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CLEON'S ORDERS AT AMPHIPOLIS

Thucydides v i0. 3-4, καὶ ὣς εἶδεν, οὐ βουλόμενος μάχην διαγωνίασθαι πρὶν αἱ καὶ τοὺς βορεῖος ἤκεν καὶ οἰόμενος ὕφεσθαι ἀπελθὼν, σημαίνειν τε ἁμα ἐκέλευεν ἀναχώρησαι καὶ παρήγγειλε τοὺς ἄπωθοιν ἐπὶ τὸ εὐνύμον κέρας, ὥσπερ μοῦν ὁλὴν τὴν ήμὲν, ὑπάγειν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἡδόνος.  

παρήγγελλε CEG.

How Cleon issued his fatal order to retreat from before Amphipolis does not seem to have been discussed by the commentators.¹ But it would appear that he violated correct military procedure, and that this violation was in itself the cause of much of the subsequent confusion in the Athenian ranks. Thucydides says that both a signal and a verbal command² were given—the signal conveying the definite meaning ‘Retire’, while the verbal command explained how it was to be done; and signal and command were issued together.

Signals are divided by Arrian into three groups.³ Verbal orders, being most readily intelligible, are preferable when they can be heard above the din of battle. Visual signals may be obscured in the dust and confusion. Finally, the trumpet is useful in overcoming ‘atmospheric disturbances’ (τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἄερος ἐμποδία).

Visual signals are found in Greek warfare from at least the fifth century B.C. onwards, but they are generally prearranged, either to convey the news that some foreseeable event has actually occurred⁴ or to coordinate the operations of two bodies of troops who are widely separated but in sight of each other.⁵ Everybody concerned must be instructed in advance that after certain developments a certain signal will be displayed, upon which certain movements will be carried out. In this way Croesus in the Cyropaedia directs the evolutions of his vast army,⁶ Antigonus plans to coordinate the separate attacks at Sellasia,⁷ and Gorgidas ends the feigned retreat of the Sacred Band.⁸ But the signals used—the display of a red cloak or a white; the raising of a helmet on a spear—are all obviously arranged for the occasion. There does not seem to have been any code by which the commander of a Greek army, at any rate in the classical period, could convey orders to his men on the spur of the moment by visual signals. In the army described by Arrian each battalion (σώματος) had its own standard bearer,⁹ and the rank and file could at least have conformed to the movements of the standard.

Trumpet signals, on the other hand, seem to have been codified at an early date. Distinct calls for the ‘charge’ and ‘retire’ are implied by passages in Thucydides, Xenophon and later writers. In the first battle between the Athenians and Syracusans, the trumpeters urged the hoplites to the charge (ξύνοντας ἐκτίναυς τοῖς ὑπάθαις).¹⁰ But in the Anabasis we find troops recalled by the trumpet (καὶ εἰσὶν ἀνακαλεσάμενοι τῇ σάλπεια ἀπήγα).¹¹ Obviously if the trumpeters had just made whatever flourishes came into their heads the soldiers could not have told whether they were to advance or to retire. Plutarch’s silly tale of the Spartan who, though his sword was lifted to strike, let his enemy go when the recall

¹ I find nothing on the nature of Cleon’s signal in A. W. Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides iii (Oxford, 1936), 646 ff. (but note the discussion of τοὺς ἀπολώνοις iii 647) or in Gomme’s essay, ‘Thucydides and Kleon: the Second Battle of Amphipolis’, in More Essays in Greek History and Literature (112-121) or in earlier editors.
² I am indebted to Professor Sterling Dow for advice and encouragement.
³ The use of παραγγέλλειν of the fire-signals in Aeschylus, Agamemnon 289, 294, is perhaps metaphorical; otherwise the word seems generally to be used of verbal orders (compare examples cited below).
⁴ E.g. Thucydides viii 95.4; Xenophon, Hellenica i 1.2, ii 1.27.
⁵ Thucydides i 63.2.
⁶ Xenophon, Cyropaedia vii 1.23.
⁷ Polybius ii 66.10-11.
⁸ Polycaenus ii 5.2.
⁹ Arrian, Tactica 10.4.
¹⁰ Thucydides vi 69.2.
¹¹ Xenophon, Anabasis iv 4.22.
was sounded (ἐπεὶ τὸ ἀνακλητικὸν ἐσήμανε) is evidence for a distinct signal, though the story is certainly borrowed from that of Chrysantas in the Cyropaedia. And in this original version there is no general signal, but Cyrus addresses Chrysantas directly and by name.\textsuperscript{12}

Better evidence is provided by stories of generals who ordered their men to attack when the recall (ἀνακλητικὸν) was sounded, and retire on the sounding of the advance (ἐπικελευστικὸν).\textsuperscript{13} By this trick Dionysius I stormed Motya.\textsuperscript{14} And the calls were sufficiently distinct to be picked up quickly even by barbarians who had never encountered a Greek army before. At the crossing of the Kentrites river, Xenophon’s rear guard was hard pressed by the Carduchii, and it was necessary to drive the enemy back to a safe distance before the Greeks entered the water. Accordingly, ‘he ordered his men, when the enemy came within sling range, at the sound of a shield being struck, to raise the paean and run upon the enemy. But when the enemy turned around and the trumpeter sounded the war note (τὸ πολεμικὸν) from the river, they were to right-about-turn and all run, with the rear rank leading, and cross as quickly as possible, each in his own place so as not to obstruct each other.’ Xenophon obviously hoped that the barbarians would recognise the Greek ‘warnote’ and imagine that it was the signal for a redoubled pursuit, and this is indeed what happened. ‘The trumpeter sounded, and the enemy ran away faster than ever.’\textsuperscript{15}

It is possible that there were other distinct trumpet calls for other contingencies, such as a sudden attack by the enemy.\textsuperscript{16} The stock saying that ‘In war the trumpets sound reveille, in peace-time the cocks’\textsuperscript{17} can perhaps be explained without supposing that there was a particular call for the purpose. And the trumpet-blast that commanded silence through the Athenian fleet before the start of the voyage to Syracuse\textsuperscript{18} does not prove that there was one special call for ‘Attention’. We do find, however, in Xenophon special signals for pitching or moving camp, sounded not upon the trumpet but upon the horn,\textsuperscript{19} a development that seems to foreshadow the different significations of the different musical instruments in the armies of the later Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{20}

But though the trumpet might convey an ‘executive’ order with the definite meaning ‘Charge’ or ‘Retire’, it could not explain how the operation was to be carried out. Therefore, whenever possible the good officer would issue a ‘cautionary’ command beforehand, giving full details of the procedure to be adopted. Once more, examples are found in Xenophon’s Anabasis.\textsuperscript{21}

The verbal cautionary order might be given by a single loud-voiced herald, like Tolmides of Elis,\textsuperscript{22} or it might be passed from man to man down the ranks, as was the watchword before Cunaxa. This procedure is justly criticised by Onasander as likely to lead to confusion and waste of time.\textsuperscript{23} It was better for the general to issue his orders to a ‘command group’ of senior officers, and send them or other ‘appropriate persons’\textsuperscript{24} to pass on his orders to the different units. In any case, he could not count on the verbal orders reaching everyone simultaneously. The cautionary order had therefore to be followed by the executive order, given by trumpet, which coordinated the operations of the different units and made certain that they all acted at once.

\textsuperscript{12} Plutarch, Moralia 236E; Xenophon, Cyropaedia iv 1.3 (compare Plutarch, Comparison of Pelopidas and Marcellus 3.1).
\textsuperscript{13} Polyænus v 16.4. The trick was played on the Argives by Cleomenes I at Sepeia, but here the Argives followed the Spartan herald, not trumpet signals (Herodotus vi 78).
\textsuperscript{14} Diodorus xiv 52.1–5.
\textsuperscript{15} Xenophon, Anabasis iv 3.29–32.
\textsuperscript{16} Polyænus i 41.3; Xenophon, Anabasis vii 4.16.
\textsuperscript{17} Polybius xii 26.1.
\textsuperscript{18} Thucydides vi 32.1.
\textsuperscript{19} Xenophon, Anabasis ii 2.4; Cyropaedia v 3.44–46.
\textsuperscript{20} Vegetius, De Re Militari 2.22.
\textsuperscript{21} Xenophon, Anabasis iii 4.3–4; v 2.12–14; vi 5.25.
\textsuperscript{22} Xenophon, Anabasis ii 2.20; iii 1.46; iii 4.36; v 2.18.
\textsuperscript{23} Onasander 25.
\textsuperscript{24} Xenophon, Anabasis v 2.12 (τοῖς ἐκτεινομένοις). These were not a special body of staff officers or A.D.C.’s (compare Anabasis vii 7.13) but just whoever happened to be appropriate on that particular occasion.
From the attention that Thucydides pays to the Spartan chain of command, from the king through the various grades of officers to the rank and file,\textsuperscript{25} it would seem that there was nothing of the sort in the Athenian army at the time of the Peloponnesian War. In any case, Cleon's first mistake was that he ordered the signal to be given as he began to issue\textsuperscript{26} his verbal orders. I suppose the signal to have been a trumpet call; whatever it was, it conveyed the definite meaning 'Retire' and part of the army obeyed it at once, before the detailed verbal orders reached them. So Cleon was trying to pass his orders along to the men who were moving off (τοῖς ἀποφεύγων), and other parts of the army were standing still waiting for the general to explain what he wanted. No doubt even within the different units some men moved on hearing the trumpet while the others stood fast; hence the confused movement of spears and heads commented upon by Brasidas.\textsuperscript{27} But it is clear that the left of the army, which was nearest to the line of retreat and farthest from danger, and also farthest from the general, so that the verbal orders would take longest to reach it, moved off at once, while the right hesitated, waiting for Cleon to explain how he was going to get them out of their difficult situation. (Thucydides speaks only of the 'right' and 'left' of the Athenian line, not 'right', 'left' and 'centre', but this need not cause difficulty. It does not seem to have been usual, either in theory or in practice, to divide the phalanx into three distinct divisions, though ancient authors frequently use 'right', 'left' and 'centre' for ease of reference. The Athenian army no doubt consisted of ten separate contingents from the ten tribes, which were not brigaded into three larger tactical units; half the army, more or less, moved and half waited, so Thucydides speaks of 'right' and 'left').

The position of the right wing was certainly dangerous. The difficulty of bringing an army off without a fight when once it has been drawn up in battle order facing the enemy is specially commented upon by Polybius.\textsuperscript{28} But Brasidas could hardly begin his sortie until the Athenians began to move, as his columns, issuing from the gates, would be crushed by the enemy line of battle before they could deploy. The first move therefore lay with Cleon, but he had to make it, as his men could not remain indefinitely in their exposed position. Brasidas had to wait, but he could afford to.

In the \textit{Cyropædia},\textsuperscript{29} Cyrus withdraws his army from a similar position before the walls of Babylon by ordering the hoplites to fold back the line (ἀναπτύσσονται τὴν φάλαγγα) from each wing, and so double the depth of the phalanx.

The centre stands fast, facing the enemy, while the two wings are turned outwards into column and then countermarched behind the standing part of the army until they meet in the middle. They are then turned into line again, and now there are two phalanxes, one behind the other, which give ground with their faces to the enemy\textsuperscript{30} until they are out of missile range from the walls, and then turn about and march a short distance before being halted and again turned to face the enemy, and so on, with increasing intervals between the halts until they have got clear away. This is not just an imaginary text-book manoeuvre; compare the manner in which Agesilaus, trapped deep in Mantinean territory, first doubled his phalanx and then brought off his army without a fight.\textsuperscript{31}

Being wise after the event and instructed by these examples, we may suggest that what Cleon ought to have done was to turn his right-hand \textit{taxis} into column right (with its shielded side toward the enemy) and then to countermarch it behind the rest of the army, followed by the second \textit{taxis}, the third, and so forth. (Nowhere in any ancient author can I

\textsuperscript{25} Thucydides v 66.3.
\textsuperscript{26} Reading παρὴγγελλε.
\textsuperscript{27} Thucydides v 10.5.
\textsuperscript{28} Polybius xi 16.5-8.
\textsuperscript{29} Xenophon, \textit{Cyropædia} vii 5.3-6.
\textsuperscript{30} ἐνι πόδα. For this phrase, compare Xenophon, \textit{Cyropædia} vii 1.34, \textit{Anabasis} v 2.32, and Polyaeus, ii 2.9; ii 5.2.
\textsuperscript{31} Xenophon, \textit{Hellenica} vi 5.18-19.
\textsuperscript{32} For the division of an Athenian expeditionary force into τάξεις; compare Thucydides ii 79.5.
find anything like the manœuvre suggested by Steup and approved by Gomme, \textsuperscript{33} the front rank remaining facing the enemy while the rear ranks marched successively to the left, again to face the enemy as a covering force, while the original front rank marched behind them. Apart from the confusion caused by breaking up of units and interchanging the different ranks in a manner contrary to the principles of all ancient tacticians, a single line of hoplites, unsupported by their comrades, would have been too easily pierced to have been of much value as a covering force.

Cleon might even have got away with the movement he did attempt—simply turning the whole army into column left, with their unshielded sides exposed, and marching off to Eion—if it had been carried out smartly and quickly. The critical question, as he himself realised, was whether he had time to get clear before the enemy attacked, and he thought that he had (οἱ ομοίως φθόνοι δείχνας ἀπέλθον).\textsuperscript{34} The left wing, being close to the only possible line of retreat and comparatively far from danger, moved off at once upon hearing the signal for retreat, without waiting for verbal orders, leaving their comrades and the general whom they distrusted to shift for themselves. When Brasidas attacked, they were separated from the rest of the army and ran away down the road upon which they had already started.\textsuperscript{35}

The right wing hesitated; no doubt the taxiarths saw the danger and waited for Cleon to make his exact intention clear to them; instead, he thought that they were wasting time and he himself gave the men the fatal order to turn left into column.\textsuperscript{36}

If this interpretation is correct, Cleon’s error in a matter of military routine throws interesting light on his character and ability. He was a vigorous leader of the democracy in war, and his strategic ability is shown by the mere fact of his presence at Amphipolis, as well as by his earlier successes. But he had not troubled to make himself properly familiar with the basic techniques of commanding hoplites in the field.

\textit{University of California.}

\textsuperscript{33} Gomme, \textit{Commentary on Thucydides} iii 647–648; \textit{More Essays on Greek History and Literature} 117. Philip V’s peltasts at Lissus did use ‘leap-frogging’ tactics in their retreat, but they withdrew one στείρα at a time, not by successive ranks. (Polybius viii 14.5).

\textsuperscript{34} Thucydides v 10.3.

\textsuperscript{35} Thucydides v 10.8.

\textsuperscript{36} Thucydides v 10.4, reading, with Gomme, σχολή γίγνεται. But the delay would seem to have been on the right wing, not the left, as it was on the right that Cleon thought his personal intervention necessary αὐτὸς ἐπισφέρας τὸ δέξοιν).
TARSUS, AL MINA AND GREEK CHRONOLOGY

'The most interesting excavated site, after Al Mina—Posideion, is Tarsus. This area may yet hold the key to many important problems, and provide firm associations between East and West which will give fixed points for early Greek history and chronology' (Dunbabin, _The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours_ 33).

The publication of _Tarsus_ iii (reviewed later in this volume) offers scholars the opportunity to judge how far the high hopes entertained for the absolute dating of Greek pottery found in the town destroyed by Sennacherib in 696 B.C. have been fulfilled. Hanfmann, who publishes the pottery, had already given some indication of the results in _The Aegean and the Near East_, 165 ff., a volume dedicated to Hetty Goldman, excavator of Tarsus. Some of the results seemed a little disturbing, like the appearance of East Greek bird bowls with rays before 696 B.C. With the publication we can see that the dating for Protocorinthian pottery of the end of the eighth century is moved back at least a quarter century (_pp. 115, 129, 308_), while the disturbance to the bird bowl series suggests even more radical changes, leaving something of a vacuum in the first half of the seventh century, so far as the usually accepted dates of Protocorinthian and East Greek pottery are concerned. Hanfmann does not pursue all the implications of this, nor was it his task to do this book. Fortunately the quality of the publication makes it possible to study these problems in some detail, to evaluate the evidence of the pottery and stratigraphy, and even to suggest possible accounts, different from those of the publishers, for the years around 696 B.C. In what follows I have taken Payne’s chronology for Protocorinthian as the standard since none of the detailed attempts to upset it seem to me to have been at all successful, while much more evidence has appeared to confirm it. Dunbabin’s remarks on the possible margins of error have also to be remembered (in _AE_ 1953–54 247 ff.).

The only illustrated pottery from the levels at Tarsus significant for the destruction and offering the possibility of close dating comprises nine fragments of East Greek bird bowls and a Protocorinthian aryballos. It is the range of the bird bowls which is most disquieting and it may be considered with regard to what can be worked out about the sequence of these vessels from other finds and in their contexts with Protocorinthian. Only pieces in significant contexts and relevant to the Tarsus fragments are cited here. The series is in fact fuller and will be studied elsewhere.

Earliest come the bird kotylai which have four panels with decoration on either side, sometimes without birds at all, and later three panels with the bird central. Below them runs a frieze of ‘butterflies’ or (probably a later stage) zigzags. Finds at Asine and Ischia place these within the eighth century, no later than Early Protocorinthian (EPC). The only possible representative of this class at Tarsus is 1447 (fig. 1), which has a panel with hour-glass ornament. The closest parallel on a bird bowl appears at Antissa in Lesbos (BSA xxxii pl. 23.26) where there is also in the field an orientalising, outlined rosette, hardly earlier than about 650. But the Tarsus piece is probably to be classed with the bird kotylai.

---

1 My references to pages, catalogue numbers and illustrations in _Tarsus_ iii appear in italics throughout this paper.
2 It is difficult to observe any marked development of shape or decoration among the bird bowls found at Tarsus (p. 296).
3 In what follows I have been greatly helped by Mr N. Coldstream, who studies these vases in his forthcoming book on Geometric Greek pottery. I have also been able to use the good stratified sequence of finds from Emporio in Chios, which has yet to be published. The drawings in fig. 1 are traced from _Tarsus_ iii, with some of the decoration restored off the sherds.
4 _Aisine_ 321 fig. 219.4 (the site apparently abandoned about 700 B.C.). Ischia, the Nestor cup, _Rend. Linc._ 1955, 215 ff., pl. 1–4, with EPC.
Bird bowls become shallower through the seventh century, and with their changing proportions the bird's panel widens, the frieze below has dashes, dots, then is empty, and the painted lower part is eventually filled with void rays. There are changes in filling ornament and the drawing of the birds also.

Tarsus 1448 (fig. 1) is early in the sequence, with a narrow bird panel and dashes below.

![Fig. 1](image-url)

It was found with 1519 (fig. 1), a Protocorinthian aryballos, transitional in shape and decoration between EPC and MPC, which Dunbabin put in the first quarter of the seventh century (and called a Rhodian imitation, BSR xxi 40) and on conventional dating could not be earlier than about 700. He was inclined to put the bird bowl in the second quarter or middle of the seventh century. Hanfmann's observations on the Tarsus pieces are that the floor on which they were found was appreciably earlier than the 696 destruction, so that the pieces should be dated '725–700 at the latest and possibly as early as 750–25' (p. 115, cf. p. 308). At Emporio in Chios the bird bowls with dashes appear in a level assigned to about 660–30.

Tarsus 1454 (fig. 1) had dots beneath the panels. In Malta such a vase was found with a Protocorinthian cup which might be as early as 700 (BSR xxi 39–41, pl. 14b, c). At Emporio two complete examples appear in a level with Early Corinthian and other pottery of the late seventh century. The squatness and broad bird panels of these vases suggest that they are well on in the series.

The Malta bowl has a pendant hoop and dot in the field, as Tarsus 1450 (fig. 1). In Rhodes this feature appears several times with pottery no later than the mid-seventh century (MPC/LPC or later). Of about this date and little later too are bowls with a pendant triangle and circle in the field (cf. Tarsus 1456, 1459, 1462; not in significant levels).

---

5 The decline in shape may not be quite steady, or keep step in the various East Greek centres producing bird bowls. Note that in Tarsus iii the profile of 1459 on fig. 145 is surely wrong, since the fragment (see fig. 99) is preserved to near its base. And 1443 on fig. 145 may be meant for 1448.

6 Clara Rhodos (hereafter CR) vi–vii 113 fig. 125 (with MPC aryballos, c. 650); 67 fig. 70 (with LPC aryballos; this bowl has rays also; Kardara, Rhodiaske Aggeiographia 17); 61 fig. 61 (with EC alabastron; Kardara, op. cit., 22). Also in an unpublished tomb from Caere, with a PC aryballos of about 650.

7 Syracuse, MA xxi 490 fig. 82 (in late MPC stratum; cf. Dunbabin, Western Greeks 473); Syracuse, NSx 1925 202 fig. 37 (? with LPC/Trans.; cf. Dunbabin, op. cit., 474); and cf. the Malta bowl. Heidelberg, AA 1963 669 L, fig. 2, said to have been found with a Protocorinthian cup no earlier than about 650 (ibid., 667 L, fig. 1).
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Tarsus 1449 and 1451 (Fig. 1) had rays at the base. On bird bowls the rays are always void. Of the many finds of such bowls in Rhodes and elsewhere none has appeared with pottery earlier than LPC.8

The long tail and angular body of the bird, together with the pendant triangle on Tarsus 1451 (Fig. 1), are characteristic of the later bowls, with broader panels, and of the late bowls with rays.9 The fragment of bird oenochoe, Tarsus 1439, is close to this general type.

This range of pottery from what was recorded as the Destruction Level and Fill would seem then to take us down to the Late Protocorinthian period, usually put in the third quarter of the seventh century. But the terminus proposed is 696 B.C., Sennacherib's destruction of Tarsus, or at the very latest, for the 'Destruction Fill' only, 681, if the city was rebuilt before Sennacherib's death in that year (on which see below). But this would imply import of pottery on a deserted site. It seems then that either all the other evidence surveyed above for the dating of the bird bowl series is at fault, or the Protocorinthian series should be back-dated by well over half a century.

