Zetemai, sur les parties de l'âme, est utilisé par Proclus, in remp., t. I, p. 234, 1-17 Kroll.

H. Dörrie ne se contente pas de rassembler ces textes, il en dégage la doctrine et il situe cette doctrine dans la tradition philosophique grecque. Porphyre apparaît ainsi comme étroitement lié au moyen-platonisme, notamment à Longin, et portant comme très original, même par rapport à Plotin. Toute la psychologie porphyrienne est dominée par la théorie concernant le mode de mélange propre aux intelligibles. Porphyre dit explicitement qu'elle remonte à Ammonius, le maître de Plotin. Mais il la formule d'une manière très originale qui révèle parfaitement sa méthode habituelle de pensée. Partant de la doctrine stoïcienne des mélanges, il définit le mode de mélange propre aux intelligibles en montrant que ce mode réunit en lui les propriétés contradictoires des différents mélanges corporels: union parfaite, comme dans la σύγχρονος, où les composants disparaissent, et portant union sans confusion, comme dans la παράδεισος, où les composants restent distincts. Il y a dans ces formules porphyriennes quelque chose de foncièrement nouveau: l'application aux objets transcendants d'un mode de considération jusque-là réservé aux êtres.
The genius of Porphyry consists in reconstituting the points of contact between the monism transcendent of the neoplatonicians and the monism materialistic of the stoics. Porphyry has chosen with great ability these points of contact, in order to convey the impression that it did not allow an escape from the physical stoicism of the metaphysics of neoplatonism (Dörrie, p. 160). H. Dörrie informs us that, rather than be confused by the clef of the porphyry. This is the greatest discovery of his work. The doctrine of Porphyry concerning the mixture proper to the intelligibles, the transcendency of the soul is marked, in fact, with a much greater interest: the role of intermediary that the platonism accorded traditionally to the soul, is free of complete- ment; the soul is not any longer to be considered as a whole in this world; it remains here and is not present in the same way as a body. It is not certain that it is not a scanda, remarking that Dörrie, if Augustine is an example, precisely, the doctrine of porphyry of the soul; the conse- quences on this is grave for the theological order and the doctrine of the soul: this is just in effect to practice the form of a liberation of the body.

It just as a means of Augustine in Dörrie has made me myself to propose a critique, of all this in effect to a mine. It emulates the hypothesis of an influence of the Zeist laughed at the immortality of the soul, on the de immortalitatem animae of Augustine (Dörrie, pp. 152-5). Malheureusement les argu- ments that he put in favor of this hypothesis interesting not are not very detailed. In another part, he proposes (p. 153) a Rückübertragung, a retrover- sion, of a passage of the Soliloquies (2, 24, 3) concerning the demonstration of the immortality of the soul. It seems difficult to practice unum quod in subiecto est par ἐν αὐτῷ oðía. The expression is used in effect very technical (cf. Aristotle, catec. 2, 1 a 21 sq.: en ὑποκειμένος) and in other part, the employment of oðía is given the reason. This reason is grounded in effect on the proportion which must exist between the subject and ses qualités. If the qualities of a subject are eternal, it follows that the subject himself is eternal. The science (disciplina, que Dörrie was to use for it, is not yet known) is a eis (Categ. 8,8 b 26) in the soul, but this "etait" is eternal. It is only when he is a subject, the soul, that is also eternal. It is the reasoning of Plotin, Enn. IV 7,8, 42-44: δει ἄρα ἄνδρον εἶναι μὲν ἄνδρον, ὃς καὶ τὰ ἐν γεωμετρίᾳ. Εἰ δὲ ἄνδρον καὶ μετονύμην, ὃς ἔσχατον. Δει ἄρα καὶ ἐν ὁ ἐστι τινός τινός εἶναι.

The reasoning of H. Dörrie is not only the merit of being able to apply to the researches on Por- phyry a more decisive, but also to place the doctrine of porphyry of the soul by rapport to all the history of the philosophical antiquity. It will be di- scussed but impossible to study the doctrines and the soul without recouring to this work, in which the analysis of the notions and is never separated from the examination of the methods and the systems by rapport among it is what is interesting.
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firm ground on which conjectures can be based with any confidence. Even more than Sakellariou C. seems insufficiently aware of this. However, he shows the complexity of the problems, and his original approach should stimulate fresh thinking and discourage historians from any tendency to facile acceptance of traditional concepts.

A. J. GRAHAM.


Archaeological research is just beginning to make a contribution to our knowledge of the settlement of the Greeks in Ionia. At the moment, however, we have to use far less satisfactory evidence, and it is inevitably with this evidence that S. is mainly concerned. His large volume may therefore mark the end of an epoch. However, his formidable command of the modern literature on all aspects of his subject, and his clear and painstaking exposition of the evidence and problems, will make his book a useful and lasting work of reference for scholars.

S. sets out to answer four questions: the geographical origin of the colonists; their ethnic origin; the date of the migration; and, finally, the state of Ionia at that time. The book is divided accordingly into four parts. In the first three parts S. takes sixteen cities in turn (for the chosen sixteen see 16), and sets out the evidence about each in two parts; first the literary tradition, then what he calls ‘les faits’. This scheme has the advantage of clarity, and the separation of the literary evidence from ‘les faits’ avoids the danger of interpreting one tendentiously in the light of the other (17), but S.’s handling of both types of evidence is open to serious criticisms. These apply especially in the first part on the geographic origin of the colonists, which is far the longest section, and the conclusions of which are in S.’s own opinion very satisfying and precise (488).

Although he expresses the fundamental difficulty that the literary evidence is all of far later date than the colonial foundations, and throughout the intervening centuries great changes took place (14), S. still seems insufficiently aware that this late literary evidence is often virtually worthless. The obviously fictional character of the detailed second-century account of Magnesia’s foundation (see 106 f.) makes one doubtful of all detailed accounts of Ionian foundations, and the extremely confused literary tradition regarding the origins of Chios (186 f.) is even more disturbing, since here we know that it goes back to Ion’s fifth-century kitesis. It seems therefore most improbable that Pherecydes had very ancient sources for the state of Ionia at the time of the colonisation, as S. supposes (403).

S.’s ‘facts’ are such evidence of origins as cults, calendars, personal names and the like. In some cases the term ‘les faits’ gives such evidence an undeserved solidarity. Personal names of Hellenistic or Roman times (e.g. 198) tell us little of the origin of the first founders. But it is in his use of myths and cults that S.’s methods are most questionable. Hanell used this kind of evidence in an exemplary way in his investigation of Megarian colonies in Megarische Studien; only very rare cults, heroes or epithets occurring in both colony and mother city were regarded as secure evidence of origin. S. is not so rigorous, and many of his foundations were so much earlier (see 357 for his chronological conclusions) that one wonders whether all the myths were localised in their classical homes before the foundations. Such doubts become even more insistent in view of S.’s conclusion, based mainly on this evidence, that most of the settlers came from Boeotia and the N.E. Peloponnesse (242). For these are the very areas which were particularly rich in myths and heroes. Has S. discovered by his methods, not the geographical origin of the settlers, but the areas most fertile in mythopoiesis?

In general S. is judicious and thoughtful in the many passages of close argument necessary for his work. It is therefore disappointing that one of the most important controversial matters, the question of the validity of the traditional concept of an Ionian Migration from Athens, is unsatisfactorily handled. It is true that many modern scholars have doubted the tradition, but that is not sufficient justification for S. simply to assume that it is fictional (3 f., 29 e.g.) without at any point giving adequate arguments for his assumption. He maintains (30) that the tradition did not exist when Aristagoras came to ask help from Athens, because Aristagoras asked it on the grounds that Miletos was founded from Athens. Since he was asking help for the other Ionian cities too, he should, S. argues, if he could, have stressed that Athens was also their metropolis. Surely, though, Aristagoras could have concentrated on the origin of his own city? In any case we need more than one doubtful argumentum ex silentio from Herodotus to discredit a tradition so well attested.

There is much less to criticise in the second part. We are not surprised to find considerable testimony that the ethnic origin of the Ionian cities was Ionian.

In the third part on chronology S. gives a very clear and useful account of all the chronological indications in ancient writers (307 ff.). He is wrong, however, to draw conclusions about chronology from Homer’s silence about the migration (328 f.). S. forgets Homer’s conscious anachronisms. Nor is this reviewer as completely convinced as S. by the publications to date that continuity of occupation from c. 1400 into classical times has been proved by the excavations at Miletos (S. gives a useful account of these excavations 333 ff., with slight changes of emphasis 505 f.).

Both in the section on chronology (327 f.) and in the last part on the state of Ionia at the time of the migration (441 ff.) S. is sceptical of the theories that Ionians or other Greeks appear among the peoples
named in oriental documents, and his arguments seem cogent. We must, in fact, acknowledge almost total ignorance of the political state of Ionia at the time of the settlements, and S.'s statements about this (477 ff.) are inevitably no more than surmise, and not always plausible. If there was no serious opposition, for instance, as he supposes, why did the early settlers choose islands off the coast and peninsulas for their sites, as they did at Bayrakli?

The book is provided with very full and accurate indices, though a list of passages cited and discussed would have been more valuable than the index of ancient literary sources. There are a few trivial misprints (e.g. 85 n. 6, 129 n. 9, 219 n. 3, 325 n. 7 (numbered 8), 471 n. 3), but in general the book is a model of careful accuracy.

If the results of S.'s laborious investigations are disappointingly meagre and uncertain, this is due to the inferior evidence. Amongst it the connexion between Athens and Smyrna attested by the pottery found at Bayrakli (233) stands out like a good deed in a naughty world, and shows the source from which we may hope that light will come.

A. J. GRAHAM.


To those familiar with the author's papers on various topics related to Ionia the virtues of this book will not come as a surprise. The evidence on his chosen subject, the early history of Ionia, is notably obscure and defective, but Roebuck consistently handles it with a well-calculated mixture of thorough analysis and controlled imagination.

In the Introduction Roebuck discusses the classical Greek view that the Ionians were soft because their rich country made life too easy for them, and states that his aim is to investigate the growth of Ionian riches or 'how Ionia achieved the state of grace from which it fell' (4). He begins with an opening section (Chapters I and II) on the land and its resources and the early development of Ionia; follows with three chapters on Ionia's relations with the outside world: first the interior, then Syria and Cyprus, and finally the Aegean; and ends with four chapters on Ionian trade and colonisation proper, arranged by the search for different requirements, for metals, for land and for food, with a final chapter (IX) on the pattern of trade. It is perhaps the fault of the varied material that the book makes a disjointed impression on the reader, and the general theme announced in the Introduction tends to be forgotten. For after the first two chapters Ionia as a whole is left behind, and the individual cities with their trade and colonisation occupy the stage.

The description of the land of Ionia and the different sites (1–17) is admirable, and the estimates of population from the figures of the contingents at Lade (22) seem quite reasonable. The settlement of Ionia (25 ff.) is also very satisfactorily treated. Roebuck is fully aware of the uncertainty of the whole topic, but, in welcome contrast to most modern works, he does not dismiss the role traditionally ascribed to Athens as entirely without foundation. He is entirely right to remark that the legends go back to a pre-polis Greece, which alone would account for their different character as compared with those of later colonisation. And his suggestion (32) that the traditions of mixed origins may be a result of subsequent reinforcements of the settlements accords well with what we know of later colonial practices. He also seems likely to be right in adopting the view (25) that, if there were Mycenaean predecessors of the Ionian cities, they would have lost their Greek character in the interval (in spite of (16) 'Colophon... perhaps a Mycenaean city with an enduring tradition').

Roebuck is very stimulating in his discussion of the Panionion and the Ionian League. In particular, his suggestion that the Panionion was the area of the first landfall of the Greek immigrants (9 f.) is very attractive. He argues that the League was in existence by the early eighth century from the story of Smyrna's unsuccessful request to be included (29): Smyrna would have requested admission soon after it became Ionian, which on archaeological evidence was probably c. 800, so the League existed and was exclusive by then. This is obviously a rather tenuous argument. Even more so, perhaps, is the suggestion (ibid.) that Neleus' twelve sons in the Iliad reflect the existence of the twelve cities. However, Roebuck is quite right to emphasise the special character of these cities, distinct as they were not only from Dorians, Aeolians, etc., but also from the rest of the Ionian ethnos.

Roebuck uses the Homeric poems to reconstruct the economy and life of early Ionia (33 ff.). The usual reservations spring to mind, but few would quarrel with the statement that early Ionian society was, like Homer's, non-monetary and non-commercial (24).

The questions of Ionia's relations with the East and the Aegean are complicated and the meagre evidence allows only tentative judgments, but Roebuck's general conclusions that the trade was limited to luxuries (18) and that Ionia was probably not the intermediary between Greece and the East (42) are unlikely to be disturbed. A very surprising bibliographical omission here is Dunbabin's The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours.

In all investigations of the early relations of Greek cities pottery provides the bulk of the evidence. But it is not simple evidence to interpret. Roebuck himself is aware of the difficulties and dangers (79, 82 e.g.), but he seems to forget them when, for example, he argues (70) that there was a change in the trading connections of the Syrian area towards the end of the sixth century because the East Greek fine ware is replaced by Attic. At that time Attic fine
were predominated in all markets, and we should be wrong to assume that it was always, or even mostly, carried by Attic traders. For similar reasons the attempt (77-9) to deduce political relations from the distribution of Corinthian pottery in Ionia in the seventh and sixth centuries is more interesting than convincing.

The same reservations are sometimes to be made regarding Roebuck’s treatment of the trade and colonisation of the Pontus. On p. 126, for example, it is assumed from the presence of Corinthian pottery in the Pontus in the seventh and sixth centuries that Corinth participated directly in the Black Sea trade. But the most serious point of difference between Roebuck and this reviewer is on the chronology of the colonisation of the Black Sea area (cf. Bull. Inst. Class. Studies 5, 1958, 25 ff.).

Roebuck takes the discovery that there was a Greek settlement in the early seventh century at Daskyleion (110) to show that the colonisation of the Propontis began at this date. But since Daskyleion is well inland, it seems unlikely that it could have been settled before the colonies on the coast had been established for some time. The lower dating of the Milesian Propontid colonies demands a lowering also of the traditional dates of the Megarian colonies on the Bosporus (114), which on general grounds seem very reasonable. Without compelling arguments this seems an unnecessarily high-handed way of treating the evidence. Roebuck also rejects the tradition of an eighth-century penetration of the Pontus (117 ff.), but his reasons seem inadequate. Neither Herodotus (iv 12.2) nor the recent slight excavations (see 120 n. 27) tell us anything definite about the date of the first settlement at Sinope. The evidence from the poet Eumelus also needed fuller treatment. Roebuck follows Will (Korinthiaki 124 ff.) but seems unaware that Will’s conclusions are based on Rhys Carpenter’s theory that the Greeks could not navigate the Bosporus before c. 700 (AJA lvii 1948, 11 ff.), a theory which Roebuck himself rightly rejects (117 n. 8).

Some smaller points. P. 19 n. 44: better evidence for the famous Ionian furniture than Critias frg. 2.6 f. (Diels, Vorsok. II 3.77) are the sale lists of the property of the Hermocipdae; 72 n. 2: on Ameinokles and early ships refer to Williams, JHS lxvii, 1958, 121 ff.; 106: the Thracian colt of Anacreon frg. 88 is not to be understood literally; 110: Roebuck should mention that the Athenians settled Elaious c. 600 rests entirely on an emendation based not on palaeographical arguments but on doubtful historical reconstructions (ATL iii 289 n. 75). The proofs were read meticulously; I noted misprints on pp. 11 (Colophon, read Colophon’s) and 99 (accounts, read account).

In general Roebuck is to be congratulated on a scholarly and concise treatment of a subject very important in early Greek history.

A. J. GRAHAM.
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(Bacchylides 11. 113 ff.)—but traces of Greek settlement go back at least as far as 700 B.C.; the Pylian and Mothonean settlement was doubtless later than that. The Achaean ικία Αλκικής in Antiocchos 555 F 12 (K. p. 42), settlers at Metapontum, may well have come from Laconia proper, and not from Pylos and Rhion: the colonists perhaps went there at the same time as Lakedaimonians settled Lokroi and Kroton, early in the seventh century (Paus. 3. 3.1).

K. (p. 93) demonstrates again what Jacoby made clear in his commentary on Rhianos (FGrHist IIIA Komm. pp. 132 ff.), that the Cretan poet dated the Messenian hero Aristomenes in the early fifth century B.C., at the time of a Messenian revolt c. 490 B.C., K. goes far (but not far enough) towards proving that the historical Aristomenes lived in the time of Leutychides II. Pausanias 4.24.3 mentions a Rhodian cult of the hero Aristomenes, and IG XII I, 8 attests it (K. p. 128); Damagetos the Rhodian kinsman of Aristomenes certainly lived early in the fifth century (Pind. Ol. 7.17). It is remarkable too that Paus. 4.24.1 from Rhianos connected Aristomenes with Theopompos of Heraia, who lived c. 500 B.C. Since Heraia was the centre of Arcadian resistance to Sparta early in the fifth century (Wallace, JHS 74 (1954) 32-5), a marriage alliance between the daughter of the Messenian insurgent leader and a Heraean noble may well have been arranged. Finally the numismatic evidence from Zankle/Messana (Robinson, JHS 66 (1946) 13 ff. K. p. 112) confirms the statement of Paus. that the Messenians were settled there by Anaxilas (whom the immediate source of Paus. mistook to the time of the Tyrrtaios war). K. (p. 122) reasonableness infers that Rhianos drew on local traditions of Messana for his account of the Aristomenes war, and he cogently argues that by χειμάτι τε ποιας τε διό και εἴκοσι πῶς Rhianos (265 F 44) meant eleven years: the verse implies that the Hira war of Aristomenes lasted from c. 500 until the time of Marathon (K. pp. 124-5). K. avoids discussing the duration of the Messenian revolt of the 460's, but if Aristomenes could hold out at Hira for ten years without the help of an earthquake, the Messenians, Thouriatai, and Aithaias could certainly have held out as long at Ithome later in the century (e.g. c. 468 to 459). The στῆμα commemorating the attacks of Aristomenes on Stenyklaras and the massacre of Arinmestos and his force in the earthquake war (Hdt. 9.64: cf. K. p. 89) suggest that in both revolts the insurgents used the same tactics—the occupation of a well defended summit, Hira in the first and Ithome in the second, from which attacks were made on Stenyklaras. K. warns against exaggerating the number of Messenians engaged in the earthquake war (p. 86).

The refutation of the view that Polydoros was the Agiad of the first Messenian war is thorough (p. 96), and K. reiterates that Plutarch confidently deduced from Tyrrtaios that at one time Polydoros and Theopompos were both kings of Sparta; both their names had occurred earlier in the poem of which Fr. 3D is a fragment: but they are unlikely to be the subjects of Πεινωένθιεν οίκοι δ' ἐνεκον. To bring oracles from Delphi was the job of the kings' agents, the Pythioi. One last point: it is true that the name Damothoidas will not naturally scan in an hexameter (K. p. 248), but that certainly does not prove that Rhianos did not mention Damothoidas in the Messeniaka. K. has judged the curious expression in Paus. 4.15.8 correctly, ἀμφατορίων τινι τε κατά ἐργον το 'Ηπείρον. The immediate source of Paus. here, a man of much industry and misguided ingenuity, determined to blend the narrative of Rhianos with an account of the Tyrritaos war. In Rhianos he found Lepreates fighting with Aristomenes against Sparta; in the account of the Tyrritaos war he found Lepreates fighting for Sparta out of hatred for the Eleians, who were then in fact opposed to Sparta. The result was the compromising statement that some of the Lepreates fought on behalf of Sparta in the Tyrritaos war. Kecklas has set a very high standard of historical criticism: we shall expect to follow his future writings closely. Would he care to set to work on early Elis, a neglected subject? His next book must have an index.

G. L. HUXLEY.


For a justifiably enthusiastic assessment of this excellent, concise and comprehensive introduction to the whole field of ancient history the reader may consult Walbank’s review of the first edition (JHS lxv 1950, 79). The third edition brings the text and bibliographies up to date by small additions where necessary. For example, short paragraphs have been inserted on the Dead Sea Scrolls (63) and Linear B (64 ff.). On the latter subject B. mentions the criticisms of the decipherment and issues a warning against unconsidered acceptance of its results.

The bibliographies bear witness to B.’s mastery of the literature, though the selection surprises occasionally. It is odd, for instance, not to find Andrewes, The Greek Tyrants, in the literature on Die ältere Tyrannis (178).

The needs of German students are no doubt met by the mixture of useful elementary information and thoroughly advanced ideas and bibliography. In England this mixture makes the book not perfectly suited to the needs of undergraduates, but for graduates it is ideal and indispensable.

A. J. GRAHAM.


This book is intended for American (or British) readers with no Greek. It provides an Introduction by the Editor, a short Reading List (books in English only), a map of the Eastern Mediterranean, and
excerpts in translation from the four Greek historians whose works are still extant, either completely or in large parts. Each section is preceded by a short biographical note which contains the little we know of the lives of the four men.

The Introduction is a brief, interesting and original contribution. In its twenty pages, Mr Finley discusses the work of the historians concerned and its intellectual background. Herodotus, whom we have learned to regard as more than a delightful storyteller, has been restored to his rightful place as pater historiarum, while certain limits of the genius of Thucydides are fairly stated. Not everything Finley says will meet with complete approval, but that is as it should be. On the other hand, I could have done without such words as editorialise and mythise which occur several times. ‘Mythic’, I suppose, is an Americanism, and the book was, after all, first published in the States and in Canada. Taken as a whole, the Introduction provides enjoyable reading. Perhaps a newcomer to the Classics may find a few difficulties in tracing and understanding the deeper issues. One minor criticism: Mytilene is constantly spelt Mitylene; that version sometimes, though rarely, occurs in our sources, but seems a mistake.

The excerpts include about 190 pages of Herodotus, 130 of Thucydides and 60 of either Xenophon and Polybius. That seems a reasonable distribution. The translations are slightly corrected versions of nineteenth-century works, of which Rawlinson’s Herodotus is perhaps the best. The selections—always at least one long narrative section and a number of shorter excerpts—are well chosen to give a fairly full impression of the authors; it would be senseless to suggest other passages which could have been taken just as well. We may, however, feel some doubts whether it is entirely satisfactory to confine the quotations from Xenophon to the Anabasis only; after all, he has written books of a historical nature even apart from the Hellenica, which Mr Finley holds beneath contempt, and they could have been used for some characteristic excerpts. Incidentally, the reader for whom the book is intended would hardly realise that the Cyrus of the Cyropaedia (p. 383) is not the Cyrus of the Anabasis (p. 381 f.).

VICTOR EHRENBERG.

BÉRARD (J.) L’expansion et la colonisation grecques jusqu’aux guerres médiques.

Jean Bérard died tragically and prematurely on July 21 1957. At the time he was engaged in writing a history of Greek colonisation. No book has been devoted to this subject since the early nineteenth century, and B.’s qualifications were ideal for such a task. We shall therefore always regret the loss of his finished work, but we must rejoice that it was so far advanced that it could be published, incomplete indeed, but without extensive editing.

The book was intended to go down to the morrow of Alexander’s conquests, as the opening chapter shows, but what we now have is, first, a chapter on the general character of Greek colonisation, in which B. rightly stresses that colonisation was constantly occurring throughout Greek history; secondly, a chapter on the first Greek migrations, those of the Bronze Age; thirdly, one on the migrations at the beginning of the Iron Age; and, finally, two chapters on the great colonising movement of the Archaic Period, which he divides at c. 675 B.C., not because he thinks that there was a single dividing moment, but in order to emphasise substantial differences between the early and later colonies within this epoch (see p. 60). A selection of texts in translation (‘Documents’) is appended.

Although the book is clearly intended for students and non-specialists, it has not the character of a textbook and will be read with profit by scholars too. For though B.’s judgement is in general very sober he never sits on the fence for the sake of doing so. The dominant feature of his work is his trust in and readiness to defend the literary tradition. For example he makes a powerful attack on the modern view that Athens’ part in the traditional account of the Ionian Migration was invented in connexion with the Athenian Empire (50 f.). This is not to imply that B. ignores other evidence; he has an enviable mastery of all the relevant material and especially the findings of archaeology. Although one may differ from his views on many controversial matters, he never conceals uncertainties and makes remarkably few errors. A small fault of wording on p. 107 suggests that the inscription SEG ix 3 is the source for the whole subsequent account of the foundation of Cyrene; but perhaps this is a misprint, for ‘d’après ces documents’ would be correct.

The task of editing has not been entirely well done. For example there is a glaring omission. Although the book is supposed to cover Greek colonisation down to c. 490 B.C., and although a large number of very minor descriptions are described, there is no mention at all in the appropriate chapter of the highly significant Corinthian colonisation in north-western Greece under the Cypselids. B. had presumably not written this section (his brief reference to the special character of these colonies on p. 14 shows his intention), but for the editors not to draw attention to such a gap is reprehensible. For some readers the footnotes will be difficult to use because no list of abbreviations is provided, and it is a serious fault for a book on Greek colonisation to contain no map.

But it would be wrong to end on a note of criticism when the dominant emotion should be gratitude that we have been given B.’s final thoughts on Greek colonisation.

A. J. GRAHAM.


More than half (pp. 13–191) of this book deals
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with the Persian Wars. Here N. maintains two theses:

(i) Literary: That ancient authors, except Herodotos, give a uniform account or 'vulgate'. This, though more concerned to explain the Persian defeat than to discover why the war was fought, sought the cause of the war in a desire of the Persians to expand their empire; it pretended that the Persian aim was to conquer the whole of Greece. Thus the 'vulgate' exalted the services which the Athenians had rendered to Greece; indeed it arose in Athens. Herodotos alone rejected the 'vulgate'. He made the first part of his work a systematic inquiry into the cause of the war. He maintained that the Persians recognised Asia as their proper domain (I, 4, 4) and had no desire for conquest in Europe (so the geographical passage in IV, 36, 2 ff. is not a digression but reasserts this thesis against the apparent contradiction provided by the Scythian expedition); the Persians only took an interest in Europe when individual Greeks, like Democedes and Aristogoras, provoked them to do so; and the Persian Wars were due to the provocation offered by Athens and Eretria during the Ionian Revolt. Herodotos brings his inquiry into causes to an end at the opening of the fighting, so from VI, 94 onwards he accepts the 'vulgate' uncritically.