Before all stylistic criteria for dating bird bowls are abandoned or the evidence of the Sicilian colonies for dating Protocorinthian completely rejected, it might be well to consider more closely the stratigraphic context of the relevant Tarsus finds. This is best done by a survey of the main excavation and the levels attributed to the period before the destruction as well as the 'Destruction Fill' itself. First it may be noted that the area excavated, some 300 sq. m., need not be representative of the whole site at this period, and that at the time of excavation, although the 'Destruction Fill' was observed, clear destruction floors were not remarked and 'the area was literally riddled between the levels of 1400 and 1500 with intrusive pits' (AJA 1938 44). There is a lack on any floor of the sort of assemblage, including complete vases, which might accompany a sudden destruction and abandonment. Not that this need be significant, but it means that the floors which were occupied when the Assyrians attacked did not exactly advertise themselves.

There are five main building complexes in the trench—P, J, K, O, N—some of no more than two rooms and none yielding a wholly intelligible plan, a street and an area (H) in the north-west corner of the trench. In the account that follows I take note only of the pottery which might prove significant for the chronology, ignoring the local and Cypriot wares for which no very precise absolute dates can be proposed. The drawing in Fig. 2 is adapted from Tarsus iii Plan II. It records the upper floors in areas P, J and K, and the full range of floors in H, O and N. Depths are measured down from the datum.

In the complex P an ash pit coinciding with a re-flooring at 14·50 m. is recorded on p. 113. It is not easily found in Goldman's account of the digging (p. 6) or the plan. It contained a complete Late Geometric skyphos (1375) which seems related to the local Al Mina Greek skyphoi (Anat. Stud. ix 163 ff.) and 'the same sublevel' had fragments of pendant-semicircle cups ('Cycladic').

In Jw there was a floor with a bean-pot oven at 14·60 m. (p. 5), but the pottery in the oven is put at 15·00 m. on p. 113, whence, no doubt, the hesitancy in the latter context about whether it is with or just below the floor level, and our uncertainty whether it is of the ultimate or penultimate phase of this period. Hansmann has it of the earliest Middle Iron Age (the whole period is taken to be of about 850 to about 700 B.C.). It includes part of a bird kotyle, 1447 (Fig. 1), and the base of an Ionian cup (1387; not illustrated: classified with

8 CR iii 46 figs. 33 and 37 (with LPC or later pyxis); 64 fig. 54 (with LPC aryballos); vi-vii 61 fig. 61 (with EC alabastron); 65 fig. 66 (with Trans. aryballos); 67 fig. 70 (with LPC aryballos). Hesp. xvii 223 D.53 pl. 82 (in EC well). Populonia, Flabelli di Bronzo, MA xxxiv 355 fig. 23 pl. 14-9 (with EC). Naucratis, CV A Oxford ii pl. 113 (nothing from the site pre-Trans.).
the main group of 'Ionian cups' but compared in the catalogue with one which has a low conical foot like the later bird bowls).

In $K$ upper floors (14·50–14·20 m.) had fragments of a Greek black glaze cup with reserved narrow bands on the interior (p. 113)—an odd technique recalling the Al Mina skyphoi unless the bands were within the lip, and bird bowl fragments are reported.

Underlying areas $O$ and $N$ was a level known in one part as the 'Red Floor' at 14·60–15·00 m. (pp. 7, 114). The buildings are taken to be all late in the Middle Iron Age by Hanfmann. In $Oa$ there are five successive floors, on the lowest of which (14·89 m.) was the Protocorinthian aryballos and fragment of a bird bowl (1519 and 1448, FIG. 1) already discussed. The building was thought to have escaped the destruction and Hanfmann considers it possible that some upper floors are post-destruction, the lowest two pre-destruction, which is a truly remarkable circumstance. West of $Oc$ at 14·60 m. was the fragment of an orientalising plate, 1632. The lowest floor of $O$ ran under the lowest floor of the adjacent complex $N$ (p. 7) whose two floors must be in some way related to $O$'s upper floors. From $N$ was a fragment of a 'white-slip lebes'. The use of white slip is generally post-geometric in East Greece.

Thus far the evidence of floors and houses. The central part of the area dug, outside the walls of $J$ and $K$ and the part of $O$ with the five floors, had been levelled up to the 14·00 m. mark with what was called the Destruction Fill. 'Following destruction by fire' is the term
used (p. 8), so it presumably contained burnt matter, although none of the excavated floors seem to have yielded a burnt level. So the material of the fill was brought in from elsewhere; a possibility considered by Hanfmann, p. 116. It yielded pendant-semicircle cups (1506, 1507) and flat dishes with pendant semicircles (1511, 1514).\footnote{These are also called 'Cycladic'. They are seen in Athens and Cyprus (with pendant-semicircle cups); see Desborough, AA 1963 205-8 figs. 43-7, where the captions give the erroneous impression that Desborough takes them for Attic.} \footnote{Cf. Hanfmann in The Aegean and the Near East 176 ff. On Samos the style appears in Well G, on which see below.} A black glaze cup (1396), a crater fragment with scroll on the shoulder (1606, fig. 107; the lip profile in fig. 149 looks very different), and the neck of a 'wave-line' amphora (1608). For vases of this type I know of no clear context earlier than the seventh century.\footnote{Cf. Taylor, Iraq xxi 91 ff.; Boardman, Greeks Overseas 62.} Nearly a quarter of the pottery from the fill was Cypriot, of CG III and some CG IV (p. 116), the bulk of the rest was local.

In the North Street there was a disturbed fill from 13.00 m. to 14.60 m., with material 'from c. 800 (?) to 600 B.C.' which 'may have been scattered from the Area under \( H \) and its successor' (p. 114).

\( H \), in the corner of the trench, is an area of little over 5 sq. m. behind a wall facing the North Street. It is too restricted an area for its architecture to be at all clear. There was a floor at 14.50 m. (about the level of the floors in nearby area \( f \)). Above this were comparatively rich finds of Greek pottery. From the way they are described, 'Area under \( H \), 14.05-14.50' (p. 111), it seems that they are from a fill rather than a floor deposit, and the top of the fill (14.05 m.) is roughly at the same level as that of the 'Destruction Fill' (14.00 m.) in the centre of the trench. But it is above 14.05 m. in \( H \) that there is a 'black fill' (p. 114) which is attributed to Sennacherib's destruction. Pieces from this upper fill are not distinguished (although in the catalogue bird bowl 1449 is said to be from 'Below \( H \), to 14.05'; contrast p. 114), nor is its top clear, for there were floors above at 13.35 m. (\( H_a \)) and 13.70 m. (\( H_b \); p. 9; contrast the account in p. 133). We may recall the top (13.00 m.) of the disturbed fill in the adjacent North Street. To the 14.05-14.50 m. fill belong (p. 114) several Ionian cups: 1385 has a conical disc foot and the lipless profile of a mid-seventh-century bird bowl, so hardly an Ionian cup in the usual sense of the term. 1395, 1397 and 1409 (with low conical foot) have painted lips, without decoration. They recall Samos Well G (\( A M \) 74 Beil. 38 and cf. \( A M \) 72 48 f.) in which I see nothing earlier than 700; its terminus is about 640 and many of the complete vases in it will be of its later period. The cups of this type at Al Mina do not appear earlier than 'Level VI/VII', an awkward term which seems to include material from the late eighth to early seventh century.\footnote{The 'krateriskos' 1499 and the plates 1511-15 are added by Hanfmann (p. 128) to the repertory of 'Cycladic' shapes (the others are the pendant-semicircle cups). The first at least is better classified separately.} The bird bowls and oenochoai include fragments which have already been discussed (1439, 1449-51, 1452-4, 1461) and dated down to at least as late as 650 on conventional chronology. A 'Cycladic krateriskos', 1499, has the shape and decoration of Chian skyphoi which are on the way to becoming chalices, with increasing lip height. 1499 matches examples at Emporio in the deposit of about 690-60 B.C. 1513 is a 'Cycladic plate' of the type already discussed,\footnote{The 'krateriskos' 1499 and the plates 1511-15 are added by Hanfmann (p. 128) to the repertory of 'Cycladic' shapes (the others are the pendant-semicircle cups). The first at least is better classified separately.} and the red-striped plate, 1517, is a later version of the same thing. The circle-metope crater fragment (1546) seems a wholly post-geometric type, leading to a stylistic series which in Rhodes, the islands and North Greece runs on into the sixth century. The lebetes fragments (1556, 1562) seem also post-geometric; there is a piece of this class from \( N \) (see under 1562) and most other examples are from Tarsus's seventh-century 'Assyrian' levels. The wave-line amphora fragment (1629a) is of the class which goes no earlier than Well G on Samos (see above) or earlier than the deposit of about 690-660 B.C. at Emporio. The range and character of the pottery from this 'Area under \( H \)' seems therefore very similar to that of the 'Destruction Fill' in the centre of the trench.
We may now attempt an account of the history of this area, using the conventional pottery chronology. We have to bear in mind that Sennacherib destroyed the city in 696 B.C., but that no obvious level of destroyed floors was observed (see in O, above) in the area dug, and that although the ‘Destruction Fill’ may contain debris from a destruction, the material was brought in from elsewhere and could contain much more. Moreover the fill was laid for a period of new building, not necessarily immediately after any destruction. We could have wished for more specific accounts of burning and destruction material, but perhaps there was little, so we should also bear in mind that Sennacherib could have taken Tarsus without burning all of it and that local fires can and do happen at any time. We do not know how representative of the whole site the area dug may be.

The Middle Iron Age floors in areas P, J and K were occupied in the eighth century B.C., to its very end so far as we can judge. The uppermost floors lie at various levels between 14·30 and 15·00 m. (in J). With these the floor at 14·50 m. in the area under H may be associated, and these should be the floors which were occupied when Sennacherib arrived in 696 B.C. In the rest of the trench the only feature which may be relevant is the floor which extended under O and N at 14·60–15·00 m., which was significantly called in one part the ‘Red Floor’: ? burnt. Hanfmann (p. 112) observed that the buildings in O and N may have been erected later than those in J, K and P. Above these floors, then, post-Sennacherib, might come the occupation in O and N, with the Protocorinthian and East Greek vases on the lowest floor of Oa (at 14·89 m.) dated to the early seventh century (and the earlier wares like the pendant- or circle cups apparently not represented). This implies a slight slope down in average ground level across the trench from west to east, such as is observed in all other periods of occupation here (the drain cut across the north of P (p. 6) slopes this way). It would also mean that P, J and K were not occupied at exactly the same time as O and N. Their relationship on the plan might seem to support this, especially when compared with the closely knit plans of the seventh- and sixth-century levels (Plans III, IV). Moreover, south of O was a north–south drain belonging to a lost complex which seems as though it must have run over P and have been levelled away with the ‘Destruction Fill’ (p. 7). Possibly this drain had something to do with the one over P (just mentioned) and with the 14·45 m. floor north of P, but this is not clear. Whatever levelling took place might have accounted for any post-destroyment levels over J and K.

The next phase involves the depositing (if it was deliberate) of the ‘Destruction Fill’ in the centre of the trench, over the North Street and in H. These fills seem to have been brought in from elsewhere and contain material going back before Sennacherib. From their latest contents it appears that the depositing could have occurred around or soon after 650 B.C. at the earliest. The buildings over this level (the excavators’ ‘Assyrian’ period) offer an Assyrian tablet for which a date of 636 B.C. is given,14 Transitional and later Corinthian pottery, a bird oenochoe fragment (1442) with orientalising rosette, a bird bowl (1462) matched elsewhere in the mid seventh century or later,15 Wild Goat style vases which cannot be earlier than about 650 on usual dating, and East Greek subgeometric styles which are known to persist long in the seventh century (as 1379; see Hanfmann’s remarks on p. 133).

I believe that this interpretation does no violence to the recorded stratigraphy of the site,

14 J.AOS lix (1939) 16 no. 9. For the number of floors with tablets see p. 132 and contrast the account in AJA xli (1937) 276. The date is derived from what is taken to be a regnal year (‘year 33’ is read, and only Assurbanipal reigned so long) instead of the usual limmu date (which it is said to be on p. 132).

15 Canciani (AA 1963 668) may be relieved of his anxiety, prompted by the Tarsus finds, about the alleged find of such a bowl (now in Heidelberg) with a mid seventh-century PC cup.
to the literary record or to the accepted chronology of Greek pottery. We are left with a Tarsus, which, unfortunately, does not add much precision to this chronology, because of the slight finds of significant Greek pottery in the eighth-century levels.

So far we have dealt only with the pottery finds, since they are more susceptible to close dating, but some other classes of object may also be considered briefly—seals and weapons. Of the scaraboids belonging to Porada’s Lyre-player Group, which on other grounds are dated to the end of the eighth century and little later, 16 no. 10 may be from a pre-Sennacherib room in F; the clay impression, 11 (? preserved by burning), is from the ‘Destruction Level’; 12 is from east of O at 14.50 m., either in the seventh-century fill or from the post-Sennacherib houses; 23 is from a sixth-century unit; 24 from earth fallen into a late Bronze Age IIa building.

Then there are the weapons—arrowheads, spearheads and the like, which we might expect to meet in a destruction level. Of the Middle Iron Age there are an iron arrowhead (58) and spearhead (112) which might be from the floors in F and K open to Sennacherib, five pieces which may be from the ‘Destruction Fill’, and a few others for which only depths are recorded. Rather a poor haul, and in marked contrast with the concentration of weapons in the Assyrian levels of the second half of the seventh century—28 arrowheads, a dagger and two sword fragments. 17 These are from the floors over the so-called ‘Destruction Fill’ and to this period also belongs the new fortification wall, part of which appeared in the south of the trench (p. 10) and which may indeed have occasioned these ‘fills’ behind it. Could it be that the Cimmerian hordes under Lygdamis, who reached Cilicia, where their leader met his death, 18 got to Tarsus? This happened some time between 637/6 and 626 B.C. The bronze arrowheads of the Assyrian level (p. 373, nos. 17–23, fig. 174) are of the type (two-edged, with spur) of which Nicholls writes: ‘although extremely common in Greece and Anatolia, it may reasonably be doubted whether it is native to either; like [the ‘Scythian’ three-barbed socketed heads] it enjoys an Iranian and Scythian distribution’ (BSA 53–4 130 (b)). 19 However, it may be that the type was already well enough established in Cilicia for this not to be a remarkable or significant feature in this level at Tarsus. It is not recorded at Al Mina.

Arising from this reinterpretation of the Tarsus stratigraphy there are other matters relevant to the city’s history and topography which invite attention. Hanfmann takes it that Tarsus was rebuilt within the lifetime of Sennacherib, that is, before 681 (pp. 21, 115) and so admits the possibility that some material in the ‘Destruction Fill’ might be later than 696 (p. 21) though not the imported pieces (p. 127 n. 119) which are the only closely datable ones. The lowest floors of O, on our view, would support this. The non-archaeological evidence is the passages from Berossos and Abydenos 20 reporting Sennacherib’s conflict with Greeks in Cilicia and a bronze monument which he erected to record his victory and his building (not re-building) of Tarsus in the pattern of Babylon, that is, as Abydenos explains, with the River Kydnos running through the middle of the town. If his work at Tarsus was recorded on the monument, that work must precede his death by an appreciable period. But the passages say nothing about his destruction of Tarsus (recorded in Assyrian annals), 21 so what is this about ‘building’ the city, and the river?

Classical and modern Tarsus lie north-east of the hill Gözlü Kule, excavated by the Americans. 22 The river had been diverted to the east of Tarsus by Justinian. Is it possible

---

17 In the catalogue some of these finds are described by the rooms of the higher, sixth-century level, but are located in the Assyrian levels by their depths.
18 Erzen, Kilikien 86. Hanfmann observes (p. 159) that the Cimmerian invasion is not reflected in the ceramics industry, nor would we expect it to be, but other finds may be more revealing for some events.
19 See now Snodgrass, Early Greek Armour 148 ff., where the same origin is indicated, and 252, n. 36, where the discordant dating evidence of the Tarsus finds is noted.
20 Erzen, Kilikien 64.
21 Ibid., 61 ff.
that originally it had run between Gözülü Kule and modern Tarsus? Gözülü Kule would have been the earliest settlement here, in fact since the Neolithic period. Sennacherib, by building a new town on the modern site, would have produced a whole occupied area (we know Gözülü Kule was still inhabited) bisected by the river. His building would have taken place on the new site, and the old, treated rather as a suburb in all its later history, may not have been developed so thoroughly. This is very much what the rather unimpressive Assyrian occupation of Gözülü Kule in the area excavated might suggest and would go some way to explain the ‘enigmatic lacuna of two centuries (520–320 B.C.)’ there (p. 143; Tarsus i 5). But these are topographical problems best decided by those familiar with the site (like the excavators who do not seem to have pronounced on them).  

All this may seem an ungracious attempt to upset, from a library chair and from a position of utter ignorance of the site and no first-hand experience of the finds, the conclusions of those who spent years in the trenches and pottery rooms. But it is only the interpretation of a few (admittedly vital) points that are contested here, not the basic observations. I would be the first to agree that excavators are more likely to be right in the interpretation of their finds than others, but in this case the excavators’ accounts (Miss Goldman in the AJA reports and Tarsus iii) are not wholly committed to close dating or interpretation of floors and levels. The explanation offered for them in Tarsus iii is given by Hanfmann whose first duty, admirably fulfilled, was to the pottery. Whether my interpretation of these levels at Tarsus is in fact preferable must be left to others to decide. Basically my suggestions only involve a disassociation in date of the buildings in P, J and K from those in O and N, and a reassessment of the character of the Destruction Fill. Only the lavish detail and care which have been devoted to the account of the digging and pottery, and which in other Tarsus volumes have sometimes been criticised, have made it possible to study these problems afresh. All students of Tarsus, including critics, must acknowledge their indebtedness to this detailed character of the publication.

With the evidence of Tarsus now before us it is possible to compare it with the record of Greek finds elsewhere in the Near East. At Al Mina and other sites we find the pendant-semicolon cups which are the earliest indication of Greek interest in the east. Study of the eastern wares found beside them in the earliest levels at Al Mina suggests that they were arriving there by about 800. The volume of Greek pottery at Al Mina before about 700 makes it look as though the Greeks were living there in some numbers, and even making pottery there. At other sites Greek pots, including the cups, appear sporadically and were probably dispersed as curios, certainly not by way of regular trade. Nor can they be taken as proof of Greek residence. At Tarsus they are frequent enough to suggest that some Greeks were living there, although certainly not the same proportion to the native population as at Al Mina, which was after all a major port and entrepôt, which Tarsus was not. This should not, at any rate, surprise us in view of the Assyrian kings’ encounters with Greeks in Cilicia towards the end of the eighth century.

At Al Mina the character of the eighth-century Greek pottery suggested that the Greeks using the port and living there were islanders, probably led by the Euboeans. The identification of several of the distinctive Euboean wares has been confirmed recently by finds in Euboea and in the western Euboean colonies. At Tarsus we do not have the same range

---

23 I have been unable to find any sketch map relating Gözülü Kule to modern Tarsus in the Tarsus volumes or indeed elsewhere. I have relied on the opinions of friends who have visited the site that my interpretation of the topography is not impossible.
24 I have sketched the archaeological history of Al Mina in these centuries in The Greeks Overseas 61 ff.
25 Taylor, Iraq xxi (1959) 91 f.
27 Notably, the imitations of Protocorinthian now found on Ischia/Pithecousai, and the skyphoi with concentric circles on the rim, which should now be taken as a Euboean speciality. The pendant-semicolon cups remain unknown in the west. They
of Euboean vases but we can scarcely doubt that the sources were much the same as at Al Mina, including, of course, the strong Cypriot interest in this part of the coast. The only difference might be the presence of East Greek ‘Ionian cups’ at Tarsus in eighth-century levels, while they are virtually unknown so early at Al Mina.

It is not easy to see exactly why Greeks were attracted to Tarsus, unless there is something more to this pattern of Greeks returning to sites they had known in the Late Bronze Age than can immediately be divined. The memory of Mopso in nearby Karatepe is a case in point. It may be that we can identify one group of objects that found their way back into the Greek world from Cilicia, perhaps Tarsus, in the Lyre-player Group of seals, well represented at Tarsus, and less likely to have been disseminated from the more southerly port of Al Mina. The latter was on the main route to the east and must have handled much of the material that went to work the ‘orientalising revolution’ in the Greek world. This may be a convenient point at which to record further evidence for this from the Al Mina finds. Ivory elephant tusks were found there. The Dipylon ivory girls in Athens tell us that eastern techniques and subjects in ivory were already known in Greece by about the mid eighth century. We know that many eastern bronze vases passed to the west, and from Al Mina is the fragmentary bronze handle shown in Fig. 3.

![Fig. 3](image)

Although recorded as from a later level (III) it must be of the eighth or seventh century. The type with long arms ending in rosettes and with loops for a swing handle is best paralleled on a bronze bowl from Nimrud and two from Amathus in Cyprus. Rather similar types are seen in the Greek world for shallow bowls, generally with shorter arms. The Al Mina fragment looks as though it belongs below the out-turned lip of a dinos. Ring handles on eastern dinoi usually have flat arms, but the use of the Al Mina type for metal dinoi (although with ring and not swing arms) are better known in Euboea now and Euboean workshops may have stopped making them by the time Pithekousai was founded, although examples may have been in use later in the century elsewhere, as at Tarsus. At Troy and ‘Larisa’ the date of the Iron Age settlements should perhaps be given by the local wares, so the pendant-semicircle cups there could be appreciably earlier than the other datable Greek pottery.

The find is mentioned by Barnett, Nimrud Ivories 165 n. 1: ‘Tusks, some partly marked for sawing up...’ One is Oxford 1954.522 with a single line cut round its base; other pieces are in London. Syrian elephants may not have survived the eighth century (Barnett, op. cit., 166).

Oxford 1963.5; JHS lviii (1938) 147 fig. 25 MN229, and p. 165: ‘apparently a fastening for furniture’. It is broken off where there may have been another ribbed moulding. In the sections in Fig. 3 the horizontal represents the axis of the rivet hole. Preserved width 0.112.

Layard, Monuments of Nineveh ii pl. 57A. Usually taken for Phoenician but there is nothing Egyptianising in it and it could be Assyrian work. Cf. ibid., pl. 60, with shorter arms. Murray, Exc. in Cyprus 102 fig. 148.8, 9.

Fouilles de Delphes v 79 fig. 276; Pareti, La Tomba Regolini-Galassi pl. 22.215–16. With shorter arms: Argive Heraeum ii pl. 121.2074, 2077 (and cf. pl. 235.2788, which might be part of a long arm); Schumacher, Bronzen in Karlsruhe pl. 8.16, 32; Lindos i pl. 29.709; and on the (?)Rhodian decorated bowl, MonPiot xlviii (1956) 26 f., figs. 1, 2, pl. 3. To judge from its three rivet holes the Tyszkiewicz bowl (Fröhner, Coll. Tysz. pl. 15; Pfühl, MuZ fig. 134) may have had a single handle of this sort.

Körte, Gordion 68 ff., figs. 45–8; Tell Halaf iv pl. 50.7; Olympia iv 133 no. 837; Fouilles de Delphes
handles) is strongly suggested by the copies of it in clay which are found in Greece. Oddly—perhaps significantly—enough, the best examples are among the East Greek vases which were taken to Al Mina in the seventh century (Fig. 4). They have the same long arms for the handles, the ribbed mouldings being shown plastically or by painted or reserved lines. A ring handle is shown hanging from a sleeve and not a swing handle from loops. The fragments seem Rhodian, hardly much later than the mid seventh century with their sub-geometric or earliest orientalising animal decoration.

At Al Mina the gap between the abandonment of the Level VII houses and the rebuilding in Level VI seems to have been short and to have fallen about 700 B.C. It could well be that the unpopularity of Greeks with Assyrians occasioned by the episode in Cilicia in 696 also had its effect on the Greek trading post at the mouth of the Orontes. Al Mina was soon rebuilt and reoccupied with an even stronger Greek element in the population, but the pottery brought to the town and used there is now mainly East Greek or Corinthian in origin, arguing a change in the identities of the Greeks now dealing with the port.

At Tarsus there was also reoccupation and Greek pottery soon arriving again, but since Gözlü Kule may no longer have been the town centre we cannot be sure that the pottery found is wholly representative of the site (unless this remained the Greek quarter; which again we cannot know without excavations in Classical Tarsus). The Greek seventh-century pottery seems overwhelmingly East Greek, with very little Corinthian, unlike Al Mina. If

---

38 (a) Oxford 1954-347 (MN600, Levels V and VI/VII), for which see JHS lx (1940) 15 fig. 7k; Schiering, Werkstätten 123 n. 287; Kardara, 71, no.8. (b) Oxford 1954-342(9) (Level VI/VII); perhaps from the same vase as JHS lx (1940) 9 fig.4b. (c) Oxford 1954-348(1) (Level VI/VII). (d) Oxford, Private. The clay is a good red, sometimes fired with a greyish core. The paint is a deep brown over a thick dull cream slip. Our group is earlier than the general run of Rhodian dinoi (cf. Schiering, 37 f.) which, if they have handles at all, have rings in spools (e.g. Vroulia 215 f., fig. 103; MA xvii 250, fig. 188, from Gela, ? Chian), and are not wholly painted inside like the Al Mina fragments. Rather like the latter are the handles with short arms on dinoi from Ithaka, BSA xliii (1948) pl. 24-393 (local), 45-599 (AntT xxxvii (1957) pl. 22.9). The latter, if not Cretan, copies the Cretan dinoi from Afrati, which, however, have handles like the later Rhodian (Ann. x-xii 164 f., fig. 176; 172, fig. 192).
this contrast means anything at all, it is that the Greeks who brought Corinthian pottery to Al Mina had little or no interest in Tarsus. I have suggested that the mass of Corinthian carried to Al Mina might as well have been brought by Aeginetans as Corinthians,44 and this essentially trading interest could not have been easily served at Tarsus. On the other hand the weight of East Greek finds of the seventh century at Tarsus, and at other Cilician sites (as Mersin)35 might suggest that the Rhodians had already founded Soloi, on the Cilician coast close to Mersin. Here we may recall the even earlier East Greek interest in Cilicia (? rather than Al Mina) with the finds in eighth-century Tarsus.

In the sixth century Al Mina seems deserted for as long as Babylon is dominant in the Near East, but whatever the reasons for this it did not affect Tarsus or the arrival of Greek pottery there, while at Tell Sukas, down the coast from Al Mina, it is just this period that sees its most flourishing relations with the Greeks.36

At Tarsus the houses excavated by the Americans seem to have been abandoned well before the end of the sixth century and the area not built on again until the Hellenistic period. Since the centre of the city was at this time probably over the river from Gözlü Kule this tells us nothing about the history of the site, beyond the possibility that under the Persians the city was smaller and of slightly lesser importance.37

John Boardman.

Merton College, Oxford.

44 Greeks Overseas 73 ff.

37 Cf. RE s.v. 'Tarsus' 2417 ff.
I have had the pleasure of discussing Tarsus problems with Miss Goldman, Professor Mellink and Professor Hanfmann.
PRELIMINARY SKETCH IN GREEK VASE-PAINTING

(PLATES I-XV)

The use of preliminary sketch in Attic red-figure is so widespread and so familiar that even in a detailed publication its presence often passes unmentioned, yet illustrations of it are not always easy to find.\(^1\) It may therefore be helpful to bring together some examples on which the sketch-work is of particular interest and at the same time to include instances of what is basically the same procedure, but applied to other techniques of vase-painting.

As is well known, the sketch is composed of shallow grooves made in the surface of the clay before firing; the lines are most obvious in the reserved areas, but it can sometimes be seen that they extend into the black background, and when they do, the shininess of the black in the grooves shows clearly that they were made before the black was applied. The exact nature of the instrument with which the sketch was drawn is not known; the grooves generally look as if they had been made with a small, blunt tool, though whether it was wood or metal or some other material cannot be determined. Each artist no doubt had his own favourite implement, but it is worth noting that occasionally, and above all on Apulian red-figure, the sketch-lines are narrow slits cut into the clay; this kind of line, at least, must have been made with something sharp, presumably a metal graver.\(^2\) The amount of detail in the sketch varies from man to man, and there may even be differences between works that can be attributed to the same hand, or between the two sides of the same pot. Sometimes the artist does no more than block out the general masses and arrangement of the figures; on other vases the preliminary work is very exact and on occasion may be more detailed than the final drawing. For instance on a fragment of a calyx-krater found during the American Excavations of the Athenian Agora there is a youth moving to the right; the lower boundary of his pectoral muscles is formed by two curved lines which run up to meet each other at the base of Athens and to publish a photograph and drawing of it, and for checking the drawing against the original; to Miss Alison Frantz for the photograph of the fragment; to Mr D. M. Bailey for his help on many occasions; to Miss Miller for the photographs used for PLATES IIa, IVa and IXa; to Mr C. O. Waterhouse for preparing and subsequently bleaching the print used in making fig. I, and for unlimited patient and invaluable advice and help in the preparation of the detailed photographs.

It would be expensive to include complete views of all the published vases of which details are illustrated in this article; for convenience selected references are given to published illustrations of many of the vases discussed; for a full list see the relevant entries in ARV and ABV. ARV means the second edition of 1963.

---

\(^1\) For some previous studies see the examples from Furtwängler and Reichhold listed in Appendix A; also G. M. A. Richter, The Craft of Athenian Pottery 38-9; J. D. Beazley, Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens 38 ff. (from PBA 30); R. M. Cook, Greek Painted Pottery 244.

\(^2\) It has sometimes been suggested that the sketch was drawn in some medium which burnt up and completely disappeared during firing, with the implication that the grooves were only produced incidentally, through excessive pressure—most recently, J. V. Noble, AJA lv (1960) 318. The suggestion is attractive, since it would explain why the sketch so often seems very incomplete, though it does not account for the areas where the lines dig deep into the clay, as for the satyr’s finger-tips, PLATE III, and still less for the slit-like lines sometimes found on Apulian. There is no need to suppose that all artists worked in the same way.
of the central line of his chest. On other works by the same artist the addition of a horizontal line encloses a pediment-shaped area at the end of the breast-bone; this line is present in the preliminary sketch on the Agora fragment, but omitted from the final version (PLATE I). There are places where an artist seems to have changed his mind; on his cup in the British Museum with satyrs attacking Hera and Iris, the Brygos Painter originally showed the left arm of one of the satyrs in the Hera scene as bent, but modified this arrangement in the finished drawing, and on the other side, where we now see a plain low platform or plinth beside the satyr next to the handle, there is sketched a stool with a panther-skin thrown over it, and a series of curving lines originally sprouted from the top of Dionysos’ sceptre; the picture on a cup in Munich by the same artist suggests what the stool with its covering would have looked like and also shows that in the first draft for the London cup the god was to hold a branch of vine or ivy. A neck-amphora in Harrow School is decorated by another artist of the same period, the Kleophrades Painter; on one side, a satyr holding a helmet of Corinthian type in one hand and a pair of greaves on a stand in the other; on the reverse, a second satyr with a spear and a shield. Satyrs are normally amorous or alcoholic rather than military, though the three qualities are not incompatible, but in the battle between the gods and the giants Dionysos sometimes plays his part, wearing full armour, and on some vases his attendant satyrs act as armour-bearers when he is making ready for the fight; they are not always non-combatants, for on a fragmentary calyx-krater in Naples a satyr joins in the battle with a helmet on his head, an animal skin over his left arm to serve as a shield, and a thyrsos in place of a spear. The krater belongs to the end of the fifth century, but satyrs are front-line troops over fifty years earlier; on a pelike in London a satyr wearing a helmet is putting on his greaves while a maenad stands by holding a panther-skin and a thyrsos (PLATE II). The scene is surely a parody, or at least an adaptation, of a human arming scene; a warrior making ready for battle while a woman—his wife, mother or sister—holds his spear and shield until he is ready to take them and march out. So far, then, it might well be that the satyrs on the Harrow neck-amphora intend to use their armour and weapons themselves, but there is a further piece of evidence which gives some support to Beazley’s view that they are preparing to arm their master. In 1946 the vase was sent to the British Museum for repair; while it was there, Professor Martin Robertson noticed substantial differences between the finished pictures and the preliminary sketch, and further study made it possible to record these discrepancies in detail (PLATES II, III); the illustrations show parts of the glaze drawing by heavy lines, and the sketch by light ones. On the side where the satyr now holds helmet and greaves, there are sketch lines for a shaft running almost vertically from his left hand to the lower border; it is clear that at one stage he was to hold a spear, and the artist also made two, if not three, drafts for the helmet, and tried the effect of mounting its crest on a tall stem. In the sketch on the reverse the right arm was straight, not bent, and the hand held a cuirass; three other lines running out between the sketched

---

8 Athens, Agora P 19291. Hesperia xviii (1949) pl. 45-5; p. 224; ARV 227, Eucharides Painter, no. 17. For the more complex rendering, see for instance London E 278; CVA iii, III I c, pl. 15.1 c; ARV 226, no. 2.

4 London E 65. FR pl. 47-2; ARV 370, Brygos Painter, no. 13.

5 Munich 2634. FR pl. 49; Lullies and Hirmer, Griechische Vasen pl. 66, above; ARV 371, Brygos Painter, no. 15.

6 Harrow 55. JHS xxxvi (1916) pl. 6; pp. 123-4; xxx (1910) 50 for references to satyrs in battle; Beazley, Kleophradesmaler pl. 29.1-2; ARV 183, Kleophrades Painter, no. 11.

7 Naples 2883. Hallhend, Vasen um Meidias pl. 104; ARV 1338. See also Euripides, Cyclops, 5-9.

8 London E 377. ARV 501, Deepdene Painter, no. 35.

9 For the satyr compare the central figure on the reverse of the stamnos Munich 2406 (CVA v, pl. 238.2; ARV 207, Berlin Painter, no. 137); the central Amazon on the stamnos Brussels A 3992 (CVA iii, III I c, pl. 23.1a; ARV 291, Tyszkievicz Painter, no. 21). For the maenad, cf. the lekythos Oxford 393 (CVA i, pl. 35-4; ARV 216, manner of the Berlin Painter, no. 17); the pelike London E 405 (BCH lxxvi (1962) 72; ARV 486, Hermonax, no. 49); the neck-amphora Warsaw, ex Potocki (CVA Poland iii; Poland pl. 129-40; ARV 487, Hermonax, no. 54).
forearm and the final version show that the artist also considered the possibility of an intermediate position; it was in fact his first plan, for these lines underlie the rest. The position of the shield was decided at an early stage, since its rim is marked by compass-drawn circles cut in the soft clay which overrun the existing right forearm but respect the sketched one which held the cuirass. In the absence of an explicit statement by the artist it is hazardous to reconstruct his reasoning, but it is possible that for the other side he was in the end attracted by the contrasts between the inert hair of the helmet’s plume and the nervous feline twitch of the satyr’s tail; in the sketch for the other picture there is a blank area in front of the satyr’s body and the figure is thrown off balance, pulled forward by the mass of the armour in the outstretched hand; the substitution of spear for cuirass and the change in the setting of the forearm make the composition more self-contained.\textsuperscript{10} One may feel greater confidence about another point; when a figure holds a shield and a spear, it is hard to tell whether he intends to use them himself or to hand them to another person, but when a cuirass is held out as in the sketch it looks very much as if it is meant for someone else, not for the holder, so the preliminary work suggests that in the original conception, at least, the satyrs on the Harrow vase were thought of as squires, not warriors. The same kind of modification can be seen on the front of a bell-krater in London; in the sketch the bearded man on the right had a stick in his right hand, which would make the position of his arm intelligible, and ‘Teucer’ (the left-hand warrior) was to face the other way, without a shield, to judge by the position of his bow-case and left arm\textsuperscript{11} (\textit{Plate IV}). In these examples the sketch and the finished product differ only in detail, but occasionally the changes are more radical. A cup in Vienna has inside it a picture of Hermes in front of an altar, holding a curious beast on a lead—a pig disguised as a dog, or vice versa; as the published drawing shows, the picture was originally to have been the other way up, and quite different; an athlete with a pickaxe.\textsuperscript{12}

It is not surprising to find traces of a similar kind of preliminary sketch on Attic white-ground vases, for many of them were decorated by artists who also worked in red-figure. An obvious instance is the cup from Camirus whose interior is filled with a majestic representation of Aphrodite riding on a bird; one might expect a swan, but here the painter seems to have taken a goose for his model.\textsuperscript{13} The picture is drawn with lines of dilute glaze and areas of solid colour; in addition a whole complex of grooves is drawn in the white slip which forms the background, grooves so faint that for the illustration it has been necessary to reinforce them in ink on a photograph and then to bleach out the photograph itself; in the drawing the ring round the outside gives the position of the glaze border, but everything else reproduces the preliminary sketch (\textit{Fig. 1}). In most respects it differs little from the final work; in the first draft the artist tried the effect of putting beneath the bird’s tail a smaller version of the tendril and flower in Aphrodite’s hand—presumably as a counterweight which he finally decided was unnecessary—and the ground-line below the group was also omitted in the final picture. The most important change is that the goddess’ head was first planned in front view; from the nature of the medium very few vase-painters were entirely successful in their attempts at the frontal face and it may well be that this cup would have merited, and received, less admiration if the artist had adhered to his original plan.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{10} For an even more marked change of mind by the same artist, see his amphora, Würzburg 507; \textit{ARV} 181, no. 1; in the sketch the Oriental wore a himation and was, presumably, the father of the departing warrior; FR ii, 224; pl. 103.


\textsuperscript{12} Vienna 3691. \textit{CVA} pl. 2.4–6; p. 9; \textit{ARV} 118, Epidromos Painter, no. 8.

\textsuperscript{13} London D 2. Pfuhl, \textit{MuZ} fig. 498; Diepolder, \textit{Penthesileaamaler} pl. 6; Lane, \textit{Greek Pottery} pl. D; M. Robertson, \textit{Greek Painting} 113; \textit{ARV} 862, Pistoxenos Painter, no. 22. Sketch lines also on the white-ground oinochoe with the picture of a girl spinning, London D 13; \textit{ARV} 403, Foundry Painter, no. 38.

\textsuperscript{14} As Professor Martin Robertson has pointed out, a similar kind of preliminary sketch is found in some Etruscan tomb paintings; \textit{JRS} xlvi (1957) 264, review of Becatti and Magi, \textit{Monumenti della pittura antica}
Preliminary sketch is also found in the third major technique, black-figure, though there it is comparatively uncommon. On the reverse of a Panathenaic amphora of the end of the fifth century two athletes stand beside a trainer or umpire; beside the palm branch held by the umpire, below the left forearm of the central figure and above the right and left arms of the left-hand one there are incised lines which do not belong to the final drawing (plate va).

They are parts of the preliminary sketch, which show up particularly well for two reasons; they were made with a fairly sharp instrument, so that they are deeper than usual, and, more important, like most black-figured vases, this amphora was given a wash of thinned glaze before the sketch and final picture were executed, but the wash was exceptionally thick so

15 Noted by Zahn on the hydria Berlin 1897; FR iii, 237; ABV 293, Psiax, no. 8.

16 London B 605. CVA i, III H f, pl. 2.3 and 6; pl. 6; ABV 411, Kuban Group, no. 4; Arias, Hirmer and Shefton, A History of Greek Vase Painting pl. xxviii; see also ibid. fig. 81 for preliminary sketch beside the back legs of the horses on another Panathenaic of the same group, London B 606; ABV 411, Kuban Group, no. 3.
that the sketch-lines, cut through to the untreated clay, are immediately apparent. On the front of the vase the area between the shield of Athena and the left-hand border of the panel gives unmistakable evidence that this wash has been applied so lavishly that it has trickled down; where it has settled most thickly, the colour is darkest, and indistinguishable from what is to be seen at some of the edges of the black-figure drawing, so that one may be sure that the liquid used for the wash was merely a dilution of the ordinary black\textsuperscript{17} (Plate vb). This kind of preparatory coating is not a late development, for it can be found on many vases of the sixth century, though in general it is discreetly applied, to be detected only by the occasional brush-stroke or where it has collected in an accidental hollow in the surface of the pot. A lekythos in the British Museum is decorated with a line of venerable satyrs playing the lyre and holding branches; a glance at the back is enough to reveal that this vase, too, has been coated with a liquid which was not applied evenly all over and which ran down in one area to form an edge which looks exactly like the thinner parts of the figure-work\textsuperscript{18} (Plate via). The Panathenaic amphora is not an ideal example of preliminary sketch in black-figure, because when it was made the technique was a pious archaism as far as Athens was concerned, retained for this class of vase alone; the use of the sketch might therefore be borrowed from contemporary red-figure practice. From the third quarter of the sixth century there is the soloist on the lip-cup by Tleson with the grooves of the sketch very plain beneath the tail and in front of the legs, but it might conceivably be argued that even this cup is not certainly earlier than the invention of red-figure\textsuperscript{19} (Plate vfb). No such doubts apply to the earliest known Panathenaic, the Burgon Amphora, made in 570–560 B.C., or not long after; a close look at the Athena shows that her posterior curve is echoed by two grooves which were certainly marked out before the final drawing, since they are underneath the glaze, and on the reverse there is a groove of the same kind at the back of the head of the driver of the racing cart\textsuperscript{20} (Plate via, 6). Preliminary sketch is also recorded on another work of the same period, the fragmentary kantharos by Nearchos which was found on the Acropolis\textsuperscript{21}; indeed, it occurs on one of the earliest known Attic vases in true black-figure, the name-piece of the Nettos Painter.\textsuperscript{22}

As black-figure was not invented by Attic vase-painters but borrowed by them from Corinth, it is hardly surprising that preliminary sketch occurs on at least one Protocorinthian vase, earlier than the earliest known Attic black-figure; the text of the publication of the Chigi jug notes its presence in the second zone and the drawing indicates the position of the grooves alongside the wings and rump of the sphinx, the tail of the hunted lion, and the thigh of one of the hunters.\textsuperscript{23} Another non-Attic example can be seen on a much later vase, an Etruscan hydria in Hamburg of about 500 B.C.; on the body, Dionysos with two maenads and a satyr, on the neck, two youths.\textsuperscript{24} The published drawings show that the pose of the right-hand figure in the shoulder-picture was altered a little, and it looks as though the staff which he holds in the finished drawing was not part of the original scheme. The sketch for the main scene includes a gnome-like creature on the extreme right outside the border of the picture and on a slightly lower level than the others; the suspicion that he was never meant to appear in the final work is confirmed by the existence of other vases on which an artist has

\textsuperscript{17} The illustration also shows further remains of preliminary sketch on either side of the capital of the column.

\textsuperscript{18} London B 560. ABV 495, Class of Athens 581, no. 158.

\textsuperscript{19} London B 410. Beazley, ABS pl. 1.4; CVA ii, III H e, pl. 14.6; ABV 181.

\textsuperscript{20} London B 130. CVA i, III H e, pl. 11; JHS bxx (1960) pl. 1–2; pp. 57–8 on the date. ABV 89, Burgon Group, no. 1.

\textsuperscript{21} Graef, Die antiken Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen i, 71 ff. on no. 611; preliminary sketch for Achilles' right arm and the horse's muzzle, both set rather lower than in the finished drawing; also, surprisingly, for the inscription.

\textsuperscript{22} ABV 4–5, Nettos Painter, no. 1; Beazley, DABF 14–5; 106, n. 8; Arias, Hirmer and Shefton, A History of Greek Vase Painting figs. 18–20.

\textsuperscript{23} AD ii, pl. 45; the sketch shown by dotted lines.