(ii) Historical: That the Achaemnids, although they claimed to be 'kings of the four quarters of the earth', had a conception of natural frontiers; the Persians were not a seafaring nation and did not want to expand beyond the seas into Europe. So on conquering Asia Minor they did not try to preserve the relations which Croesos had developed with European Greece. The expedition of 490 was strictly punitive and was due to the provocation made by Athens and Eretria during the Ionian Revolt. In 480-479 the Persians tried to punish Athens, Eretria and those who sympathised with these; but in demanding earth and water they tried to exclude as many states as possible from the conflict, and this shows that they had no serious intention of conquering the whole of Greece.

On (i) note: (a) Herodotos says that his praise of Athens will incur criticism from most of mankind (VII, 139, 1); it follows that there was no pro-Athenian 'vulgate'. (b) The reason why extant sources other than Herodotos say little about the causes of the war is not that they follow a different theory but that they are much briefer (cf. p. 51). (c) It is true that Herodotos tries to explain every act of violence as retaliation for previous violence committed in the opposite direction (for extreme, and therefore probatory, examples see II, 139, 2 and III, 109, 2), but this need not exclude other motives—i.e. even though he finds 'the beginning of troubles' in Atheno-Eretrian intervention in the Ionian Revolt (V, 97, 3), he can without inconsistency treat the Persian crossing of the Hellespont as hybristic (VII, 56, 2, etc.). (d) Herodotos is not successfully systematic in tracing the chain of grievances that led up to the Persian Wars; he tries to extend it back to Democedes and to Croesos, as well as to Aristogoras. Indeed although N. complains briefly (p. 73; cf. p. 64) about 'la teoria dei logoi', and whatever may be thought about the views of De Sanctis and Powell, the less systematic but evolutionary Herodotos of Jacoby is a more credible figure.

On (ii) it might suffice to say that to talk about Greek provocation to Persia is like talking about a mouse provoking an elephant. Further, even granting that Dareios in 490 could distinguish Athenians and Eretrians from other Greeks, it should be observed that kings can remember or forget their grievances as suits them. If the Persians tried to conquer European Greece by a land-invasion, the real difficulty was commissariat; the sea-route was quicker but required control of bases, like Naxos, Carystos, Eretria and Athens—the places attacked in 490.

N. s ideas on two points concerning the Persian Wars deserve attention:

(i) The Scythian expedition. After examining other views, N. suggests that Dareios sought by a military demonstration to protect the frontiers against possible raids (pp. 144-53). This may be right.

(ii) The causes of the Ionian Revolt. Using Roebuck's figures, N. claims that population in Ionia had expanded appreciably beyond what local resources could support; people blamed the tyrants and Persian rule for the consequent economic decline (pp. 166-76). The fact that most Ionian cities let their tyrants go free (Hdt. V, 38, 1) tells against N.'s theory; and the Revolt may have been due simply to a change in the balance of power between rival political groups within the governing class in the various cities.

The other essays deal with the supposed treaty of 306 between Rome and Rhodes (pp. 195-212; N. convincingly explains Polyb. XXX, 5, 6 as alluding to the siege of Rhodes by Demetrius Poliorcetes), Alexander's western plans (pp. 215-57; N. defends authenticity of a plan for an expedition against the Carthaginians), the Roman embassy to Alexander (pp. 261-81; N. doubts it), 'imitatio Alexandri' in the 'Res Gestae Divi Augusti' (pp. 285-308), and Gaius and Lucius in the policy of Augustus (pp. 311-47; N. holds that Augustus tried to observe the republican principle of collegiality in choosing these two men as his successors). There is no index.

R. SEALEY.


This Festschrift has unusual homogeneity, since the publication of Documents has concentrated interest on the Anatolian and Aegean languages with which the distinguished scholar honoured had been fruit-
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fully concerned since 1911. Many of the articles provide interesting commentary on each other.

H. T. Bossert writes neatly on wooden tablets, distinguished by their handle from clay tablets from Uruk IVb onwards, with the Hieroglyphic Hittite wood-sign borrowed from Sumerian in the first half of Mill. III. He has also informative historic and modern parallels. For LM/LH III there is unfortunately little evidence, since Plutarch's story of the Tomb of Alcmena is dubious and the use of papyrus or skins cannot be wholly excluded. E. L. Bennett and N. Platon publish new hieroglyphic and Linear A inscriptions, and Sp. Marinatos an Eteocretan (?) inscription of c. 300 B.C. with three enigmatic signs. Problems of Linear A are discussed by P. Meriggi, H.-L. Stoltenberg, and E. Peruzzi, and by E. Grumach who uses his hypothesis to disprove Linear B phonetic values. If the logic is right, I should reverse the argument. Two other infidels are Jane E. Henle, who asserts that word and ideogram for sword cannot occur on the same tablet (a must-have-been like the official view on the eve of Pearl Harbour that the Japanese could not attack while the Russians held, on which Schachermeyr has some wise words, p. 370 ff.), and A. J. Beattie, who sets out to disprove the decipherment by the unsoundness of the 'spice' identifications and ends by using the unsoundness of the decipherment to explain away the identifications. S. Luria judiciously inculcates respect for ideograms and context, the probability that in similar contexts words with one sign in the stem different are either similar in sound or antithetic in meaning (e.g. 43-ke-u/34-ke-u, either ai/ai or tall/squat), and abhorrence of acrophonic explanations and reliance on names. His criticisms apply to many of the interpretations offered by V. Georgiev, V. Pisani keeps Aigeus, maker of tripod-cauldrons 'for mixing' or 'of Cretan style'. P. Chantaine rejects all suggestions for te-u-ta-ra-ko-ro, and tentatively finds a man's name. A. Tovar argues from his earlier identification pe-epo-po-epo, collector of madder, master-dyer, to a professional name Papyrii and 783 = qep, W. Merlinge usefully analyses the pairs 8/25 and 3/16, and K. D. Kistopoulos the case-endings. A. J. Van Windekens offers a Pelasgian origin for ἡκταριής, Τριτογένεα and Ρεχνος, and J. Chadwick a more factual list of Homerid parallels, which cross-fertilizes with words (εὐχαιρεῖ, δέρη) and customs in three Cypriote inscriptions of c. 400 published by T. B. Mitford. H. Bisantz finds Linear B signs on a Boeotian bowl of saec. V, on which A. D. Ure in BICS 6 has said all I meant to say. W. Brandenstein develops Bossert's account in Belletten 14 of the script and language of Paphiany Side.

G. Pugliese Carratelli convinces me that e-qe-ta was sacerdotal, perhaps connected with Poseidon; the objection is their presence among the troops, but from Calchas onwards priests have played their part in war. E-qe-ta appears again with religiones in F. J. Trirsch's important article on the women of Pylos, which disproves a number of convenient fallacies. Presence or absence of name or ideogram does not show social status, which must be extracted from what the tablet says. On this basis much of great interest emerges, especially the division of free women into a few certainly or probably concerned with cult and a large number of refugees from threatened areas in or outside Messenia, assigned progressively to emergency duties, the bath-attendants being V.A.Ds. 'Is it really surprising to find among the refugees Cythereans, Cnidian, Milesians, Chians and Lemnians?' I should reply that the collapse of the Hittites and the sea raids were so likely to uproot Mycenaeans settled at least in Cythera, Miletus and Chios, that Trirsch is overcautious in doubting the identifications with later places on the Asiatic side of the Aegean. This is a valuable contribution to the history of the Late Bronze Age, and emphasizes the need for synchronizations within Myc. III B. What was happening at Mycenae when the palace at Pylos was burnt? The pottery from the houses destroyed outside the walls looks rather earlier, and G. E. Mylonas has confirmed that the fortification of the E. acropolis was later. Trirsch accepts Peleia; M. S. Ruizperez makes a strong case for Persa = Persephone, with Pisa for Phleia and *82 = sa2. S. Alexiou suggests that the bird on the Idaean tripod appears also on the Oxford ring, on both diving to carry away a rower. I have re-examined the ring, and I cannot reconcile the mark with a bird; it is unidentifiable, but more like two objects, possibly a girl and a tree (?) L. Deroy derives lighting and pack-saddle from pre-Hellenic *astrapa, Paul Faure is sceptical and amusing about the Tomb of Zeus, and J. Puhvel introduces a short study of Helladic kingship and the gods with a warning, which should begin every discussion of Mycenaean society, against adding together philological apples and archaeological oranges.

F. Schachermeyr cautiously reaffirms that the balance of the evidence favours the identification the King of Achawa with the King of Mycenae; unfortunately Mellaart's advocacy of north-west Anatolia (AJA 62, 9 ff) and Page's of Rhodes (History and the Homeric Iliad, 1 ff) were just too late to be considered. H.G. Buchholz establishes a sequence of ingot forms, based both on shape and on change from incised to stamped signs. The Linear B ideogram is closest to the type of c. 1400. The view that on the CORSLET-tablets it is a unit of value has been much weakened by the discovery of a Myc. II/IIIA corset (BICS 7, 58, 65). Helga Reusch proves (in my opinion) the Minoan ancestry and connections of the Knossos Throne Room, and comes near to proving that the throne's occupant was not Priest King or Achaean conqueror, but the goddess personified by her priestess. At lowest she substitutes a reasoned case for assumptions. She might have added the Cyprus Procession Krater (AJA 62, pl. 99). In an article which should be widely read, I note name for frame, p. 354, Greifenhügel for -flügel p. 355, and archäischen for ach- p. 336. C. A. Blegen
suggests that the resemblances between the tablets from Knossos and the Mainland call for a re-examination of all the Knossos evidence, including Evans’s Note-books, to see if it is consistent with a date of c. 1200 for the Throne Room and the burnt palace to which the archives belonged. My chief reason for undertaking this review was to discuss this suggestion in the detail that it is important even if the full evidence is available. Finally, there are purely archaeological articles by G. E. Mylonas on the new Grave Circle at Mycenae, by H. Sulze on Mycenaean carpentry, and by Agnès Xenaki-Sakellariou on Minoan prism seals.

Rich and varied fare: it deserves an index.

D. H. F. Gray.


This little book is a critical summary of what is known, believed or conjectured about prehistoric Greece and Anatolia. Professor Severys places Homer in the ninth century and insists that the history of the preceding five hundred years is necessary for comprehension of the Iliad and Odyssey. He also thinks it desirable, for the same reasons, to include all developments in the eastern Mediterranean before the year 800. It is indeed a tour de force to have comprised so much in the limited number of pages prescribed by the publishers. There seems to be no aspect of Aegean archaeology, chronology, anthropology, ethnography or linguistic, which is not in some degree examined, the nature and content of the Linear B texts receiving detailed notice. S. accepts the published interpretations of these, but is careful here as elsewhere to inform his readers of the uncertainties involved, the documents having been written in imperfect script for people who understood their own language à demi-mot. Exigencies of space and consequent absence of references in footnotes sometimes obscure the reasons for decisions. In disputable matters on the Greek side the author’s conclusions are generally orthodox, but ‘northern Helladic’ is hardly an orthodox term for the Macedonian and Thracian regions, L.M. II tholoi are not only not unique at Knossos but are not yet known there, and no great Achaeen centre is known or likely to be known in Macedonia.

In Anatolia, where there is less orthodoxy and greater opportunity for conjecture, more statements of evidence or authority are needed. Some of the racial movements described there are indeed far-fetched: the Phrygians from the Middle Danube and across the Bosporus after the Trojan War, the Philistines from Illyria before the War, across the Hellespont to the Troad, where they left their Dardanian and Teurcian kinsfolk, thence ‘along the coast’ to Cilicia, where they awaited the moment for their only known migration down the Syrian coast to Palestine. Troy is represented as a meeting-place of migrant peoples: it is certainly a colliding-place of vagrant theories. The first invaders were the Indo-European Luvisians, ‘who may have been responsible for the fall of Troy II’. They were followed by the Hittites, who had recently parted company with the ‘Minyan’ ancestors of the Hellenes. Finally, the Troad with its dependencies was the kingdom of Ahhiyawa, and Troy VI was ‘almost a Mycenean colony’. The identity of the Minyan ware of Greece with the principal pottery of Troy VI has long been recognised (noted in detail by this reviewer in JHS of 1914), but the Hellenic–Hittite migration theory does not explain its presence in Greece. The kingdom of Arzawa is placed in Pamphylia, and its name displaces Arad in the Medinet Habu inscription of Rameses III. This looks like a wolf in sheep’s clothing, an ethnographical speculation incorporated in a historical text. In any case it calls for explanation. Theories of this kind are useful to the researcher, but perhaps misleading for the lecteur non spécialiste for whom the book is designed. That hypothetical personage might also be alarmed by the amplitude of the bibliography, some of which could take him very far away from the subject. It is recent and useful, but has some strange omissions. Nilsson and Schachermeyer are mentioned in the text but their books are not in this list. There are several references to the two grave-circles at Mycenae, but no mention of the publications by Karo and Mylonas.

John Forsdyke.


The main theme of this important book is the demonstration of what can be achieved by a technique developed very largely in one region when it is transferred to another. Although a major book has yet to be written on archaeological air photography in Britain, its methods and achievement are familiar enough to most of us. B., however, has broken the parochial barriers which sometimes seemed to restrict the practical application of aerial photography to Britain by showing that quite as much can be learned of the ancient topography of Mediterranean and Near-Eastern countries by this method. He treats his material in two main sections. In the first, he describes the different sorts of physical conditions which enable sites to be detected from the air, and details the ways and means whereby such sites, once found, may be recorded and interpreted. He makes clear the need for constant re-examination of the same site at different times and under different conditions in order to extract the utmost information from it. He also stresses the absolute necessity for subsequent
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Ground exploration of sites found from the air, and reminds us that there is a limit to the amount of knowledge to be obtained in these ways, and that most of the problems presented by such discoveries are answerable only by recourse to the spade.

The second half of the book contains a series of practical illustrations of the workings of the methods already described, drawn almost entirely from B.'s own work, notably on the remarkable series of Neolithic occupation sites in Apulia (of which he was the discoverer), on Etruscan cemeteries, and on centuriation in different parts of the Empire. However, this is by no means all, for there are heretofore by no means less important sections dealing with terraced field systems in Attica, with the plan of the Classical town of Rhodes, and with the complicated topography of Ostia. The record of personal achievement is most impressive, particularly when it is realised that B. has not only checked most of his finds on the ground, but has also made test excavations at several sites, particularly in Apulia. The very publication of so much new evidence would alone make the importance of the book outstanding.

The value of field exploration is sometimes glossed over in archaeological literature, where pride of place goes either to the excavation report, to type studies or works of synthesis. But the results of field survey, particularly of the quality that B. has achieved, deserve full recognition as an integral and essential factor in the task of building up an image of what the several parts of the ancient world were like, and how they worked, at different periods. By appreciating to the full the immense potential value of aerial survey and, further, by seeing that it works just as well abroad as it does at home, B. has surely made one of those great steps forward in his subject which it is granted to but few to make. B.'s lead deserves a wide following; if it is forthcoming, no branch of archaeology could have more to contribute to the intelligibility and coherence of archaeological knowledge, especially in the Mediterranean.

Finally, it must be said that Ancient Landscape is a beautifully produced book; the reproduction of the plates is good, and they are well chosen to demonstrate points made in the text.

H. W. Catling.


The Knossos area has been occupied from Neolithic times to the present day, and has been explored by archaeologists on and off for sixty years. It is a site which is important not only for the intrinsic interest of particular buildings, like the Minoan palace, but for the opportunity it gives to observe and interpret the history of the site from period to period. The Minoan remains were explored by Evans, but even for this period it has been impossible to get a good overall picture of occupation in the area. Most of the foreign schools in Greece have awakened in recent years to the necessity for proper publication of the major sites in their care, and this book at once gives an index to the excavations at Knossos, and lays bare how much has still to be presented of the discoveries, and how much has still to be discovered. The work of publication, as well as fresh excavation is being most capably carried on under Mr Hood's guidance.

A large folding map (1:5,000, surveyed by Mr Smollett) presents the whole area with the archaeological loci numbered. These are listed, with their full bibliography and minimal description. Here more dates would have been welcome. Three smaller maps, with a brief commentary, summarise what is known of the area in Minoan, Geometric and Archaic, Classical and Roman times. These show up the gaps in our knowledge of the site—notably of the Minoan and Greek town area, and of the nature of many of the Roman remains. Chance finds and further planned excavation can fill these gaps—and there is always the Unexplored Mansion which, dug with all the care of modern technique, might well supply the answers to many vexed questions about Minoan and Greek history in the Late Bronze Age. With this book Knossos becomes one of the best documented sites in Greece. It is wholly praiseworthy that at this stage of work the project for such a survey was prepared and has been completed and published so neatly.

John Boardman.


These volumes continue the publication of the German discoveries in the cemeteries of the Athenian Kerameikos. As explained in the Preface, the supplementary volume Kerameikos V 2, which is intended to deal with the scattered finds of tenth-eighth century Attic geometric pottery, and to discuss in general the cemeteries of this period, has been deferred. The present volumes contain the finds from the late eighth century down to the first quarter of the sixth (the large grave mound 'of the fifties of the sixth century', which overlay a portion of one of the two areas involved, is reserved for Kerameikos VII). They deal with the grave structures (i.e. the actual burials, both inhumations and cremations, and the surface structures above them) and provide a final publication and study of the Protocorinthian and Corinthian pottery found in them. The far more important Protoattic and Early Attic black-figured pottery has been reserved for Kerameikos VI, part 2, which appears to have progressed as far as the final organisation of the plates, to which references are given in the volumes under review. Some
account of these excavations was given in Arch. Anzeiger 1932–1943, and commented on by the present reviewer (in BSA xliv 170, and 254–7 added when AAI 1943 became available after the Second World War) and others (e.g. J. M. Cook, in his review in Gnomen 1951, 212–14, of Kübler’s Altattische Malerei (Tübingen, 1950) in which a good deal of the Protoattic was illustrated). For the final publication the graves and associated structures have been distinguished by a variety of numbers and Greek and Roman letters different from the original numbering in AAI: see the concordance in pp. 11–12 of the text volume.

As in the case of other excavations of which the publication has been deferred by the Second World War, publication of the Kerameikos finds has not been easy; the death of K. Gebauer, who took part in the excavations (the other participants being K. Kübler and W. Kraiker), the difficulty of identifying certain sherds, and the loss of some daybooks, plans and sketches must have made things difficult, especially in view of the fantastic complications of the site. As Kübler points out (Preface, 1) a good deal of the understanding and elucidating of the process of excavation had to depend on the recollections of the excavators. Furthermore conclusions drawn during the excavations had to be modified in the light of the completed work. As far as is humanly possible Kübler has contrived to put on record the details of the excavation and the close and complicated relations of the burial monuments. The general plan (Beilage 44) shows the position of the two areas under consideration: the one on the north side of the Eridanos, west of and not far from the Pompeion and the Dipylon Gate; the other south of the Eridanos in a triangle bounded by two ancient roads to the Piraeus and Eleusis respectively and modern Piraeus Street, on the former site of the Church of Hagia Triada. This latter excavation is set out in detail in Beilage 1, which makes clear, for the most part, the separate groups and superimposed structures of the period under treatment. Later structures are omitted: they could hardly be inserted on the same plan without producing an intolerable confusion, but it is a pity that the possibility of a transparent oversheet was not explored, bearing the outlines of later structures in different colours. This would have made the descriptions of the ‘Anlagen’ easier to understand. The letter forms used are sometimes a little difficult, and the omission of certain grave mounds is at first a little confusing until the reader consults the detailed plans and sections Beilagen 2–42. But no trouble has been spared: very abundant photographs (Plates 1–55) are provided of the complicated grave structures: the details present in the photographs are identified and made more comprehensible by a series of outline sketches included in the text volume.

It is impossible not to be impressed both by the excavators’ skill (some of the difficulties are made clear, pp. 6–7) and by the careful and detailed publication of the two sections of the cemetery, divided into Anlagen I–LXXVI. For the present reviewer the outstanding interest is the possible historical significance of the cemetery; the inhumations and cremations, and the relationship of the two practices (discussed by Kübler, pp. 80 ff., the curious Opferinnen (a misnomer occasionally perhaps by an earlier misunderstanding of their use, since they do not appear to have been ‘channels’ or ‘conduits’, and indeed are sometimes oddly placed in relation to the others elements with which they seem to be contemporary), and the very odd funeral procedure which the great length of some of them seems to suggest (pp. 87–8). The relationship and comparison of these Kerameikos ‘Grabanlagen’ with other cemeteries in and out of Attica, especially Vourva, Phaleron, Velanideza, and Vari are treated by Kübler in a chapter (95–104) of outstanding interest. The Kerameikos funeral monuments, like some of those in the countryside of Attica, obviously belonged to important individuals, possibly to important families. Unhappily they lack anything which can serve to link them with the early history of Athens as known from other sources, and to link them to each other (the state of the skeletal material seems to preclude any anatomical study). The question of the relationship, say within a family, of successive burials is of some importance since a major preoccupation of Kübler is with chronology (as in the preliminary publication in AAI: see the present reviewer’s remarks, loc. cit. 254–7): ultimately with the chronology of Protoattic pottery, immediately, in this volume, with that of Protocorinthian and Corinthian. Some of the grave structures are directly superimposed one on another (especially the grave mounds, Opferinnen and other tile structures), or overlap to a greater or less degree. Kübler thinks it is possible to draw chronological conclusions from this. Since there is evidence that some of the surface monuments were allowed to fall into decay, and in some cases were overlaid or overlapped in such fashion as would destroy the monumental character and ‘prestige’ value of those so affected, he has concluded that a certain lapse of time must be postulated between one grave monument, and therefore one burial, and another. This lapse of time must of necessity be a matter of subjective judgement; a generation, say thirty years, was originally postulated (see BSA xliv 256). In this final publication the periods intervening seem to be more liberally adjusted, and range from thirty to ten years, according to the degree of superimposition or overlap observed. This theory is used to obtain, through the associated pottery, a chronology of Protoattic, and also, ultimately of Protoattic and Early Attic black-figured pottery. In the original conclusions (AAI 1943) the divergence from Payne’s chronology was rather wide. This has now been readjusted (part of the reason given being the study of the excavation as a whole), and the results are such that the divergence is not now of great impor-
tance at any rate for Late Protocorinthian, Transitional, Early and Middle Corinthian styles, especially if the dating margins given, p. 120, are taken into account. Indeed, in some cases (cf. p. 116 on the relationship of Anlage XXV to XIX) a readjustment of Kübler's use of 30, 20 and 10 year intervals (the choice is subjective) would more or less give Payne's dates. An essential part of all this is the Protoattic and Early black-figured Attic pottery, which is of greater volume and importance. Since it is omitted from the volume under consideration a discussion of it is not relevant to this review even if the reviewer were qualified to undertake it (something is said about it in BSA, loc. cit.), but the total omission of illustrations of it is irritating, as e.g. the interesting b.f. aryballos, a close imitation of Corinthian, AA 1935, 207, fig. 7; worse still, the Attic koytle (Inv. 689) mentioned p. 122 in connexion with Anlage LX as following Middle Corinthian models, but nowhere illustrated apart from Kerameikos VI 2, which is yet to appear.

It is impossible to discuss in the space here available the Protocorinthian and Corinthian pottery in any detail. It must suffice to say that the confusion of burials, the later cutting into the earlier, with all the possibility of the mixing of associated objects, plus the character of the pottery (much of which is not easily dated) and its restricted quantity, make it difficult to regard this excavation as anything like important for the chronology of Protocorinthian and Corinthian, when the issue of dates is brought down to decades or half-decades. This is not the fault of the excavators who have done what they can. It is, however, abundantly clear that Kübler, in his account of the structures and the pottery, subjects his basic assumption to adjustments which cannot be wholly independent, in his mind, of the accepted chronology or some close approximation to it. The result is a series of datings, at any rate for LPC, Transitional, EC and MC, given in Kübler's full description of the pottery (pp. 124 ff.), with which the reviewer would be willing enough to agree, with the conviction that it would be foolish to dispute, for some of the pieces, margins of ten years one way or the other. The Protoattic and Early Attic black-figured pottery would help, stylistically, to counter-check the Protocorinthian and Corinthian: it is a pity that the pottery had to be published by categories rather than by 'Anlagen' groups. As for Kübler's general premises, it is as well that their application did not produce something grossly aberrant in the way of dating (as they might have done, if adjustments had not been made), since it would be easy to call them in question. Is the period of 'respect' for a grave somehow conditioned and shortened by the use of cremation rather than inhumation? What allowance must be made for the possibility of political reverses and declines? What if the blood-polluted Alkmeneids were here interred? How far did competition to secure a place in this prominent cemetery reduce respect for previous burials, especially if they belonged to the same family? Then there is always the question of the relationship of the date of manufacture of pottery to its deposition in a grave—a point of which Kübler is well aware. Not unconnected with this, perhaps, is his discussion (pp. 151—7) of the funereal significance of the pottery decoration. If it was made for this purpose, like some of the Protoattic, there is a certain likelihood, if no more, that its date of manufacture is not too far from the time when it was used at the grave. Each reader will have his own opinions of Kübler's interpretations. The reviewer, at any rate, is of the opinion that Kübler has grossly overdone his interpretation of the inner significance of horse-heads, sphinxes, lions, juxtaposition of animals, sacred tree motifs, rosettes and the rest. Are we really to take him seriously when he writes (p. 157): '... so leuchtet doch selbst noch aus den flüchtig aufgemalten 'Füll' Rosetten der Kanne Inv. 1927 ... wie aus deren Tierfriesen ein Lebensglanz, den man den Toten darbringen konnte'?

In terms of chronology, then, this Kerameikos material contributes little that is new, and Selinus and Smyrna still seem more important for Corinthian considered by itself; the association with Protoattic is another matter. Kerameikos VI 2 will be eagerly awaited. Meanwhile Kübler is to be congratulated on the meticulous publication of an excavation carried out with a skill worthy of the German School at its best. Few printing errors have been detected; p. 122, line 5, for Taf. 56, read 66.

R. J. HOPPER.


This is the first comprehensive account of a subject that has been tentatively discussed by many scholars. The author first enumerates the female figurines with raised hands executed on a rather large scale such as those from Prinias, Pangalokhori, Gazi, Karphi and the group found in 1957 at Gortyn, and secondly those on a small scale such as the examples from the shrine of the Double Axes at Knossos, from Zakro and Phaistos, and examples attached to vases such as those on the Keros at Kourtes. After a discussion of fragments which probably belong to similar figures the author reviews briefly the representations of similar figures on Minoan seals or vases, etc.

Alexiou then quotes various prototypes of this figure from MM I times onward from Phaistos, Mallia and Phylakopi, etc., notably that on the silver diadem from Syra which so exactly reproduces the Ψ form of Mycenaean figurines of a thousand years later. He rightly distinguishes between the figures that hold up empty hands and those that hold up attributes such as the snakes in the hands of the so-called priestess from the Temple Repositories (interpreted by Nilsson as the goddess and by Matz as
the Queen Priestess appearing as an incarnation of the goddess).

The MM I examples invalidate Professor Swindler's objection to deriving this type from Mesopotamia and Alexiou regards as certain the oriental derivation of the gesture, though it is also found in Egypt, sometimes even made by male deities. Here is the only weakness in the author's theory that the goddess with raised hands is invariably the same, and I suspect that the deity on the sarcophagus of Vatheianos Kambos may really be a God.

Students of Minoan religion are divided into those who follow Evans in regarding the varying representations of feminine deities in Minoan art as embodying various attributes of one great mother goddess and those who like Nilsson believe that the Minoans had several goddesses and endeavour to differentiate their functions. Alexiou follows Evans's theory, which was slightly modified by Marinatos, who speaks of 'an incomplete monotheism', and he strongly criticises Nilsson's theory that polytheism must be always earlier than monotheism, quoting Frankfurt's statement that the dedications on Mesopotamian seals of the third millennium B.C. 'are in many cases designations of one male and one female deity'.

An epilogue discusses the survival into the classical period of this Minoan goddess with raised hands, of which the most interesting is the Protogeometric shrine in Dr Gimelilaki's collection.

The groundwork for the study of Minoan religion has been well laid by scholars such as Evans, Pernier, Xanthoudides, Nilsson, Matz and Picard and the time is ripe for more detailed monographs such as the present thesis, and we may hope the author will follow it up with others on, let us say, Eileithyia or Britomartis or the Curetes.

R. W. Hutchinson.


The above-mentioned work is a comprehensive monograph on the Minoan double axe, its origin, distribution and significance and the decorative ornaments derived from it, and should be acquired by all libraries interested in Aegean art. In discussing the double axe 'in corpore' Buchholz discards five main types, I with rectangular profile, II the trapezoidal form with blades tapering towards the shaft, III the axe with concave upper and lower surfaces and usually with convex blades, IV the axe with straight upper and lower sides except at the ends where they broaden into convex blades and V the form with double blades each side. I is typologically early, IV and V late, while II and III might reasonably be placed in the middle of the series but the types overlap and I after its first appearance never dies out. Actually only type III has been found in an EM II context, while I and III cannot be quoted from deposits earlier than EM III.

Fifty-nine examples of axes or moulds of type I have been found in Crete as against 109 of III or forms intermediate between III and IV, 4 of II, 9 of IV and only 1 (the mould from Seteia) of type V. The type II axe from Kythnos (the only omission I have noted in Buchholz' otherwise excellent catalogue) is rather an interesting example. It has a slightly oval shaft-hole and is one of a hoard of what appears to be a group of carpenter's tools including one shaft-hole knob-hammer axe, a plain, single-bladed shaft-hole axe, one miniature axe-adze, an adze and a chisel. The worn condition of the double axe (especially one blade) is evidence that this was a work-a-day tool and not here a sacred emblem, whatever it may have been elsewhere. The distinction between cult and work-a-day axes is sometimes hard to draw, especially as tools made for working may sometimes have been used in shrines. All types except V were suitable for practical purposes but we may class as religious emblems all examples in gold, silver or lead and all that were too large or too small for practical use. A small double axe in iron in shape resembling Buchholz' type I and of uncertain date, but I think genuine, was formerly in the Selman collection in Cambridge, may be quoted here and if genuine added to Buchholz' catalogue.

The axe symbols in the linear scripts and also those painted on vases regularly reproduce the forms of type III but Late Helladic I vases also exhibit two degenerations, unknown in Crete, of this form, a 'mussel shell type' and another where the central part of the double axe has been thinned almost to a line. Late Minoan reproductions of type V, which first appeared on MM III frescoes, are shown as cult emblems on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus and on the LM III B steatite mould from Seteia.

The cult double axes were often decorated with incised designs usually linear but including such exotic ornaments as the lion on the axe from Mallia, the boar's tusk helmet on the one in the Gimelilaki collection, and the butterfly on the example from Platanos.

Against Nilsson's theory that the double axe was primarily the weapon with which the priest slew the sacred ox Buchholz objects, justifiably I think, that the connexion between bull and axe seems late and secondary and that the double axe is originally a symbol of the great goddess. The oldest representation of the double axe hanging from its handle is on a MM I vase and not till MM III times does it appear associated with a bucranium. Its association with the sacred knot is also comparatively late, but as a symbol of the goddess Innini it appears in Mesopotamia in Early Sumerian times. 'Late forms of the Cretan double axe cult', says the author, 'will only be misleading, significant for the use of the double axe in the early period is its identity with a feminine deity.'

On the mainland the double axe symbol is sometimes altered almost beyond recognition; the
examples in gold leaf or on gems from the Peloponnesian Buchholz regards as Cretan imports, and if this be accepted there is little evidence in the Peloponnesian for the evidence of a double axe cult except the gypsum base from Mycenae, since there are no examples of its use in sacred caves or household chapels.

The author discusses and rightly rejects any derivation of the double axe from the series of Nordic battle axes. In Egypt the double axe occurs very early both as a sacred emblem in the form of the Predynastic flint amulet in the British Museum and as a weapon on the lion-hunt palette. Newberry even translated a certain Fifth Dynasty title as ‘Khetpries of the Double Axe’. But the palette in question and certain rock drawings of this sign in the Wadi Hammamat have been supposed to indicate West Asiatic influence, and it is in the ‘Fertile Crescent’ that we find the earliest examples such as the amulets from Chagar Bazar and Arpachiyah and the symmetrical double axe in basalt from the latter site. To bridge the gap between Mesopotamia and Crete there are infrequent but scattered examples from Asia Minor, in stone from Ahlat Libel and Troy, in copper from Amasya, and representations of such weapons from Boghaz Koi and district.

The monograph ends with a comprehensive catalogue of double axes in Crete and adjacent countries and thirteen plates of linear drawings.

R. W. Hutchinsion.

**Thasos. L’agora, fasc. 1, par R. Martin.**


My only serious complaint about this book is that it is not big enough, I mean that M. Martin was not able to include more of the agora of Thasos, one of the most interesting of agoras, within its covers. It is quite a slim volume, devoted entirely to two buildings, the North-West Stoa and the ‘Édifice à Paraskénia’, after a brief introduction on the history of the investigation of the site.

Martin has done as much as any man for our understanding of the nature and form of the Greek agora, and of its constituent parts. He says much in this book which supplements and illustrates his previous work; he is repeatedly drawn into discussion of the planning of the Thasian agora and its relation to the rest of the city, as for example in the short section which he inserts between the two main chapters, on the North-West Propylaia, which formed a monumental approach from the harbour, and which belonged to the South-West Stoa even more closely than to the North-West. Martin promises a comprehensive treatment in the final stages of the publication; one would have welcomed something more on account, a concise general treatment providing a frame in which the various elements would then take their place. However, one can turn to his terse description in *L’Agora de Grecque*, pp. 390–1, though this now has to be modified at some points; and good up-to-date plans are given of the site as it is and as it can now be restored, besides a vivid restored plan of the whole of the city of Thasos.

Martin’s descriptions are full and clear; the plans, drawings and photos are excellent. In restoring the buildings from very scanty remains Martin proceeds with all caution. He notes ‘comme le caprice de la fouille est grand’ (p. 75). In his revised reconstruction of the winged stoa he illustrates the dangers of drawing negative conclusions from negative evidence, in this case the paucity of fragments of columns; on the other hand a single block can go a very long way, when it is ‘un bloc faîtier du cheneau rampant’ (p. 80).

The North-West Stoa, a Doric building of marble, 97 m. long and nearly 14 m. deep, takes its place among the great monumental stoas with a terrace in front. Martin expected and looked carefully for traces of interior supports, but was finally forced to the conclusion that there were none. ‘La charpente de la stoa exigeait une consommation de bois que seule la situation de Thasos—in the Macedonian sphere—peut expliquer’ (p. 44; the roofing of the other building too, as he restores it, was prodigal in the use of heavy timber, p. 83).

For several bays at either end the intercolumniations were filled by a wall probably surmounted by a grille. Martin suggests that the stoa was used for commercial purposes, and that the enclosed portions may have been the offices of harbour-magistrates, agoranomoi or such-like.

The stoa was carefully constructed, the work progressing from the middle outwards, according to Martin’s observations. Effective precautions were taken against shifting of the foundations on ground which was ‘meuble et humide’. The stylobate has curvature as in the South Stoa at Corinth.

The architectural style and the proportions of the order lead Martin to date the stoa at the turn of the fourth and third centuries B.C., and the archaeological evidence is not against this. ‘Cet édifice paraît se situer au tournant des traditions classiques et des procédés hellénistiques.’

By contrast, the ‘édifice à paraskénia’ is a miniature Stoa Basileios, 21.5 m. by 9.3 m. maximum depth. The most important feature of Martin’s careful reconstruction is that he establishes almost beyond doubt that not only the central portion, but also the projecting wings, which formerly were generally thought to have solid walls, had Doric colonnades. ‘Suivant une règle constatée sur d’autres édifices du même type, en particulier à la stoa Basileios, les ailes sont traitées comme un motif indépendant, tétrastryle, obéissant aux règles classiques de l’ordre’ (p. 80). Martin dates the building tentatively in the second half of the fourth century B.C.; it replaced an earlier building, simpler but with a monumental entrance.

Martin suggests that the ‘édifice à paraskénia’ was
similar not only in form but in function to the Basileios, that is, it served political and judicial purposes. (He has always believed that the North-West stoa in the Athenian agora is both the Stoas of Zeus and the Basileios, and in this he can now be reassured by Vanderpool's recent investigations of the streets in this area, Hesperia xxviii, p. 289.) Blocks from the building re-used in paving the later Basilica, and inscribed with lists of archons, confirm his theory. But perhaps he pushes the Athenian analogy too far (p. 88). He finds good reasons to identify the enclosure and small shrine in the north-eastern part of the Thasian agora, not far from the winged stoa, as belonging to Zeus Agoraioi; but his association of Zeus Agoraioi with the Stoas Basileioi at Athens is more questionable. We shall no doubt hear more of these problems in the succeeding volumes; one's expectation is sharpened.

R. E. Wycherley.


'This volume,' says Professor Lehmann in the foreword, 'is at its very core a source in a series which will be published the results of the excavations carried out in Samothrace by the Archaeological Research Fund Expedition of the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University.' Volume 2, in two parts, deals with Inscriptions on Stone and Inscriptions on Ceramics and Minor Objects. A series of volumes on the principal monuments and sites is to follow; Professor Lehmann announces that in each of these topographically arranged volumes all the important finds made in a specific area, of whatever kind, are to be included—it will be interesting to see how this method of publication works out. Finally there will be a volume (9) on 'The History and Religion of the Sanctuary of the Great Gods.' The series is sponsored by the Bollingen Foundation.

The collection of literary sources contained in the present volume was begun by Professor Lehmann himself—he remarks in the foreword, 'The written statements of ancient authors provide the firm foundation of all archaeological work in Greece'—completed and edited by Professor Naphtali Lewis. One will best be able to use the book and appreciate the value of Professor Lewis's labours when the other volumes, especially the last, have appeared. Meanwhile Volume 2 provides a mass of material not only on the sanctuary and the cult but on the island generally, and indeed on Greek mythology and religion.

The book is beautifully printed and the lay-out is lavish of space. An excellent photograph of the site is included, and a map of Samothrace from L'Egeo Redivivo by F. Piacenza, 1688; Lewis includes an appendix on the mysterious authority 'Nicostratus' quoted by this writer.

The material is organised under three main headings, with subdivisions: 1. Physical and Economic Geography. 2. The Island and Sanctuary in Legend and History (King Perseus provides the most dramatic episode). 3. Religion of the Sanctuary (origin of the cult; the various deities involved; Cabiri, Corybantes, Dactylis, etc.; Roman syncretisms—Lares, Castor and Pollux, Penates, Great Gods; fame and influence of the cult; its characteristics and attributes). Lewis would be the first to admit that these divisions are very artificial. Many of the testimonia fall equally well under several headings. 94 (Herodotus on the Thasian mines) might have been better in the geographical section; 193 ff. (Philip and Olympias, Lucullus, etc.) in the historical. Lewis makes great efforts to overcome the difficulty by means of copious cross-references. But the reader too still has to work hard at times. For example, to investigate the fascinating variety of names given to the island (Leucosia, Leucania, Saos, Melite, Thracia, Dardania, etc.) one has to pursue research beyond the section devoted to the subject; and there is no comprehensive entry in the index. Brief synopses of the information on various topics would have been welcome. One looks forward all the more eagerly to the publication of Volume 9. Discussion of much of the material presented here can best be deferred till then.

Within the sections too the arrangement of material calls for ingenuity and compromise. 'The texts are presented', says Lewis in the preface, 'in a general chronological sequence, which is interrupted at times, however, by the juxtaposition of intimately related sources'. He gives relevant critical notes, and places careful translations alongside the text, thus providing 'the most succinct form of interpretation' and reducing the need for explanatory footnotes to a minimum. For some authors the translations are adapted from the Loeb—in a specialised work of this kind it is often unsafe to adopt a translation made for general purposes.

Lewis has spread his net very widely in classical and Byzantine literature and its mesh is very fine, as it should be. He is generous in the amount which he quotes. Inevitably there is much that is repetitive, though one should bear in mind that it is dangerous to assume that slight variations on learned notes are without significance. Some items do not tell us much (13, 'Samothrace—an island in the Aegean Sea'); some are curious rather than helpful (24 ff. and 133, Samothracian onions; 137, the gentleman of Samothrace who grew teeth at 104; 139, the Samothracian name for Thursday). The texts give very little precise information about the buildings and monuments.

The book is thoroughly indexed, though one would welcome further analysis of some of the long entries under Greek and Latin names and Notabilia. Index 1 (Sources) and Index 2 (Authors) might well
have been combined into a complete index locorum, and one would have been grateful for a little information, if only dates, about the many very obscure authors in Index 2, many of whom remain mere names which one has never heard of. Editions, too, might have been mentioned.

These are minor criticisms, made in full knowledge that to collect and handle a mass of source material of this kind is a formidable task. Professor Lewis has done his part with great thoroughness and presented the results in a most impressive form.

R. E. Wyckerley.


The latter work, on the origins and early history of the Delian sanctuary, was inspired by the author's discoveries at the Artemision in 1946. It is intended first to synthesise the investigations begun in 1878 by Homolle into what Picard noted as the 'passé légendaire' of Delos. The work, which is dedicated to the memory of Courby, is divided into three parts.

The first traces the evolution of Delos in pre-Hellenic times from the first human settlement on Mt. Cynthus (end of the third millennium), discovered by A. Plassart, to the development of the 'villages' of the plain in the late Bronze Age. Barren as the little island was, it had fresh water, acquired from wells, and offered shelter for shipping. The primitive inhabitants of Cynthus were perhaps fishermen or pirates, or both; they sought security in their hill dwelling. If subsequently Cynthus was abandoned—as the northern Cyclades are alleged to have been—there remains the difficulty of accounting for the Hyperborean tombs and the pre-Artemision, which would appear to imply the presence of deities, and for which the author accepts a pre-Mycenean origin (2000-1500). Evidence for Mycenaean settlements is provided by sherds, notably on the site of the future precinct of Apollo, where was traced an agglomeration of human dwellings and cult-sites. The author notes possible evidence of an Aegean 'palace', rejected by Courby. There is evidence in the inhabited area of a drainage system or possibly a canalisation for the conservation of water, such as was employed in the Hellenistic period. There is evidence for the religious life of the period in the existence of five sacred monuments, the primitive pre-Artemision, two other temples (I' and H), as well as the famous Hyperborean 'tomb', the Theke and the Sema seen by Herodotus, to which presumably veneration was accorded. The pre-Artemision (Ac) is distinguished not only by the richness of the foundation offerings of gold, ivory and bronze (found in 1928 and 1946) but by the solidity of its walls and the originality of its plan; it appears to be the most ancient recinline building on Delos and prototype of the classical hieron to come. The fragments of Mycenaean pottery found on the lowest level everywhere belong mainly to the late Bronze Age, and it is arguable that Delos had an upsurge of prosperity towards the end of the second millennium, a prosperity geared, as at other Aegean sites, to the economic supremacy of the Mycenaean continent. M. de Santerre thinks that in the present state of our knowledge the Mycenaean sanctuary of Delos appears superior to all the others in Greece; the Mycenaean town as such yields place among the island sites only to Phylacopi. This town was formed by an agglomeration of inhabited areas near the harbour, which was already of importance; perhaps the growing importance of such a rocky island was not due to economic causes alone.

Part II is devoted to an examination of the origins of the Delian cults. The initial difficulty is that archaeology indicates that the oldest known temples were in the plain near the harbour, while the oldest literary tradition associates Mt. Cynthus and the upper valley of the Inopus with the most sacred episodes of the Apolline legend. Topographical uncertainty overhangs both the Horned Altar and the famous palm tree. Theogonis, it is true, associates the birth of Apollo not only with the palm tree, but also the wheel-shaped lake (Herod. II, 170), and he makes no mention of Cynthus. It would be tempting to regard with E. Bethe the temple of Leto as the oldest cult-temple of Delos and scene of the birth; but no pre-Hellenic remains have been found at the lake, and the Letoon cannot be associated with the lake before the archaic period. The famous Cave of Cynthus is not primitive, but of Ptolemaic date, as Plassart showed. Though he may bear the epithet Cynthus in later times, Apollo has no definite location on Cynthus, whereas Leto and Artemis were early located in the plain.

In a chapter (VIII) devoted to the Apolline triad M. de Santerre points to Cretan and oriental influences—tree worship included—in the cult of the pre-Artemis. Offerings on the spot would appear to indicate a goddess of war and the chase, not, however, the virgin huntress of classical fame, but a goddess associated with Dionysus, as elsewhere in the Aegean. This primitive Artemis seems to have come late into association with her 'brother' Apollo, who, whatever his ultimate origins, came immediately from Asia to Delos. There is no hint of fierce rivalry between Apollo and the established goddess, whose rich hoard he cannot parallel. Nor if the edifice I' is Apollo's first temple in his precinct are its successors built on the same site, as is the case for the Artemision. Where so much is conjectural it is noteworthy that at Claros too an older female goddess (Earth) was supplanted by Apollo. As to Leto, her temple site was unknown till in 1929 R. Vallois found it (see below). E. Bethe argued
that Leto had an outstanding place in the Delian religion of primitive and archaic times; certainly temple and temenos remained independent of the great Apolline precinct throughout Delian history, whereas Artemis declined as Apollo advanced. What seems indisputable is that some female power, some Mediterranean mother-goddess, reigned first in Delos, with whom are associated minor female deities (cf. Hymn to Apollo, 92-7), and perhaps a male assessor, son or lover; the Hellenic Apollo was comparatively a latecomer to Delos. The author, in dealing next with the other gods and the godlets known to Delian records and myth, suggests that the Hyperborean Maidens were ancient local goddesses dethroned.

Part III deals with Delos in the geometric and archaic periods. The proteogoeometric period is obscure everywhere. The name of Delos is significantly absent from the Iliad, there is one important reference in the Odyssey. Archaeological evidence points to a continuing, if impoverished, occupation of the island. But sherds of the geometric and archaic periods are found almost everywhere, those of the former period being the most numerous. The ninth and eighth centuries are centuries of development: the great mole is built, and new temples; a new ‘village’ arises in the region of the future Theatre Quarter, there being four chief inhabited areas in the geometric period. Now the cult of Apollo expands: witness the Colossus of the Naxians, and the Porinos Naos. The Delian festival is described in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (c. 700 b.c.). Archaeology attests the growing splendour too of the cult of Artemis and of Leto (whose temple Vallois dated c. 540). And apart from the Apolline triad, to the early archaic period belongs the Heraion A of Cythous (c. 700) and other sanctuaries of secondary gods and heroes. The last two chapters assemble the archaeological, literary and historical evidence from which the commercial, political and religious relations of Delos with her ambitious neighbours, notably Naxos, Samos and Athens, may be determined. Delos was now famous; from about 550 town planning was imperative.

In this volume the author has realised the intention expressed in the foreword—to be as comprehensive as possible. None of the problems (some are insoluble) has been neglected, and his reassessment of evidence is stimulating. The documentation is impressive and there is plenty of visual aid. From a conspectus of the centuries M. de Santerre turns to a limited archaeological field in his next work. This handsome volume, No. xxiv of the Exploration archéologique de Delos, includes the most famous feature of Delos and one of its most puzzling buildings. The lions were not visible above ground after the visit of Stuart and Revett in 1753. Some fragments were found in the later nineteenth century, but it was not till 1905 that the first almost intact lion was discovered. The lions, all male, each sculpted along with the plinth, from one block of Naxian marble, were set up in a row parallel to the oldest retaining wall of the terrace and facing the famous lake. Today there are four in evidence; a fifth reposes now (with modern head) at the Arsenal at Venice; but from the evidence of fragmentary plinths it seems clear that in antiquity there were nine at least (Leroux). Lions guarded doors and roads, in double array, but here is a single row, because the pilgrims landed originally at the north-west (Bay of Skardana) and approached, between the lions and the sacred lake, the shrine of the mother of Apollo, Leto, who was πόταμος θηρίου. The author considers that all the statues are from the same workshop, and were set up according to a scheme (reflecting Naxian pretensions) about 600 b.c., that is, some half century before the construction of the Letoon. The time-lag can be explained, he says, by ‘la lenteur des réalisations architecturales d’une telle ampleur’. Up to the end of antiquity the terrace underwent only minor modifications, but when the pilgrims to Apollo’s temple landed further south at the Sacred Harbour, the terrace lost its importance as a dromos and became a kind of open space.

A marble bench runs around the Letoon, hence the building was known as the ‘temple à banquettes’, or ‘édifice à bancs’, before Vallois, relying on the evidence of Strabo, identified it in 1929. (His identification was confirmed by an inscription discovered the following year.) Investigations carried out by the author in 1947 made it clear that no older edifice had stood on the site. The cult statue of the goddess was a wooden xoanon, the goddess being seated on a wooden throne; the base existing in the middle of the cela is of such a size as to indicate that the statue was of imposing proportions. From architectural details and the evidence of sherds the temple is presumed to have been built in the middle of the sixth century. The temple is well known in plan, scarcely at all in elevation. To the south of the cela was a vestibule, which Vallois thought was hypaethral, the site possibly of the altar of Leto; but the partition wall of later date makes this unlikely. It is probable that a sloping roof covered at least the cela, with pediments to north and south, adorned by cornices. Apparently the surface of the surrounding bench was used by loungers as a kind of lusoria tabula—there are graffiti too on some of the lion plinths. The fame of the Letoon in archaic times is certain, but the glory of Leto, as of Artemis, bowed to that of Apollo. Courby noted that the temple is scarcely mentioned in the archives of the fourth and third centuries. The Portico of Antigonos (253-248), closed on the side facing the Letoon, open to the hiron of Apollo, effectually separated the sanctuaries of mother and son. And it was hemmed in to the east by the vast Agora of the Italians, to the west by the so-called ‘Monument de grani’. This last building, one of the biggest ruins of Delos, derived its name from the fact that its external walls are principally of granite. It is isolated from its neighbours on all sides. The ground floor consists of
eighteen independent rooms or compartments (shops?), some of which have a kind of extension room behind. There is a south façade, with enormous blocks of granite at the angles. Inner walls are ashlar (gneiss). There is no trace of cement. A deep covered cistern lies below the only linked two compartments. One narrow compartment is in effect a vestibule, with staircase to an upper storey, its trace showing on the white glaze of the wall. This upper storey, as in other Delian buildings, was the piano nobile containing the chief rooms. The walls are of poros, in some cases stuccoed. The roof was a terrace, whence the rain water was conducted to the cistern. The purpose of this building is still unknown. It is rich in columns but has no peristyle. Fragments of mosaic and of mural paintings from the upper floor suggest a private house; but what private house required such a façade? Santerre suggests, as Holleaux, Roussel, Picard and others have done, that it was a place of reunion, as were the great building of the Poseidoniasae near by and the Agora of the Italians—visiblement inspiré par le même urbainisme'. It has no sculptural, ceramic or epigraphic remains of any marked importance. The confusion of the ruins suggests that the building was suddenly abandoned after catastrophe, perhaps in 88 or 69 B.C.

This volume is enriched by many drawings, photographs and appendices, and is produced with the elegance and accuracy one has come to expect in this series.

W. A. LAIDLAW.


French scholars have acquired a well-merited reputation for their painstaking, methodical studies of individual Greek buildings. A book such as this must therefore be judged by the most exacting standards. Its subject, too, is one that badly needs exact scrutiny. Scholars like Miss Broechner have sought to cast doubt on the normal, natural interpretation of the plans of Roman Thermæ. So a search into their origins, in later Hellenistic bath-buildings, would be very timely. Ginouvès is prompted to attempt this, among much else, by the bath-building he has recently excavated in the Asklepieion at Gortys, that remote Arcadian city near the modern Karytaena. His description is, on the whole, detailed in the admirable way that we have come to expect. We are given all the main dimensions—admittedly not very elegant—in terms of a local foot, of 0·301 m., that is not Dinsmoor’s. We learn from which end a certain course was laid (p. 10), and whether some stones were cut before being laid (p. 43). It is in dating and interpretation that this book seems so open to criticism.

The sanctuary lies well below the city and just west of the gorge of the R. Lousios. The bath-building forms an isolated ‘complex’, of roughly square plan, north of the small temple and south of the unfinished large temple. It was entered from its eastern side. Ginouvès divides its history into three phases. In the first it was a rather large example—about 18 x 16 m.—of a plan well known at Gortys, the square house with rectangular rooms and a long court down the centre. It was perhaps already used as a bath; for the main conduit carefully avoids the large temple, and so should date from this phase.