\textsuperscript{24} Hamburg 444. Studi Etruschi xi (1937) 366 ff., figs. 5–6; pl. 39. 1. For preliminary sketch in Chalcidian see FR i, 166.
idly sketched a figure, or part of one. An Attic amphora in London has Herakles and Kyknos on one side and two mounted Amazons on the reverse; each of the Amazons has her shield slung behind her back, and on the shield of the leading Amazon is a satyr-mask shown as in high relief (Plate vii). Between this mask and the head of the second horse is a careful and very detailed incised drawing of the head and the upper part of the body of a woman to left, dressed in an Ionic chiton, her long hair bound up at the back and her right hand raised in front of her, holding a flower; her left arm is drawn back, slightly bent; most of this drawing is in the reserved background, but parts of it extend into the glazed areas, the woman’s back hair falling across the satyr-mask, her forehead overlapping that of the horse and the flower and her fingers running over its lower jaw. The glaze goes over the incised lines, so the drawing was certainly done before the black-figure picture, yet it does not look like a preliminary sketch; for one thing the head is rather a long way below the upper border, whose position is standard for an amphora of this period; for another, when it does occur, preliminary sketch for black-figure is not normally so detailed—note especially the array of careful lines for the hair. Moreover, the style of the sketch seems to have little in common with that of the black-figure work; in costume, arrangement of hair and proportions it reminds one of the right-hand maenad in the black-figure picture on an amphora in Madrid by Psiax, though the face on the London vase is more sharp-featured. As so often, one can point to something comparable in Corinthian; on the top of each of the handle-plates of the Amphipatroas krater in Berlin is a running Gorgon, and to the right of one of them, scratched in the clay while it was still soft, is the upper part of a figure which is obviously irrelevant to the final drawing.

The vases in the British Museum give a sample of the relative frequency of preliminary sketch in two of the three principal techniques; the vast majority of the red-figured vases show at least some traces of sketch, whereas out of some eight hundred black-figured pieces there are possible sketch lines only on sixteen, seven of these being late Panathenaica, and where the sketch is present it is normally very scanty. One reason for its rarity in black-figure may be that the artist working in this medium had at his disposal a completely different kind of preparatory work. A detailed view of the feet of Athena on the Burgon amphora shows that the contours of her advanced right foot are repeated by lines of thin glaze a fraction of an inch away from the solid mass of the final drawing; the remains of the same kind of line are visible beside her right elbow, biceps and forearm, though here the line merges with the main area of glaze at several points, and on the actual vase it can be seen that her chin and neck have a brown edge of exactly the same character (Plate viii). It seems quite clear that the artist first drew the figure in outline with dilute glaze and then filled it in with a thicker mixture. On many black-figured vases the edges of the drawing shade off into brown; the reason may often be that the glaze has run thin at the edge of the brush-stroke, but in some cases, at least, it looks as if the artist has not quite covered his initial outline. A close examination of the left hind leg of a ram on a fragment of a plate in London reveals two components, an area of solid black, of the same consistency as the greater part of the drawing, and a smaller section of brown in front of the shank (Plate ix a); the

25 London B 158. CVA iii, III H e, pl. 27.2; von Bothmer, Amazons in Greek Art, pl. 63.1; ABV 368, Leagros Group, no. 105; ‘recalls the Acheilos Painter’. It is impossible to light the vase so that all parts of the sketch show clearly at the same time; the woman’s left shoulder and arm overlap the lower part of the shield.

26 It is not ‘part of an original design abandoned’, as stated in the text of the CVA.

27 Madrid 11008. Pfuhl, MuZ fig. 264; CVA i, III H e, pl. 25.1; ABV 294, Psiax, no. 24.

28 Berlin 1635. FR pl. 122; iii, 8.

29 See Appendix B.

30 For the same procedure in Chalcidian see FR ii, 221. In Attic red-figure, too, there are sometimes traces of an initial outline in thin glaze, in addition to the outline stripe and the relief contour.

31 London B 601.23. JHS xxix (1929) 255, fig. 2.2. From the same plate, B 601.25, Oxford G 128.1 and 8, Toronto C 46; ABV 9-10, Gorgon Painter, no. 19.
front of the black runs in a concave curve, whereas the brown ends almost in a straight line; it is hard to see how this effect could have been produced by a single stroke of the brush with the glaze running thinner at the edge, whereas it is easily intelligible as the result of two separate operations, one with thick glaze, one with thin.

A contributory cause of the comparative rarity of preliminary sketch in black-figure may lie in the fact that the forms were not defined by a single line, as in red-figure, but could be built up by repeated strokes of the brush. Even so, line drawing is an essential part of the technique; within the shapes produced by the brush alone the details are marked by incised lines. With red-figure, the line had to be right first time, since an erasure would blemish the surface of the pot and betray its presence, so it is no surprise to find traces of preliminary drawing made by the artist to guide himself when he came to execute the final incisions, lines lightly cut in the glaze, which often do no more than graze the surface and are visible only under magnification and with a favourable light; the existence of this kind of sketch was observed long ago by Reichhold but since his day it seems to have received little attention.\(^\text{32}\) For convenience it may perhaps be called, preliminary incision. Examples of it are abundant from the earliest days of Attic black-figure onward;\(^\text{33}\) in the British Museum alone preliminary incision can certainly be seen on more than eighty vases and fragments, while faint traces of it may be found on many others.\(^\text{34}\) It is inevitable that its presence should not be universally apparent, for when the lines of the finished drawing coincide with the sketch they are bound to obliterate it; in the majority of instances no more remains than the forked end of a line, or a repeated curve, one stroke being strong, the other very faint. If that were all, it could be said that as he came to the place for each incision the artist first made a preliminary, tentative stroke which he immediately repeated more firmly, but on a certain number of vases the whole series of incised lines is repeated, once faintly—to be seen only on very close inspection—and again more heavily; where the two overlap the deeper lines overran the light ones and were clearly done later. This kind of duplication and displacement must surely mean that all the details were first sketched in, then given their final form in a slightly different position. Look, for example, at the picture on one side of a neck-amphora in London, with Herakles and Triton shown in the usual scheme, Herakles striding across the monster and grappling him from behind, trying to force him down; his right leg is on the side nearest us and one leg of the lion's skin falls in front of it. The detailed picture shows part of Triton's fishy body curving down in a U and accentuated by a white stripe; superimposed on it, Herakles' leg and part of the lion's skin; the incisions which are visible when the vase is studied at arm's length show as strong white lines, but in addition along the front and back of Herakles' thigh and calf, and round the lion's paw, there runs a series of fainter lines, echoing the final incisions, but not coinciding\(^\text{35}\) (Plate ixb). Higher up, Triton's nose, ear, eyebrow and curly hair are also duplicated, to mention only what is apparent in the photograph; the traces are in fact even more extensive (Plate xix). The same subject is represented on a hydria, where the preliminary incision can be seen beside the upper contour of Triton's left forearm and along the lower edge of his wrist, across his

32 FR i, 24; pl. 4, above; the amphora Munich 2901; ABV 255, Lysippides Painter, no. 4.
33 On the Nettos amphora, Athens 10022; ABV 4-5, Nettos Painter, no. 1. See Beazley, DABFPpl. 5-1, where it is visible under magnification on the lobe of the Gorgon's left ear, on the tips of the wing-feathers to the right of the first three locks of the beard, on the eyes and nose. Traces also on the head of the other Gorgon. On the bowl of the krater from Vari, Athens 16384; ABV 6, 'probably by the Nettos Painter, a late work'; on the lower contour of the right forearm of Herakles, along the hem of his sleeve and for part of his upper arm. On the bowl of a second krater from Vari, Athens 16982; ABV 3, below; for the peaked line which forms the forehead of the pantheress and for the line which runs from the animal's left ear to form the eyebrow and part of the nose. On a fragment of a krater, Athens, Kerameikos 154; ABV 3, Chimaera Painter, no. 3; in the ear and ruff of the lion's head.
34 See Appendix C.
35 London B 223, CVA iv, III H e, pl. 55-2; ABV 284, near the Group of Toronto 303, no. 7.
knuckles, on both sides of Herakles' forearm and round his hand, on Triton's ear, round the crown of his head, and in other places\(^\text{36}\) (PLATE X\(b\)).

In general the final incision repeats or coincides with the first draft, as on the last two examples, but occasionally there is clear evidence of a change of plan. The main scene of a hydria of the Leagros Group is dominated by the figure of a hero carrying the corpse of an Amazon.\(^\text{37}\) He wears a helmet of Attic type which leaves his face exposed; other, fainter incisions run from the eye to the chin, back along the beard, turn up to circumnavigate the ear and then sweep down to the neck; another line marks the back of the head (PLATE X\(a\)). In other words, in the first draft he had a Corinthian helmet, and it may be that the artist made the change because he wanted to enliven the face of the principal character, the more so because it is set against the black mass of the Amazon's chiton.

Preliminary incision for black-figure is not confined to Attic; on the Pseudo-Chalcidian Polyphemos vase in London, the reverse shows Herakles and other Greeks fighting against Amazons, and here the preliminary work is visible where the mouth of the lion's skin frames Herakles' face, in the ear and nostril of the skin, along the upper edge of his forearm, and, on one of his companions, at the front of both thighs and on the cheek-piece of the helmet\(^\text{38}\) (PLATES X\(ib\), X\(ia\)). The front of this neck-amphora illustrates another interesting technical point; it has already been said that most black-figured pots were given a wash of dilute glaze before the drawing was begun, and careless handling or the attempt to remove glaze which had been put in the wrong place was liable to remove the wash, leaving a dull patch (this may be why it is not uncommon to find an accidental splash of glaze;\(^\text{39}\) the mark left by its removal would have been as conspicuous as the splash itself). In the Blinding of Polyphemus Odysseus is the leading man on the spit; he raises it above his head with both hands, putting all his weight on his right leg. In front of the leg is a patch whose surface is duller and rougher than that of the rest of the reserved background; along either side of this patch is a narrow, luridous brown strip of thin glaze, and at its lower end a curved triangle of glaze sprouts up from the extended left leg of Polyphemos, merging into the rough area\(^\text{40}\) (PLATE X\(ib\)). It looks very much as if the artist originally drew Odysseus' right leg too far forward, perhaps realised his mistake when he saw that there would not be room for the outstretched left leg, and so scraped off the glaze as best he could.\(^\text{41}\) If this reconstruction of events is correct, he must here have worked from right to left, first drawing the Cyclops and then Odysseus.

On some black-figured vases there are lines just like preliminary incisions which have a slightly different purpose; they are guide-lines for applied white. Their presence is particularly clear on an Attic neck-amphora of about \(510\) B.C. which shows the death of Priam\(^\text{42}\) (PLATE X\(ia\)). His white hair hangs down in three long locks, and between the middle and right-hand locks there is a gap in the triple incision which marks the hem at the neck of his chiton, with a faint wavy incised line on either side of the break; the hem is also interrupted where the two outer locks cross it, and here too there are faint incisions, on either side of the white, but the middle lock runs over the hem.

\(^\text{36}\) London B 312. \textit{CVA} iv, III H e, pl. 79, 1; \textit{AJA} xxvi (1922) 187. Compared by von Bothmer with the hydria Boston 62.1185; \textit{Classical Journal} lix (1963-4) 198, figs. 9-10; 200; 207, n. 13.

\(^\text{37}\) London B 323. \textit{CVA} vi, III H e, pl. 84, 3; \textit{ABV} 362, Leagros Group, no. 33 (Painter A).

\(^\text{38}\) London B 154. Rumpf, \textit{Chalkidische Vasen} 161, Polyphemos Group, no. vi; pls. 202-3. Preliminary incision also reported on the Corinthian columnkrater with the Departure of Amphiarao; Berlin 1655; FR iii, 12.

\(^\text{39}\) E.g., under the shield and between the legs of the figure on PLATE X\(ib\).

\(^\text{40}\) The detailed photograph was taken with a highlight falling on the area so that the thin glaze and the edge of Odysseus' legs are lighter than the background, and the rough patch is darker.

\(^\text{41}\) For examples in other fabrics of corrections made by scraping off the glaze, see Appendix, D.

\(^\text{42}\) London B 241. \textit{CVA} iv, III H e, pl. 59, 1; \textit{AJA} lviii (1954) pl. 58, 16; \textit{ABV} 375, Leagros Group, no. 175. Reichhold reports the presence of preliminary sketch for added white on the François vase; FR i, 12.
artist completed all the incised details of the black-figure work, leaving gaps where the strands of hair were to cross the hem and sketching their proposed shape; he subsequently placed the two outer strands as intended but changed the position of the middle one. On another vase of the same fabric, shape and period the subject is an excerpt from the Judgement of Paris, with Hermes leading the three goddesses⁴⁸ (Plate xiii). The white used for the female flesh has perished in some places; on the goddess who is first in line the right hand and wrist are well preserved but much of the arm has gone, leaving a greyish area where the application of white has dulled the glaze. There is an incised line above the upper edge of the forearm and parallel to it; a second line runs from the surviving white of the wrist through the grey area to the edge of the figure, and a third incision meets it at right angles. These lines must have been drawn before the white was put on; they may be another example of preliminary sketch for added white.

In the technique named after the Dutch scholar, Jan Six, who first studied it, the figures are drawn in matt white, red or brown on a black background. Much of the body of an Attic alabastron in the British Museum is covered with a white slip, decorated with black bands and patterns; the neck and mouth are black and so is a broad zone round the middle of the vase⁴⁴ (Plate xiv). In this zone a youth holding the reins of a restive horse and a second horse standing beside a tree are drawn with added white which has flaked away in many areas, leaving only a ghost; the details were put in by lines incised with such control that they only grazed the surface of the underlying black without cutting through to the clay body of the pot; they are particularly apparent on the shoulder and neck of the free horse and on the chest of the youth. Apart from these lines there are other, much fainter incisions, to be seen in the illustration along the lower contours of both thighs of the youth; two other converging lines run from his shoulder and the small of his back; preliminary sketch for Six’s Technique, with evidence for a change of plan, since the lines behind the youth show that at one stage the artist thought of drawing him with one arm drawn back. In conclusion we may note the use of preliminary sketch in the variant of Six’s Technique where the drawing is executed on a ground of black glaze by means of lines incised exactly as in black-figure, details or minor parts of the drawing being added in white, red or brown; the technique was never very popular, the reason no doubt being the difficulty of making the figure stand out effectively against the background. An Attic lekythos of the end of the sixth century is a typical example⁴⁸ (Plate xv); the body is solid black from the shoulder down, a horizontal band of red serves as a ground-line, and above it is the figure of a girl dressed in a chiton and himation, running to right, looking back and holding a lyre in her left hand. The exposed parts of her arms and legs, her face and neck, the fillet on her head, and the cross-bar of the lyre are white; her hair and the sound-box of the lyre are light reddish-brown, and the edges of her clothes are reinforced with red lines. Lines traced lightly in the surface of the glaze can be seen along her right upper arm and right leg, and elsewhere on the figure; preliminary sketch for drawing with incisions on a black ground, or black-ground incised.

University College, London.

⁴³ London B 238. CVA iv, III H e, pl. 58.2; ABV 392, Nikokenos Painter, no. 9.
⁴⁴ London 1900. 6–11.1. Mélanges Perrot 252; ABV 294, Psiax, no. 25; 669 and 674 on the kalos-names. A similar kind of preliminary sketch is found on two fourth-century Attic calycekraters in Munich, on which the figures are executed in applied white, the details being drawn with lines of dilute glaze; FR ii, 211.
APPENDIX A

Preliminary sketch in red-figure; the references at the end of each entry are to the appropriate plate or volume of FR; where the reference is in brackets changes in the sketch are mentioned but not illustrated.

2. Berlin 2180. Calyx-krater; ARV 13-4, Euphronios, no. 1. Pl. 157; slight change in the position of the head of the youth pouring oil from an aryballos.
3. Arezzo 1465. Volute-krater; ARV 15, Euphronios, no. 6. Pl. 61; minor changes.
4. Munich 2590. Cup; ARV 24, Phintias, no. 12 (i, 171; minor change).
7. New York 07.286.47. Cup; ARV 175, Hegesiboulos Painter (ii, 185; minor change).
9. Munich 2344. Pointed amphora; ARV 182, Kleophrades Painter, no. 6. i, 234-5; pl. 44; above; minor changes.
10. Naples 2422. Hydra; ARV 189, Kleophrades Painter, no. 74 (i, 187; minor change).
11. Louvre G 152. Cup; ARV 369, Brygos Painter, no. 1. Pl. 25; minor change.
12. Würzburg 479. Cup; ARV 372, Brygos Painter, no. 32 (i, 254; minor change in the interior).
14. Vienna 3695. Cup; ARV 429-30, Douris, no. 26. Pl. 54; below; minor change.
15. Munich 2648. Cup; ARV 441, Douris, no. 185 (i, 115; minor change in the interior).
16. London E 768. Psykter; ARV 446, Douris, no. 262. Pl. 48; changes in some of the poses.
18. Munich 2345. Pointed amphora; ARV 496, Oreithya Painter, no. 2. ii, 192.
19. Louvre G 164. Calyx-krater; ARV 504, Aegisthus Painter, no. 1. Pl. 164; sketch for an altar where the tree now is.
20. Munich 2417. Psykter; ARV 536, Pan Painter, no. 101 (i, 78-9; considerable changes).
21. Naples 2421. Volute-krater; ARV 600, Niobid Painter, no. 13. Pl. 28; change in the position of the left arm of the standing Amazon.
22. Louvre G 341. Calyx-krater; ARV 601, Niobid Painter, no. 22 (ii, 253; the shield below Athena was shown in side view in the sketch).
23. New York 07.286.84. Volute-krater; ARV 613, Painter of the Woolly Satyrs, no. 1. Pl. 116, above; radical change in the pose of one of the centaurs.
25. Berlin 2415. Oinochoe; ARV 776, Group of Berlin 2415, no. 1. Pl. 162-3; the horse set higher up, with its tail raised.
27. Munich 2384. Calyx-krater; ARV 1057, Group of Polygnotos, undetermined, no. 98. Pl. 7, above.
30. Berlin 2589. Skyphos; ARV 1301, Penelope Painter, no. 7. Pl. 125, below; change in pose of satyr.
31. Karlsruhe 259. Hydra; ARV 1315, Painter of the Carlsruhe Paris, no. 1 (i, 144; minor change).
32. Ruvo, Jatta 1501. Volute-krater; ARV 1338, Talos Painter, no. 1 (i, 202; minor change).
33. Rome, Villa Giulia 2382. Bell-krater; ARV 1339, near the Talos Painter, no. 4. Pl. 20; minor change.
34. London E 279. Hydra. CVA vi, III I c, pl. 93-2. Scheffold, KV pl. 76; Untersuchungen no. 170; 'Workshop of the Hippolytos Painter'. ii, 104.
36. The Hague 2579. Early Apulian calyx-krater. iii, 340; pl. 174; the sketch for the twig of the fennel held by Dionysos is shown in the plate, but it is also stated that one satyr was originally given a fawn skin.

APPENDIX B

Preliminary sketch in Attic black-figure; examples in the British Museum.

1 B 130. Panathenaic amphora. See note 20, and PLATE VIIa, b.
2 B 145. Neck-amphora. ARV 139, Group of London B 145, no. 1. The chariot wheel was traced with a compass.
4 B 202. Amphora. ARV 284, below, no. 1. For the helmet of the fallen warrior on A.
5 B 410. Lip cup. See note 19, and PLATE VIb.
6 B 421. Lip cup. ARV 161, middle, no. 1. Round the tail and legs of the dog.
7 B 426. Cup, type A; Eye cup. *ABV* 256, Lysippides Painter, no. 20. For the eyebrows.
8 B 436. Cup, type A. *JHS* lxxviii (1958), 14 ff.; pls. 5-6 and 14e. For the gorgoneion in the interior.
9 B 601.3. Fragment. *ABV* 347, 'recalls Nearchos'.
10 B 603. Panathenaic amphora. *ABV* 414, Kiktos Group, no. 4.

**APPENDIX C**

Preliminary incision in Attic black-figure; some examples in the British Museum.

1 B 131. Panathenaic amphora. *ABV* 405, below, no. 4. A little on Athena.
3 B 145. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 139, Group of London B 145, no. 1. On the horses on A.
4 B 159. Amphora. *ABV* 330, above, no. 2. A good deal on A.
7 B 170. Amphora. *ABV* 671, Kalos-name Oenotor, no. 1. In various places on A; on the horse on B.
8 B 179. Amphora. *CVA* iii, III H e pl. 32.2. On the horses on A; a little on B.
11 B 186. Amphora. *CVA* iii, III H e pl. 45-5. For the shield on B.
12 B 191. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 152, Amasis Painter, no. 24. On the boar which is the device on one shield.
13 B 195. Amphora. *ABV* 335, Rycroft Painter, no. 2. Traces on A.
14 B 196. Amphora. *ABV* 366, Leagros Group, no. 84. A little on A.
16 B 199. Amphora. *ABV* 367, Leagros Group, no. 89. Clear traces on A.
17 B 200. Amphora. *ABV* 330, Priam Painter, no. 3. Extensive. On B the final incision cuts through the preliminary where the horse's belly meets the back legs.
20 B 206. Amphora of Panathenaic shape. *ABV* 369, Leagros Group, no. 120.

B 604. Panathenaic amphora. *ABV* 413, Kiktos Group, no. 1.
12 B 605. Panathenaic amphora. See note 16.
13 B 606. Panathenaic amphora. See note 16.
15 B 610. Panathenaic amphora. *ABV* 417, above.
16 B 612. Panathenaic amphora. *ABV* 414, Kiktos Group, no. 5.

21 B 208. Amphora of Panathenaic shape. *ABV* 260, manner of the Lysippides Painter, no. 29. Traces on A; a little on B.
22 B 209. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 144, Exekias, no. 8. For the eye-holes of both helmets and on the right forearm of Memnon on B.
23 B 210. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 144, Exekias, no. 7. Round the eye-hole of the helmet on A.
27 B 225. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 371, Leagros Group, no. 144. On Herakles on A; on the mule and satyrs on B.
29 B 233. Neck-amphora. *CVA* iv, III H e pl. 54. 4. A little on the right-hand warrior on A.
30 B 237. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 286, Eye-Sirens Group, no. 3. On Herakles on A.
31 B 239. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 371, Leagros Group, no. 147. Extensive traces on A.
33 B 254. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 673-4, Kalos-name Pythokes. Traces on the horses on A.
34 B 255. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 331, Priam Painter, no. 14. Possible traces on the left figure on A.
36 B 265. Neck-amphora. *CVA* iv, III H e pl. 66.1. Traces on Hephaistos' mule; a few remains on the other side.
37 B 267. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 272, Antimenes Painter, no. 85. For the shield on B.
40 B 274. Neck-amphora. *ABV* 272, Antimenes Painter, no. 95. Very faint traces; might possibly be brush-marks in the glaze.
PRELIMINARY SKETCH IN GREEK VASE-PAINTING


46 B 305. Hydria. *ABV 276, manner of the Antimenes Painter, no. 2. Possible traces on the chest of the leading horse (might be changes in drawing with glaze).