In the second phase, it largely assumed its present form. The new inner walls were erected on ground-courses of blocks robbed from the unfinished large temple. The largest room, about nine metres by seven, was the central rotunda, built over the old court. It had apses to east and west and a rectangular bathing-alcove on the north, and served mainly as a ‘concours’ for waiting bathers. Beyond its north-west corner was the subterranean furnace, the hot gases from which, after skirting the south side of a circular room with nine niches and tubs, ran eastwards to a hypocaust beneath the circular ‘laconicum’ (dry sweating-room) and thence under the east apse of the large rotunda and the north apse of the south-east room (perhaps the undressing-room). A vent was contrived north of the laconicum, and a final large chimney beside the south-east room. There was only one suite of rooms, as in the Imperial Thermæ. Water ran to the large rotunda and the circular bath-room, but the only known waste-pipe was unimportant—at the building’s south-west corner. The building technique is Hellenistic. The jambs of the niches in the circular bath-room lean inwards, as did the embrasures of the apses off the large rotunda. The arch that framed each apse was curved to follow the circumference of the main rotunda, and each apse was struck from a centre on this arch. The main dome and the apsidal vaults were of light rubble, and the floors near the furnace were of that excellent insulator, pumice. A portico and its back-wall were added to the block’s east façade, four degrees off the proper alignment. It was walled in, with engaged Ionic half-columns externally, but had a large door in the centre. According to Ginouvès, it was of re-used blocks, and was thrown out of true (how?) by the awkwardness of the site.

In the third phase the subterranean furnace, which had collapsed, was replaced by another above ground-level, and the north-west corner of the baths was patched up in consequence, on a rather pinched plan. Some time later the building was deserted and the site unoccupied until the fourth century A.D., when one or two houses were built for private owners—of remarkable wealth, if we are to judge from their coin-hoards.

Ginouvès dates the apogee of the city, the beginning of the large temple and the rectangular house to the mid-fourth century, the beginning of the second phase to the earlier third century, the altera-
tion of the hypocaust to ε. 100 B.C., and the desertion of the baths to the early first century A.D. Can one really believe that so developed a plan, with three different rotundas, two, at least, very complex, goes back in so remote a place to the early third century? Would we find arches of cut stone on a curved plan much before the second, even in advanced cities? Was Gortys so far ahead of Olympia, where (Ginouès, p. 166) a developed hypocaust-system is not found before the first century B.C.?

Ginouès' date seems to me best supported by the portico. I do not believe that this re-uses blocks carved earlier. For each ante is returned for a few inches on its own west side, and this, despite Ginouès (p. 108), is just what is needed here to give the portico a neat boundary, where it meets the main building at an angle. Again, it probably resembled the early Hellenistic tombs of Macedonia more closely than it does in Ginouès' restoration, Fig. 18. For he seems to make the door too narrow, and to let it float between the columns. He has to narrow it to about 3 ft. 6 in., probably because of the strangely small bearing-surface (about 9 in.) that he allows for the lintel. He must surely have misunderstood the block, no. 271. With a door-opening of about ten feet by five, tied artistically to the main order, he could obtain an effect far closer to the Macedonian tombs and the fourth-century Propyla at Labraunda (Jeppe, plate XXI). However, the detailing might show this portico is quite late. It reminds me, in some things, of the Corinthian entrance to the Stadium at Olympia (Olympia, Bauten, plate 48). So I am not prepared to dogmatise.

On pp. 135-9 Ginouès gives a long table of coins found. But it is useless at present. There are no pictures and no references to the coin-types of the standard manuals. And the stratification, of course, is much disturbed. Even when T. Reekmans publishes the coins properly—in a separate 'fascicle', alas!—they may prove little. For they seem undatably local—there is only one of Athens, none of Macedon or Rome—and presumably in the half-century before Augustus the Arcadians traded with coins struck long ago. I see nothing compelling in the pottery evidence, although admittedly not qualified to judge it. Finally, the Hellenistic bath-buildings collected on pp. 156 ff. all seem simpler than ours.

Speaking of rotundas, Ginouès (p. 130) refers Cratinus' expression ϕιλαι βαλανιωραλοι to the appearance of 'les tambours et les voutes' of the tholoi in some Athenian baths, shooting up through more ordinary surrounding roofs. How would these recall ϕιλαι mesomφαλοι?

Timarchos says (Athenaeus 501 f.): τα πλείστα τούς Αθηναίων βαλανιωροι κελληνοι ταῖς κατασκευαῖς πόλεις, όποιοι εξαρχουες ἔχει κατὰ μέσων, ἑρ' ὠ τοις ψυχοῦς ὀρμανοῦς ἐπεστε. The outflow in the centre, which should have existed at Gortys in Room G, is very apparent in the Italian's Bath on Delos (Delos XIX, plates 18/19). A bronze omphalos above this would give the interior a close resemblance to the ϕιλαι mesomφαλοι. The roof would be irrelevant.

I can complain of few omissions. The book is even too long and detailed. But one could have done with a proper restored drawing of the vaulted roofs. There are very few misprints. On p. 139 in note 5 for 'Corinth IV, i' read 'Corinth IV, 2'. In several places, including p. 100, third line from foot, the large rotunda 'C' is printed as 'G'. There are two faults in the production. (1) The scales on the drawings are too short, so that it is difficult to measure anything. (2) The two plans at the back do not unfold clear of the text, so that one turns backwards and forwards, with increasing fury, several times at every page.

Hugh Plokker.


One of the heartening things about modern aesthetics is their desertion of functionalism, the theory that we need worry only about the practical use of things, and their beauty will look after itself. It has been very popular, because by it the practically-minded capitalist or committee-man has a moral right to the last word on every design. But the dissal doctrine is now on the way out. Cornell, in the book under review, sees that architects must have both a practical and a humane side, and believes that specifically artistic work exists, i.e. work artistic in intention. He is also prepared to study Classical buildings, because they recognise more steadily than others the many-sided nature of architecture. So he is on the side of the angels.

How effectively does he fight?

A building, he says, will be seen to the full, only if we see its practical and aesthetic aspects as integrated. Architecture is practical reality aesthetically organised. One facet of this organisation is the manner in which the most obvious approaches and entrances to a building are made to serve our aesthetic appreciation of it, which, with a building, is best defined as 'taking possession': for it is depth which is the most strongly-felt dimension in architecture, and interiors in which our enjoyment of buildings must find its consummation. Another facet is the manner in which practical, constructive symbols, the initial language of architecture, can be developed and transcended, blended with the figure-arts or arranged so as to suggest the human activities that a building will subserve. Hence, too, the exterior will be more practical ('tectonic') in appearance, the interior offer a readier field for pure solid geometry ('stereotomy'). So once again we reach fulfilment in the interior, although, admittedly, a fulfilment for which the façade should have prepared us.

According to Cornell, the Pantheon is the oldest
NOTICES OF BOOKS

building in which exterior and interior were so co-
ordinated. For, up to the mid-fifth century B.C.,
architects thought quite separately of (1) exterior,
(2) interior, and (3) outdoor enclosed space. The
early Doric temple is a perfect example of a building
that is all exterior, the Treasury of Atreus of an
immutable, stereotomic interior thought of as a
closed universe, the Great Court of Knossos of a
self-centred, closed outdoor space. The Parthenon
begins to have an interior with its own life, not
wholly crushed by an uncompromising exterior.
But generally the Late Classic, Hellenistic and Early
Roman periods show few attempts to blend the three
fundamental types of plan. Then, in the Pantheon,
we suddenly find a building whose architect appreci-
ated all Cornell’s rules, where the exterior and
pronaos slowly heighten the visitor’s expectancy, and
the interior fulfils it—a closed world, beginning
tectonically at ground-level, and ending at the ‘eye’
in pure stereotomy.

Cornell, then, has wrestled with architecture. He
seems to have the makings of an interesting and—
far more important—an honest theorist. His lan-
guage is heavy. But at least he thinks about
buildings, not epigrams. Unhappily, his historical
sense is stunted. If one must consider Knossos and
Mycenae, why leave out Sumer, Egypt and the
rest? Have Luxor and Karnak nothing to teach
about the relation of exterior and interior, Deir-el-
Bahari and Persepolis nothing about the heightening
of expectancy? Why omit a discussion of those
Greek temples certainly or possibly hypaethral?
When considering ceilings as imitation heavens, why
say nothing about Greek painted coffers? It is
willful to suggest that early architects never com-
bined, say, exteriors and interiors in single unified
designs. Cornell can do so, because he omits the
deep pronaoi of the typical Ionian temple, and
allows the large central courts of Knossos and
Phaistos to mesmerize him. It seems doubtful
whether the builders of Knossos worried much about
the effect of the court. The private apartments
seemingly turned their backs on it. On the other
hand, the southern approach to Knossos, its south
terrace and the long, axially-planned series of halls
and propyla, leading from here to the main state-
rooms, all show a knowledge of practical circulation-
problems and architectural effect, which would not
have disgraced the École des Beaux Arts. The same
may be said of the beautifully planned chariot road
at Tiryns from the foot of the hill to the front door of
the megaron itself. Yet Cornell says (p. 56) that
the builders of these palaces ‘must have been in-
different to the question of raising expectancy in a
visitor’.

Cornell also underrates the cleverness of Priene
and of the Pompeian House. He too blandly
assumes that the forms of the Greek Orders are
tectonic in origin. But is not the Greek Doric
column pure stereotomy? It is not true, despite
Cornell, that Pope Benedict XIV’s wanton altera-
tions of the Pantheon accorded ‘with the conception
of antiquity of that age’. For Christopher Wren, not
long before, had evidently adopted it for his peristyle
round the dome of St. Paul’s. Finally, Cornell shows
a distressing optimism. On p. 30, for instance, he
says that the architect’s job is to provide for the
good and edifying sides of life, and that he could
hardly plan for evil and destructive activities. But
modern architects are planning horrible buildings
nearly all the time, most of them for activities at once
evil and destructive.

HUGH PLUMMER.

SCHMIDT (M.) Der Dareiosmaler und sein
Umkreis: Untersuchungen zur spätan-
ischen Vasenmalerei. (Orbis antiquus, 15.)
Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhand-

This is a well-planned and scholarly appreciation
of the work and workshop of the last important
Apulian red-figure vase-painter, based on a close
museum study of most of the vases discussed. About
thirty vases and fragments are treated in some detail,
and there is a suggested list of some forty-five lesser
school pieces. Best known as the perpetrator of the
two great volute kraters found together in a grave at
Canosa in 1831, the Darius painter’s name vase has
been the subject of learned expositions ever since its
discovery, and to enlarge on this much further is not
the author’s aim. She agrees with C. Anti (Arch.
Class. 4. 1952) that the famous picture is most
probably to be connected with a Paeus of Phrynichos.
Her main interest is with style and artistic achieve-
ment, and her object to present as complete a
picture as possible of the painter’s extant output,
discussing his relation to predecessors and contem-
poraries, both Attic and Apulian and relating his
general stylistic tendencies to other manifestations
of late fourth-century art. First-hand study of the
material gives her a claim to speak with authority,
and if all her conclusions do not win acceptance, they
command attention and respect. But it has to be
admitted that as illustrations of such a theme, the
scale of the pictures in this book is very small, and
much of the detail of drawing or composition cited in
support of her arguments cannot be checked. The
author is aware of this defect and recommends the
use of the illustrations in the late Anna Rocca’s
article (Arch. Class. 5. 1953). These are a little
larger and in some cases clearer. This article is
concerned with the Darius vase and the other closely
related vases found with it, but no outside attribu-
tions are made. Miss Schmidt offers several (prin-
cipally fragments) and makes some important and
challenging subtractions. To enhance the validity
of these conclusions and also to lead to a full defini-
tion of the artist’s personality, there are critical
stylistic analyses of all the pictures and ornamenta-
tion on the Darius and Patroklos kraters and on the
Andromeda Thymiaterion (or cylindrical amphora).
This last is submitted to an elaborate scrutiny as
regards both style and interpretation. Also of course are fully described the newly attributed fragments, two sets each in Halle and Heidelberg, and one piece from an American private collection. The Hellas fragment in Rome, well-illustrated on the dust-cover, and in the plates, already bears Curtius’ attribution. Fully accepting this, Miss Schmidt considers it to be a late work, and uses this as one of her arguments for rejecting the two Munich kraters (Medea and Underworld. Jahn 810 and 849. Found in 1813). These have for long been closely associated with the Darius painter, and Trendall has assigned them to his hand. They pose a problem. Structurally and in regard to the ornamentation so very like the Canosa pair, the style of the drawing is certainly much coarser and more aggressive. Convinced of the essential refinement of the Darius painter, Miss Schmidt shrinks from the idea that he could have painted them. An elaborate analysis of three amazonomachy scenes, from the necks of the Darius and Munich Medea kraters, and the upper zone of the Munich Medea amphora (also rejected) is used in support of this belief. Again, it is very difficult to check the arguments by the illustrations. Nor is it, I think, correct to say that Reichold points to marked differences between the Medea and Darius kraters. He does point out that the architectural pattern on the neck of the former is something new (and typical of Apulian bad taste), and also states that there are fewer figures in the amazonomachy scene. (In fact the difference is not great. Darius 10. Medea 8.) Otherwise, he stresses the extraordinary similarity between the two scenes. The reviewer still sees these Munich kraters as works of the Darius painter. Apart from similarities of detail mentioned by Reichold, the whole conception and arrangement of the scenes bears this painter’s stamp. The question is of more than merely academic interest on account of one of the arguments used. The vase fragment, which is certainly a careful piece, is affirmed to be a late work. So the Darius painter, at the end of his career, had deteriorated. Therefore he could not have painted the Munich kraters. This bears the implication that if A is in general like A, but not so good, it must be a late work. Is this view really axiomatic? Could other causes never have been at work? Ill-health? Anger? Was any part in the production of these funeral vases played by the client?

I am more inclined to agree that the two amphorae found in the same grave and clearly from the same workshop, Naples 3221 (Medea), and Naples 3218 (Europa) may not be by the master. The zone of marine creatures on the Medea amphora is said to compare unfavourably with the one on the Andromeda Thymiateria. Certainly there is nothing on the former in quite the same class as the crayfish that inadvertently tickles Cassiopaeia’s toes. If it is accepted, as the author maintains, that the Darius painter did not employ an assistant to paint the marine friezes (as it is suggested was his practice sometimes for the reverse scenes and unimportant figures), we must praise him highly for his skill and sensitivity in this field. And more might have been said of the success of some of his floral ornamentation. Late Apulian vase-painters were eminent in this department, and might sometimes have been well-advised to let well alone. The intrusion of full-length figures into the floral complex on the neck of the Patroklos vase perfectly illustrates their curious lack of taste. A single head is all that is really permissible.

A critical account of the Lykurgos painter, as being the immediate forerunner of the Darius painter, stands at the beginning of the book, and will be of much interest. The publication of the Naples Rhesos Situla is specially welcome. Of the suggested additions to Trendall’s list of vases by this painter, the reviewer can only speak at first hand of the small volute-krater in the Barrocco Museum, the ancient parts of which are certainly by his hand.

Apart from some controversial questions of attribution, all of which cannot be discussed in a short review, this little book succeeds in focusing attention on a serious and painstaking artist, serious in intention and by tradition, refined by comparison with many products of his period, occasionally able to endow a single figure with feeling, though for the most part a rather undistinguished draughtsman of the human form.

There are a few printing errors: p. 20, T16 should be T17. p. 53, T15b should be T14b and T14b should be T15b. p. 60, No. 14 Ausonia 9 1919, p. 190, not p. 265. P. 88, Europa amphora, T18a not T14.

N. R. Oakeshott.


This book is to be welcomed as the first comprehensive monograph devoted exclusively to archaic relief pithoi in the Aegean area. In spite of the fragmentary nature of much of the material, the rewards of such a study are high, especially in view of the superlative quality of the best figured work, and the interesting light cast upon the early iconography of mythical scenes.

Three areas are considered in turn: Crete, Rhodes, and Tenos-Boeotia. Each section begins with a full catalogue divided into chronological stages, with brief general remarks on the style and a suggested scheme of dating; there follows a fuller analysis of the figured scenes and the linear ornament, and finally a resumé of the salient local features: this strictly symmetrical arrangement allows the regional characteristics of each group to stand out in sharp focus. The treatment is admirably concise, and yet goes deep enough to illuminate for the reader not only the
development of relief pithoi, but also the general character of all early archaic art in these three areas. The illustrated photographs, almost confined to the Cretan group, are intended to supplement those that are already available, rather than to provide a representative selection.

The Cretan material is placed without difficulty in a sound chronological framework. The figured series begins soon after 700; the finest figured work (in Stage III) is associated with the prime of the Dedalic movement in the middle of the seventh century, while the last stage (V) reflects the general decline of the arts in Crete in the early sixth. As a rule the mould is preferred to the stamp, bringing the relief into closer relation with metalwork than with vase-painting, but here the free-modelled pithos from Phaistos constitute an exception. The full forms of their animals are rightly compared to late seventh-century vases, but in the unanatomical and purely decorative use of paint it is tempting to see a local resurgence of Minoan tradition: with Schäfer’s plate VII of the large LM III (or Subminoan?) terra-cotta bull from the same site, MA XII, 1902, 123, fig. 54.

The Rhodian group is less easy to date by reference to contemporary art forms. In the first two of the three chronological stages the decoration is exclusively linear, and largely dominated by spiral designs, for which parallels on contemporary pottery are hard to find. The frequent occurrence of the spiral net on Attic Geometric jewellery of the eighth century, among other considerations, leads the author to begin his first stage of Rhodian pithoi at c. 740: I would suggest that this date be lowered to c. 700 for three reasons:

(a) At least three out of the five pieces quoted come from Vroulia, where the finds are thought to begin in the seventh century (Lindos I, 250).

(b) The krater B1 from Johansen’s recent publication of the Exochoi cemetery shows that the spiral net was not entirely shunned by Rhodian vase-painters. It occurs in a context soon after 700.

(c) Inside the primitive pithos from Lindos, BCH 1950, plate 20,1, which is typologically earlier than Stage I, it is stated that Sestieri claimed to have found a ‘piccolo ariballo protocorinio’ (ibid., 171).

Matters become no easier when figured scenes eventually arrive in Stage III, since they often suggest a stylistic date anything up to a century earlier than their context would allow (p. 64). Evidence of repair may indeed argue a long life as storage vessels before use in graves, but one must also contemplate the possibility of the same cylinder-stamp being re-used for many years. At all events, the Rhodians seem to have been the least progressive among the makers of relief pithoi.

Turning to the third group, the well-known series from Boeotia now proves to owe its inspiration—perhaps also its provenance—to a lively and progressive Cycladic school reaching well back into Geometric times, and well represented in the recently discovered pithoi from Professor N. Kontoleon’s excavation of the sanctuary at Exouborho on the island of Tenos. Schäfer illustrates none of this new material, and confines his lucid discussion of it to the tantalising disjecta membra already reproduced by the excavator in preliminary reports and articles: only when the material is fully published will it be possible to answer some of the important questions which still remain outstanding:

(a) Were the Boeotian pithoi made in the same workshops as the Tenian, or did Tenian potters travel to Boeotia? Only a scientific analysis of the fabric can help us here (p. 89).

(b) Does the movement towards mythical representations, so apparent in Stage II (early middle seventh century) have its roots in the purely Geometric figured scenes of the first stage, whose finest pieces (plates X, 2 and XI) Schäfer dates as early as the second quarter of the eighth century? (Personally I should be surprised to see such a relaxed treatment of the human anatomy before 730: the men on these pieces seem clearly later than the figures on the Dipylon kraters.)

(c) The ultimate origin of the Tenian–Boeotian amphora shape remains obscure, especially since no profile has yet been recovered for Stage I. Nevertheless it would not be surprising if the pithos industry of Tenos began in the Bronze Age, as is the case in Crete, and probably also in Rhodes (where cf. the primitive Lindos piece, BCH 1950, plate 20,1 with the Minoan 'bottle-shaped' type). It is worth mentioning that at the unexcavated site of Akrotiriou O unin, thirty minutes’ walk to the east of Tenos harbour (BSA 1956, 13) sherds of large coarse vessels with linear relief decoration applied in the Minoan manner lie around in great quantities.

I noted the following oversights and misprints, in addition to those already mentioned on the fly-leaf: p. 9, t. 34; for Taf. 41, 1–3, read Taf. 41, 7–9. P. 46, l. 40: for Taf. 67 read Taf. 66. P. 50, l. 41: for I5 (Lindos) read I1 (Lindos). P. 53, l. 21: for Abb. 10, 1 read Abb. 19, 1. P. 57, l. 28: omit (Taf. 12). P. 64, l. 40: Kamiros Stufe I8 is not included in the catalogue. P. 69, l. 21 and p. 86, l. 32: for T3 read T4. P. 77, l. 24: for T8 read T7. P. 79, l. 22 and note 340. This krater is hardly Geometric: for earlier winged horses see Delos XV, plate XXV, Ad 2. P. 83, l. 37: for Beil. 34, 2 read Beil. 54, 2. P. 86, l. 40 and p. 88, l. 24: for ‘siphnischen’ read ‘chiotischen’; for a Cycladic Geometric use of the motive in question, see Delos XV, plate XXXV, Bb. 4. P. 111, note 253: for C525 read C325. P. 116, note 320: Delos XV, plate 54, A4 seems Cycladic to me; for the earliest Attic grazing horses (by no means rare in Late Geometric) see the amphora in Boston, Lane, Greek Pottery, plate 6. The ‘Pferd’ on the fr. BCH xxxv, 1911, 377, fig. 37, is surely a goat: this same piece, here ’vielleicht naxisch’ becomes ‘vielleicht meilisch’ on p. 77, l. 32; the former is the more probable surmise of the two.

J. N. Coldstream


Dr Brommer’s book consists of twenty pages of text, with a general account of the Acropolis and Parthenon, and a fuller discussion of the pediments; twenty-six pages of illustrations; and six pages of detailed notes on the illustrations.

A book like this has been needed for a long time, and those who have followed Brommer’s recent work will agree that he was eminently the man to write it. He has not disappointed us in the execution. In the text he summarises nearly everything that can now be confidently said about the contents of the pediments; and he illustrates all the statues and significant fragments, well, and on a reasonably large scale, and in their proper order. The presence of the fragments is particularly welcome. Several pieces can now be appreciated in their context which before lay either isolated in the periodicals (like the Vatican horse-head, and the standing ‘Hera’), or buried among unassignable fragments in the plates of A. H. Smith’s catalogue (like the so-called ‘Hephaistos’ torso). There are also pictures of the additions which the author himself has recently made to familiar figures, ‘Iris’ and ‘Amphitrite’, and for which he is to be warmly congratulated. One regrets only that he does not figure the scraps of the olive-tree and snake, which he has also augmented; though few and little, they can yet tell something new about the versatility of the Parthenon sculptors.

The photographs are supplemented by two valuable outline figures (5 and 6), which show respectively all the certain surviving fragments from the West Pediment in their probable positions, and these fragments in combination with Carrey’s drawing. Thus it is possible to see at one glance all the visual evidence we now have for that pediment, both in marble and on paper.

Altogether the book ranks as the most useful summary of the subject that has yet appeared, and this not only because of the recent material which it brings together, but also because of its lucid and temperate presentation of the material as a whole. A few of the details, indeed, but only a few, are not beyond question:

*Page 7,* statement that there was originally an altar before the east front of the Parthenon; there is no authority, literary or archaeological, for this.

*Page 15,* Brommer supposes that there was a lost standing or reclining goddess in the north half of the East Pediment corresponding to the surviving ‘Hebe’ (G) in the south half; a reclining figure at this point is clearly impossible: misprint?

*Page 47* (notes on the illustrations), he repeats his striking suggestion that sculptures once existed deep in the angles of both pediments, outside the apparent angle-sculptures which we still possess. If this is true, the effects on the composition will clearly be profound. But, with all respect for his judgement and experience, it ought to be said that the evidence which he has so far published (mostly in his *AM* articles) is not, at least on paper, convincing. It amounts to this: (a) unexplained cuttings in the extreme corners of the pediments. While it is believable that sculptured objects could have been fixed in such a position on the West Pediment, as Brommer proposes, the East Pediment is a very different matter: what could ever have been set, without bathos, left of the mounting Sun or right of the declining horses of the Moon? And if the eastward cutting cannot have served for sculptures, it is not likely that the similar westward cuttings did so. (b) A piece of stone in the West Pediment, on the left of ‘Ilissos’ (A); this is not shown in Carrey’s drawing, but is found first in Dalton’s, and is thereafter traceable, apparently, until Balanos’s restoration-work in 1898–1902. But it does not look like a piece of *sculpture* in Dalton’s drawing, nor was it so described by Sauer in 1891. Sauer’s language is: ‘a block pushed under the raking cornice’; if it had borne any resemblance to a sculptural fragment, would he not have said so? (c) A drawing of the year 1802 by Sir Robert Smirke, first published by Brommer, shows not merely this mysterious stone, but also a further, upright piece just to the right of it; again Brommer interprets this as a piece of sculpture. If this was really a sculpture, which is by no means clear from Smirke’s vague drawing, it can hardly be in its original place, or it would have appeared in Dalton too (not to mention Carrey); it cannot, therefore, stand as evidence for Brommer’s present suggestion, whatever else it may indicate. In short, though one cannot dismiss the possibility that further sculptures stood in the angles of the West Pediment, at least—there is certainly the space there—one would gladly hear more substantial arguments for their existence.


3 Such as ‘a snake or an attribute’ (*AM*, 69/70, p. 60).

4 *AM* 71, Beil. 129. In the same article, p. 237 and n. 17a, Brommer adduces a drawing by H. W. Williams, dating from 1813–1818, as ‘confirming’ Smirke; in this the fragment certainly looks more like a sculpture, but does not seem to be in the same position as that in which Smirke saw it.

5 How uninterested Smirke was in the contents of the pediments, as opposed to the architecture, can be seen from his sketchy and distorted rendering of the ‘Cecrops’.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

Page 48, note on Fig. 8: the traditional identification of West Pediment A with Hissos or Kephissos is admitted on all hands to be uncertain, derived as it is only from Pausanias’ interpretation (V. 10.7) of the angle-figures in the East Pediment at Olympia. But Brommer’s sole argument against the traditional identification, ‘der entsprechende Liegende im Ostgiebel ist aber sicher kein Flussgott’, hardly decides the matter; rather it is positively misleading, since it implies the novel and unlikely principle that corresponding figures in opposite pediments must belong to the same class of being.