49 B 312. Hydria. See note 36, and PLATE Xb.


54 B 319. Hydria. *CVA vi, III H e pl. 82.3. On the horses.


57 B 323. Hydria. See note 37, and PLATE XIa.


60 B 327. Hydria. *ABV 369, Leagros Group, no. 38.


64 B 338. Hydria. *ABV 366, Leagros Group, no. 72. A line on the arm of the second woman from the left.

APPENDIX D

Corrections made by scraping off misplaced glaze; examples noted in FR. Only the first one is illustrated.

1 Berlin 1655. Corinthian column-krater; Departure of Amphaiaros; Funeral Games for Pelias. iii, 12; pl. 121, below; removal of glaze above the feet of the middle judge of the chariot-race has taken with it part of the slip.

2 Munich 2301. ‘Bilingual’ amphora; *ABV 4, Andokides Painter, no. 9 (i, 26; the little object on the left of the cup in the red-figure picture was made by removing the glaze with a sharp instrument).

3 Munich 2509. Cup; *ABV 24, Phintias, no. 12 (i, 171).

4 Munich 2620. Cup; *ABV 16-7, Euphronios,
no. 17 (i, 109; some of the feet of the cattle were at first omitted and then put in by removal of the glaze background).

5 London E 466. Calyx-krater (iii, 37; glaze scraped from the faces of the boys).

6 Berlin 2531. Cup; *ARV* 1318–9, Aristophanes, no. 1 (iii, 56; correction by removal of the glaze background).

7 Munich 2344. Pointed amphora; *ARV* 182, Kleophrades Painter, no. 6 (i, 235; removal of intrusive relief line in some places).

8 London E 224. Hydria; *ARV* 1313, Meidias Painter, no. 5 (i, 45; occasional removal of incorrect relief-line). I could not find any trace on the vase.

9 Naples 3253; 3254; Munich Jahn 810. Apulian volute-kraters (ii, 141; many examples of correction by removal of relief-line).
HOMER’S WILD SHE-MULES

Hellenists still debate whether the ‘wild she-mules’ (Ἡμιόνων γένος ἐγγοτεράκων) of the Iliad (ii 852) are domestic mules or wild equidae.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that the ancients did not seem to differentiate adequately between the true wild ass and the wild hemione, although, according to Hančar’s authoritative book—which incorporates the findings of modern zoology—the two are definitely distinct. There is, furthermore, a great deal of plausibility in Keller’s statement that the ancients did not always differentiate properly even between wild horses and wild hemiones. In fact, the only author who seems to have had more than an inkling that there is a difference between wild asses and hemiones is Aristotle (Historia Animalium vi 36–580b). Even the distinction between wild species and the domestic mule is sometimes so blurred that only the report that a ‘mule’ had a foal enables one to decide that the animal is a domesticated hemione or wild ass. Under these conditions little help can be derived from nomenclature, though, for the sake of completeness, we will indicate whether the animal is called hemionos, onos agrios, onagros, asinus ferus, or mula.

These difficulties must be taken into consideration in our attempt to contribute to the solution of the homeric ‘wild she-mules’ problem by seeking to determine the ancient natural habitat of the wild species. We hope to show that the ancient data concerning the occurrence of wild equines are apparently quite reliable, in that these animals are localized in the type of ecological setting which they are known to favour. They are never mentioned for areas where modern ecologists and ethnozoologists would not expect them to occur. Specifically, we propose to show that they did not occur on the north (Pontic) coast of modern Turkey, which is cold, rainy and altogether unsuitable for hemione and wild ass alike. This point is of some importance, in that the Heneti or Eneti of the Iliad seem to have inhabited precisely this area, which, on ecological grounds alone, would make it quite improbable that their country was inhabited by herds of wild hemiones, or wild asses. In this context it matters little whether one accepts Zenodotos’ view that this term referred to an ethnic group (Scholium A, B, ad Iliad, ii 852), or Leaf’s view that possibly a locality may have been meant, provided only that one assumes that the area in question lay north of the high plateau of Anatolia, on the Pontic coastal strip.

Even this point requires certain qualifications. Thus, it could be argued that the Iliad considers these animals Henetic because they came from, i.e. were exported from, that country, as sinople got its name from Sinope, which exported, but did not produce it. The main argument against this point is that the exportation of so outlandish a commodity as wild hemiones or wild asses either during the period when the Trojan war took place, or during the period when the Catalogue of Ships was composed, is quite unlikely. Moreover, the text clearly states that wild she-mules are involved and—as any mule-breeder knows (Columella, Re Rustica vi 37.5)—the female ass (or wild ass) is not in demand for mule-breeding purposes, since the crossing of stallions with wild or domestic she-asses produces a hybrid inferior to the genuine mule, sired by a jackass on a mare. Also, were one to maintain that the herds of wild she-mules were genuine wild animals, one would wonder what had happened to the males of the herd. The last argument that could be advanced is that

1 F. Hančar, Das Pferd in prähistorischer und früher historischer Zeit (Vienna, 1956).
2 Olek’s article ‘Esel’ in Pauly-Wissowa uses a wholly obsolete taxonomy, apart from being poorly reasoned.
3 Die antike Tierwelt i (Leipzig, 1909).
in *Iliad* ii 852 the feminine is used to denote the species in general, as, according to Liddell-Scott-Jones, it sometimes is in regard to deer. If so, this would be the only instance in which the Greek generic name of an *equine* species is the feminine.  

This being said, we may now consider the distribution of hemiones and wild asses according to Greek and Roman authors.

We must disregard from the start the 'horned' asses of Libya (Herodotos iv 191) and of India (Claudius Aelianus, *Natura Animalium* iii 41; cf. Aristophanes of Byzantium, *Historia Animalium* 612; Ktesias fr. 25 apud Photion, *Bibliotheca* 48B), since it is obvious that rhinoceroses are meant.

**India**: The chariots of the Indian contingent of Xerxes' army are pulled by wild asses (onoi agrioi) (Herodotos vii 86). Ael., *NA* 16.9 refers to 'wild horses' which were probably either onagers or hemiones, since the Greeks often confused wild horses with wild asses.

**Karamania** (North coast of Persian gulf): Even the war chariots are pulled by asses (onoi), and asses are sacrificed to Ares. (Strabo xv 2.14 = 727C). It is possible that domesticated wild asses or hemiones are meant, since in earliest South Mesopotamia wild asses were so used.

**'Arabia' (= Mesopotamia)**: Xenophon (*Anabasis* i 5.2) mentions the hunting of onoi agrioi. His reference was known to Arrian (*Cyn.* 24).

**Persia**: The flesh of onoi agrioi was considered a delicacy. (Theophylactus Simocatta iv 7.5).


**Africa in General**: Mago apud Columella (*Re Rustica* vi 37.3 'mula' and vi 37.4 'onagrus'.

**Libya (Eastern)**: Herodotos (iv 193) says that the 'asses' (onoi)—which, from the context, implies wild asses—do not drink water. Plinius (*HN* viii 68.169), presumably alludes to this area when he describes the she-asses' fear of water. Cf. also Arr., *Cyn.* 24.

**Libya (Southern)**: Lucian (*Dips. 2*) mentions the hunting of onoi agrioi.

**Babylon**: A female hemione belonging to the Persian army besieging Babylon foaled a colt. (Herodotos iii 151, 153). It was obviously a domesticated animal, but, since it foaled, must have belonged to a wild species. Since it belonged to the Persian army, it might have been imported, though we cannot know whence. It could just as well have been a local animal, captured from their enemies by the Persians.

**Skythia (South Russia)**: Strabo (vii 4.8 = 312C) reports that the Skythians hunt the onagros. Ock (*l.c.*) deprecates this statement because Herodotos (iv 28) states that (domestic) hemionoi (mules) and onoi (asses) are absent in Skythia, being unable to stand the cold. Aristotle (*Historia Animalium* viii 28 = 606b) also states that domestic asses do not exist in Skythia and in the Celtic countries and are small in Illyria, Thrace and Epirus. Ock's scepticism is due to the fact that he does not realise that the Central Asiatic (Mongol) wild hemione is an inhabitant of the cold steppes, while the *domestic* ass of antiquity—as he himself points out—was usually a descendant of the African true wild ass, as may be judged from monuments showing domestic asses with horizontal stripes on the inner surface of their legs. We might add in this context that domestic asses were also lacking—not being bred there, due to the cold—in Pontos (Plinius *HN* viii 68.167).

**Armenia**: Ooni agrizoi are mentioned by Claudius Aelianus (*Natura Animalium* xvii 31) for Armenia proper. For the Armenian frontier regions the onos agrizos is mentioned by Xenophon (*Cyropaedia* ii 4.20). The variable boundaries of this large country do not permit

---

* W. S. Barrett, *Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964) ad vv. 231, 1131 indicates, however, that, in Homer, the team harnessed to a chariot was sometimes spoken of as feminine, while the self-same horses, when spoken of individually, were referred to as males.
a precise localisation, but most of it is terrain suitable for wild hemiones as well as for domestic herds.

*Syria:* Hemiones are mentioned by Aristotle *(Historia Animalium* i 6, 7=491a and vi 36=580b; also in pseudo-Aristotle: *De Mirab. Auscult*. 831a where the text speaks of onoi agrioi.) The ‘coming’ (=bringing) of Syrian hemiones to Phrygia is mentioned by Aristotle *(Historia Animalium* vi 36=580b).

*Lydia (Sardis):* The foaling of a hermaphroditic colt by a hemione is mentioned by Herodotos (vii 57). Whether it was a local domesticated animal, or part of Xerxes’ army train, is uncertain.

*Lykaonia:* Asini feri are mentioned by Mago apud Varro *(Re Rustica* ii 1.5) who, referring in the same work to asini feri once more (ii 6.2–3), explains that they are also called onagros. Under the name of onagros they are mentioned by Strabo (xii 2.10=539C and xii 6.1=568C), who specifies that they inhabit treeless plateaux. Plinius also mentions onagers for this country *(HN* viii 69.174).

*Phrygia:* Asini feri are mentioned by Mago apud Varro *(Re Rustica* ii 1.5) who, when referring to asini feri once more, specifies that they are also called onagros (ii 6.2–3). Plinius *(HN* viii 69.174) also mentions onagers. This coupling of Phrygia with Lykaonia suggests that we are dealing in these texts with Greater Phrygia and not with Hellespontine Phrygia. By contrast, when Aristotle *(Historia Animalium* vi 36=580b) mentions that nine Syrian hemiones were brought to (came to) Phrygia in the time of Pharmacas, father of Pharnabazos, and that, by his time, only three were left, one is obliged to assume that Hellespontine Phrygia, with its capital at Daskyleion (Herodotos iii 120), is meant. Indeed, Aristotle’s text specifies that these animals ‘came’ (=were brought) to Phrygia, which necessarily means that they did not exist there in a wild state. Now, whereas Greater Phrygia is entirely suitable for wild equidae, Hellespontine Phrygia is not. Their importation into Greater Phrygia would have meant bringing owls to Athens. Their importation into Hellespontine Phrygia does, however, make sense. That animals under human control were meant, is proven by the fact that the precise number of the imported animals—nine—and the precise number of those surviving out of (or descended from) these nine was known. They were probably meant for the satrap’s game park at Daskyleion (Xenophon, *Hellenika* iv 1, 15), which makes sense, though, given the somewhat confused account of Xenophon, it is not entirely certain that Daskyleion in Propontis is meant.

*Kappadokia:* The occurrence of hemiones and/or onagers is exceptionally well attested for this area, which, for our purposes, may best be thought of as embracing much of the Anatolian high plateau; an ideal country for hemiones. For Kappadokia in general, hemiones are mentioned by [Aristotle] *(De Mirab. Auscult*. 70=835b), and by Theophrastos apud Plinius *(HN* viii 69.173) who—an ecologically important point!—specifies that they do not cross the boundary between Kappadokia and Kilikia (viii 82.225). Strabo attests them for the following localities, which, as he specifies, are treeless: Orkaorkos and Pitnissos (xii 6.1=687C); and for Bagadana, Garsauria and Morimene (xii 2.10=539C).

*No Origin:* ‘Onagri’ found in Italy (imported), without specification of origin, are mentioned by Plinius *(HN* viii 68.170) Columella *(Re Rustica* vi 37.3) and Julius Capitolinus *(Historiae Augustae Scriptores* Gordianus iii 33).

*Absence:* The absence of wild equidae in Kilikia is shown by Plinius *(HN* viii 82.225). The ecologically and climatologically relevant absence of domestic asses in Pontus and Skythia was noted above (s.v. ‘Skythia’). Not even domestic asses’ bones were found at Troy (Olck, l.c.).

It cannot be a coincidence that the one solitary mention of onagers on the rainy and cold north coast of modern Turkey pertains to those imported to Hellespontine Phrygia by Pharmacas. These animals apparently did not flourish there, since their numbers decreased from nine to three in a relatively short time. The decrease is noteworthy even if one assumes
that they were hunted in the game-park. Since they were not replaced, their indiscriminate, wholesale slaughter seems unlikely.

In the light of the finding that:

(1) Hemiaones and/or onagers are found everywhere where climatic and geographical conditions would lead one to expect to find them, and

(2) That they are not found anywhere where these conditions are as unfavourable as they are on the Pontic coast,

the least that can be said is that—unless one is willing to place the Henetians (or Enete) far from the coast and deep inside Paphlagonia—the theory that the wild she-mules of Iliad ii 852 were either wild hemiones or onagers cannot be accepted without serious reservations.

The problem posed by the Iliad's use of the term 'agroteros' will be discussed in a separate study, and still another paper will examine the arguments positively favouring the interpretation that the wild she-mules of the Iliad were simply unbroken 'range mules.'

G. DEVEREUX.


7 Edmonds' emendation of ὤκειπον to ὤκειπων in Alkman, Partheneion 49 has been ignored, both as geographically irrelevant and as untenable on other grounds.
MUSICAL THEMES AND IMAGERY IN AESCHYLUS

ALTHOUGH imagery from music and song is not uncommon in Greek poetry as a whole, it is usually of no more than superficial significance. In Aeschylus, however, its roots strike deeper, and for that reason I have chosen to concentrate on him here. For the sake of comparison, a briefer survey of its uses in Sophocles and Euripides will be added.

Aeschylus’ method of using key images to sustain and develop a dramatic theme has for some time now been recognised as an important feature of his style. Whether he expected the subtleties of his technique to be appreciated by his audience—even by a perceptive minority—is another question. His painstaking craftsmanship would tend rather to suggest that he wrote with more in view than the immediate appeal of the spoken word, deliberately shaping his work as a κτήμα ἐς αἰεί. A number of dominant images in his drama, such as the yoke in the Persae, the ship in the Septem and the alternating light and dark in the Oresteia, have already received their fair share of attention. But this has not been so with his musical symbolism which, although less apparent, is employed with greater consistency. In no drama is it entirely absent, and it permeates the substance of the Septem and the Oresteia.

At this point a word of caution is called for; it is necessary to distinguish between verbal symbolism, that is the mention of a particular type of song, and symbolism of action, or the singing of it by the chorus. Naturally it is impossible to separate these two aspects entirely since frequently they interact, the one complementing the other. But it is with the former that I shall be mainly concerned.

Aeschylus’ own vocation—he was a musician as well as a dramatist—must have made it natural for him to think in musical terms. But his professional activities were not the sole source of his inspiration. Equally important was the place of music in daily life outside the theatre, and at this we must briefly glance before proceeding.

With Aeschylus’ younger contemporary, Pindar, choral lyric had reached its high-water mark. Numerous genres of composition were being practised. While it is unnecessary to envisage so rigid a degree of systematisation as was drawn up by the Alexandrians, it is nevertheless clear that in the best period each of the major genres possessed a separate and recognisable character. This is shown by Plato in a passage in the Laws (ii 700 A-B) in which he complains of the breakdown of formal distinctions in his own day. The compound of words, metre and musical accompaniment which formed the ethos of each genre was, of course, merely a formal definition of what already existed in popular art. Paean, ἡδερής, hymeneal and other such songs belonged to an ancient folk tradition through which they were transmitted orally with their characteristic refrains, set phrases and formulas. Side by side with them existed a number of wordless chants such as the ἀδαλαγῆ or ἀδαλαγῆ, the paean as a simple call and the ἐφώ. Each of these songs and chants was related through long-standing tradition to one or more specific occasions.

The same can be said of musical instruments. The kithara, with its sweet and placid tones, was connected in the Greek mind with all that was bright and joyful. It was pre-

1 See especially O. Hiltbrunner’s Wiederholung und Motivtechnik bei Aischyllos, Bonn (1950).
2 For a good survey of the different types and functions of music referred to by Aeschylus see E. Moustopoulos, “Une philosophie de la musique chez Eschyle,” REG lxxii (1959), 18-56.
3 In making this distinction I follow the suggestion of R. F. Goheen, ‘Aspects of dramatic symbolism in the Oresteia,’ A. J. Ph. lxxvi (1955) 113-37.
5 For the ἀδαλαγῆ and the related ἀδαλαγῆ and ἔκλειδ see especially L. Deubner, ‘Ololeuge und Verwandtes’, Abh. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. (1941), no. 1. It was most commonly raised as a shout of joy, a confident battle-cry (usually in the a-form, more suited to the masculine voice) and at sacrifices, where it was customarily chanted by women. In the Bacchic and similar religions it took the form of an ecstatic shriek. For its relationship with the paean call see below.
eminently the instrument of Apolline worship. The aulos, being the more popular instrument, acquired a general ritual function, being used to accompany the sacrifice and libation. Since the original purpose of such accompaniment was to ward off evil spirits, the music of the aulos so played was held to have a good-omened significance. On the other hand the emotional range of the instrument suited it to occasions as widely divergent as the Bacchic celebration and the ceremony of mourning.

Thus Aeschylus found in the various types of music and song practised in his day a convenient set of symbols, the significance of which would be immediately apparent to his audience. Around each clustered associations of occasion, atmosphere and emotion which could be counted upon to awaken a definite, predetermined response. With skilful manipulation such images could be used to focus a climax, to highlight a moment of conflict or irony or, linked together from scene to scene, to underline the pattern of a drama.

The 
S
upplices

is the only drama in which the musical symbolism is probably of limited significance only. There the play of image with image is confined within the bounds of a single ode. In the hymn invoking blessings on the Argives (625–709) the chorus deprecates Ares as ἀχρόνον ἀκίθαρον (681). Such euphemisms, it is true, abound in Aeschylus and elsewhere, and the τῶτος of Ares’ antipathy to music and song was a conventional one. Aeschylus, however, counterbalances the depreciation with a prayer for the pious observance of religious festivals (694 f.) including the songs of bards (ἀοώδος) and hymns accompanied by the kithara (φημα φιλοφθόρας). Like the contrast between Ares the morder of men (637–8, 663 f.) and the prayer for a prosperous harvest (688 f.), the theme contributes to the elaborate antithetical structure of the ode. Whether its relevance was intended to stretch further is doubtful. Certainly there was to be no lack of war and bloodshed later in the trilogy. And if Aeschylus had wished to define more closely the positive side of ἀχρόνον ἀκίθαρον, the ground had been prepared in the parodos. There the Danaids refer to their plaints in the language of the lament as ἔλεκμοι and γόοι (115–16) and compare themselves with the nightingale, whose dirge was occasioned by an unnatural crime similar to that which they will themselves commit.

An example in the 
Prometheus touches what is more certainly a vital dramatic nerve. In the second stasimon the chorus, after reflecting in moralistic vein on the ἀλάλοις τύχαιος of Prometheus, recalls the far different strain of the hymenaeal which it raised at his wedding to Hesione (555 f.). The effect is to establish a contrast, first between present grief, as delineated particularly in the previous stasimon, and past joy, and secondly between the chorus’ foregoing depreciation of Prometheus’ evil fate and the congratulations conventionally expressed in the hymenaeal through such formulas as: ἔλεμε γάμῳ (Sapph. Fr. 112–L.–P., Theoc. xviii 16), ὁ τρύπαμακαρ (Ar. Peace 1333), τρίς μάκαρ . . . καὶ τριτάκις δόξα (Hes. Fr. 81.7.R.), μάκαρ (Eur. Phaeth. Fr. 781.27.N.). In the light of the reiterated prophecy of a ruinous marriage in store for Zeus (764, 859, 909) and the account of his union with Io (645 f., cf. 887 f.) the image gains retrospectively a more sinister significance and is at the

8 See P. Stengel, 
Die griechische Kultusaltumer (1920) 112, 115, 149.

7 The two instruments are discussed at length by H. Huchzermeier, 
Aulos und Kithara in der griechischen Musik bis zum Aufgang des klassischen Zeit (1931).

8 The expression might have been intended to look back to ἀξορων in 635, although the construction of the word with either ὠον or ὀος is eccentric. Kruse’s emendation ἀκόρον ὀος is syntactically much more acceptable.

9 Cf. in particular Eur. Phoen. 784 f., and for the opposite idea with reference to Eirene, Bacchyl. Fr. 3 (J), Eur. Fr. 453.8 (N.), Ar. Peace 976.

10 Notice the alternating series of depreciations (659–66, 678–87) and prayers (667–77, 683–97), these corresponding in turn to the strophic divisions of the ode; further the complementary invocations of Artemis and Apollo (676–7, 680–7) and the corresponding positions of δίκας (703) and Δίκας (709) in the final pair of strophes.

11 ἔλεμοις and γόοι were applied in a technical sense to the popular, more primitive version of the ὑβρίς. There seems to have been little, if any, distinction in meaning between the two terms. This emerges from the study of E. Reiner, 
Die rituelle Totenklage der Griechen (1938) 4 f.

12 Where, as pointed out by Thomson in his commentary, the key word is στένειν.
same time linked with a central theme of the tragedy. It is also in the Prometheus that we find the expression τὰν Διὸς ἀρμονίαν (551), denoting the ordering of all creation by a divinely appointed law, against which Prometheus has transgressed. The phrase is deliberately introduced to point forward as well as backward and, in a manner characteristic of Aeschylus, to give a momentary glimpse of the trilogy's final and far-distant scene of reconciliation.  

The remaining musical imagery in the play is less important dramatically. Evidently the syrinx was an instrument which readily suggested itself to Aeschylus.  

The verb ὑποσώριζεν is used of the whirling of the air when brushed by the Oceanids' wings (126) and the simpler form σωρίζειν of Typhon's hissing (355). The former instance involves a poetic conceit, well-suited to the daintiness of the nymph-chorus. In the latter the metaphorical force of the verb is probably muted. After Aeschylus, both σωρίζειν and its derivatives were regularly applied to the hissing of serpents, and the usage was probably an accepted one in his own day. More powerful is the effect of the verses ὑπὸ δὲ κηρύκλαστος ἐνοβεῖ δώνας ἴχτας ὑπονιδοθάν νόμον (574–5), referring to the droning of the gaddly which pursued Io and carrying a direct reminiscence of the herdsman's pipe of Argus.  

The sharp paradox, in which the monstrous is spoken of in terms of the harmless and familiar, is our first example of a device which was exceedingly common in Aeschylus.  

As a final example from the Prometheus, the persuasive words of Zeus are described as magical incantations, ἐπαυθάκει (173), a usage in which Aeschylus anticipated Plato (cf. Phaedr. 267D, Gorg. 484A, Laws vi 773D, vii 812C).

In the Persae we first encounter the opposition between the paean and ὀλολογη indulge with the help of which Aeschylus was to return in both the Septem and the Oresteia. At the climax of the messenger's account of the battle of Salamis, the Greeks' triumphant attack is marked by the raising of the paean (388 ff.), the echo of which resounds (ἄντρικλαξ) from the neighbouring rocks, and by the sounding of the trumpet. Thereafter they sweep all before them, leaving Xerxes to groan aloud and rend his robes.  

Related to the passage is Atossa's admission that her ears are ringing with a κέλαδος οὗ σαίων (605). The sound is a premonition of the lament in which the chorus will shortly indulge with Xerxes and which will be taken up by the whole land in mourning for its dead (548 ff.). Indeed the lamentation of the Persians is a leitmotif of the play, sustained both through the actual words and actions of the chorus and through repeated references to their grief. The picture of the ecstatic Oriental lament with the beating of the breast and the rending of robes and veils

---

13 The view of the Aeschylean trilogy as a weaving together of discords into a harmony is well-known from T. E. Owen's book, The Harmony of Aeschylus (1932), esp. 6 ff. The metaphor itself, while perfectly open to interpretation on the mundane level, may possibly have conveyed to better-informed minds a further-reaching allusion to the theories of universal harmony put forward by Pythagoras and Heraclitus.

14 This has been noticed by J. Dumortier, Les Images dans la Poésie d’Eschyle (1935) 203.

15 If there is not actually a fusion here of the literal and the metaphorical. The gaddly is described in 367 as the εἰόδωλον of Argus.

16 This has been noted by Fraenkel in his commentary on Ag. 1186.

17 The two calls were often closely associated. On occasions of joy the woman's ὅλολογη would respond to the man's paean, as in Sapph. Fr. 44.31, Bacchyl. xvi 127 ff. There is a variation in Soph. Trach. 205 f., where there are injunctions for the ὅλολογη to be raised with the sacrifice and for companion paean to be sung to Apollo and Artemis by the men- and maidservants respectively. Men raised the paean with the pre-battle sacrifice and followed it with the ὅλολογη: Xen. Ephor. vii 1.25, Anab. v.2.14 (ἡλείαξα), vi 5.27. In Anab. iv 3.19, where women are present, the ὅλολογη is added. But when the calls were not raised responsively, they might be taken up by members of either sex, e.g. Ar. Knights 1318 (paean from the audience), 1327 (ὁλολογη from the chorus).

18 There is an element of burlesque in this caricature of Xerxes. It is repeated from 199 and occurs again at 834 ff., and 1030. The quaint concern of Atossa over her son's clothes is to be explained by Aeschylus' desire to keep the image before the eyes of his audience.

19 Broadhead is probably mistaken in denying a reference to the paean here and in translating 'healing'. While this is the natural sense of the word with reference to, for instance, the hand of Zeus (Suppl. 1066), it is less readily applied to a shout. κέλαδος, moreover, was frequently applied to the paean call, e.g., Eur. H.F. 694, Phoen. 1102, and is indeed so used in the above-mentioned passage (388).
is introduced in the parodos (120 f.), repeated both in the first stasimon (537 f.) and on the arrival of Xerxes (939 f.), and is finally enacted before the eyes of the audience.

In the Septem the same contrast is worked out in greater detail. At the back of Aeschylus’ mind, both here and in the Oresteia, lay also the antithesis between the paean as a prayer for good and the curse. The various images are deftly disposed so as to reflect the dramatic irony from as many facets as possible. As early as the seventh verse of the prologue the minds of the audience are attuned to the paradoxical use of musical terms which is to be developed as the play progresses. In the verses, 'Ετεοκλής ἄν εἰς πολύς κατὰ πτόλην ἱμωντι’ ἀστῶν φροιμός πολυρρόθοι | οἰκώμασιν θ’ (6-8), φροιμός juxtaposed with ἱμωντι’ yields the meaning ‘hymn’, the idea of which is reversed in the following words. The Theban women are later instructed by Eteocles to raise the sacred ὀλονυγα, the counterpart of the men’s pre-battle paean: ὀλονυγαν ἱερον εὐμενε παιώναον, | Εὐλογικον νόμωμα θυσιάς βοῖς, | θάρσος φόλοι, λόουσα πολέμων φόλοι (267-70). A short time afterwards the Scout reports Polyneices as praying that he might raise the ἀλώσιμον παιῶν over the captured city (635 f.). But in the event the city, although victorious, loses its leader. Nor is Polyneices’ prayer granted. Faced with the dilemma πότερον χαίρω κατολοχίω | τῆς μυχερὸς καὶ δυναμώνας ατέκνους κλαύσω πολεμάρχους; (825-8), the chorus decides on the latter course. It is fitting, the women declare, τὸν δυσκελάδον θ’ ἵμον Ἐρενώς | ἅμεν Ἀλέα τ’ | ἔχθρον παῖων ἐπιμισθείσαν (867-70), to celebrate, that is to say, both the fulfilment of the curse and the death of the two brothers. This will by implication be accomplished through their lament.

The grim oxymora are set in the context of an elaborate metaphor (854 f.) comparing the boat which, wafted by the γόος of the chorus, will carry the brothers across the Acheron, to the sacred ship which conveyed the Athenian theoría to Delos. The figure becomes the more dreadful appropriate when we recall that it was Apollo who was responsible for the downfall of Laius’ house (745, 801). Later in the play (953 f.) the Achai themselves are represented as raising the ἀλάλαγη. The a-form suggests the shout of triumph on the battlefield, and the idea is pursued in the following verses, which present the image of Ἀτας τροποίων raised over the two brothers. There may also be a recollection of the ἀλαλάγη of Hippomedon (497) who, Ἠθεος ... Ἀρεί, shrieked it in the manner of a Bacchant. This image in its turn reveals yet another facet of the situation by contrasting the peaceful enthusiasm of Dionysus with the destructive frenzy of war.

An additional function of the musical references in the Septem is to provide a background of ‘noises off’. Reiterated aural images accumulate to create the impression of a continual, maddening cacophony, so permitting the audience to experience the terrifying reality of the siege. The shrill syrinx is the instrument aptly chosen to play the leading role. Doubtless it was the temptation of word-play which, in the first instance, suggested a comparison between this instrument and the screaming of the enemy’s chariot wheels: ἐνει’ ἄκουσα σανα τὸν ἀρματόκτιτον ἄρματον ἀρμάτων ἅλτριχα (203-5). But the metaphor is foreshadowed in 151, ἄρματον ἰκεῖον ἄρματον, and is repeated with reference to the muzzles of the horses, which στιόξουσα βάρβαροι βροίμων (τρόπον codd., 463). The impression is intensified by the allusion to the κινύρα and by the mention of bells and trumpet. The verb κινύρεσθαι (123) is introduced primarily for its ill-omened significance. The κινύρα, or

20 The occurrences of the word φροιμόσ in Aeschylus are reviewed by H. Meyer, Hymnische Stilemente in der fruhgriechische Dichtung, Würzburg (1939) 29 f. His view that it will always reveal the basic meaning das Hervorgesagte (as is possible in the passage under discussion) is sensibly disputed by Fraenkel in his note on Ag. 1216.

21 The verses are among those condemned by both Bergk and Wilamowitz. See, however, the careful re-appraisal of the problem by H. Lloyd-Jones, “The End of the Seen against Thebes,” CQ n.s. ix (1959) 80-115, which leads to the conclusion that there is insufficient evidence to warrant the atheisation of either these verses or of 1005 f. In favour of retaining the passage it can certainly be said that the imagery bears the characteristic Aeschylean stamp. Several parallels from the Agamemnon will be noticed below.

22 This is no doubt felt to be contained in 871-5.

23 The finer points of the comparison are illuminatingly discussed by Tucker in his note ad loc.
Hebraic harp (κιννόρ), was an instrument which, on account of its lugubrious tones, was used in mourning.²⁴ Terror is inspired by the bells attached to Tydes’ shield (336 f.). Such trappings were not purely ornamental, but the bells had the purpose of exerting, when jangled in the face of the enemy, their almost demonic power of fascination.²⁵ The equally vivid detail of the trumpet (394) is dramatically introduced to evoke that cold thrill of alarm which must have been familiar to anyone who had fought for his country at Aeschylus’ side.

When it has fulfilled its function in relation to the material events of the drama, the imagery of battle-music is drawn into the complex of ideas discussed above. Its ironic potentialities are fully revealed in another of Aeschylus’ great composite images when, after hearing of the death of the two brothers, the chorus sings: ἔτευξα τύμβρω μέλος ἵππος αἰματοσταγεῖς | νεκροῖς κλόουσα δεσμήρως | δανώτας ἣ δύσορνες αί | δαίμονια δόρος (835–9).

The interpretation of these verses is problematical, but an understanding of their place in the symbolic scheme of the drama may help to clarify their meaning. ἡ δαίμονια δόρος can, I believe, refer only to the recent battle, not to the singing of the chorus in accompaniment to the fighting. In the first place ἡ δαίμονια, on the analogy of συμφωνία should mean ‘a playing together of flutes’; ὤπο- was the prefix which signified accompaniment.²⁶ Secondly, and more important, the figure continues the syrinx imagery of the earlier scenes—although now with a significant variation. The closely related aulos was the instrument of Dionysus, whose worship, through the proximity of ἡ δαίμονια, it here suggests. The point of δύσορνες is that Bacchic music was normally cheerful and auspicious whereas, in its transferred sense, its character has been reversed. Inspired by it, the women of the chorus have chanted a frenzied μέλος (sc. 720 f.) during the singing of which they heard—from their own lips—of the brothers’ death. The chorus’ words were as though divinely given. Excited to ecstasy by the terrifying discord around them, they became its prophetic interpreters.

We pass on now to the Oresteia in which musical symbolism plays a major role. It is used to throw into relief the irony of false victory and of the prayer thwarted by the curse, and it marks the passage of triumph into despair. It is most prominent in the Agamemnon but is continued throughout the trilogy, finding its completion in the exodos of the Eumenides.

We notice first that every victory, whether recounted or represented in the drama, is marked by the raising of the ἀλογογει or the paean. The theme is introduced in the prologue, where the Watchman bids Clytemnestra, ἀλογογον ἐφθημοῦντα ... ἐπορθάζει (28–9); the news of Troy’s capture is an occasion for a χαρίων κατάστασις and he meanwhile will express his own joy by dancing the prelude (31). Clytemnestra later announces that she has in fact raised the ἀλογογει (587) and that it has been taken up in the customary manner by the women throughout the city while sacrifices of thanksgiving were offered (594–6). She utters the call again δισενέπ ἐν μακρές προτην on the death of Agamemnon (1236–7). Shortly afterwards comes a passage (1385 f.) which Fraenkel has justly described as ‘the most powerful piece of grandiose blasphemy in Aeschylus’. In it Clytemnestra refers to the third stroke dealt to Agamemnon as a prayer offering, εὐκταίαν χάρων, to Hades, Soter of the dead. The blasphemy lies not only in the audacious fusion of the two aspects of Zeus but in the recollection in so frightful a context of the joyous paean-prayer conventionally raised to Zeus Soter, as by Iphigeneia (243 f.) with the pouring of the third libation at the opening of a symposium. When Clytemnestra in her turn is struck down, the chorus of the Choephoroe sings a hymn of jubilation with an ephymnion beginning ἐπολλείσατ ὁ δεσμοφόρον δόμον | ἀναφυγα κακών ... (942, 952). The hymn represents the paean which the chorus had earlier wished might replace the θρήνος ἐπιτομβίδοιος of the kommos (342–4). The ἀλογογει had also been antici-

²⁴ See further Dumortier loc. cit.
²⁵ For the custom of attaching bells to armour in general see E. Espérandieu in Darenberg-Saglio, s.v. ‘Tintinnabulum’ (p. 342). He is probably right in regarding the bells so used as a means of fascination rather than, as suggested by Tucker in his note, a prophylactic symbol.
²⁶ See H. W. Smyth, Greek Melic Poetry (1900) lxx n. 1.
panied (386–9). In all of these instances, however, the victory celebrated contains within itself the seeds of disaster. It is a defeat in disguise, a victory for the forces of violence, bloodshed and discord, released by the curse. In a number of passages the irony is brought sharply into focus. The Erinyes emerge in Cassandra’s vision as an unholy choir celebrating in the manner of a Bacchic κόμος the πρώταρχον ἄτρον of the house (Ag. 1186 f.). Earlier, the Herald had commented ἀπρὸς of his tale of the shipwreck after Troy, πρέτει λέγειν παῖαν τόν Ἔρινθον (645). Stasis raises the διόλυγη over the sacrifice of human flesh (1118). The evil daimon of the race croaks his hymn like a crow over the corpse of Agamemnon (1472–5). Not until the exodos of the Eumenides does the διόλυγη signify true and lasting victory. Here for the first time the call was no doubt raised on the orchestra. It would have responded to the second ephymnion, διόλυγατε ὑπὸ μολυσίς (1043, 1047), and possibly also to the first, εὐφαμεῖτε δὲ χαρήται (1035), πανδαμεῖ (1039), although I prefer to imagine that, for the sake of restoring the paean also to its proper significance, it was that chant which was expected here. This final triumph-song has, however, been anticipated. In the hymn to Zeus in the parodos of the Agamemnon (160–83) Aeschylus gives his audience a glimpse of the superhuman drama which provides the key for the dénouement of that on the stage. Like the Oresteia it is a drama in three acts in which, after a contest of violence, victory is made permanent by wisdom. And there too the climax is marked by a song of triumph. Zeus succeeds to the throne of Olympus ἐπάνω ἐν θάλασσᾳ, singing, that is, the καλλικος chant. From a sample of the song given by Aristophanes (Birds 1763 f.), it can be seen that its refrain contained, besides the τήνελλα καλλικος element, the διαλαλαι and the ἵν παῖον.

The paean appears in the Oresteia in the further aspect of a good-omened prayer. But it is a prayer which is not granted. It is counteracted by the curse. The Erinyes are ἔωσταργοροι βροτοί (Eum. 384), and where the ἄτη which they provoke is present, the gods are deaf to supplications (Ag. 396). Thus the paean-prayer leads inevitably to the θρήνος. Aeschylus introduces the image in such a way that its ambivalence is apparent from the start. In Calchas’ prayer deprecating the windless calm at Aulis (140 f.) the verse ἵππον δὲ καλέω Παῖαν is intended to convey an echo of the paean raised in time of distress. But the prayer is both preceded and followed by the ephymnion αἴμων αἴμων εἰπε, τὸ δὲ νῦκτα. This combines the refrain of the Linus dirge with an auspicious formula of the type that usually accompanied the paean call. Later in the parodos, the picture of Iphigeneia singing the paean in her father’s hall (543–7) is set against the background of her sacrifice. Shortly afterwards the prayer of the Herald, καθ’ αὐτῆς συντήρησε ἰστι καὶ παῖον, ἀνακ. Ἀπολλών (512–13), is followed by the tale of the Greek army’s sacrifice at Troy and the certainty of divine wrath as a consequence. It is worthwhile recalling here the chorus’ request to Clytemnestra παῖον τε γενοῦ τῷ δαιμόνι (99); in the event, her news will increase rather than diminish their foreboding, and the application of the word παῖον to her is paradoxical enough in itself. Since from passages such as these the paean acquires an ominous significance, it is no surprise to hear that it will not prevent the death of Agamemnon (1248). Nor to find that in Cassandra’s invocation of Apollo (1076 f.) both prayer and θρήνος are united, causing the chorus to point out the anomaly, ἵν δ’ αὐτῆς δυσφημία τῷ θεῷ καλέτ, ὁ δ’ οἰδ’ ἀγγέλων προσήκοντ’ ἐν γέοις παραστατεῖν (cf. Stesich. Fr. 232/55 Page). Lastly, by a reversal of the

21 This could hardly have happened at Choe. 942, 952, where there is no pause after the injunctions. Moreover, it would have been much more effective to reserve the actual raising of the chant until the end of the trilogy. The exhortations to do so would presumably have been given by the leader of the supplementary chorus while all the others present on the orchestra (χαρήται, πανδαμεῖ) responded.

22 For this popular lament see Reiner, op. cit., 109 f., and Wilamowitz, Herakles ii 88 f.

23 Cf. Ar. Peace 453, Soph. OT 1067–7, Similar good-omened formulas occur throughout this play and the next (Ag. 20, 217, 549, 674, Choe. 782, 868) and are indeed typical of Aeschylus’ style. See further the remarks of W. Kranz, Stasinom (1933) p. 39 and E. Neustadt, ‘Wort und Geschehen in Aischylus’ Agamemnon’, Hermes lxiv (1929) 259.
theme, the θρήνος becomes a ‘paean for the dead’ (Choe. 151). From this point onward, verbal symbolism is replaced by the actual prayers and θρήνοι of both chorus and actors until, in a climax of horror, the counteracting force of the curse comes to life in the binding-spell of the Erinyes.80

These ideas set up a series of reverberations which chime repeatedly through the phrases of the trilogy. Again and again we hear of songs which are no songs, music which is no music and songs of joy which turn to lamentation. In the prologue of the Agamemnon the Watchman complains that whenever he thinks to hum or sing on a sleepless night he turns instead to bewailing the misfortunes of the house (16–18). The war-cry of the Atreidae is compared with the γόροι of eagles robbed of their young (48 f.). The hymeneal of the Trojan princes has had to be relearned as a strain which is πολύθηρον (707 f.). After Agamemnon has entered the palace, the chorus speaks of its foreboding as a prophetic chant which, unlike the joyful άτιθά of the bard, is unbidden and unhired (979 f.).81 The metaphor is then varied to that of the untaught θρήνος of the Erinyes, hymned, in the usual manner of the dirge, ἀνευ λυρίας.82 Similarly the Erinyes themselves describe their chant as ἄφορομεκτος (Eum. 332, 345) and Cassandra euphemistically refers to it as οὐκ εὐφωνος (Ag. 1187). Cassandra’s lament is spoken of as a νόμον ἄνωμον (1141), a ‘tuneless tune’.83 The same word is later used in a technical sense in τά δ’ ἐπίθεσθαι | ἄσωστον κλαγγα μελοτυπεις ὀμοιό τ’ ὀρθίον ἐν νόμοις (1151 f.). The reference here is to the well-known Orithian nome, proverbial for its high pitch. This nome was, however, according to the Suda, not only ἀνασταμένος but ἐγείνον καθαρός (Ag. 70) and in this respect was diametrically opposed to the δύσφαιτος κλαγγά of Cassandra. In the same way the use of φρομιωμος (1216) for the agony preceding her prophetic account of Agamemnon’s death was probably intended to evoke a reminiscence of the prelude in hymn form which introduced an epic recital. Still from the same play, we might add the retort of Aegisthus that the taunts of the chorus are the opposite of the melodious strains of Orpheus, and will lead to further κλαμάτα (1629). In the Chaerophon the παράμοιος ἄτασ | αἵματοσ πλαγά and the δύστον ἀφερτα κηδή of the house are deployed in the kommos (467–70) and towards the end of the play Orestes uses the metaphor of the hyporchemo to describe his mingled anger and fear, πρός δὲ καρδία φόβος | ἁδειν ἐτοιμος, ἢ δ’ ἐπορθεῖσθι κόμῳ (1024–5).

We have noticed how in the Eumenides the true meaning of paean and ὀλολυγη, distorted in the two previous plays, is restored. Something similar happens with regard to the incantation. In the Agamemnon the chorus declares that no one ἐπαιδήδων can recall a man’s spilled life-blood (1021). Iphigenia’s sacrifice is boldly described as an ἐπαγωγόν θρηκτικόν ἀγμάτων (1418). The kommos in the Chaerophon, summoning Agamemnon’s spirit to vengeance, is not only a γόροι but a δύνομα (475), the word being in this case, as in Pers. 620, 625, synonymous with ἐποθή.85 Lastly, in the tremendous δέκαμοι ὑμώος of the Erinyes, the evil potentiality of the spell is fully released.