Brommer’s views on the central sections of the pediments will best be postponed until we have introduced Mr Corbett’s The Sculpture of the Parthenon. The text of this welcome addition to the King Penguin series is, within the limits imposed on it by its author, almost faultless. It is a survey, at once lively and scrupulous, of the architecture, purpose and fate of the Parthenon; of the style and content of its sculptures; and finally (an admirably balanced discussion, this) of the question of Phidias’ authorship. Care is taken to give further references for controversial points in the notes, and there is also a good select bibliography. The plates include a surprisingly large proportion of the sculpture. Perhaps too much: who, coming fresh to the subject, would not be frightened and confused by twenty successive pages each containing two two-inch-high strips of frieze? One would have thought that fewer plates of that sort, and more close-ups, would have proved more effective in a book of this series; and further the pediments have suffered in consequence of the inclusion of so much frieze, ‘Hebe’, the left-hand ‘Fate’ and several other statues being omitted. The photographs in themselves, however, mostly from the official negatives, are very clear, if a little unadventurous—there is a striking contrast in national photographic methods on Plate 12/13, where a French photograph of the Louvre slab, flamboyantly lit from one side only, is dovetailed in among two British Museum photographs with their even, unemphatic lighting.

Taken together the two books here discussed should give an excellent view of the present state of our knowledge of the Parthenon. Naturally, they also throw into relief our ignorance. The centres of both pediments—just those passages of the enormous sculptural complex which the ancient visitor to the Parthenon would have noticed first and remembered longest—remain, alas! matters for dispute. Corbett and Brommer do not even agree about the action of the two central figures on the West: ‘... Poseidon starting back in amazement, Athena striding by with a gesture of triumph; ’im Giebel sind beide streitenden Gottheiten herbeigezelt, stossen in der Mitte zusammen und prallen wiederauseinander’. Neither interpretation is perfectly satisfying; it is difficult to draw a distinction between the attitudes of Athena and Poseidon, nor do we willingly think of the Gods as rebounding. The traditional answer still seems most likely: both are recoiling before the shock of each other’s miracles, which have happened so suddenly (the chariot-horses are still being reined in) that their effect is that of a physical blow. Still less do the authors agree about the centre of the East Pediment, with the Birth of Athena. Corbett illustrates the Madrid Puteal and tentatively accepts it in its entirety as evidence for the composition. And indeed there is so much Parthenionic about the three chief actors on the Puteal that there is a strong prima facie case for supposing that they, at least, are connected with the East Pediment, even if only via some intermediate sculptural creation.7 Brommer therefore seems to go too hastily when he dismisses all attempts to reconstruct the central scene as ‘besten-falls nur ein geistreiches Spiel’, and ignores the Puteal entirely. The reader would at any rate have welcomed his reasons for rejecting its evidence.

C. J. HERINGTON.


This book consists of eleven separate studies written by pupils of Professor Carlo Anti at Padua on Greek and Roman sculptures found at Cyrene. The inspiration has been Professor Anti’s own work at Cyrene, and the book is published as a tribute to him; as such it must be one of the best ‘Fest-schriften’ ever produced for, although the subjects range from a late archaic Greek head to two Roman portraits of the late second century A.D., the book has a unity of purpose which such books can hardly ever claim. It is beautifully printed and the photographic reproductions are uniformly very good. Dr Enrico Paribeni’s Catalogo delle Sculture di Cirene appeared while this book was in the press; although all but two of the sculptures discussed here appear also in Paribeni’s Catalogue, they receive a much fuller and more provocative treatment than is possible in the limits of a catalogue.

L. Polacco opens the series with the study of a little late archaic male head wearing what he interprets as a kind of mail helmet (Paribeni no. 13), though Paribeni took it to be hair. The impression of archaising one gets in the photographs must be completely illusory since it does not cross the minds of Polacco or Paribeni, the latter attributing it to the Laconian school and the former, influenced by the outlandish headdress, believing it to be local work under some such influence. If Polacco’s study is to be criticised, it is for over-confidence in attributing

6 In the regular Parthenon attitude for this movement; cf. North Frieze, Slabs XI, no. 43, and XVII, no. 58 (indistinguishable in attitude from the pedimental Athena, so far as she is preserved); West Frieze, Slab XIV, no. 27.

7 So most recently W. Fuchs, die Vorbilder der neuattischen Reliefs (1959), pp. 142–3.
to a ‘school’ on what seems to be tenuous evidence and the same criticism is applicable to Polacco’s second contribution on the splendid ‘severe-style’ head of a woman (Paribeni no. 15). One admires, but not with implicit trust, the confidence with which the Aeginetan school is distinguished from other contemporary schools as the source of this particular head.

L. Beschi discusses two sandstone reliefs with two-figure groups (Paribeni no. 45) found in the eastern necropolis at Cyrene; the subjects are connected with the myth of Alcestis. These must be local works but in the style of the Attic ‘koine’ of the late fifth century and were made, so Beschi thinks, to flank the door of a tomb. One wonders whether at this period we need suppose the artist to have been ‘personalità educata in ambiente attico’ when there were to be found at Cyrene such pieces as the Hoplite relief, now headless, from the Agora (Paribeni no. 51). L. Beschi rightly describes the piece as Attic work of about 400 or a little later, and it must be one of the finest sculptures so far found at Cyrene. Neither F. Bertocchi’s treatment of the statue, now headless, of a seated god (Paribeni no. 192) whom he identifies as Zeus copied from a fourth century original nor G. Traversari’s consideration of two statues of Apollo Citharoedus (one is Paribeni no. 150 and the other is now lost) involve long and detailed discussion of the typology of the figures. It is interesting that both these writers date the copies with which they are dealing to the late Hellenistic period; Traversari thinks his copies may be inspired by the fourth-century cult statue in the Temple of Apollo at Cyrene.

With the Dioscuri of Cocceianus (Paribeni nos. 376–9, 386–8) also discussed by Traversari we come to the Roman period; for these are Hadrianic copies of works of the mid-fifth century b.c., stylistically the earliest Dioscuri we have. E. de Franci’s article deals with a statue of the young Dionysos (Paribeni no. 317), which seems to be a unique but rather poor copy of a late fifth-century figure. M. T. Fortuna writes about a headless colossal female figure (Paribeni no. 154) which she identifies rightly as Hera though Paribeni thought Artemis. One of the most learned and stimulating contributions is L. Beschi’s discussion of two replicas of the Rospigliosi type Artemis (Paribeni nos. 163–6). He offers a most detailed ‘Kopienkritik’ of the type and distinguishes three principal families of copies with a complicated interrelation; he goes on to associate this very popular type with the stauryn group dedicated by Attalus of Pergamon on the Acropolis at Athens. The date of the dedication wavers between Attalus I and II, but if the Rospigliosi type formed part of it the latter must be preferred. In the last contribution L. Polacco deals with two portrait heads of a Roman lady found at Apollonia; one is clearly an imported piece and the other a copy made locally. The lady is confidently identified as Lucilla, daughter of Marcus Aurelius, but it is only with the eye of iconographical faith that a head in Ostia, another from the Agora at Athens and the two from Apollonia can be held to represent the same lady at different times of her life.

D. E. Strong.


The Mainz collection has been formed since 1948 on a basis of several small private collections. The pottery published in this first volume is valuable teaching material, but it is of no very great interest apart from one group of Attic vase fragments of the early seventh century b.c. which occupies plates 8–26 of the Corpus volume and forms the sole subject of the second work under review. There are a number of Geometric pieces (including two known figured hydriai), some minor Corinthian and Boeotian, and rather more Attic Black Figure. The photographs are fair and the text is adequate. The mug plate 7. 5–7, with its tall form and running ornament, should be distinctly post-Geometric. The Siuna cup, plate 41 below, seems to be by the C Painter, but painted on a day when he made the horses’ tails pass in front because it was less trouble; on the other hand, the cup, plate 41 above, which is attributed to the Amsias Painter, seems—despite the resemblances of detail—to lack the clarity and finesse of the master’s own hand.

The early seventh-century group of Attic fragments is fully published in both the Corpus volume and Hampe’s book; but only the latter contains a discussion of the wider context in which they need to be considered and of the problems they raise. The group seems to comprise a single find, consisting of fragments of about five tall, elegant pedestal-labes which were offered and shattered in a ceremony at an Attic tomb. The vessels, of which two have been skillfully restored, had rich plastic decoration under the rim and were evidently products of one single potter’s workshop. The paintings on them were distinguished by a liberal use of applied colours—rust-red and white in addition to the dark glaze—which is unexpected at so early a date; but they were not all painted by one hand, and Hampe rightly distinguishes the work of at least three different painters. This is of exceptional interest, because these painters, with their different styles, are thus shown to have worked side by side at a single moment and in a single workshop. We have never before had so concentrated a shaft of light played on a school of early Greek painting; and we have especial reason to be grateful to the authors for the skill and care with which they have studied and
assembled these desperately worn and often burnt fragments and made them available to the public.

Hampe's best discovery is his 'Passas Painter', who is named after an unpublished amphora in a collection in Athens. That Stand B (with which no doubt go Lebes A and Lebes B) is a work of the painter of the Phaleron fragments (Pa 2) is accepted by Miss Simon also, and it is beyond question. A personality of the early Protoattic thus emerges. Hampe recognises the Passas amphora as his work, and on the basis of this attribution he adds the New York amphora (Pa 1) which was previously not assigned to a known painter but, with the Phaleron fragments, placed in the loose group of vessels named 'N Group'. The authors assume that there are four heads to the team of horses on Stand B, but comparison with the New York amphora seems to show that there are only two pairs of lips.

The stand of Lebes A was painted by a very different painter—a finer and cleaner, but rather more conservative one. Hampe recognises him as the Analatos Painter. But the file of hooded mourners—bold, expressionistic and relying on a three-colour rhythm—which forms the principal decoration of Lebes D seems within this group of vessels to be attributable only to the master of Stand A; and Hampe therefore assigns Lebes D to the Analatos Painter. At first sight this is little short of incredible. As we know it in other works, the Analatos Painter's style is one of classic beauty and poise in the strongest contrast to the turgid billowing rhythm of the mourning crones. Yet the mastery of line is the same; and if we ask whether the Analatos Painter could have painted these hooded hordes, we may ask even more pertinently whether anyone but the Analatos Painter could have painted them. Hampe sees Stand A and Lebes D as relatively early works of the Analatos Painter. But in some ways it seems easier to put them in the last stage of his career, and this gives a progression in his womenfolk from the delicate maidens of the Analatos hydras through the matrons of the Paris amphora to the bent old hoodies of Lebes D.

Assuming the identification to be correct, the significance of this master in the history of European art is now fully revealed. Besides his perfect control of line and almost infallible sense of positioning he was capable of executing the boldest of conceptions; and his example guided Athenian painting through its most critical period from the close of the Geometric to the era of alternating colour effects. Hampe denies the Analatos Painter the British Museum lid (BSA xxxv, plate 42a); yet the lid seems to be in his purest style; and if the horses' rumps differ from those on the Munich crater, they have the same form as on the Aegina sherds which Hampe assigns to the Analatos Painter (An 6) and which seem to come from a crater of precisely similar form to the Munich one (not from an amphora). The beginnings of the painter's work need closer study. The Oxford amphora, which Hampe rejects (p. 77 of his book) is early and less developed in some of its renderings; and it has other connexions which are difficult to define. But its figures do seem to have the special rhythm which only the Analatos Painter could achieve. These two vases apart, Hampe's list of the painter's works is excellent; they now number twelve.

The third of Hampe's painters is more obscure. He is given Lebes C and Stand C and is made residuary heir to the old 'N Group'. His distinguishing characteristic is a three-stroke N ornament in the field. Hampe speaks of this as a signature, and it is conceivable that it is literally so (e.g. the initial letter of the painter's name). It is quite true that the emphatic isolation of these Ns does seem peculiar to this small group of vessels. But the clumsy vigour of N 1–2 is a long way from the practised clarity of outline seen on some of the sherds, and a single personality does not seem to emerge from the eight works which Hampe bestows on his 'N Painter'. The master of Stand C was certainly an artist of skill and some power; but it remains to be seen whether Hampe has found the right connexions for him.

This raises a general point about identifications in the Late Geometric and Orientalising. When we have two works painted by one painter at the same stage in his career and presenting similar themes, the identity of the painter may be immediately apparent. But it is less easy to recognise different stages in a man's career. Painters were sensitive to influences that could change the character of their style, and then only their persistence in peculiar stylisations will reveal their identity for certain (the painter of the Benaki amphora is a good example of this, BSA xlii 150). Gradually, as more pieces come to light, the careers of individual artists can be extended and linked together. But an identification requires either identity of major forms (which will involve above all the relationship of outline and volume) or a multiplicity of identical individual stylisations. A general similarity of forms or an occasional common peculiarity is not sufficient; these can arise from the interaction of painters on one another or even from general trends of the time. More material to work on and steady progress in stylistic studies will enable scholars to isolate the individual and to perceive distinctions where their predecessors found identity. It would be surprising if in the course of time Hampe's analysis of these painters is not proved erroneous in some points; but it is a tremendous contribution to the understanding of the Protoattic.

For chronology this find is very important. It links the Analatos Painter so closely to the Black and White Style and the Polyphemus Painter that a date before the first quarter of the seventh century is impossible. The Analatos hydras can hardly go back appreciably before 700; and the beginning of the Orientalising must belong to the last quarter of the eighth century, and not (as Kübler has so convincingly maintained) to the third quarter. This
inevitably reacts on Protocorinthian and the western colonies. As regards workshops, Hampel not unnaturally assumes that the painters who worked on the Mainz vases were regular colleagues. But there are difficulties in this. Elsewhere the vases that the Pallas Painter and his kind painted were of different (and generally less elegant) forms from those that the Analytus Painter painted. It is perhaps worth considering whether in exceptional circumstances painters from outside workshops may not have been called in to help when a large order had to be completed against time.

Hampel devotes his penultimate chapter to the themes on the vases, and finds that they all relate to the cult of the dead. There is of course truth in this, and certainly the Mainz vases were a funerary order. Indeed, for all we know, the sphinxes may have been recognised as keres and the filing dogs may have been imagined as denizens of the corpse-strewn battlefield. But speculations of this sort are perilous; if they were viewed in a wider context they would so often end in the conclusion that the painters forgot the symbolism that they were devising and the purchasing public took to their homes and temples the wares that were intended solely for the tomb. In his last chapter Hampel discusses the ceremonies at the grave and convincingly argues that the Mainz find must have come from an offering channel similar to those excavated in the Kerameikos.

J. M. COOK.


Attic b.f. kraters of various types—dinoi, column-kraters, volute-kraters, calyces; mostly unpublished, and mostly new—put together from fragments in the Campana reserve, and therefore free from restoration. The nicest vase, the column-krater E629, Corinthianising work by the Poon Painter, is not unpublished, but the new photographs do justice to it for the first time. Are not the beardless revellers (if reveller is the word) youths rather than women? An unusual detail, the little rests under horn and phialai. Another pleasant vase is the column-krater with Herakles and the Centaurs, from the Group of Lydos (ABV p. 119, above, no. 2, after Bothmer and Villard); within the Group, it is not far from the Painter of F6. C11251 (Sophilos): Villard has added other fragments to the two mentioned in ABV p. 40 no. 23.

The remarks that follow are confined to those vases that are not in ABV. CA9351, provincial-looking imitation of the XK Painter. C11255, Tyrrhenian Group, same style as the column-krater Altenburg 184 (CV pl. 13-14) and another in the Hauptli collection at Aarau. C11259 and C11282: Painter of Villa Giulia 482, who is connected with the tail-end of the Lydan tradition; the oinochoai called the Group of Vatican G48 in ABV p. 433 are also by this painter. C11261: Towry Whyte Painter, compare the amphora Würzburg 263. Villard has seen C11263 and C11264 to be by the Painter of Bologna 48 (which he calls Bologna C21); compare also C11265. C11266 and C11267, by the same hand as Villa Giulia M449 (Villard); near these, C11277 and Villa Giulia M448 (Villard): tail-end, again, of the Lydan tradition. C11268, same painter as the front picture of C11269 (Villard). C11270: Painter of Boston 01.17. C11278: Rycroft Painter, late: compare, for instance, the amphora Oxford 1911.256. C11279: '510' is perhaps a little late for this. C11283, from the same workshop as C11282 (see above) (Villard), but hardly the same hand. C11284, workshop of C11287 (Villard). C11287, by the painter of C11286, as Villard suggests. C11289, same workshop as CA2209 (Villard): Mikra-Karakurin Group; a third is Alabania 1932, p. 72, fig. 8. C11291: compared by Villard with the Golvol Group. C11295: might not these fragments belong to the heavily restored F315 (CV pl. 7, 1-2)? C11294, Psiax or near (Villard); the same may be said of C11295. C11298: manner of Exekias, and by the same hand as the calyx-krater in Volos (Villard): true of the chariot-scene and the animals, but B seems hardly to be by the same hand: it recalls the Taleides Painter (especially the Purrmann oenochoe), and the Towry Whyte Painter, who resembles him.

J. D. BEAZLEY.


Part only of the great collection of Attic red-figured cups in Florence. The descriptions are careful and accurate. The reproductions are good: the only faults one might find is that some of the inside pictures are tilted a little too far back or forward, and that some of the handle-palmettes are neglected, the complete design not appearing in the photograph. The shapes are given as well as the pictures, though in rather small photographs. There are neat drawings of the Etruscan graffii.

The cups vary in quality, from masterpiece to hackwork. The finest is the cup by the Panaitios Painter, pl. 87. Next comes the exquisite cup by Onesimos, one of J. A. Spranger’s many splendid gifts to the Museum.

Pl. 73: the heroes may be Odysseus (on the left) and Ajax (on the right), with Agamemnon in the middle. Pl. 74: Oltos has written Chilos, but probably meant Chiton as on his London cup G19. Pl. 82: ‘Hoppin Rf. II, p. 323 n. 9 (attributed to Pittore della Gigantomachia di Parigi)’: but, first, Hoppin did not profess to make attributions in that work: what he did was to chronicle attributions which had been made by others (see his II, p. 345, for the exception proving the rule); and, secondly, the cup that he describes ‘ibid., p. 323, is Florence

The Greek vessels belonging to the Landgraf Philipp of Hesse and housed in Schloss Fasanerie at Adolphseck (near Fulda) must form the largest collection in private hands in present-day Germany. Although some of the vessels were published before the war in Neugebauer's Antiken in deutschem Privathesitz and a few others more recently in Brommer's small guide to the collection (Antike Klein Kunst), the majority remained unknown and their publication in the Corpus is therefore particularly welcome. The first fascicle (1956) contained the Attic b.F. and r.f. vases (with the exception of no. 76 which, as Beazley pointed out in his review of this volume in AJA 61, 1957, p. 111, is Early South Italian by the Pistici Painter); the second is mainly devoted to the non-Attic vessels—Egyptian and Cypriot (pl. 53), Mycenaean (pl. 54), Melian Geometric (pl. 55), East Greek (pl. 57), Corinthian (pl. 58-60), Pseudo-chalidian (pl. 61-2), Boeotian (pl. 63-5), Etruscan (pl. 69-71), South Italian (pl. 73-86 and 88-94), various relief wares (pl. 95-6), though it includes Attic Geometric (pl. 56), some b.F. and r.F. of recent acquisition (pl. 66-8) and black-glaze (pl. 87-9). There is also a useful list of corrigeanda and addenda to the first fascicle, with a number of important new references or attributions.

A few notes on points of detail:

No. 114, pl. 60, 8-10: For ring-aryballoi see also Schauenburg, Jahrbuch des RGZM, Mainz, 4, 1957, pp. 63 ff.

Pl. 65: The numbering of the illustrations on the plate does not correspond with that given in the text (p. 23).

No. 136, pl. 67, 5-6: On the Caecilie Group of head vases see also Kern, Mnemosyne 12, 1959, pp. 129-33.

No. 167, pls. 3-4: The connexion with the vases of the Cassandra Group is clear from the use of the fan-shaped floral (cf. Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen 2, 1960, p. 22). The subject remains something of a problem; Brommer thinks of Eurycle, the wife of Kreon, killing herself after the death of her son Haimon (cf. Sophocles, Antigone 1282-3) or of Theseus and Pyramus, but, as he himself admits, neither interpretation carried conviction. The list of female suicides given by Hyginus (243) is unhelpful; perhaps we should also consider the possibility of a reference to the first Hippolytus of Euripides in which Phaedra took her own life with H.'s sword (cf. the painting in the Vatican from Tor Marancia). The inscription ΆΥΚΟΙΟΣ is surely a modern addition; incised inscriptions are not uncommon on Apulian vases, especially those with mythological scenes, but they are extremely rare in Campanian.

No. 168, pl. 74, 5-6: This pelike may now be assigned to the painter of B.M. F63, an important member of the Errera-Caivano Group; his draped youths are very characteristic (cf. Naples 147870, NMS 1937, p. 124, fig. 8; Capua, GVA 1, pls. 42, 2 and 4).


No. 172, pl. 75, 4: The date is too early; in style this vase reflects something of the influence of the Lycurges Painter and is also close to the early work.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

Richter (G. M. A.) Greek Portraits II. To what extent were they faithful likenesses? (Collection Latomus, xxxvi.) Brussels: Latomus. 1959. Pp. 47. 16 plates. Fr. b. 100.

Greek Portraits I was published in the same Collection in 1955 and reviewed in this journal vol. lxvii, 1956, p. 132. This continuation is also based on lectures, but while Greek Portraits I was an introductory survey, the second essay is more specifically concerned with the question posed in the sub-title. Like many other archaeological questions, this is one to which we do not, in fact, expect an answer but an assurance that the question can be legitimately posed at all. Miss Richter has to begin by assessing the reliability of the various kinds of indirect evidence upon which we depend for our knowledge of Greek portraiture—the copies made during the Roman period in various media—and the methods of identifying the person portrayed. In a final section she considers briefly how accurately the original Greek portraits, which now exist only in copies, depicted the subject.

Miss Richter deals first with the most trustworthy evidence, the mechanical copies of Greek statues, herms and busts; coin portraits, portraits on gems and the relief emblemata of terracotta bowls may be considered as more or less trustworthy while the evidence of marble and bronze reliefs, statuettes of Hellenistic and Roman date and paintings and mosaics is clearly of secondary value and may be positively misleading. Part II is concerned with the methods of identifying the persons portrayed—firstly, by the names inscribed on herms or quotations from the works or sayings of the person represented. Old drawings of inscribed herms now lost obviously need to be treated with caution; on double herms two portraits of persons in some way connected with one another are often combined so that if one person be known a plausible guess at the other is possible—but, too often, several equally plausible guesses. Most of Parts I and II is general introductory material, but one or two interesting iconographical problems are dealt with in passing to illustrate the value of the evidence; the Rieti herm, for example, though inscribed with some lines of Euripides does not seem to represent the dramatist (pp. 31–2), and the discussion of double herms (pp. 34–6) reveals the fascinations and pitfalls of the game of identification.

Part III attempts to answer, briefly, the question posed in the sub-title. Having eliminated the long-posthumous, and obviously imaginary, portraits of men who lived in the seventh and sixth centuries, Miss Richter concludes that portraits made in the lifetime of men who lived in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. accurately represented their appearance. Even though one suspects Themistokles or Perikles to look a little too much as one would expect them to look, her conclusion would seem to be as true for Greek portraiture as it is of the portraiture of any subsequent period. Certainly it cannot be disproved. Less certain is the case of those portraits which are known to have been set up a generation or more after the death of the person portrayed but, as Miss Richter points out, the Greek comic stage must have preserved the likenesses or, at least, the recognisable characteristics of important contemporary persons and she makes what is surely a very plausible suggestion that there existed contemporary sketches in clay or other media which could be used later to make an accurate likeness in marble or bronze.

The evidence that Miss Richter in fact brings forward for the existence of such sketches is very slight and hardly applies to the fifth and fourth centuries. Nor will many be convinced by her argument that two different and equally genuine portraits of Sophokles—the Lateran and the Farnese—must go back to originals made at different periods in his lifetime. But clearly the material which Miss Richter deals with in this last section of her essay offers the best approach to an answer to her question, and it is to be hoped that she will return to deal with it more fully in a further study.

D. E. Strong.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


The great value of this book is that it has an up-to-date list with well-documented commentary of personifications in Greek art. A brief introduction on the general history of personification and a brief conclusion on the history of personification in Greek art surround the main chapters which catalogue and comment on personifications under the headings: topographical, political, agonistic, intellectual work, ethical ideas, mental states, social relations, material goods, chronological, the circle of Aphrodite, and the circle of Dionysos. The last two last two from the names of the women attached to Aphrodite and the maenads attached to Dionysos who appear on late fifth-century vases: a strange phenomenon, which the author slightly underrates because she does not quite realise how common the personification of abstracts is in the latter half of the fifth century and that Euripidean choruses sometimes provide collections of personified abstracts extremely like those on the vases. It was perhaps also a pity to leave out many of the stage personifications such as the Nomoi of Kratinos, Menander’s Agnoia, Philemon’s Elenchos, because they belong to the same way of thinking and seeing.

She adopts the rather difficult classification of Matz into ‘ naïve’ and ‘reflektierte’ personifications and only lists the second class, which means the exclusion of all personification of natural elements, of rivers and mountains, and of all personifications with a mythology of their own. No one will ever agree with anyone else’s list of personifications, and the author may have had good reason for omitting the following which I should have included: Agathodaimon and Agathe tyche, Alka (Payne, NC no. 861), Eudia (ARV 801/1, etc.), Himeros and Pothos, Choreia (ARV 79/2), Horai, Psyche.

In a few cases additions can be suggested: Dolos, add Payne, NC no. 1436; Eutychia, add Reading 52.3.2; on Kraipale the name of the other figure, probably Thymedia, should have been discussed; Nyx, only the Pan painter’s lekythos with Theseus and Ariadne is mentioned and Erika Simon’s identification of the figure as Parthenia (O. Jhb. 41 (1954), 81 f) should have been quoted as well as Semni Karouzou’s discussion of Nyx in JHS 65 (1945), 43 f.

But these are small points and detract little from the value of this extremely useful reference book.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.


This is a careful and well-documented account of the representation of grief and laughter in Greek art. The section on grief is treated historically from the Mycenaean Warrior Vase to Pompeian wall-paintings and Roman sarcophagi. All through the treatment of grief in literature is also noted. The eighth-century geometric scenes of prothesis are naturally very important. In the seventh century tearing the cheeks, as distinct from beating the head, is found, and the gestures of lamentation are given to figures in scenes other than funerals. In sixth-century funeral scenes the men behave with greater restraint than the women (the Corinthian jug in Brussels, NC no. 1416 is interestingly interpreted as Achilles mourning for Bresies: this needs expansion), and Exekias finds new possibilities of expression. The fifth century not only adds new gestures but begins to show grief in the drawing of faces. It is an interesting point that one of the new attitudes, the figure with his head covered by himation, is used for Achilles on vases considerably earlier than any likely date for the Aeschylean Achilles. The difficulty of describing these attitudes as well as interpreting them is considerable. Thus ‘supporting the head’ covers (1) the seer from the East pediment of Olympia, (2) Penelope (Chusi skyphos), (3) woman on white lekythos (Buschor, fig. 223), (4) youth on Lokanian stele (Friis Johansen, fig. 40), (5) Medea in the Peliades relief, (6) Athena and woman on the Trophy painter’s London Nolan amphora (Pfulh, fig. 513), and others. These are all very different gestures, and (5) and (6) denote planning rather than grief (like the os columnatum of comic terracottas). Yet another pose (not quoted) in which the fingers are put on the chin denotes seeing a vision (Carlsruhe painter’s cover cup in Boston, Orestes on the new B.M. silver cup). The Priam of the Hector painter’s Vatican amphora is a good introduction to the study of facial expression as distinct from gesture. It should perhaps be dated after rather than before 450 B.C. A comparison with theatre masks is natural, and the author finds the first ‘sloping’ brows on the mask of an old man on the Peiraueas relief: I do not feel certain of this and doubt if they occur before, at earliest, the third quarter of the fourth century. After the fifth century there is a considerable increase in the use of facial expression, and the author has interesting things to say about the Demosthenes of Polyxenos and the sarcophagus of Mourning Women. On the Gnathia fragment with the tragic actor the mask with slightly raised brows has surely more to do with pride and anger than grief, and the character probably should not be called ‘König im Elend’. I also doubt whether it is sound to argue from Middle Comedy statuettes to tragedy: it is possible that before the middle of the fourth century much more emotion was allowed to these comic figures than to the heroes of tragedy.

Laughter is treated more briefly because the material is slighter, and it is divided by topics instead of chronologically. The author sees the archaic smile as evidence of a concentration of life energy which can have magical and apotropaic results. This may be true of the laughing Gorgon (her second topic) but it is not clear why, when sculpting kouros and korai, the Greeks should have wanted to express
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this in the sixth century but neither earlier nor later; for the archaic smile of men and gods 'court style' still seems to me the best explanation. There is little to be said about gestures of joy (except a doubt whether the rhythmical clapping by his companions of a jumper accompanied by a lyre player on a geometric vase in Copenhagen should be included here, cf. also the Pyrrhias aryalbos). Satyrs and their kin laugh apotropaeically like Gorgons. Praxiteles made a mercérix gaudens as a pendant to a flens matrona, and she has her parallels in statuettes of actors taking the part of hetairaí in Comedy (the statuettes quoted in notes 439–41 are caricatures rather than actors of New Comedy but it does not affect the argument). Laughing slaves are commoner in the New Comedy material than the author allows (e.g. Pickard-Cambridge, Festivals, figs. 125, 139, 158). They, however, like hetairaí, belong to the lower stratum of society. Among the respectable only children were allowed to laugh and they first in the Hellenistic age.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.


Mr Higgins' work on the terracottas in the British Museum is wholly admirable as the first volume of his catalogue showed. The new volume shows the same high standard of detailed description, the same mastery of the subject, and the same skill in choosing relevant parallels. This volume falls into two parts: plastic vases of the seventh and sixth century B.C. and plastic lekythoi of the fourth century B.C. It has evidently been decided to treat these two classes of plastic vases as terracottas instead of inserting them gradually, like their Attic fellows of the late sixth and fifth centuries, in the Corpus Vasorum. This may be somewhat illogical and slightly untidy because there is a yawning gap between the two sections of this book, but it is very much to our advantage to have these vases properly treated by Mr Higgins now.

The first section includes plastic vases (decorated in glaze paint) produced all over the Greek world including such wholly delicious pieces as the swallow from Rhodes, the antelope's head from an East Greek group, the Corinthian hare. I can only comment on a few problems.

The Rhodian group has a curious history. Mr Higgins dates it from just before 600 to about 540 B.C., but about 560 the potters introduced plastic vases, particularly female figures, decorated with matt paint instead of glaze paint, and from about 540 only produced these (the specimens in the British Museum are illustrated in Vol. I, nos. 47–103). In fact the earlier group starts soon after the middle of the seventh century as Mr Higgins' notes on 1601–5 show. In general Mr Higgins' dating is admirable, but I still think that no. 1612 may be considerably earlier than no. 1608 with which it is compared; long straight nose, thin flat eyebrows, eyelids less amygdaloïd (cf. Antiquaries Journal, 16 (1936), p. 141).

Nos. 1659–62 belong to the group identified by Professor Martin Robertson in JHS 58 (1938), pp. 41 ff., and connected by him tentatively with the firm making Chalcidian vases, which he believed to have worked in Italy; later (ibid., p. 255) he noted that certain fragments found in Lindos belonged to the group, which argued against the Italian origin. He has a very nice stylistic argument for dating the group after 550 B.C. and probably near 530 B.C. Mr Higgins produces evidence from excavation which leads him to date the group before rather than after the middle of the century and finds a parallel for the fabric in a class of almost certainly Ionian vases decorated with horizontal black bands. I find the attribution to the firm that made the very fine Chalcidian vases extremely attractive, and Mr Boardman has argued again recently (BSA 52 (1957), p. 12) for their origin in Chalcis, and Chalcidian pieces in Smyrna match the plastic fragments in Lindos. The question must be left open.

In the Corinthian group the most interesting are the 'men squatting'. On no. 1665 (early sixth century) Mr Higgins says firmly 'he must be an actor representing a comast, the counterpart of the Attic and Ionian satyrs'. I should only hesitate about the term actor at this early date, but he is certainly dressed up and the costume reappears on contemporary Corinthian vases, e.g. Athens, N.M. 664 (Bieber, History, fig. 83) and Brussels A 83 (CV, II7, pl. 1, 26). Perhaps he should be called a tailless satyr rather than a comast, if the ordinary padded dancers are to be called comasts. The dots on his costume represent hair. Mr Higgins finds an earlier example in no. 1664; and Munich 6633 (CV, Munich, pl. 148) probably comes between them. Mr Higgins' list of parallels to no. 1665 omits Dunedin 48.187 (Anderson, pl. 4) and Oxford, CV, 2, pl. 8, fig. 7; the latter like Mr Higgins' no. 5 in Bonn is more ithyphallic than the rest but not very ithyphallic like the example recently found at Isthmia (Corinth IP 1708, Bronze, Hesperia 28 (1959), p. 335, no. 10, pl. 71a, b). This new squatter has no dots below the breastbone but instead a pair of dancers painted on either side of the phallus; a similar subject with satyrs instead of dancers is found on an Attic blackfigure lekythos (N.M. 9690, ABY, p. 505).

The second section of the book describes the rather unpleasing plastic lekythoi of the fourth century B.C. which are decorated in front in terracotta technique and in vase technique behind; only the Kephals (no. 1707) has real artistic merit. All the twenty are Attic except for one Boeotian and one Campanian imitation. The artists do not make identification easier by adding wings to the figures for the aesthetic
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T. B. L. WEBSTER.


M. Villard has in recent years published a number of archaeological studies about finds on western Greek sites and their historical significance. In his new book the early pottery from Marseilles, much augmented by excavations since the end of the last war, is presented, and serves as text for a study of the town's commercial importance. The pottery is of little intrinsic interest although there is now enough of it for the foundation date of Marseilles to serve as another 'peg' for the dating of Corinthian and some East Greek vases. Some plainer East Greek vases are attributed to Phocaea, faute de mieux, and local Massaliot wares are well defined. Aeolic bucchero is rightly distinguished from Rhodian (better not 'Ionian'). The fragments are published skilfully and accurately. I would only remark that pl. 12.10 shows not Herakles and Triton but a warrior or a woman without a belt; pl. 18.12, why not an Attic glaube?; pl. 18.14, better fifth-century; on pl. 19.2 the figure on the right holds a bird; on pl. 19.3 the 'lyre-player' is a komast with his usual Chian headgear. If the fragments had been presented in a simple catalogue form it would not have mattered so much that every page reference in the List of Plates is wrong. The reader might also more easily have borne the different scales of the cut-out fragments on each plate if they had been arranged in the order in which they were discussed. The photographs are very good, but many of the drawings lack horizontals or centre-lines.

A sharp decline in the import of Greek pottery is noted at the beginning of the fifth century; the sharper, perhaps, for V.'s reluctance to put much of the latest b.c. after 500. The attempt to explain this decline is the most important part of the book, and, among other things, it occasions a review of the archaeological evidence for the import of Greek and Etruscan objects to Gaul and of the importance of the Mt. Lassois (Vix) oppidum as entrepot for trade through Marseilles. There are no maps! Marseilles' decline is explained in terms of the failure of her connexions inland, the overthrow of the Hallstatt centres, like Mt. Lassois, and shift of power to the La Tène cities of the Rhine valley. Instead of the sixth-century Greek things through Marseilles to central France we see fifth-century Etruscan things passing over the Alps to Switzerland and Germany. This had been pointed out by others, but Marseilles' part makes the picture clearer. Only one point seems weak: the insistence on the relations of Marseilles with Chalcidian colonies in the west, which relies on scraps of 'pseudo-Chalcidian' pottery and on V.'s theory of the provenance of the Vix crater; but this does not affect the main argument. Finally, the author suggests that it was the overland tin-route from England that made Marseilles so important in the sixth century. Ancient testimonies for the sources of tin are collected and the discussion ranges from the evidence for the land-route to consideration of the sea-route, Tartessos, Gades and Phoenicians. V. would have placed us further in his debt had he analysed as carefully the finds in Spain, but he cannot fairly be criticised for absence of such detailed digressions.

JOHN BOARDMAN.


Students of Greek drama have every reason to be grateful to Professor Trendall for this exemplary publication. It is extremely cheap, it has pictures of
twenty-seven vases (hitherto unillustrated or badly illustrated), and only Professor Trendall could have done it; only he has the knowledge to add about fifty new vases to the existing lists and to assign them to their fabrics. It is much more than a very full bibliography (general and special) of one hundred and ninety vases; each vase is dated, attributed to its fabric and sometimes painter; the pictures of stages are classified and the masks are identified; the subjects are interpreted. In the main catalogue the vases are arranged first under shapes and then under museums within each shape. An appendix adds South Italian red-figure vases (i.e. excluding Gnathia) in which ‘other types of masks’ form part of the design. This is followed by an index of masks, an index of museum numbers, and a most useful concordance of numbers in Trendall’s list with the numbers of Heydemann, Zahn, Wüst, Cattareuca, and Webster (Greek Theatre Production) and with the figures in Miss Bieber’s Denkmäler and the two editions of her History. A general introduction discusses classification, costume and staging, and subjects.

I add some notes on points of detail: nos. 1 to 15, the inclusion of earlier Attic red-figure and polychrome and contemporary Corinthian red-figure emphasises the likeness of the performances on the mainland. Add to catalogue and concordance that nos. 1, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14 will be figs. 202, 184, 208, 210, 209, and 203 in Miss Bieber’s second edition of History. Professor D. Amyx reports a further Corinthian fragment in the Corinth Museum. No. 8, the only Attic picture earlier than Aristophanes, must have been very like no. 23 in subject. No. 55, a new Paestan vase of the mid-fourth century has Phrynis with his lyre struggling with Pyronides, who wears a cloak. Pyronides as a nickname for Myronides is attested both by a papyrus fragment of Eupolis’ Demes and by some of the MSS. of Plutarch quoting the Demes. Myronides and Phrynis were contemporaries. This must almost have been an Attic comedy, played something like a century later in Paestum. No. 70, also Paestan, belongs to the ancestry of the end of the Dyskolos: two thugs drag the elderly Charinos off his money-chest. No. 78, Apulian about 400 B.C., also represents an elderly man in difficulties between two tormentors, a Scythian and an old woman; if the inscription is read straight across the vase it makes an iambic tetrameter catalectic like the thug scene of the Dyskolos. Nos. 105, 124, explained as caricatures rather than stage-performance: so also Binsfeld, Gylllow, Cologne, 1935, 19, who adds also no. 104. No. 127, explained as marionettes, cf. Plato, Laws 644d, and further discussion in J. Döring, Antike Kunst, 1, (1958), 41. No. 154, it may be noted that the McDaniel collection has another fragment of this vase with part of a tragic actor wearing grey cloak, red sleeves, yellow himation: the painting is astonishingly fine and beautifully preserved. Appendix, no. xxii, is now published in British Museum Quarterly, 29 (1959), 100.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.


The following notes cover those articles only which relate to Greek coinage.

1. J. F. Healy discusses the place of the electrum stater bearing the head of Apollo and MYTI in the Lesbian series, and concludes that this unique coin is to be associated with the revolt of Mytilene in 427 B.C. (1 Plate.)

2. A. R. Bellinger compiles a list of the earliest tetradrachms of Ilium (188–193 B.C.). He suggests that such small but showy issues, produced by many cities in Asia Minor, were coined not for economic reasons, but from motives of prestige. He rejects the traditional view that magistrates’ names appear on such coins as a measure of control, and argues plausibly that this was an honour conferred on public-spirited citizens, who may have contributed the cost of the issue. (4 Plates.)

3. A. R. Bellinger summarises the issues of Alexandria Troas from Antoninus Pius to Gallienus. Sixty-three types are listed, ranging from the statue of the local deity, Apollo Smithneus, to what appears to be a view of the city council in session. From the reigns in which each type occurs and from the number of specimens of each preserved in the major collections, a general picture of the activity of the mint is obtained. Major peaks both in volume and variety appear under Commodus, Caracalla, Severus Alexander and under Valerian and Gallienus. (6 Plates.)

4. S. P. Noe contributes a note on a tetrobol of Histiaeia, on which the stylist on reverse is inscribed NIK[H] in minute letters. He draws attention to an already published example inscribed ΑΘΑΙ[N] and to a vase showing a stylist inscribed ΖΕΥΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ. (1 Plate.)

5. G. K. Jenkins publishes and comments on the Iberian section of a hoard of Roman and Iberian denarii from Cordova, buried late in the second century B.C. The hoard indicates that the most prolific period for the native silver coinages was that between the Numantian and Sertorian wars. (6 Plates.)

6. G. K. Jenkins proposes that an Augustan issue usually given to Carthago Nova should be re-attributed to Ilici. (1 Plate.)

7. C. H. V. Sutherland offers a new interpretation of a rare countermark found on early imperial cistophori. He shows that the usual expansion giving the name of Vespasian must be rejected and that the true reading is impressum Niconiade (= countermarked at Nicomediea). (1 Plate.)

8. A. A. Boyce studies the use of ‘Severus’ in the titulature of Caracalla. Though never found on the imperial coinage, and nowhere before the death of his father, thereafter the inclusion of the name appears to be the official form in some places. Clearest is Egypt where the practice of the Alexandrian coinage from 211–215 is repeated in inscriptions
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and papyri. The usage, common also in Asia Minor and Thrace, is an example of the practice of adopting the name of a predecessor for reasons of continuity and prestige. (4 Plates.)

9. G. P. Galavaris examines the symbolic aspects of the imperial costumes seen on Byzantine coins, and traces the changes in emphasis in coin types which take place throughout the history of the Byzantine Empire. (6 Plates.)

C. M. KRAAY.


Part 5 of the Sylloge, Vol. IV, Sicyon-Thera, continues the record of the Leake and General collections of the Fitzwilliam Museum. The 545 coins catalogued are derived from the cities of the Peloponnese, Crete and the islands of the Aegean. Noteworthy series are those of Sicyon, the Achaean League, Elis and Crete.

Recent volumes of the Sylloge belong to one of two categories: they are either (i) a catalogue limited to factual details, on the grounds that the provision of further information is the province of the specialist, or of the author of the monograph (cf. Sylloge von Aulock), or (ii) a complete record with additional references to the latest works on specific mints, or to detailed treatments of problems connected with the coins catalogued. Professor Heichelheim is once again responsible for the present, well-planned text which follows the second pattern including 'the maximum information in the minimum of space'. He performs a valuable service in re-examining the attribution of many issues (3553, 3557, 3570 and others) and further revises Leake, Numismata Hellenica (to which cross-references are given wherever possible), publishing a number of omissions from this earlier catalogue (3515, 3560 and others); unrecorded coins from the McClean collection (3960 and 4019) are also included. The most noteworthy issue from this part of the Sylloge (3722) carries a portrait of the emperor Hadrian, of exceptionally fine style and, as its reverse type, a head of Pheidias Zeus. It is a bronze from Elis—one of three extant examples—'discovered' in the Fitzwilliam collection in 1941 by the author: Leake had incorrectly attributed the coin to Hydrela, in Phrygia. Among the many other interesting issues are a didrachm of the Arcadian League (3851) and rare didrachms from Olus and Tylissus (3976 and 3997).

In the text to 3538 read monogram and, in 3670, Naster: in 3660 the countermarks should read 2i and xiii (similarly 3661); the page reference (3662) is, in fact, 11. The abbreviations employed are not always consistent (Katoche hoard, Lacroix, Reproductions and similar) but there is no danger of confusion.

The plates are of good quality and the casts are arranged in order except where economy of space decrees otherwise.

Professor Heichelheim is to be congratulated on the continuation of this extensive and important work.

J. F. HEALY.


The present monograph is a catalogue of the coins—753 in number—discovered during excavations carried out under the auspices of the University Museum of Philadelphia between 1932 and 1953. The coins recorded range over a wide period of time and represent a cross-section of Curium's history.

Greek coins, from the ancient sanctuary of Apollo Hylates and mainly Ptolemaic in date, were struck in Cyprus itself (1–146), elsewhere in the Greek world (147–206) or are from unidentified sources (207–209). Roman coins, imported from Rome, or from mints in Asia Minor (210–693), miscellaneous imitations (694–670), Byzantine (671–733) and Mediaeval (734–753) complete the account. In addition to the descriptive text, which includes details of types and size (but not weights), Miss Cox gives a stimulating commentary on certain of the more significant issues and problems connected with them. The limited utility, however, of the coins is summed up in the introduction (p. ix): 'They represent only phases in the life of the city. Their relative numbers can give no indication of the importance of the place at different times. Their significance lies almost wholly in their being found at Curium.'

The references in Head, Historia Nummorum, pp. 738 and 745, indicate the vagueness surrounding the mint at Curium and its activities (although Babelon, Traité, p. cxxviii, attempts to be more positive in his attributions). The coins do, however, throw some new light on outstanding problems—among them the identification of local mints in Cyprus, or of branches of the Paphos mint, on the date of the accession of Evagoras II (p. 88) and on the distinction between Cypriote and Egyptian issues struck under Ptolemy I (p. 96). The volume of evidence is not great but tends, on the whole, to confirm much of the earlier work of Poole, Regling and Svoronos.

A number of unpublished, or rare coins occur—of Severus Alexander (145), Pergamum (153), Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (190) and others. One of the most interesting discoveries, however, was a medallion (230) of unpublished types carrying as obv. confronted busts of Marcus and Commodus and rev. the legend—unique in the numismatic field—PROPAGA/TORIBUS/IMPERRI (a similar inscription occurs on an aureus of Caracalla and on an aureus and denarius of Plautilla): Miss Cox suggests that the
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medallion may refer to Commodus’ marriage in A.D. 177.

The ten plates, which are of good quality, illustrate a selection of the more important coins. The concisely presented monograph provides a valuable record.

J. F. HEALY.


This fine new annual can be given a whole-hearted welcome. Its aim is to provide a milieu for publishing articles of scholars on the archaeology and art of glassware of all periods and countries; and if future numbers are of the standard and coverage of this first one that aim will continue to be triumphantly attained.

For readers of the JHS chief interest centres in the classical glasses of the Greeks and Romans and in their successors that were current within the Byzantine Empire and neighbouring countries down to A.D. 1000 or somewhat later. Within that field fall the first five articles here presented and the first two of these, in particular, are basic studies of great importance which Hellenists cannot afford to ignore. In the first Mrs Weinberg discusses a very interesting and closely allied series of pyxes of green, yellow or brown (occasionally verging on colourless) glass-metal, none of which can be pinned down to any provenience outside the Aegean area and no less than eleven are from Crete. The group has for long been recognised by a few specialists, and it is good to have it at last described so fully and authoritatively. The vessels are moulded and polished (usually free-hand) with no decoration except occasional grooves and Mrs Weinberg believes with justice that they date from the Hellenistic period and that their distribution-pattern indicates a factory in Crete, perhaps near Elyros.

The second article, by Axel von Saldern of the Corning Museum, discusses a number of pieces of the Greek and Hellenistic periods recently found at Gordium. First and foremost there is the by now well-known omphalos-bowl of almost colourless glass found in Tumulus P of the late eighth century B.C. This bowl is a key piece in the story of ancient glassware, being of the finest workmanship, moulded and afterwards ground and polished. Von Saldern connects it with a number of other greenish or yellowish or colourless vessels, including the Sargon alabastron and others from Nimrud, the Aliseda jug, and the footed dinos from the R. W. Smith collection, now in Corning—a group which seems to spread over the eighth to sixth centuries B.C. He is not prepared to say firmly where all these were made, but hints at Mesopotamia. Perhaps we should think of Phoenicians as their makers (the form of the Aliseda jug is typically Phoenician), but even so the place of manufacture could well have been in Assyria, where Phoenicians may have worked for Assyrian masters. Von Saldern’s second group is a series of moulded and cut bowls of Hellenistic date of a type represented by fine pieces from Canosa, Aegina and Ephesus in the British Museum, and by others elsewhere. Thirdly he discusses fragments of a two-layer gold-glass bowl which is a close parallel to the fine pair in the British Museum that also came from Canosa. These again are Hellenistic, probably third century B.C., and he believes—no doubt rightly—that they come from Alexandrian workshops. It is good to have these three groups of important glasses so thoroughly discussed and described.

The next three articles are slighter. Hanffmann discusses briefly some fragments (mainly seventh century A.D.) recently found at Sardis; Seyrig describes some stone moulds of the Islamic period which may have been for small glass vessels; and Megaw illustrates and describes a fine gold-painted bottle of the late twelfth century A.D., found in the castle at Kato Paphos in Cyprus, of a type already discussed in Mrs Weinberg’s publication of the twelfth-century Corinth factory-site.

The remaining articles pass to much more modern times, spreading into eighteenth-century latimo plates from Venice, eighteenth and nineteenth century American glasses, and even Japanese glasses.

There are two further useful features. The first is a series of illustrations and short descriptions of recent acquisitions of glass by public and private collections, covering glass of all periods. This and its successors in future volumes will constitute a most useful record as well as permitting students to keep abreast of the movements of good quality glasses through sale-rooms and dealers’ hands. The second is a detailed bibliography of recent publications, both books and articles.

We may all be grateful to the Corning Museum of Glass for initiating this venture. A periodical publication devoted solely to the history of glass has long been needed. The editors, who are all members of the Museum staff, may be congratulated on an excellent first volume, and we may be confident that future issues will be even better value for the very reasonable subscription price that has been fixed. Future volumes should, however, include a list of illustrations, and the printers should take care not to cut the illustrations so closely that portions of the glasses are lost to view.

D. B. HARDEN.


In his review of the first report on the excavations carried out between 1935–1938 at the site of the Great Palace in Istanbul (JHS lxvi (1946), 135–6), Professor Talbot Rice concluded that it was 'as satis-
factory a publication as could be desired, and as it bears the sub-title "a first report", one only hopes that at some future date a continuation of the excavations is envisaged'. The present sumptuous volume is the report on that continuation, sponsored as before by the Walker Trust of St. Andrews, under his own direction between 1951-1954, and once again it is without doubt as satisfactory a publication as could be desired.

The area where the previous excavators discovered the large rectangular Peristyle with its now famous mosaic floor apparently underwent several transformations. Beneath it are substructures, perhaps of the fourth century; but the earliest structure which can confidently be associated with the Palace is a paved way running across the court, to which the Peristyle was a later addition. The mosaics themselves belong to a second period, which lasted long enough for them to need considerable repairs; and they were subsequently overlaid by a marble pavement. The Peristyle is now seen to have surrounded the forecourt of an Apsed Hall, which was itself the successor to two earlier buildings to which the Paved Way had given access. A further section of the mosaics was unearthed, comprising thirteen more isolated groups of figures in three rows, with part of the border surrounding them. The group of the two very large boys on a very small camel being led, as if round the Zoo, by a hefty attendant, and the lively scene of the man being kicked off his mule are in themselves sufficient reward for all the labour of rescuing these mosaics from oblivion. To the two great bearded heads of Oceanus framed in the fine scroll-work of the border previously discovered is now added the striking and strangely barbarous head of a man with a greyish-blue moustache.

Professor Talbot Rice analyses the decoration of the floor mosaic as a whole, discussing its technique and artistic significance, thus complementing the account of G. Brett in the first report. He suggests a date between A.D. 450 and 550, and not about 410 as was formerly proposed. Although comparable in points of style and subject-matter with many others widely separated in time and space (from Piazza Armerina to North Africa and Syria), yet these mosaics point to the future rather than the past. They cannot be labelled as predominantly Roman, Syrian, Hellenistic, or oriental. They present, in fact, a pre-view of the fully-developed form of the Constantinopolitan style of Byzantine art. On the problem of identifying the Peristyle and the Apsed Hall Professor Talbot Rice and Mr Ward Perkins are understandably cautious; but they very sensibly treat the matter in the light not only of the circumstantial evidence but also of general probability on historical grounds. It is highly unlikely, e.g., that Theodosius II, who is known to have been deeply religious, would have ordered a mosaic floor wholly secular in subject. Nor does the earlier identification of the Peristyle with the Helikon of the Pharos seem probable. It is tempting to associate it with Marcian (451-457); but it then remains to decide whether Marcian should be credited with the earlier or the later phase of the buildings. On the present evidence the only safe conclusion is that for the whole complex of buildings some date between Marcian and Justinian, or possibly even Justin II (565-578), must be sought.