The Erinyes’ change of heart is revealed through a benediction (938–1020), and this too

80 See the revealing comparison of the ephymnion (328 f., 341 f.) with the Attic curse-tablets (App. to IG iii. 3 (1897) ed. Wünsch) by R. Knöke, De Hymnis Graecorum Tragicis, Diss. Gott. (1924) 2 f.
81 This passage is admirably discussed by Fraenkel in his commentary.
82 For the significance of these words see above, p. 34. Denniston and Page compare Euripides’ ἄλοιπος ἑλέγον (Hel. 185) and ἄλοιπος ἑλέγος (IT 146), to which might be added ἄλοιπος . . . μοῦθαν (Phoen. 1028) ἀντιφάλλους φόλας (IT 178) and possibly ἄλοιπος . . . ὠμος (Alc. 447, although see note of Dale ad loc).
83 The translation is Fraenkel’s, who is probably right in preferring, on the analogy of this passage, to read ἐκνόμος rather than ἐνόμος for the hymn of the daimon in 1473. See also the discussion of ἀνόμοι (σε. νόησαν) in 151 by H. Lloyd-Jones, CQ. n.s. iii (1953) 96, who not implausibly suggests the meaning ‘unaccompanied by the flute’.
84 The version of it, at any rate, which was associated with Terpander. Nothing more is known of the auletic type attributed to Klonas and Olympus. For further details of the Orithian nome see Vetter in RE s.v. ‘Nomos’ (2 p. 843).
85 See Knöke, op. cit., 4, for further examples of this usage.
is an incantation. Aeschylus takes care to designate it as such through the choice of the verbs ἐφύμενε (902) κατεύχεσθαι (921), ἐπείχεσθαι (979). Thus it is shown that the incantation can work for good as well as for evil. It may be unable to restore the dead, but where amity and understanding prevail, the power which it embodies can be turned to a health-giving, life-giving purpose.

It remains now to compare the method of Aeschylus with those of Sophocles and Euripides. A difference is to be expected. Aeschylus thought in vividly concrete terms whereas the two later poets tended to be more abstract and analytical. The continuous thread of imagery, woven into the texture of a drama and worked out as meticulously as a sub-plot, was not a characteristic part of their technique. An exception is to be found in the Troades where the leitmotif of ironic contrast between the lament and the song of joy—which will be traced below—was doubtless inspired by the example of Aeschylus. But the theme is neither so many-sided nor so fully developed internally as the parallel themes in the Septem and the Orestes.

Generally speaking, musical imagery is used by both Sophocles and Euripides not, as by Aeschylus, to reveal the deeper meaning of a drama but to enhance the effectiveness of the plot and to strengthen the emotional impact made on the audience. Particularly in Sophocles, it serves to heighten the contrast between one scene and the next. References to music, dance and song, to the raising of the paean and ὀλονγι, help to paint a picture of merriment and rejoicing which acts as a foil for the succeeding catastrophe. This always occurs in a choral ode, usually a hyporcheme (Aj. 697 f., Antig. 1134, 1144 f., O.T. 1093, Trach. 205 f., 640 f.). Euripides has an example in the Hercules Furens (763 f.). Earlier in the same play (673 f.) and occasionally elsewhere (e.g. Heraclid. 892 f., El. 873 f.) it is the gloom of the previous scene which is set in relief. Joy and grief in the life of an individual character are likewise contrasted. Music is a symbol of happiness which has passed or is anticipated as an end to misery (Sop. Aj. 1202, Eur. Hipp. 1135 f., Hec. 916, Troad. 544 f., 1011 f., Alc. 343 f., Rhes. 363, cf. Med. 190 f.). The hymeneal is often recalled in this connexion, as by Evadne before her leap on to the funeral pyre (Eur. Suppl. 997) and by Admetus after returning home from his wife’s burial (Alc. 915 f.). Alternatively the hymeneal stands for the happiness of a marriage never attained (Sop. Ant. 813 f., El. 692, Eur. Ion 1474 f., Phoen. 347, I.T. 367, 856 cf. 1143 f.). Particularly poignant is the third stasimon of the Iphigenia in Aulis (1036 f.) in which the chorus, after dwelling on the colourful scene of banquet, dance and song at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, passes on to the pathos of Iphigenia’s expected fate.

Musical imagery was also used by Sophocles and Euripides to evoke the atmosphere of a particular occasion or situation. Mention of pacans in the Oedipus Tyrannus (5, 186 cf. 154) conveys the feeling of a city in distress and that of night-long choruses in the Antigone (152 f.) creates the spirit of a victory celebration. In Euripides’ Electra the call for a καλλίνικον φόνι (865) sustains the elaborate comparison of Orestes’ triumph to an Olympic victory.

The grim euphemism and oxymoron much cultivated by Aeschylus are, in so far as musical terms are concerned, rare in Sophocles. His reference to Hades as ἀνυμένοιον ὀλοφος, ὄχος (O.C. 1221 f.) is the most notable instance. Euripides, on the other hand, displays a marked partiality for this type of figure. Usually it serves to create an effect of irony, bitterness or sarcasm although sometimes, one feels, it results from the sheer love of

---

36 The section 1036–79 is itself cast in the form of a narrative hymeneal. With the opening verses compare Menand. Rhet. παστεί κατεύχεσθαι, p. 400.265 (Spengel). For the literary treatment of the Peleus–Thetis wedding in general see R. Reitzenstein, Hermes xxxv (1900) 73–105.

37 The καλλίνικος is also mentioned in HF 681— with particular appropriateness, since the universally popular version of the chant by Archilochus (Fr. 119 B.) commemorated the exploits of Heracles.

38 Two possible examples of oxymoron are, εἰ τινδε μὴ λέξεις γύον... χνους τίθεν ἐκτὸς ἄμμες κακά (El. 379–82), αἰσθή γιο τοῦ δοκοῦ Τετάρτων κλέον/ βοῶντος ἄτης τίθεν ἐπίσκοπος μέλος (Aj. 975–6).
paradox. The *Troades* reveals the extent to which the practice could be carried. In it we have: a reference to the *μοῦσα* ... *ἄγορείτος* of Hecuba’s lament (120–1 cf. 609), which is later contrasted with the *μολύττη* in which, as chorus-leader, she once honoured the gods (148f.); the mention of the Greek ships advancing ἀνάβαντι παῖαν στυγνῷ συρήγαν δ’ ἐνδυκάγγος φωνῇ (126–7); the travesty of a hymenaios placed pathetically in the mouth of Cassandra, with injunctions to dance, sing and raise the wedding refrain (308–40, cf. 351–2); the parody of a conventional hymn opening in ἀμφί μοι *Πλοῦν, ἄκ Μοῦσα, κανὼν ὕμνου | δέουν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὄδαν ἐπικήδειν* (511 f.). 39 Andromache’s question τί παῖαν ἐμῶν στενάζεις; (578); and Hecuba’s suggestion that a *μουσοποίος* should inscribe on the tomb of Astyanax that he was murdered by the Argives (1188 f.). Finally the theme is given a wry Euripidean twist. If the city had not been destroyed, Hecuba says, ἄφαντες ἄν ὄντες οὐκ ἄν ψυχήματι ἄν | *μοῦσαι άμμας δῶντες υστέρων βροτῶν* (1244–5). Although nowhere else with such consistency, the antithesis between the music of sorrow and that of joy is frequently exploited by Euripides. Paean and θρήνος are repeatedly contrasted (Alc. 424, Hel. 177 f., I.T. 179 f., Suppl. 795–6, H.F. 348 f.); the shriek of the murdered Lycus is a μέλος to the ears of the chorus (H.F. 751); the lament and its accompanying gestures is the χορον τὸν *Αἰθος σέβει* (Suppl. 75), and the Sphinx sings ἀμοιωσάταται σὺν ὀδαίς (Phoen. 807 cf. 1506). The music and dance of the Bacchic cult furnish analogies for the frenzy of Lyssa (H.F. 871, 879 892, 897 f.), Ares, (Phoen. 784 f.), the Erinyes (Or. 319–20 cf. Aesch. Ag. 1189) and for the lament of Hecuba, described as a βακχεῖον ... νόμον (Hec. 686–7). 40

Musical metaphors and similes of a more conventional variety are rarer in the two later dramatists than in Aeschylus. The most notable in Sophocles are the comparison of Athena’s voice with a Tyrrhenian trumpet (Aj. 7) and the use of ὄμαλός for the mingled strains of the paean and the wail of distress (O.T. 187). In Euripides the rivalries engendered by bigamy are compared with those of a musical competition (And. 476 f.). Electra enjoins the chorus to speak σύνγγος ὅποις πινδοῖ | λεπτοὶ δόνακοι (Or. 145–6) and sight and sound are vividly fused in the image of the μέλος or song of mourning represented by the letter left by Phaedra (Hipp. 879–80).

Lastly, a characteristic of the Euripidean lyric is the picturesque vignette of a musical scene from myth or ritual. Sophocles provides but one example in the mention of the Muses’ choruses in the Colonus ode (O.C. 691–2), but in Euripides there is usually more detail. He portrays Pan with his syrinx (El. 703 f., I.T. 1125 f., Ion 492 f.), Apollo with the kithara (I.T. 1128, Alc. 563 f., Ion 881), the singing swans of Delos (I.T. 1104), the choruses of the Nereids (I.T. 428 f., El. 434, I.A. 1054 f., Ion 1081 f.), the Mother of the Gods with her orgiastic instruments (Hel. 1305, 1341 f.), the universal dance and song at the epiphany of Iacchos at Eleusis (Ion 1074 f.), Orpheus (Bacch. 562 f.), Amphinon (Phoen. 823 f.), and Paris with the syrinx (I.T. 573). 41 Ritual scenes described include the maidens’ choruses at Delos and Delphi (H.F. 687 f., Hec. 462 f., Phoen. 234 f.), at the festival of Hera at Argos (El. 178 f., I.T. 221) and in Spartan worship (Hel. 1465 f.), the dancing and singing of youths and maidens at the Panathenaic παναγής (Heraclid. 780 f.), the bardic performances at the Karneia (Alc. 445 f.) and the Bacchic dance, which is of course mentioned repeatedly in the *Bacchae*.

We have now moved a long way from Aeschylus. In most of the instances just cited imagery has ceased to be functional and has become purely ornamental. But it has gained the new qualities of grace and delicacy. It looks away from the Classical age and anticipates the spirit of Alexandria.

J. A. Haldane.

---

39 Cf. Ar. Clouds 594 and Schol., Terp. Fr. 697/1 Page, Hom. hs. vii 1, xix 1, xxii 1, xxxii 1.
40 See also the note on ἄδυντο above and the scene in the *IA* in which Iphigenia instructs that a paeon be sung at her sacrifice, as in the more orthodox version of the ritual (1468, 1480).
41 Cf. Ion 905 and HF 1393 where Apollo and Hera respectively are reproached for their musical pastimes by the victims of their callowness.
PERSONAL FREEDOM AND ITS LIMITATIONS IN THE ORESTEIA

There has been a tendency in recent studies of Aeschylus to exalt Zeus or Fate into a position of supremacy from which they dictate and determine the actions and the conditions of men. The argument of this paper is that Aeschylus believed men to be free in taking some actions and at the same time recognised the limitations which circumscribe the conditions of men. This argument is developed through a study of the issues which Aeschylus set forth in the Oresteia, and it leads on to an analysis of the meaning of Moira and of the extent of human responsibility.

I take as a starting point Professor H. Lloyd-Jones’ interpretation of the guilt of Agamemnon.¹ It expresses the exaltation of Zeus and the powerlessness of man in a precise and striking manner. In his view Agamemnon had no choice when he was faced with the demand for the sacrifice of his daughter at Aulis; and even if he had had a choice he could not have exercised it, because his power of judgement was taken away by Zeus. As Lloyd-Jones puts it,² ‘Zeus is indeed determined that the fleet must sail; Agamemnon has indeed no choice. But how has Zeus chosen to enforce his will? ... by sending Ate to take away his judgement so that he cannot do otherwise.’ Lloyd-Jones sees the same thing happen when Agamemnon is asked by Clytemnestra to walk on the purple carpet.³ ‘Zeus has taken away his wits. But why has Zeus done so? For the same reason as at Aulis; because of the curse.’ Agamemnon is seen as a puppet, of which the strings are pulled by Zeus. But Agamemnon is only one figure in what Lloyd-Jones describes as the grand design of Zeus’. This design is traced back by Lloyd-Jones to the πρώταρχος ἄτη of Thyestes. As he puts it in his concluding sentences, ‘the curse comes first and determines everything that follows’.

At this point we must draw a distinction between a drama written for production and a text studied in isolation. If the curse is to come first and to be the fons et origo of the ensuing actions in a living drama, then it must be presented early in the drama by the playwright. Yet Aeschylus does not mention anything like the curse’ until the Agamemnon is two-thirds done! We the audience, if we can imagine ourselves at the dramatic competition, have already had our opinions formed by the creative art of the poet on the subject of the guilt of Paris, Helen, the Trojans, the Greeks, Agamemnon and Menelaus before any mention whatsoever is made of the πρώταρχος ἄτη or generally of the curse. In a play the dramatic evolution is of sovereign importance. One cannot reverse the sequence on the stage as readily as one can read back a motive in a written text. In terms of drama I do not think that the curse can possibly be the fons et origo of the actions which bring us to the moment before the murder of Agamemnon. What in fact is the curse in the play? Cassandra does not use the word. When she mentions the κώμος συγγόνων Ἐρινῶν and the πρώταρχος ἄτη, she immediately explains the context as being the adultery committed by Thyestes with the wife of Atreus. It is this adultery which aroused the σύγγονων Ἐρινῶν and involved Thyestes and his descendants, just as it later involved Atreus and his descendants when Atreus retaliated. Cassandra mentions no curse arising from this affair; if the audience is expected to fill the lacuna, it should imagine a curse affecting the house of Thyestes as much certainly as the house of Atreus. We come at last to the curse’ at line 1601. Aegisthus tells the

I am grateful to Professor H. Lloyd-Jones, Professor D. E. Eichholz, Mr A. R. Thornhill and Mr D. O’Brien for reading and commenting on this article; their comments have been very helpful. All references to Aeschylus are to the Oxford Text.

¹ In CQ xii (1962) 187 f., which should be read together with his important article ‘Zeus in Aeschylus’ in JHS lxxxvi (1956).
² P. 192.
³ P. 197.
audience that Thyestes kicks over the table and curses; his curse being aimed at the utter destruction of his brother's family, the so-called Pleisthenid branch of the Pelid line. We are nearly at the end of the play. I do not find the mention of this curse so vivid that it illumines the whole motivation of all that has preceded with a new light. Moreover, it is a curse which is concerned only with Atreus-Agamemnon-Orestes. The much more dramatic words of Cassandra were concerned with the adultery and the κόμος συγγένων 'Εραυνίων which involved Thyestes-Aegisthus as well as Atreus-Agamemnon-Orestes, and it is these Erinyes who are active in the trilogy after her speech has introduced them.

Returning to the theory of Lloyd-Jones we note that, as the curse is held to determine everything, 'such guilt as the king contracts from the sacrifice of his daughter and from the annihilation of Troy with its people and its temples is only a consequence of the original guilt inherited from Atreus'. This is not stated or suggested by any character or by the Chorus in the passages which describe the sacrifice of Iphigeneia or the annihilation of Troy. Even when Agamemnon is persuaded to walk on the purple carpet, there is no word in the play to suggest that Zeus or 'the curse' has taken away his wits and determined that he should act as he does.

But more important than the question whether and when the curse begins to be prominent in the play is the other facet of such an interpretation, namely the belief that, because 'the curse comes first and determines everything that follows,' Agamemnon and Clytemnestra have no freedom of choice or of action, but each is merely 'an instrument of Zeus' destructive purpose'. We are presented with a picture of Kismet, anthropomorphised indeed in the person of Zeus but less familiar in the days of triumphant Athenian democracy than in the atmosphere of oriental despotism or of disillusion at Athens: θεοῦ τὸ πράγμα μηδὲν ἀληθῶ βροτῶν (Eur. Cyclops 285). 'God's job it is; hold no man responsible.'

There is one passage in the Agamemnon where the theory of Lloyd-Jones is more or less stated. Clytemnestra, wishing to deny her personal responsibility for the murder of Agamemnon, says 'it is the fierce Avenger of earlier time who took the form of this dead man's wife and made him pay for the cruel preparing of the banquet' (1500 f.). The playwright's means of supporting or refuting this statement lie in the reply of the Chorus. If he intends us the audience to suppose that Zeus took away her wits and so achieved his destructive purpose, then he can make the Chorus say as much. But no; the Chorus expresses a less simple view of the matter. 'No one will testify that you are guiltless (ἀναίτιος) of this murder; how could anyone? Yet the Avenger may be a collaborator (συνδιηντορ) from the time of his father. Black Ares forces his way through floods of kindred blood, advancing to the point where he will exact justice for the clotted gore of the children's flesh.' The Chorus places the responsibility fairly and squarely on the shoulders of Clytemnestra. She chose to murder Agamemnon and Cassandra. Indeed one of the objects of the long scene which Aeschylus placed after the murders is to show the true motives of Clytemnestra, who has now no need to dissemble: her motives are hatred of Agamemnon (1374 f., 1391, 1407 f.), lust for blood (1384 f. and 1427 f.) and adulterous love for the despicable wolf Aegisthus.

4 See the excellent note by E. Fraenkel, Aeschylus, Agamemnon, iii 546 and 740. The explanation of the name Pleisthenid is lost to us, but the meaning is clear at 1503, where Clytemnestra tries to appease the daemon of Agamemnon's own line (as opposed to that of her lover Aegisthus).

5 The picture of the powers behind men's actions is more complex than this in Homer, where Agamemnon, for instance, ascribes his impulse in taking Briseis to three agencies 'Zeus and Moira and the Erinyes who walks in darkness'. As E. R. Dodds remarks (The Greeks and the Irrational, Berkeley 1951, 6 and 49) 'we must resist the temptation to simplify what is not simple'. It is only when we turn to Euripides' polemical plays that we find the simplification of the issues in such statements as the one in his Electra that Zeus sent a wrath of Helen to Troy ὡς ἐρις γέγονε καὶ φῶς βροτῶν.

6 This is the moral of Euripides, Electra 1245 and 1266 Δοξίς γὰρ αἰτίας ἐς αὐτὸν ὀμίλει. But Aeschylus is as different from Euripides as chalk from cheese.
N. G. L. HAMMOND

(1224 f., 1258 f., 1435 f. and 1625 f.). These motives figure more prominently in the play than any grief for Iphigeneia; indeed Clytemnestra’s picture of Iphigeneia greeting her father with a kiss in the underworld (1555 f.) is inspired not by love for Iphigeneia but by hatred for Agamemnon. These motives are important precisely because Clytemnestra acted of her own choice; they and the thoughts she expresses determine the quality of her action, and Aeschylus leaves us in no doubt that her motives and so her acts were criminal. Aristotle, who is (not surprisingly) the best interpreter of Greek tragedy, throws special emphasis on the importance of such πρωιέρεις and its motivation.

The collaboration of God and man, whether or not man is aware of it, does not deprive man of his ability to choose. This is common enough in fifth-century literature, in poetry and in prose. When Thucydides, for example, records the response of Apollo that he will collaborate with the Spartans whether hidden or unhidden (i 118.3 ἦττα τολμήθησαν), he does not imply that the Spartans have lost the ability to choose for themselves. Aeschylus had made his own position clear in an earlier play. For the ghost of Darius saw in Xerxes’ fall the fulfilment of oracles but explained that ‘when a man is eager himself, the god takes part as well’ (ὅταν σπείρῃ τις αὐτὸς, χωθεὶς συνάπτεται, Persæ 742). This idea of coincidence between human choice and divine will is found in many religions. The gospels portray Jesus as fulfilling the purpose of God in his death but as being free to choose in the Garden of Gethsemane. Judas Iscariot is the instrument of betrayal; his treachery is foretold by the prophets and by Jesus (St Luke 18.31 f. and St Matthew 26.2) and Satan enters into him (St Luke 22.3); but Judas is represented as choosing of his own will and for motives of monetary gain to betray the Christ. The ideas which are expressed in Darius’ comment on Xerxes are very much the same as those in the gospel account of Judas:7 φεῦ, ταξεῖα γ' ἠλθε χρησμοὺς πρᾶξις, ἐς δὲ παῖδ' ἐμὸν Ζεὺς ἀπέσχηθεν τελευτὴν θεσφάτων... ἄλλ' ὅταν σπείρῃ τις αὐτὸς, χωθεὶς συνάπτεται.

A related problem in religious thinking is the relationship between foreknowledge (whether it is shown in oracles, dreams or prophecy) and fatalism. Aeschylus gives one insight into the problem in the Prometheus Vinctus. Prometheus, having prevision, knows that if Zeus acts in a certain way, a certain result will ensue; and in the event Zeus does not act in that way. Here foreknowledge does not determine the future. He gives another insight when he portrays Cassandra. She knows what will shortly happen inside the palace and what will happen eventually to Aegisthus and Clytemnestra; and the irony of the situation for her (as for other human beings with prevision) is that she cannot change what will happen. Here prevision is, as it were, an extension of normal vision. Just as my vision of what I did this morning does not preclude my having had free choice to act as I did, so a prevision of what will have happened by noon tomorrow does not preclude my having free choice to act until noon tomorrow. The revolubilis hora has moved ahead, exposing to those who have prevision what will have happened by noon tomorrow. The idea is not unfamiliar to us. Jesus prophesied that Peter would deny him thrice; but there is no suggestion that Peter was not a free agent each time he made the denial (St Luke 22.34 and 55 f.).

In Clytemnestra’s murder of Agamemnon there are three forces at work. The first is Clytemnestra’s eagerness, inspired by personal hatred, to kill Agamemnon. The second is the will of Zeus which punishes the moral crimes of Agamemnon in accordance with the laws of Justice. The third is the call of blood for blood, personified in the Avenger, Black Ares and later the Erinyes. At one point in the play these three powers coincide in the killing of Agamemnon. Those who discuss the Agamemnon in isolation are apt to think that Zeus and ‘the call of blood for blood’ or ‘the curse’ are interchangeable, as Lloyd-Jones implies in his final summary. But this is not so in the Eumenides, which revolves on the point that the Olympian Gods and the Erinyes are fundamentally different in outlook.