Many difficulties and frequent hazards were encountered by Professor Talbot Rice and his colleagues in excavating this tortuous and fearsomey overbuilt site; and it is a credit to their skill, patience and intrepidity that they have produced so much order out of chaos. A special word of praise should go to Dr Spencer Corbett for his admirably lucid plans and drawings. The remains of the successive buildings and substructures now revealed are eloquent advertisements for the remarkable conservatism of Byzantine building techniques; and on this subject Mr Ward Perkins contributes an important chapter, comparing the new material with some of the other early buildings in Byzantine Constantinople, and probing the origins of the methods employed by the first Byzantine architects. He concludes that they derived from practices already current locally at the beginning of the fourth century, which had entered the 'local repertory' in the previous two hundred years. In other words, so far as building materials and techniques are concerned, the 'Orient oder Rom' controversy is pointless; for they were the product of conditions already established in the area.

Finally, Dr Corbett reports the results of his excavations with Mr Ward Perkins in 1953 on the site of the 'House of Justinian' on the north edge of the Bucoleon harbour. He has established two distinct phases in the building of the sea-walls of the city at this point, the second of which he assigns tentatively to the seventh century, and two phases in the construction of a vaulted loggia of the Palace overlooking the harbour, which in its final form may be dated provisionally to the eighth century. It was a happy thought to include as an Appendix the hitherto unpublished review of the first report by the late Dr A. M. Schneider, who knew perhaps as much as anyone can know about Byzantine Constantinople on the evidence so far available. A very few misprints (e.g. on pl. 42) seem more offensive than they really are in so magnificent a publication.

D. M. NICOL.


The linguistic and cultural divisions between the Greek East and Latin West had a fundamental effect on the history of the Christian Church. By A.D. 200 the original division between the Jewish-Christian communities of Palestine, Syria and Egypt and the Hellenistic Christians of Asia Minor had been superseded by a far more serious cleavage between Chris-
tianity as understood in the Greek and Latin-speaking worlds respectively. This cleavage embraced the whole field of Christian teaching. It extended to the doctrine of God, the doctrine of Man and the role of the Church in society, and thence to different interpretations of the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ, and finally, to differing views of Church organisation. It is hard to find two theologians contemporary yet so utterly opposed in outlook as Tertullian and Clement, and their contrasting standpoints were never reconciled by their successors. Indeed, one aspect of the history of the Church in the thousand years which followed the conversion of Constantine is the successive crises between East and West, in which the Council of Sardica, the Photian Schism, the breach of 1054, and the sack of Constantinople by the Latins in 1204, are the main incidents.

The author has examined the basic spiritual causes of this situation. He is not an historian, and indeed he is inclined to be critical of the historian's approach, even though his first chapter on 'The Roman Background' opens with Eusebius' famous description of the triumph of Constantine and the Church over Licinius (Eusebius, Hist. Ecc. x. 9. 6-9). He prefers to proceed, as he says, from 'an acceptance of principles of a non-historical order'. Thus, as Truth is ultimately one, even though beyond formulation in 'conceptual and logically coherent terms' (p. 51), so we must regard the Church also as one sub specie aeternitatis. 'The events' of Christ's life are repeated wherever and whenever the members of the Church participate in the Mysteries', and these, together with 'the mystagogal life which centres around them constitute, in their totality, the Church' (p. 45). Thus, in a sense the Church has always been one, and the schism between East and West cannot be regarded as a breach of that Oneness. It is merely the product of different mental images of the Truth which led first, to differing dogmatic formulations, and thence to rival conceptions of ecclesiastical formulations and authority (p. 50).

The author gives a very clear and full explanation in theological terms why the Filioque dispute arose. From his account it can be seen that it was in reality the same problem of the interpretation, in human terms, of the Divine Essence that had kept East and West from genuine agreement during the Trinitarian controversies of the fourth century. At the same time he shows the connexion of this dispute with that concerning ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The Greek view of the essential equality of the members of the episcopate resulted from an acceptance of the fact that the bishop imagined the real but invisible presence of Christ Himself, wherever he might be ministering. Thus no one bishop could be pre-eminent over his fellows. The Latins, however, insisting on the absolute simplicity of the divine nature, demanded the primacy of one bishop, that of Rome, as a means of expressing this uniqueness on earth.

In the second part of his book, the author follows out the religious history of the Greek world, with its growing alienation from the Latins down to recent times. He has much that is interesting to say about Platonism in East and West and the Greek contribution to the ideas of the modern Western world. These pages demonstrate the depth and scope of this primary religious division in Europe. It is a pity, perhaps, that the author, spanning fifteen hundred years of history, should not have attempted to fuse religious and historical perspectives, the religious and non-religious antipathies, and thus have produced a basic study of the problem for our own day. He might have been interested, for this purpose, in Harnack's famous lecture to the Academy of Sciences in Berlin in 1912. Harnack's study of Eastern and Western Christianity had as its background the historic cultural frontier between Latin and Greek in the Balkans, along which the successive Balkan crises of 1908–1912 were erupting. For, the understanding even of theological differences demands an historical approach; especially if these differences coincide with cultural and linguistic divisions, as the fifth-century historian of the Church, Socrates, perceived, and when these in their turn affect questions of war and peace. It is remarkable how closely Harnack's and the author's analyses of the religious differences between East and West coincide.

The latter, however, has seen his problem purely as one of theology, and the result is a penetrating, if incomplete, study of the religious cleavage which divides eastern and western Europe. It is a book, however, of learning, perception and fair-mindedness. As such it is to be welcomed unreservedly. One hopes that in a second edition, the author will complete his task by discussing the cultural background of this division as clearly as he has now discussed its theology.

W. H. C. Frend.


This book has a sub-title, Libanius, Chrysostome et les moines de Syrie. It is essential to keep this sub-title in mind: the book is not a history of Antioch, or even of the church there, but a study of the tensions involved in the cultural and spiritual life of a great city in the late fourth century A.D., as portrayed by contemporary authors, and as evidenced by the lives of a large number of individuals connected with Antioch or Northern Syria. J'ai donc essayé, à l'aide de ces textes (principally of Julian, Libanius, Chrysostom and Theodoret), de revivre un peu mo-


2 Socrates, Hist. Eccl. ii. 22.
mêmes dans la grande capitale de la province d'Orient' (p. 9). The Antiochene scene is rich in sources, and Festugière lets them speak for themselves. A considerable part of the book is therefore made up of translation, sometimes in the text, sometimes in separate sections.

Libanius, in Or. XI (Antiochikos) gives a topographical description of the city, Orientis apex pulcher, as Ammianus called it (xxii. 9. 14). While we could understand the Antiochene situation without this description it is not unifying that it should form the content of Chapter I. To understand this description a commentary is essential and that of M. Roland Martin is full and clear (pp. 38–61).

Chapter II (pp. 63–89) deals with Julian’s controversy with the Antiochenes—in fact the name of Julian might well be added to the sub-title. Part of this chapter has already been published in JR(S) (1957), pp. 53–8 (Julien à Macellum). In that period at Macellum lies the key to the ‘ton disgracieux’ of the Misopogon (p. 63). Julian was, in his austerity, totally at cross purposes with the populace, who, though in a large measure Christian, had not lost their love of pleasure and tumult—‘Crétiens de bouche, sans que leur croyance eût rien changé à leur caractère foncier et à leurs moeurs’ (p. 80). But his abundant sacrifices brought no pleasure to these, his economic measures, designed with the best intentions, were ill-judged and increased his unpopularity, as did his objections to the public amusements which the people loved. But the crown of his displeasure was reached when the temple of Apollo at Daphne was burnt, as a reprisal for which he shut the great church (a building not of course mentioned in Libanius’ description).

The satire of Julian sets the stage for the cultural tensions of Libanius and Chrysostom. The question whether the former taught the latter is handled in Additional Note A on pp. 409–10, but is left unresolved; but the evidence is reduced to the testimony of Socrates alone. The rhetors were men of great importance, whose instruction was the gateway to official careers, notwithstanding the complaints of Libanius about the kind of men who secured office from the time of Constantius II onwards. The reign of Constantius had marked a stage in the abandonment of ἡ τὰς ἀσκήσεις, which Libanius regarded as closely connected. Life indeed was not easy for the rhetor. He was constantly struggling against the attraction of legal studies, and against rivals. But, as F. points out (p. 99), wordy battles were a characteristic of the age and affected theologians and monks as well. To a sketch of Libanius’ career F. adds a selection of letters (pp. 119–39) dealing with his pupils, and showing his care for these boys and for their subsequent careers. They frequently came to him from distant homes: and, if one may anticipate what F. says in his conclusions (p. 403), ‘La société bourgeoise que l’on devine par ces lettres est honnête et saine’. Libanius is more gentle to his provincial pupils than to his young Antiochenes. But (p. 404) he is impervious to Christianity. He and Chrysostom, with the same moral ends in view, ignore one another.

The whole question of Paidéia grecque et Éducation chrétienne is of extraordinary interest. On this subject, however, the book becomes too discursive and there is repetition in Chapters V and VI. The object of παιδεία, as shown in Libanius, is the development of the Ἐλληνικὸς Βίος, which is made up of good moral qualities; on pp. 218–23 F. gives examples of what is Ἐλληνικὸς and what is not. The Christian opposition to παιδεία centred on the stories in Greek literature of divine immorality and on the actual worship of the Gods. F. thinks that the effect of the former, as portrayed in the authors usually studied, was negligible, and that the theatrical representations, a far greater source of danger, have nothing to do with παιδεία, and are actually attacked by Libanius. He also thinks that Libanius, though superstitious, is not a particularly religious spirit and that his alliance of ἱερὰ καὶ λύποι came about because of the attacks on culture and on paganism by Christian emperors and by the monks (pp. 235–9). Many Christians had of course come to terms with παιδεία. F. cites Basil of Caesarea, and the Christians who, according to Chrysostom, sent their children to the sophists: one can also cite the indignation caused by Julian’s edict forbidding Christians to teach. But the monks and the moralists were on the other side. Chrysostom has got the answer: either adopt the monastic life, or send the young for a long, though unspecified, period to the monks for ‘la formation morale’. In Book II of his work against the detractors of the monastic life he had transferred to the monks the qualities long deemed to be the possession of sages. Antioc was a βόρβορος τῆς ἀσκήσεως. F. takes up one point only (pp. 195 ff.), that of homosexual corruption. The gravity of the situation was such that one must flee to the monastery, which was ready at the gates of Antioch. It is not hard to demolish Chrysostom’s case: F. does it vigorously, aptly using the words of Epicetus to the Epicureans (p. 188), attacking the race suicide to which the ideals of Chrysostom (and of Jerome) would lead, pointing out that their views are opposed by a weight of Scripture, which it requires desperate exegesis to eliminate. Moreover, the whole question of vocation arises, ‘entré sans vraie vocation dans un monastère, il y sombra dans une profonde neurasthénie’ (p. 192). Nor did the idea of a ‘monksh’ education exist in Syria, and Chrysostom’s solution was in effect impracticable.

We now come to the second part of the book, Les Ermites de Syrie (pp. 245–401), who, notwithstanding Chrysostom and Jerome, have not the fame of their Egyptian counterparts. In Chapters VII and VIII F. draws from the Historia Religiosa of Theodoret accounts of certain monks who made their influence felt in the Church of Antioch, or who actually lived there. An example of the former is Julian Sabas, who intervened in 365 in the troubles of the Antiochene church, of the latter Aphraates from Persia,
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who lived at Antioch from c. 365–post 400, and whom Theodoret met when a boy. As F. shows (p. 274) there grew up ‘un folk-lore antiochien’ on Aphraates and, as in so much monastic literature, it is hard to tell where fact ends and fable begins.

Most of the monks did not know Greek: many were repulsive in their looks and appalling in their austerities: they attached to themselves heavy stones and chains, a practice that had its critics in Egypt (1), some enclosed themselves in huts or caves in the greatest discomfort, others rejected all shelter and were ἐκπαρκοῦντες, the extreme example of the latter being the ‘pillar’ saints.

Chapter X deals with the monks who lived in monasteries, which are given as listed by Theodoret, and there follows a study of how the monks lived. One problem is whether they lived in cells or in dormitories. The different views of Lassus and Tchalenko are discussed. No cells are found in the ruins of Syrian monasteries and the problem arises of the use of the large rectangular buildings, with porticoes, which is a feature of these (a plate opposite p. 320 clearly shows two examples). As the supreme object of the monks was contemplation, it is far more likely that the view of Tchalenko is correct, that the monks lived round about in cells that have vanished, and that the big room was a meeting place or workshop. F. illustrates Chrysostom’s views on monasticism by a long series of extracts. ‘ἁπατος ἐστίν’ the preacher’s constant cry, and we may judge that the monkish life exerted a moral influence on the visitors. But the pictures of Chrysostom are ‘tableaux idylliques, loin de la réalité’. He is the inventor of ‘la poésie des cloîtres’ where the institution is viewed from the outside and from the tumult of the city (p. 345).

Finally in Chapter XII we have a detailed analysis of the sources for the life of the first pillar saint, Symeon the elder. These sources have been edited by Lietzmann. They consist of Theodoret’s account in HR (translated on pp. 388–401), a Syriac life, and a Greek life by ‘Antony’, translated in Appendix III (pp. 493–506). Here once more we are in the midst of monastic literary forms. F. concludes (p. 387) that for Symeon’s stay at Teleda, his first monastery, Theodoret is the best source, for his stay at Telneshin we have an ‘official’ legend, and that for his death the Greek life is a superior authority. He prefaces his translation of Theodoret by a brief analysis of the variations in style in the narration, which reveal different sources.

This book, therefore, contains material of very different kinds, analysis, translation, narrative and comment. Festugière has long been well known for his studies of the religious thought of the ancient world. Here we have another such study, and the author must be congratulated on his handling in text, notes and additional notes of his complicated material. But he is never afraid to criticise the authors whom he knows so well. Nor is he averse to the expression of modern parallels. ‘Toute grande

ville est essentiellement paleïenne. Et tout Chrétien réfléchi se retrouve, par force, devant les mêmes difficultés’ (p. 406). ‘What has been is what will be, and what has been done is what will be done’ (Eccl. 1. 9).

J. STEVENSON.


The author’s wide knowledge of the abundant material and use of unfamiliar sources, Kern’s Acta e.g. no less than Holobolos, deserve immediate praise.

He divides his book into three parts, describing successively Michael Palaeologue’s Nicene career, the first years of the restored Empire and, lastly, the conflict between Charles of Anjou and Palaeologue, seen as the crowning-point, not only of the years spent staving Charles off, but of Michael’s whole career.

Chapter I (following Introduction and Prologue) is called ‘Formative years’. Hence, I suppose, the section on lack of evidence of maternal influence on Michael’s youth, which, with its exhaustive notes, reads so wonderfully like the parody of a work of massive erudition. The space might, however, have been given to more positive information. Chapters 2 and 4 are better balanced. To Chapter 3 (‘The Battle of Pelagonia’) I shall return later.

The central section deals with the return to CP, measures of administration and defence, attitude adopted towards Latin population, courting of Rome, relations with Genoa and Venice, with Manfred and Greeks and Franks of the Peloponnesse, all in considerable detail. Not for nothing is the book Michael and the West. But a balanced account, even of relations with the West, requires a minimum of reference to the East. In no section of the book is that minimum provided. Even the Balkans are dealt with so fragmentarily and incoherently that their role is barely comprehensible. And the further from the West, the scrappier the treatment. ‘The Turkish peril’, says G. ‘... has been taken into consideration as it affected policy toward the West’. Let me quote the consideration given to the Turkish peril: ‘The charge frequently levied against Michael of virtually unqualified neglect of his Asiatic frontiers must, to a certain degree at least, be modified in the light of his bold plan of using Latin crusading armies to restore Anatolia to Byzantine rule’ (pp. 4–5, repeated in different terms p. 290; pp. 287–91, expanding the point, contain a few disorganised references to the Eastern situation). Add such rare and abrupt utterances as ‘fortifying Michael’s decision was the recent severe defeat of the Greeks at the hands of the Turks on the Sangarios river’ (p. 349). What Greeks? What Turks? A coherent account, however brief, of Michael’s remarkable Eastern policy of alliances, at least, is necessary—and deserved a little
more space than an idea which he was unable to carry out.

The last and longest section extends from Manfred's defeat at Benevento to the Sicilian rising. The unrealisable union with Rome dominates everything. G. remarks that the Pope (here Clement IV) did not realise that his demands were too uncompromising for Michael to have a hope of getting them implemented. On the other hand his solemn considerations as to whether Nicholas III was party to secret machinations between Michael and Peter of Aragon leave things much as they were, i.e. that the Pope realised Charles was getting out of hand, and accordingly did nothing to help him or hinder Peter. Distributions of Greek gold to a few cardinals would make little difference. And if Nicolas in person had received some, he would hardly have sold his soul for it, i.e. felt obliged to render in exchange any services he considered unsuitable.

The narrative closes with Michael's death, leaving CP freed from the Angevin menace.

Two appendices follow: 'Further arguments on the existence of a Greco-Aragonese Alliance' and 'Six unpublished documents illustrating Byzantine-Latin relations'. Of these latter, five are chiefly of interest for commercial and business practice. The sixth consists in fact of three 'anonymous epigrams in political verse... eulogising Michael VIII P., or, very possibly, his grandson, Michael IX. The verses, of conventional panegyric style and wording, offer no new material of particular historical importance'. All these documents would perhaps be happier in a specialised review, but one must be grateful for any space allowed to the publishing of new texts.

To return to G.'s chapter 'The Battle of Pelagonia', which relates the campaigns between the death of Lascaris and the taking of CP. He gives these events almost exclusively in terms of quotations from the sources. The value of this method depends on an appreciation, firstly of the sources themselves, secondly of the way the information is presented in the sources. True a footnote mentions that Acropolites was a prisoner at the time. (Incidentally, G. might have had some comment to make on Acropolites' silence after the taking of CP. Did A. prefer to keep quiet about a period when he had been so conspicuous a servant of the Union?). The assessment of the Chronicle of the Morea: 'if its material can be controlled by Byzantine or Latin sources—especially in the case of the Morea itself, about whose affairs the authors were presumably well-informed, there seems no valid reason to disregard its information' can hardly even mean anything except to a reader already fairly familiar with the Chronicle. (While on the subject of the Chronicle, I regret that none of the numerous notes concerns that 'sebastocrator Theodore', who embraces in his one person both John the Bastard and John Palaeologue). To the reliability of Gregoras a sufficient clue is given, though not till p. 350, note 31. In fact, for the campaigns of this chapter his most dependable contributions are his mistakes. 'A late and muddled account', says Nicols. Pachymeres presents his own difficulties. Reluctant, as he says himself, to break the thread, he will carry a particular story to its conclusion, resuming the general narrative at a point whose identification may be easy—or extremely hazardous. A brief analysis of his version of these events shows, apparently, three campaigns. (1) Michael of Epirus, aware of the Nicene crisis, decides on an offensive and appeals to his sons-in-law for support. His own bastard, John, is busy holding up John Palaeologue at Verroia (how J.P. got there is not explained). The Despot assembles his own and allied troops, and, before we know where we are, a battle recognisable as Pelagonia is beginning. The consequences for William of Achaea are pursued until after the taking of CP. (2) Back to a campaign immediately after Pelagonia, between the Despot's son, Nicephorus, and Strategopoulos. (3) After describing Michael's coronation and some considerable diplomatic activity, Pachymeres says that Michael sent his brother, ἕτοι δομιστικόν ὀνόμα, out west, where he ranges from Dyrrachium to Neo Patras, taking a large number of fortresses. To reward him, the Emperor promotes him to sebastocrator, sending the insignia out west. What does G. make of this campaign, with its wealth of place-names, whereas the first campaign has the single name of Verroia? And when does he date it?

In fact Acropolites, though he may dwell less on the tale of treachery, is the only one of the Greek chroniclers to give an account of these campaigns that might be reliable and chronologically ordered. To his description of the gradual retreat from Vorila Longos, past Stanos, Sokos and Molykos, to the final débandade at Prilap G. does not do justice. Pachymeres' account is, in spite of G., very close to Acropolites'. The decisive rôle they both attribute to the Bastard would in any case set them apart.

A fairly recent article, D. Nicol's 'Date of the Battle of Pelagonia', with the conclusion of which G. seems to express a sort of vague agreement, follows Acropolites quite closely, dividing hostilities into an autumn expedition (Ἀκρ. πρὸ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ σταυροθηρίου, also Gregoras), a successful spring campaign followed by a regathering of the Despot's forces, and then the operations leading up to Pelagonia.

G. neither makes these difficulties clear, nor takes a decided line in interpreting them.

Topography of the battle remains to a large extent obscure. But surely a book which purports to give the most complete and up-to-date account of certain events should not so frequently send the reader back to a preparatory article. Particularly if this article is merely to send him further back... to the Μεγάλη 'Ελληνική 'Εργυκλησία.

A sampling of scattered complaints: firstly concerning dates which are not always made as clear as they might be, or at best in a footnote twenty pages later. The Muzalons were murdered 'only a few
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days' after Theodore's burial. According to Acropolites οὔπω τριτάιος, while Pach. and Greg. state that it was at the ninth-day ceremony. P. 192 similarly: 'not long after the battle of Benevento', while a footnote runs 'Cf. Ptolemy of Lucca... Anno Domini 1269... Also Del Giudice who believes Charles began preparations... after vanquishing the Saracens of Lucca (1269)'. The text, it is true, continues with events attributable to 1266, but gives no date. Again, the author has every right to accept the Anonymous of Trani, and date the marriage of Helena to Manfred 2nd June 1259. He should, however, give warning that Acropolites and Pachymeres state categorically and repeatedly that it is accomplished, in connexion with different events of 1258.

G.'s partiality for his hero is natural. But when he says (p. 309): 'Victory, nevertheless, fell to the imperial forces', citing Ogier's report and Pachymeres, what Ogier actually says is that the Bastard nocuit eis (the Emperor's troops), while Pachymeres simply speaks of the imprisonment of Andronicus and his companions, not of the events that caused it.

One is tempted to transfer to Michael Psellus and the West its author's judgement on Hopf's Geschichte 'wretchedly organised and frequently inaccurate, yet still extremely useful because of its enormous amount of detail'.

P. Karlin-Hayter.

Note.—The Autobiography of Michael has recently been re-issued by (1) D. A. Zakythinos, Byz. Zeitschrift, βασική βιβλιοθήκη no. 3, Athens, 1957 (2) H. Grégoire, Byzantion 1959—60, Brussels.


In studying the texts of the Greek Fathers, the Oriental versions are of great importance. The translations into Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopic, Georgian and Arabic are often older than the extant Greek manuscripts, and in some cases were made within a few years of the writer's death. Several Syriac manuscripts date from the fifth or sixth century. It not infrequently happens that whole works are preserved in a translation, all Greek manuscripts having disappeared for various reasons. Syriac collections have been the most explored, but in Armenian there are many thousands of manuscripts containing Patristic works still uncatalogued. The most important collection still generally unavailable in the West is that in the Matenadaran, the State library at Erevan, which now also includes the collection formerly held at Etchmiadzin and catalogued by Karinean.

It was in Erevan in 1904 that the Armenian scholar Ter-Mkerttschian found a manuscript of the thirteenth century containing inter alia the completely unknown work of Irenaeus, the 'Proofs of the Apostolic Preaching'. It is remarkable that the existence of this work was only suspected through a single reference in Eusebius (HE V, 26: where it is called 'Εισόδες τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος) and that no quotations were known in any language. A few years later an Armenian collection of Patristic extracts, dating from perhaps the seventh century, was discovered by the same scholar and was found to contain two quotations from the 'Proofs'. The text of this lost work was first published by Ter-Mkerttschian and Harnack in 1907, since when it has been translated into various European languages (English edition by J. P. Smith, 1952).

The Armenian is literal to the point of forced constructions and phrases, a very common feature of translations made after the earliest classical period. (The most extreme examples of this kind of translation are so literal as to be incomprehensible unless the reader can supply the obvious underlying Greek.) This particular text is probably to be dated to the turn of the sixth and seventh centuries.

The new French edition by Froidevaux contains a fresh translation and follows the pattern of the 'Sources Chrétiennes' series. There are notes to the text and an introduction describing the manuscript and the style of the Armenian translation. The Armenian script is not used, but the transliteration follows the standard method of Meillet. The notes are copious and deal with philological as well as theological questions. This is a valuable addition to the critical texts available to Patristic scholars.

R. W. Thomson.


Comme album, ce petit ouvrage est de premier ordre. Beaucoup de ses photographies en couleurs, qui sont, pour la plupart, l'oeuvre de le. Paul de Marchie van Voorhuyen, rivalisent en finesse et en force expressive avec les meilleures photographies en couleurs d'un autre album récent sur le Mont-Athos: Chrysostomus Dahm, Athos, Berg der Verklärung, Offenburg, Burda Verlag, 1959.

Quant au texte lui-même, il appelle une appréciation moins enthousiaste, surtout si on le juge d'un point de vue purement scientifique et historique.

Pour être équitable à l'égard de l'auteur et de ses intentions, je me permets de citer presque en entier le foreword, dont il a fait précéder cette édition anglaise (qui a paru après la traduction allemande de 1959):

'In the pages of text that follow I have not sought to give a record of personal impressions of a visit, or of several visits, to the Holy Mountain. Rather I have sought to present certain aspects of the life of Athos and of its monks as objectively as possible. To this end I have included in the texts many passages—historical, descriptive, spiritual—from the works of other writers. The names of some of these
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writers are given in the notes. The names of many others—Robert Byron, R. M. Dawkins, Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta are examples—do not appear. But to both—to those I mentioned and to those I do not mention—I am conscious of my debt, and of how much what is of any value in the text owes to them, and of the fact that in preparing it I have done little more than arrange extracts from their works in a way which has seemed best for the presentation of my subject.'

Nous sommes donc dûment avertis. Avec une parfaite sincérité, l'auteur nous dit qu'en vue de mieux atteindre le but qu'il s'est proposé, il s'est borné, le plus souvent, à arranger des extraits d'ouvrages récents et sérieux sur la Sainte-Montagne, sans se croire obligé à citer toutes ses sources. En face d'une si charmante modestie, j'aurais mauvaise grâce à me plaindre de cette utilisation assez massive (et à laquelle je me m'attendais point) de ma Presque Île des Calyéres (Paris, 1955).

Rédigé avec des sentiments de révérence et même de fervente admiration pour le monachisme anthonite —le Dr Sherrard est lui-même un membre de l'Église orthodoxe— cet ouvrage est assurément une bonne introduction à la vie des moines hagiorites, à l'usage des lecteurs de langue anglaise qui ont besoin d'une première initiation. C'est à ce titre que ce livre, orné de tant de photographies prises au vif, doit être recommandé, et qu'il mérite d'être largement répandu parmi les amateurs de belles images et de belles histoires.

J'ai employé à dessein le terme de 'belles histoires', parce que, dans presque tous les chapitres de ce livre, le Dr Sherrard aime conter à ses lecteurs quelques-unes des 'belles histoires' dont raffolent les calyéres.

Prenons par exemple les pages 5 et 6. L'auteur nous apprend que la 'sainte ceinture' de la Mère de Dieu est aujourd'hui conservée dans un coffret d'or à Vatopédî. Il nous raconte en détail la légende, qu'il semble présenter comme un fait historique, de la visite de la Mère de Dieu à la presqu'île de l'Athos encore païenne, alors qu'elle était accompagnée de l'apôtre Jean et qu'elle se rendait à Chypre pour y rencontrer Lazare. A en croire le Dr Sherrard, tous les habitants païens furent alors baptisés; Marie déclara que désormais la Montagne serait sa propriété, et une voix miraculeuse, venue du ciel, confirma la prière et la bénédiction de Marie. Il nous apprend également que la vie monastique a été inaugurée à l'Athos par 'saint' Constantin le Grand, qui vint à l'Athos et y construisit trois grandes églises, sur les emplacements des monastères actuels de Vatopédî, d'Iviron et du Protaton de Karyés. C'est avec un plaisir évident que le Dr Sherrard narre ces 'belles histoires', mais il omet d'ajouter qu'elles sont purement légendaires.

Aux pages 6 à 8, il cite des extraits, édifiants à coup sûr, mais également légendaires, de la Vie légendaire de Pierre l'Athonite. Le plus long extrait reproduit un discours que la Mère de Dieu avait adressé à saint Nicolas en faveur dudit Pierre.

Ces quelques exemples, que l'on pourrait multiplier, montrent qu'en rédigeant son premier chapitre sur l' 'histoire' du monachisme anthonite, le Dr Sherrard s'est placé résolument au point de vue hagiorite. Dans cette perspective, l'histoire et la légende se mêlent inextricablement, à la grande joie des lecteurs qui aiment les 'belles histoires'. Les historiens ou simplement les esprits qui recherchent avant tout les faits assurés et contrôlés, pourront se dispenser de lire le chapitre 'historique'.

Le deuxième chapitre traite brièvement de l'organisation de la vie monastique sur la Sainte-Montagne. Vu le caractère populaire de ce livre, l'auteur rappelle assez longuement les origines du monachisme byzantin (pp. 29-36), et consacre plusieurs pages (pp. 50-6) aux icônes 'thaumaturgiques' (la Portaisa d'Iviron, la Trikherusa de Chilandari, l'icone de saint Georges à Zographou) et aux reliques. En rapportant ces 'belles histoires', l'auteur consent souvent néanmoins à employer le terme de 'légende', mais c'est surtout à propos de certaines reliques que le Dr Sherrard semble faire preuve d'une excessive crédulité.

Les deux derniers chapitres (la vie du moine et la vie contemplative) sont de loin les meilleurs: l'auteur se sent davantage dans son élément. De longs extraits du Grand Euchologe nous mettent sous les yeux quelques-unes des plus belles prières de la triple profession monastique des calyéres de l'Athos. On trouvera aussi des indications élémentaires mais assez exactes sur la nourriture, le travail et la prière des moines. J'ai regretté que les trop courtes pages consacrées à l'office divin (pp. 78-9) ne contiennent aucune notation précise sur l'hespérinos, l'apodipnon, le mésonyktikon, l'orthos et les Petites Heures. Rien non plus sur la Liturgie, dont le nom est simplement mentionné. C'est là une grave lacune dans un pareil ouvrage.

Quant au dernier chapitre, qui traite de la vie contemplative, il est excellent. L'auteur y cite abondamment Syméon le Nouveau Théologien et nombre d'écrivains spirituels byzantins, dont il emprunte les textes à la Philocalie de Nicodème l'Hagiorite, qu'il utilise dans les traductions anglaises de E. Kadloubovsky et de G. E. H. Palmer (1951 et 1954). La prière dite 'de Jésus' y reçoit évidemment le développement qui lui revient.

EMMANUEL AMAND DE MENDIETA.
BOOKS RECEIVED


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abrocomas, and Cyrus</th>
<th>154-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adria, vase B562, 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeschylus, the Danaid trilogy</td>
<td>141-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetolian League, 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander, 16-43; in India, 20-3; mercenaries and exiles, 25-31; reign of terror, 16-25; siege of Tyre, 138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaxagoras, cosmology, 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaximander, cosmology, 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaximenes, cosmology, 106-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigonus, 19, 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipater, 17, 24, 28, 35-41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollo Patroos, 7-8, 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, wall construction, 132-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenian Tribute Lists, Caria, 57, 62-3; Euboea, 124-32; Syme, 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena, in workshop, 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, and Alexander, 30-40; cults, 1-2, 7-8; and Euboea, 124-32; and Harpalus, 31-6, 41-3; land tenure and Solon's Seisachtheia, 76-98; phratries, 1-15; \textit{strategia}, 118-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, Acropolis vase (b.f.), 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, Agora vases, P25965, 74; P4948, 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, National Museum, vase 5893, 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atomists, cosmology, 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin Painter, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin, vase 2160, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, vase, 53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulls, and birds, on vases, 44-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bustards in Greek art, 48-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, vase, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caria, Chersonese, 56-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpathus, 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Ashby, vase 29, 74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle egrets in Greek art, 44-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalcis, 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleander, 17, 21-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnidus, and the Peraea, 56-66; the Spartan base, 67-8; the coinage, 66-70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coins, 'alliance' coinage of East Greece, 70-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnidus, 61, 66-72; Croton, 69; Sybaris, 47; Syracuse, 46; Thouria, 46-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen, vase, Rhodian, 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus, birds in, 44 ff.; see Vases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus Museum, vase A15444, 4-5; 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus the Younger, route through Syria, 153-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demades, 34-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demosthenes and the Harpalus affair, 32-9, 42-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demotionidai, 3-4, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDEX TO VOLUME LXXXI

I.—GENERAL

Douris, 74
Draco, 1, 81, 96-7
Empedocles, cosmology, 111-12
\textit{Empyleton} masonry, 133-40
Erine, in Caria, 62-6
Euboea, and Athens, 124-32
Eupatridae, 77 ff.
Ferrara, vase T814, 74
Florence, vase 3879, 53
Gennetai, 1-15
Harpalus, 16-43
Hektemoroi, 90-7
Hellenic League, 26, 29
Heraclitus, cosmology, 107-10, 114-15
Heraklion Museum seals, 100-3
Horoi, 76, 83 ff.
Hyphasis, meeting, 20
Inscriptions, letter-forms at Athens, 132

Inscriptions:

\textit{Agora I.3183}—118
\textit{ATL D1} 2—118; 3-4—130, 132; 7—128-30, 132; 8—128, 130; 10—124, 130; 14—130, 16-17—124-32; 18—118; 21—125; Lists 25-6—128; 34—121
\textit{DAA} 14, 260, 382—122
\textit{IG} 2 10—130; 17—124; 19—124; 22—124; 25—125; 32, 39—124; 41—124; 45—124; 49—125; 51—124; 52—124; 132; 55—125; 57—124; 130, 132; 63—128; 65—128-30; 66—128; 68-9—124, 129; 70—126; 127, 129; 71—127; 76—130; 87—124, 126; 90—126; 97—128; 101—131; 103—129; 115—1; 144—124, 128, 129; 155—128; 295—125; 309—121; 335—121; 352—126, 375—131; 376—125, 130, 131; 392—122; 943—121
\textit{i}² 3—71; 71—125; 126.1—1—11; 142—71; 244—140; 1214-18—77; 1237—2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14; 1241—12, 14; 1252; 1353; 1259—2; 1263; 1271—11; 1289—6—87; 1388—101; 1396—101; 1629, 1631, 1632—37; 1672-24—4; 2343; 2344—11; 2345—9—12; 2347—11; 2355—2; 2602—7; 2631, 2632—87; 2670—11; 2720—11; 2723—11; 11-12; 3629, 3630—7; 4973—7
\textit{iii} 267, 1335—78, 96
\textit{vii} 385—122
\textit{xii.1} 694—57; 732—64; 977—58; 994, 995, 1033—59
\textit{xii.3} 6—57; 1269, 1270—59
\textit{Ins. Cos} 148—131

| VOL. LXXXI | |
### INDEX TO VOLUME LXXXI

**SEG** x 13-5, 15-124; 49, 75-125; 80-124, 125; 81-124, 129; 84-126, 129; 85-125, 108-124, 128; 110-130; 114-139; 226.6-121; 227-119; 304-130, 313; 330-11 xi 25-128; 34-139 xiii 12-22-131 SGI 4264-57 Syd. 125-129, 56, 68, 141-83, 312-30, 33; 339-57; 987-4 Tit. Camir. 109-57 (Linear B) Er 312.7-80; Un 718.11-80; Docs. 152.7, 171.11-2

Kleisthenes, 1, 13-15, 98

Leningrad Painter, 73-5

Leosthenes, 27, 37-40

London, British Museum, vases, A733, 54; Bt, 58, 117, 53; C332, 355, 50; C372, 44, 48; C390, 50; C400, 50; C402, 49, 45; C411, 14, 48; C412, 416, 44; C422, 45; C577, 59; C583, 45; C831, 46; C858, 859, 50; E140, 74; 64.10-7.21, 54; 64.10-7.1658, 74; 67.5-6.54, 53; Minoan seals, 101-3

Makron, 74

Mercenaries, of Alexander, 25-31

Milan, Torno Coll, vase, 73-5

Munich, vases 2304-5, 74

Myson, 73-4

Nicanor, 28-9, 42-3

Orestes, return of, 99-104

Orgeones, 1-15, 76-82, 89-90, 95-8

Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, vases, 1911.345, 46, 51; 1933.1678, 51; Minoan seals, 102-3

Oxford, Pitt-Rivers Museum, vase, 46

Parmenides, cosmology, 110-11, 114

Parmenio, 21-3, 36-7

Philochoerus, on phratries, 1-15, 77 ff.

Phratries, in Athens, 1-15; Mycenaeans and Homeric, 15

Phocion, 31-3

Pisistratus, and land tenure, 84-6

Plato, and knowledge, 113-15

Plutarch, on Solon, 91-5

Ptolemy, 41

Pythagoreans, cosmology, 107-8

Rhodes, and the peraeas, 56-66

Rhodes Museum, vase 13091, 74

Seals, 99-104; wearing of, 102-3

Seisachtheia, 76-98

Solon, 1, 15; land tenure and seisachtheia, 76-98

Sophists, cosmology, 112-14

Spartans, at Cnidus, 67-8; and East Greek coinage, 71

Strategia, double representation in, 118-23

Syme, 59-60

Syria, route of Cyrus, 153-5

Taenarum, base for mercenaries, 25-7, 31, 37-40

Teleology, 115-17

Thales, cosmology, 107

Thapsacus, site of, 153

Thiasoi, 9-12

Tibron, in Asia, 70-2

Tyre, walls of, 136

Vases: Argive, 52; Attic b.f., 54; Attic r.f., 73-5; Boeotian, 53; Cypriot, 44-55; Fikellura, 53; Laconian, 53; Protoattic, 52; Rhodian, 54

Vases, metal, 73-5; painters, 73-5

Vitruvius, and Greek structure, 133-40

Xenophanes, cosmology, 108

Zeus, Hikesios, 7-8, 77; Phratrios, 9

---

### II.—GREEK WORDS

άμορφος, 82

διαβασιαία, 3, 4

διμελετος, 133-6

'Ερμεύς, 62-6

ἐνσπατρίδαι, 78, 79

δίας, 10, 11

θείρων, 72

Θενδώμοιο νόμισμα, 72

Θεοφρον, 47

κτόνα, 57, 58

---

όμογιάλακτες, 79

όργειν, 80 ff.

πλούτινος, 82

πρατις ἐτὶ λόθα, 91-5

σφραγίς, 101, 102

τέτραχ, 51

φρατρίζη, 13

φρούριος, 46
IV.—BOOKS NOTICED

Adkins (A. W. H.), *Merit and Responsibility; a Study in Greek Values*, 186 f. (G. B. Kerferd)


Alexiou (S.), *‘Η Μικραία θέα μεθ’ ὑφομένων γειτονίων* 207 f. (R. W. Hutchinson)


Angelidou (V. P.), *Ai προσωποποιήσεις ελ' την ἀρχαλαν 'Ελληνικῆ γένιν*, 225 (T. B. L. Webster)

Anti (C.), (Ed.), *Sculture greche e romanee di Cirene*, 219 f. (D. E. Strong)

Bengston (H.), *Einführung in die alte Geschichte*, ed. 3, 200 (A. J. Graham)

Béard (J.), *L'expansion et la colonisation grecques jusqu'aux guerres médiques*, 201 (A. J. Graham)

Bona (G.), *Il 'νόος* e i 'νόοι' nell'Odisea, 159 f. (J. B. Hainsworth)

Bradford (J.), *Ancient Landscape. Studies in Field Archaeology*, 204 f. (H. W. Catling)

Brommer (F.), *Die Giebel des Parthenon. Eine Einführung*, 218 f. (C. J. Herington)


Burgièr (P.), *Histoire de l’infinitif en Grec*, 181 (A. C. Moorhouse)

Cassola (F.), *La Ionia nel mondo miceneo*, 196 f. (A. J. Graham)


Corbett (P. E.), *The Sculpture of the Parthenon*, 218 f. (C. J. Herington)

Cornell (E.), *Humanistic Inquiries into Architecture*, 214 f. (H. Plommer)

Corno (D. del), *I papiri dell’Ilaidi anteriori al 150 a. Chr.*, 158 (J. A. Davison)

*Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*. Deutschland XV, Mainz I, Ed. R. Hampe and E. Simon, 220-2 (J. M. Cook)

—. Deutschland XVI, Schloss Fasanerie II, Ed. F. Brommer, 229 f. (A. D. Trendall)

—. France XIX, Louvre XII, Ed. F. Villard, 222 (J. D. Beazley)

—. Italia XXX, Firenze III, Ed. A. Magi, 222 f. (J. D. Beazley)

Cox (D. H.), *Coins from the Excavations at Curium, 1932-1953*, 229 f. (J. F. Healy)

Déllos. *Exkursion archéologique, XXIV, La terrasse des lions, le Létoon et le monument de granit*, by H. Gallet de Santerre, 211-13 (W. A. Laidlaw)


—. *Plaidoyer civils*, III, IV, Ed. and trans. L. Gernet, 170 f. (C. Rodewald)

Dörrie (H.), *Porphyrias’ ‘Symmikta Zetemata’*, 193 f. (P. Hadot)

Düring (L.) and Owen (G. E. L.), *Aristotle and Plato in the mid-fourth century*, 188 f. (D. M. Balme)

Edmonds (J. M.), *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, II, 166 f. (W. G. Arnott)


Festugière (A. J.), *Antique païenne et chrétienne*, 232-4 (J. Stevenson)

Finley (M. I.), *The Greek Historians: the Essence of Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius*, 200 f. (V. Ehrenberg)


Galiano (M. F.), *Dieci cisielle tablillas micenicas*, 178 f. (J. Chadwick)

Gaya Nuño (B.), *Sobre un giro de la lengua de Demóstenes*, 171 f. (J. H. Kells)

Geanopoulos (D. J.), *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258-82*, 234-6 (P. Karlin-Hayter)

Ginouves (R.), *L’établissement thermal de Gortys d’Arcadie*, 213 f. (H. Plommer)

Greene (D.) and Lattimore (R.), (Ed.), *The Complete Greek Tragedies Translated, Euripides*, II, 111, 165 f. (P. T. Stevens)

Groningen (B. A. van), *La composition littéraire archaique grece*, 156 f. (P. Walcot)

Hampe (R.), *Ein frühchristlicher Grabfund*, 220-2 (J. M. Cook)


Hood (M. S. F.), *Archaeological Survey of the Knossos Area*, 205 (J. Boardman)


Journal of Glass Studies, I, 230 (D. B. Harden)

Kassel (R.), *Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur*, 175 f. (A. J. Gossage)

Kenner (H.), *Weinen und Lachen in der griechischen Kunst*, 225 f. (T. B. L. Webster)
INDEX TO VOLUME LXXXI

Kerameikos. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen, VI. 1, by K. Kübler, 205-7 (R. J. Hopper)
Kiechle (F.), Messenische Studien, 199 f. (G. L. Huxley)
Kirk (G. S.) and Raven (J. E.), The Pre-Socratic Philosophers, 182-4 (J. B. Skemp)

Lana (I.), I Proigmnasmi di Elio Teone, I, 175 (E. W. Bower)
Lattimore (R.), see Grene
Lesky (A.), Geschichte der griechischen Literatur, 157 f. (M. J. McGann)
Loenen (J. H. M. M.), Parmenides, Melissus, Gorgias, 184-6 (D. Grey)
Lucian, trans. K. Kilburn, (Loeb), VI, 173 f. (B. J. Sims)

Méautis (G.), L’autenticité et la date du Prométhée enchaîné d’Eschyle, 161 f. (H. J. Rose)
——, La Mythologie grecque, 193 (H. J. Rose)
Moorhouse (A. C.), Studies in the Greek Negatives, 180 f. (D. M. Jones)
Moraux (P.), Aristote: Le dialogue ‘Sur la Justice’, 191 f. (D. J. Furley)
Moulinier (L.), Quelques hypothèses relatives à la géographie d’Homère dans l’Odyssée, 160 (W. B. Stanford)
Murray (R. D.), The motif of Io in Aeschylus’ Suppliants, 161 (A. H. Coxon)

Nenci (G.), Introduzione alle guerre persiane e altri saggi di storia antica, 201 f. (R. Sealey)

Owen (G. E. L.), see Düring
Oxyrhynchos Papyri, XXV, Ed. E. Lobel and E. G. Turner, 179 f. (J. Barns)

Parmenides. Testimonianze e frammenti, Ed. M. Untersteiner, 186 (R. Mathewson)

Quaglia (L.), La figura di Ettore e l’etica dell’Iliade, 159 (A. W. H. Adkins)

Raven (J. E.), see Kirk
Richter (G. M. A.), Greek Portraits, II, 224 (D. E. Strong)

Roebuck (C.), Ionian Trade and Colonization, 198 f. (A. J. Graham)
Rose (H. J.), Some Problems of Classical Religion, 194 f. (E. D. Phillips)

Sakellariou (M. B.), La migration grecque en Ionie, 197 f. (A. J. Graham)
Schäfer (J.), Studien zu der griechischen Reliefsphitai, 216 f. (J. N. Coldstream)
Schmidt (M.), Der Dareiosmaler und sein Umkreis: Untersuchungen zur spätälpischn Vasenmalerei, 215 f. (N. R. Oakeshott)
Schuhl (P.-M.), Études platoniciennes, 188 (D. Tarrant)
Severns (A.), Grèce et Proche-Orient avant Homère, 204 (E. J. Forsdyke)
Sherrard (P.), Athos: the Mountain of Silence, 236 f. (E. A. de Mendicta)
Sherrard (P.), The Greek East and the Latin West, 231 f. (W. H. C. Frend)
Srebny (S.), Studia scacnica, 163 f. (A. M. Dale)
Swanson (D. C.), Vocabulary of Modern Spoken Greek, 182 (J. T. Pring)

Syllage nummorum Graecorum. IV, Fitzwilliam Museum, V, Sicyon-Thera, 229 (J. F. Healy)
Szádeczy-Kardoss (S.), Testimonia de Minnerni Vita et Carminibus, 159 (J. A. Davison)

Thasos. L’agora, I, (Ét. thas. VI), by R. Martin, 209–10 (R. E. Wycherley)
Trendall (A. D.), Phlyax Vases, 227 f. (T. B. L. Webster)

Villard (F.), La céramique grecque de Marseille (VIe–IVe siècle), 227 (J. Boardman)
Voegelin (E.), Order and History, II, III, 192 f. (A. W. H. Adkins)

Weitzmann (K.), Ancient Book Illumination, 176–8 (M. H. Bräude)
CATTLE EGRETS AND BUSTARDS IN GREEK ART
PLATE II

1. London C583
2. London C831
3. Oxford 1911.345
4. 5. Oxford, Pitt Rivers Museum

6. Little Bustards

CATTLE EGRETS AND BUSTARDS IN GREEK ART
CATTLE EGRETS AND BUSTARDS IN GREEK ART
CATTLE EGRETS AND BUSTARDS IN GREEK ART
THE CAPUTI HYDRIA
THE CAPUTI HYDRIA
THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES
31-34 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1.

HONORARY MEMBERS

H.M. the King of Sweden.
Akurgal, Prof. E., Dil Tarih Fakultesi, Ankara Universitesi, Ankara, Turkey.
Blegen, Prof. C. W., 9, Ploutarch Street, Athens, Greece.
Breccia, Prof. E., Via della Vite 7, Rome, Italy.
Buschor, Prof. E., Universitat, Munich, Germany.
Byvanck, Prof. A. W., Burggraavenlaan, 24, Leiden, Holland.
Charbonneaux, Prof. J., Palais du Louvre, 32 Quai du Louvre, Paris, France.
Daux, Prof. G., 6 Avenue Paul Appell, Paris XIV, France.
Dinsmore, Prof. W. B., School of Architecture, Columbia University, New York, U.S.A.
Dow, Prof. S., Widener Library, 690, Cambridge 38, Mass., U.S.A.
Eitrem, Prof. S., Institutt for Klassisk Arkeologi, Oscarsgate 30, Oslo, Norway.
Haspel, Prof. C. H. E., Archaeologisch Instituut, 33 Weteringschans, Amsterdam, Holland.
Jaeger, Prof. W., Widener Library, 774, Cambridge 38, Mass., U.S.A.
Johansen, Prof. K. F., The University, Copenhagen, Denmark.
Karo, Prof. G., stadstrasse 14, Freiburg i. Br., Baden, Germany.
Karouzos, Dr. Ch., Director, National Museum, Athens, Greece.
Karouzou, Mrs. S. P., National Museum, Athens, Greece.
Kloffenbach, Dr. G., Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, E. Germany.
Kunze, Dr. E., Deutsches Archaeologisches Institut, Athens, Greece.
Larsen, Prof. J. A. O., University of Missouri, Columbia, U.S.A.
Maier, Prof. A., Museo Nazionale, Naples, Italy.
Marinatos, Prof. S., Poynia Street 47, Athens, Greece.
Meritt, Prof. B. D., Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.
Merlin, Dr. A., 5 Villa de Villiers, Neilly-sur-Seine, France.
Orlandos, Prof. A. C., Veranzos Street, 4, Athens, Greece.
Papadimitriou, Dr. J., Xenias Street, 2, Athens, Greece.
Pfeiffer, Prof. R., Hillensbergerstrasse 21/0, Munich 13, Germany.
Picard, Prof. C., 16 Avenue de l'Observatoire, Paris VP, France.
Richter, Dr. G. M. A., 81 Viale delle Mura Gianicolensi, Rome, Italy.
Robert, Prof. L., 31 Avenue Pare de Montsouris, Paris XIV, France.
Romilly, Prof. J. de, 38 rue Guyenne, Paris VP, France.
Rumpf, Prof. A., Universitat, Cologne, Germany.
Schaeffer, Dr. C. F. A., Le Castel Blanc, 14 Rue Turgot, St. Germain-en-Laye, France.
Snell, Prof. Bruno, Universitat, Hamburg, Germany.
Thompson, Prof. Homer A., Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.
Zanotti-Bianco, Dr. U., Palazzo Taberna, Monte Giordano 36, Rome, Italy.
The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

31-34 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1

President: Professor R. P. Winnington-Ingram, F.B.A.

The Society, founded in 1873, to advance the study of Greek language, literature, history and art, maintains in conjunction with the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies and in association with the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London a 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 Institute of Classical Studies, which is complementary to that of the Society. Communications about books and lantern slides should be addressed to the Librarian.

Four general meetings, with lectures, are held in London annually, and there are other meetings in different parts of the country. Subscribers receive 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 biennial announcements of new acquisitions by museums in Britain. This second periodical is on sale to the general public at £3 and £6, 6d. respectively.

The annual subscription to the Society is £2. The Composition fee for life-membership is twenty guineas for persons over fifty years of age and thirty guineas for others. Members for Libraries and Student Associates are £2 and £1 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 F. W. Walbank, F.B.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 object, the Society endeavours to encourage the study of British under Roman occupation, by devoting space in its Journal to articles on Roman-British history and archaeology, and by maintaining a medium which is both scholarly and popular. The Society has a library of works on classical antiquity and a collection of lantern slides. Meetings for the reading and discussion of papers are held in London about four times a year. Meetings are held in various parts of the country. Notices of all meetings are sent to all members.

The Journal of Roman Studies contains articles written by leading British and foreign scholars, a full 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 3s.

The annual subscription for membership of the Society is £2. The composition fee for life membership is £21 for those over fifty years of age and £31 10s. 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 ISAURIA (Cilicia Traches). By A. C. Headlam. Folio. London. 1893. Price £1 1s. for both volumes.


No. VIII THE GREEKS AND THEIR EASTERN NEIGHBOURS By T. J. Dunbabin. 122 pages. Demy 8vo. Price 16/-


Note: Supplementary Papers II, 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, £3 5s.). 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 in each year. A special subscription to Greece and Rome may be obtained for an annual subscription of £5.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer of the Association (Mrs. Edna M. Hooker, M.A., The University, Birmingham, 15). Inquiries should be addressed either to the Hon. Secretary of the Association (T. W. Mellish, M.A., Boc School, London, S.W.17, and Professor J. D. Richardson, M.A., t. Howell's 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 (Exeis), Sussex, Swansea, 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 Unwin Brothers Limited, Woking and London
"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book lean and moving.