7 The gospels are often closer to the ideas of the classical Greek period than to those of modern times.
Aeschylus had already stressed the difference in the *Septem* 720 f., where the Chorus sang of the triumph of the Erinys ‘a goddess not like the gods’.

\[ \text{πέφρακα τάν ὦλειοικον} \\
\text{θεόν, οὐ θεοίς ὁμοιός,} \\
\text{παναληΐη, κακόμαντιν,} \\
\text{πατρός εὐκταίαν Εὐρύν} \\
\text{τελέσαι τὸς περιθύμωσ} \\
\text{κατάρας Οἰδιπόδα βλαψύρνονος.} \]

The difference between Zeus and the Erinys is so well known that a brief summary will suffice.\(^7\) The Erinys are primaeval goddesses, daughters of Night, who carry out the laws of the natural world mercilessly and automatically. They require, for instance, the persecution of Orestes to the death (e.g. *E.* 225), because he has killed one of his own blood and ‘blood calls for blood’. They are not concerned at all with the motives which determine the quality of his action in terms of morality; for the natural world was in the beginning, its laws are immutable and the Erinys implement them without regard to personal motives. The gods of Olympus, on the other hand, came into existence later than the Erinys. Zeus was born later still, being the grandson of the first ruler of the sky. He would not always rule the Olympian gods, if he relied on force alone, as Aeschylus indicated in the *Prometheus Vinctus*; and he certainly had no power over the primaeval gods and goddesses. Zeus never had been and never was omnipotent. At the end of the *Oresteia* he wins the Erinys to his way of thinking not by force but by the persuasive powers of his daughter Athena (*E.* 885 f.).

The opening scenes of the *Agamemnon* are dominated by Zeus. The complication of the religious issues is delayed until Agamemnon and Clytemnestra have entered the palace (1068). Aeschylus has written thus in order to drive home the first stage of his beliefs about Zeus.\(^8\) In the opening ode (170 f.) the chorus expresses its faith in Zeus not as one who is omnipotent but as one who gives a purpose to human experience:

‘If I am to expel the fruitless burden of anguish from my heart in very truth, I cannot find anything comparable to Zeus, even though I measure all things. . . .
‘For it is Zeus who leads man along the path to understanding, Zeus who lays down the sovereign law that suffering leads to learning, Zeus who brings understanding to man even against man’s will.’\(^9\)

The Chorus sees the justice of Zeus at work in the Trojan War. They feel that the sin of Paris is about to be punished through the agency of the Atreidae; for Zeus is sending the Atreidae against Paris (40–62). The beacon signal confirms their expectation; they acclaim the justice of Zeus in the sack of Troy (362–67 and 704 f.). But the Chorus is not so simple as to suppose that, if Paris and Troy are in the wrong, the Atreidae and the Greeks are in the right. In this war, as in many wars, both sides are in the wrong: Troy in accepting and defending Paris and Helen, and Greece in going to war for the sake of a woman who knew many lovers (62 f.). Paris, of course, was in the wrong. So was Agamemnon, as the Chorus says to his face (799–804):

\(^7\) See for instance F. Solmsen, *Hesiod and Aeschylus* 196 f.
\(^8\) It is these beliefs which form the main theme of the trilogy; see E. Fraenkel, *Aeschylus, Agamemnon* iii 147 (referred to hereafter as Fraenkel).
\(^9\) In this passage ‘the burden of anguish’ is the apprehension which the Chorus feels on hearing the prophecy of Calchas. This anguish is not eased until the end of the *Oresteia*. Fraenkel, ii 102, Denniston-Page, *Agam. 84* (referred to hereafter as Denniston-Page) and Lloyd-Jones in *JHS* lxvi (1956) 62 seem to take the passage out of its context. When the play is produced, the context has the immediate and important impact, and the anguish of the Chorus is conveyed not only by the sung refrain but also by its acting.
Paris and Agamemnon now have the blood of many men and women on their hands. The gods do not fail to mark those who are responsible for much blood, and the Erinyes bring them to darkness in the course of time (461–467). The punishment of Paris and Troy has been carried out through the Erinyes which took the form of Helen herself (749); and the punishment of Agamemnon will be carried out by an Erinys which takes the form of Clytemnestra (1119). But this does not mean that Helen and Clytemnestra were right to do what they did, or that they had lost their freedom of choice. Clytemnestra has committed murder for criminal motives and Justice, the daughter of Zeus, overtakes her in due course (Ch. 948 f.), as Cassandra had foreseen (A. 1284–5).

Agamemnon’s case is very similar. Agamemnon’s purpose in promoting a war against Troy happened to coincide with the will of Zeus to punish Paris and Troy. This coincidence is no credit to Agamemnon. It does not relieve him of responsibility for his motives in going to war. The point is clearly made by the Chorus. For while the Chorus says that Zeus sends the Atreidae against Paris (60 f.), it censures Agamemnon for marshalling the army in order to recover a willing wanton (799 f.). When Agamemnon had taken this first step, the adverse wind was sent by Artemis, because ‘she loathes the feast of the eagles’ (135 f.), that is because she loathes the bloodshed of the war which Agamemnon and Menelaus are starting. This is an independent action by Artemis, such an action as we may expect in a polytheistic world, where Zeus is not omnipotent. For Artemis is no servant of Zeus; she is the goddess of the weak and helpless, and she abominates the brutality of the impending war (140 f.). Calchas, having second sight, had already foreseen the reaction of Artemis to the prospect of war (135 f.); and when the wind came, he declared it was the doing of Artemis (202), and he indicated to the sons of Atreus that the wind would cease to be adverse, if Agamemnon sacrificed his daughter Iphigeneia.

Aeschylus puts the following words into the mouth of Agamemnon:

\[ \text{βαρέω μὲν κηρ τὸ μὴ πιέσθαι} \\
\text{βαρέω δ’ ει} \\
\text{τέκνον δαιζω, δόμων ἀγαλμα.} \]

‘A bitter thing surely not to hearken
And bitter too
To slay my own child, my royal jewel.’

10 The translations in verse are from G. Thomson’s translation of the Oresteia.

11 This manner of speaking expresses the way in which Zeus and the Erinyes act through human agents, so that they bring punitive disasters upon one another. Despite the doubts which are voiced in Denniston-Page, 135, the story of the lion-cub and the effect of Helen on Troy are analogous; for Helen came as a darling of love and became the embodiment of the Fury—in a metaphorical, not a literal sense—and brought disaster on the family of Priam and on the city of Troy.

12 When Lloyd-Jones says that Zeus ordered the expedition (so too Danniston-Page, xxvi, and J. Jones, On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy, 75 and 78), he puts the initiative on Zeus in a way in which the Chorus does not; for the Chorus sees an analogy between the Erinys sent by a god to punish the robbers of the vultures’ nest and the Atreidae sent by Zeus to avenge the rape of Helen. It does not follow that the god or Erinys appeared to those who punished the robbers or that Zeus appeared to the Atreidae. We are not even told that Apollo urged the Atreidae to go by uttering an oracle, as he did later to Orestes (Ch. 269 f.).
Agamemnon sees two courses open to him—either to reject the course recommended by Calchas, or to accept it and kill his own daughter. Those who say that Agamemnon has no choice between these two courses can only mean that the choice is difficult; for Agamemnon mentions two courses of action and chooses one course deliberately. It is, as E. Fraenkel expresses it, 'Agamemnon's own voluntary decision'. The choice is, of course, a difficult one. It is very familiar to those who are engaged in a war and exercise command, as so many Athenians were doing in 458 B.C.; for the question is this—is one to stop or is one to take an action which will involve the death of innocent persons? It is immaterial whether the instrument of death in war is the sword, the bullet or the bomb. \( τι \ τῶν \ χαμάτων \); The choice is bitter. But it is very much a choice, and a choice for which one bears a heavy personal responsibility. The words which Aeschylus makes Agamemnon say show a deep understanding not only of war (as so often in this play) but also of the type of general who takes such a decision as Agamemnon took. They form a soliloquy of deep psychological insight.

'A bitter thing surely not to hearken,
And bitter too
To slay my own child, my royal jewel,
Myself her father, to spill a girl's pure blood.
Whate'er the choice, 'tis ill.
How shall I fail my thousand ships and desert my comrades?
So shall the storm cease, and the host eager
for war crieth for that virginal blood righteously! So
pray for a happy issue!'

The order in which Agamemnon puts the alternatives shows his own preference. The rhetorical question marks his choice.\(^{13}\) He prefers the pomp and the ceremony of the ships and the confederation,\(^{14}\) just as later in the play he prefers the ceremony of the purple carpet. In the next sentence he tries to shrug off his own responsibility by saying that the passionate desire for the virgin's blood to stop the wind is—right and proper (\(δῆμος\)). These words are almost blasphemous.\(^{15}\) They show that passion for war and fear of public opinion are turning Agamemnon into a hypocrite. He and Menelaus are described next as 'lovers of war' \(φιλόμαχοι \ βραβῆς\), when they disregard the supplications of Iphigeneia (230). We know that passion for war has many crimes to its credit. Agamemnon himself is uneasy. He knows he is committing a wrong but he hopes for the best, as he does later when he walks on the purple carpet (944–7). Therefore he ends his words with the phrase \(εἶδος \ γάρ \ εἶναι\).

The speech of Agamemnon has revealed his decision. His inner mind is made up. It is this decision, as much as the action to which it leads, that now alters the personality of Agamemnon (218 f.):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἐπεῖ δ' ἀνάγκας ἐδὺ λατάνων} \\
\text{φρενὸς πνεῶν δύσεβις τροπαίων} \\
\text{ἀναγνω, ἀνέρον, τόθεν} \\
\text{τὸ παντότολομον φρονεῖν μετέγγυω.}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{13}\) So Fraenkel, ii 122 'it is decisive that the answer implied in this "rhetorical" question can only be impossible'.

\(^{14}\) Thomson's translation 'desert my comrades' for \(ἐξυμμαχάς \ ἀμφότερον\) has a modern ring. In 458 B.C. the immediate connotation of \(ἐξυμμαχίας\) was the Athenian Alliance, of which Thucydides saw a fore-runner in the coalition led by Agamemnon. J. Jones, \textit{op. cit.}, 76, translates correctly 'our alliance'.

\(^{15}\) As Fraenkel remarks (ii 126) 'he knows that the task he has in hand may be necessary, but it cannot possibly be \(δῆμος\). Lloyd-Jones in \textit{CQ}, xii 191 seems to infer from Agamemnon's words here that Aeschylus regarded Agamemnon's decision as justified. The opposite is rather the case. Agamemnon's words are a shallow excuse, in which the subject of \(ἐπιθομεῖν\) is left deliberately vague.
'From the moment when his spirit veered to an impious, unclean, unholy quarter and he put on the strap of the yoke of necessity, from that moment he changed his mind to adopt a course of utter recklessness. For what emboldens men is a dreadful delusion, which counsels dishonour and is the beginning of sorrow. So then he dared to sacrifice his daughter, in furtherance of war for a woman and in initiation of the fleet' (218–227). What we may call the psychological consequences of the decision are here expressed in typically Aeschylean terms. Agamemnon takes the decision with utter impiety of spirit. This decision subjects him to inevitable consequences (as such decisions do—μὴν δὲ μιμοῦτος ἐν θρόνῳ Δίος παθεῖν τὸν ἐργαστὴ φθείραν γὰρ ἔτημον γάρ. 1563 f.) ; he has put on the yoke, he has passed under the bar and there is no turning back. From then on he is utterly reckless in carrying out the sacrifice of his own daughter. In generalising terms the source of this recklessness is a delusion of mind, through which a man takes a dishonourable course and pays for it with pain. The same sequence of impiety of spirit (or Hybris), delusion (Ate) and recklessness (Thrasos) is evidently contained in the corrupt text at 763–771, where I take Thrasos to be the child of Ate in line 770. Xerxes in the Persae 821–2 is an example of this sequence:


An utterly reckless decision such as that of Agamemnon sets up a series of inevitable consequences, spreading like ripples on a pool. 'The impious deed begets other deeds like to their parent' (758 f.). The war into which Agamemnon now leads the Greeks will bring sufferings to the Greeks as well as to the Trojans (66 f.), and the curses of those who lose their dearest ones will rest upon the leaders, responsible as they are for shedding much blood. The gods will not fail to mark the leaders, and 'the Black Furies' wait (429–467 τῶν πολυτούν γάρ οὐκ ἀσκοποὶ θεοί). The full significance of this passage was felt by the audience in 458

18 The metaphor of the changing wind and the changing course is graphic to anyone trained in sailing; it is particularly apposite here because the wind at Aulis is about to veer likewise.

17 The word παραπόλεμος is a variant here for ἀθη as Fraenkel, ii 545, remarks, just as the epithet πρωτοσημίου is a variant for πρώταρχος at 1192.

18 The literal meaning of the words ἀνάγκας ἓν κέπαθον is disputed. A similar phrase occurs in Persae 191, where Xerxes puts the yoke on the necks of the two women κέπαθον ἐν ἀνάγκας τίθησι. In our passage Agamemnon passes under the yoke, like a horse passing under the yoke, and his course from then on will be a necessary one. The action comes first; the consequences follow. The exact moment at which Agamemnon passes under the yoke—'the starting-point of the fateful change of mind', as Fraenkel calls it—is emphasised by τόθεν resuming ἐπει and the present participle πεῖνων. The moment came in the soliloquy; then his spirit veered and thereupon he put on the yoke of necessity. We use a similar metaphor when we say that Agamemnon became the slave of his decision. He was now committed to necessary consequences of the kind which Aeschylus illustrates in the trilogy. Fraenkel, ii 127 gives parallels for the metaphor, and he discusses its meaning at iii 487 and 729; in the last passage he favours an interpretation similar to mine. On the other hand Denniston-Page, 88, find such an interpretation untenable and take the meaning to be that 'Agamemnon acts under Necessity... Artemis compelled Agamemnon to commit the crime' (see also p. xxvi). But when we recall the metaphor, the point is not that the horse is compelled to put on the yoke but that the horse once yoked is compelled to follow a restricted course. The metaphor is commonly used by Aeschylus, with τίθημι or τίθηται. At PV 107 θεοίς γάρ γέρα πορών ἀνάγκας ταίσθε ἐνέκειμαι. Prometheus gave fire to man and yoked himself to necessary consequences; it is not the act but its consequences which were compulsory.
b.c.; for it was probably in this year that the Erechtheid tribe suffered the loss of 177 men
'in Cyprus, Egypt, Phoenicia, Halieis, Aegina and the Megarid'.

The first part of the play is concerned not only with Agamemnon but with the fulfilment
of the Justice of Zeus in the context of Troy and the Greeks. Paris has sinned against Zeus
Xenios, and Troy has sinned in defending Paris and Helen. Once the high altar of Zeus
has been kicked aside, there is no protection (whether at Troy or at Argos), but the man who
sins in his satiety (Koros) 'is driven on by fell Persuasion (Peitho), dread child of fore-scheming
Delusion (Ate)' (381–6). The sinner sets a dread brand upon his city (395). Such a
one is Paris (399). The sequence is the same with Paris as with Agamemnon: a choice
made in impious satiety or over-confidence, a reckless delusion, an impious act begetting
further impious acts, and the branding of the group or state which supports the sinner.
Helen is another example. She made her choice in recklessness ἀτλητα πλάσα (408), and she
brought destruction upon her associates (689 f.). Now Zeus has punished Paris, Helen and
Troy in accordance with his own laws of Justice (355 f.). The Chorus has a sense of fore-
boding; Agamemnon too has sinned and has blood on his hands, and many of the Greeks
have already been destroyed in the storm which was οὐκ ἄμψιτος θεὸς (649). There is a
dreadful irony in the words on his homecoming, that 'the gods who sent him forth have
brought him back' (A. 853). The final test of Agamemnon comes when Clytemnestra asks
him to walk on the purple carpet. He knows it is wrong to do so, but in his arrogance, his
recklessness and his weakness he does; and he passes into the palace, while Clytemnestra
prays to 'Zeus the Accomplisher'. We know that the blow of Zeus is about to fall upon the
guilty man, as it has already fallen on Paris, Troy and many Greeks as well as Trojans for
their acts of impiety. The first part of the religious movement is now complete.

Cassandra and also those who speak after the murders introduce new themes, which will
continue to be important until the final resolution of the harmonies and discords in the
reconciliation of Zeus and Moira. We learn from Cassandra, for the first time as far as the
play is concerned, that a long history of crime lies upon the house of the Pelopidae and
involves Agamemnon and Aegisthus in its consequences. Cassandra speaks clearly of the
πρῶτη ἀτη, the act of delusion which marked the beginning of suffering, namely the
seduction by Thyestes of the wife of his brother Atreus (1192–3). In revenge Atreus killed
Thyestes' two older children and served them up to their father (1217 f.). Now Aegisthus,
the surviving son of Thyestes, has seduced the wife of Agamemnon, a son of Atreus (1258 f.); and,
as Cassandra sees, the wife of Agamemnon is about to murder Agamemnon at the
instigation of Aegisthus (1224). The sacrifice of Iphigeneia by Agamemnon is not men-
tioned by Cassandra. It is not included in the series of crimes which have arisen between the
brothers and their descendants, and it is not this which prompts Clytemnestra to murder
Agamemnon. This feud within the family has roused the revel of Erinnyes, who sit upon the
palace-roof, the σύγγονον Ἔρωνες. Their desire to exact vengeance from Atreus coincides
with the plot of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus to kill the son of Atreus, Agamemnon. There
seems to be no suggestion here that, because Aegisthus is involved in the desire of the Erinnyes
to exact vengeance, he is ἀμύντιος; and in the Choephoroe reference is made to him as ὁ ἀμύντιος.
He is portrayed in the speech of Cassandra as a cowardly lion and as a wolf (1224 and 1259)
and in the interchanges with the Chorus as a crafty, cowardly and bullying adulterer (cf.
Ch. 990). When Aegisthus hails the murder as the work of the Erinnyes (1580) and claims
that he is 'a just designer' of the murder (1604) the Chorus censures him for hybris (1612)
and says he planned the murder ἐκών—that is not under compulsion from the Erinnyes. His
suggestion is as absurd as the plea of Clytemnestra (1498 f.). He has made his own choices,
and they have coincided with the purpose of the Erinnyes. The play ends with the guilt of

19 I prefer Denniston-Page, 103, who join πλοῦτον
with ἐπιφάλεις, to Fraenkel, ii 199.
20 Fraenkel, ii 201, compares the phraseology of
206 f. with this passage.
21 It is important to keep to the dramatic sequence,
because the play was written for performance.
Clytemnestra and Aegisthus made clear. Cassandra has foretold that they too will pay (1280 f.). The Chorus hopes for the return of Orestes to repay murder with murder (1646 f.). In the latter part then of the play the Erinyes dominate the divine stage, and they continue to be prominent for the next two plays of the trilogy. The Ἐρυνιὲς σύγγοναι and the daimon, who is perhaps thought of as the δαίμων γενέθλιος, have their place on the palace-roof or swoop down upon the house (1191 and 1467); but their wishes coincide with the purpose of Zeus, in whom the Chorus has already put its faith in measuring the universe. The daimon and Zeus are both the accomplishers of what has come to pass.

Thus the Agamemnon ends with the triumph of Justice, daughter of Zeus, in the punishment of Paris, Troy, Agamemnon and the Greeks for the unjust war, in which they all engaged; of Paris especially for the breach of hospitality which offended Zeus Xenios; of Agamemnon especially for his lawless sacrifice of his own daughter (cf. Ch. 935 f.). At the same time the punishment of Agamemnon coincides with the desire of the Erinyes to avenge the killing of Thyestes’ children by Atreus through the killing of Agamemnon, the son of Atreus, by the agency of Aegisthus. This is all overseen by Zeus, but it has come about without any infringement of the free will of the agents—Agamemnon, Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. They acted as they did for their own personal reasons, which were in each case sinful. Punishment has already come or will in future come upon them.

Another religious theme appears in the Agamemnon, namely that of Moira. The word means 'apportionment'. Its significance is made clear by the Chorus at 1017 f. ‘When the blood of a man is shed dark upon the ground, no magic can recall it. Otherwise when he (Asclepius) raised the dead by his skill, Zeus would not have stopped him (as he did) to avert damage. For ordained Apportionment prevents (our human) portion from gaining more than its due in accordance with the will of the gods; if this were not so, (my) heart would outstrip (my) tongue and pour out its thoughts.’ Here ‘the ordained Apportionment’ is the primaeval allocation of powers and spheres to gods, men and all physical things. The wardens of this allocation are the Moirai and the Erinyes, whom I have described above as carrying out the laws of the natural world mercilessly and automatically. ‘The ordained Apportionment’ makes things what they are: it makes bloodshed final (Ch. 48, E. 261 f.), the loss of virginity irretrievable (Ch. 71 f.), marriage a strong bond between man and woman (E. 216 f.) and death unavoidable for man (E. 648 f.). The order of the natural world, the kosmos, depends upon the maintenance of this apportionment, and any disruption of the order produces damage and disorder. Prometheus upset this order by giving fire to man; he and man suffered from the consequent disorder, and Zeus put an end to the activity of Prometheus. So here Asclepius upset the order of the universe in resurrecting the dead; Zeus therefore stopped him in order to avert further damage and disruption. So too in the Eumenides 171 f. the Furies accuse Apollo of overvaluing the cause of man and of damaging the ancient apportionments (as Prometheus had done) in trying to liberate Orestes.

---

22 E. R. Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational, 39, draws a distinction between the views of 'the poet, speaking through the Chorus' and 'the characters'. Writing of the passage which I have just quoted he says 'where the poet, speaking through his Chorus, is able to detect the overmastering will of Zeus (παντατείον, παντεργέτα) working itself out through an inexorable moral law, his characters see only a daemonic world haunted by malignant forces'. This view is not compatible with the fact that it is the Chorus which introduces the daemon at line 1468; indeed it names the daemon and Zeus as active in the very same stanza, which we have quoted in the text.

23 Some are usually outside the control of any god. This is the point of the protest which the Furies make to Apollo in E. 172.
Each of us has his or her personal apportionment. So have Orestes and Cassandra. Through no choice of hers Cassandra is a daughter of Priam. She has been captured at the sack of Troy and brought to the palace of the Atreidae. The Chorus says that she has been caught in the net of Moira (A. 1048 ἐν τὸς δ’ ἀλοσά μοραίων ἀγνευματών). She is free to decide her own attitude to this situation, and the Chorus urges her to yield to the necessity of her situation (1071 whether ἐκοῦσ’ ἀνάγκης τῇς δεῖ is read or έλκουσ’ ἀνάγκη τῇς δεῖ). The chorus of Trojan slave women suffers from the same αἰσχρα and ἀνάγκη (Ch. 75 f.), and they have come to terms with it. The free as well as the enslaved are involved in the chain of events which form the history of the palace (Ch. 103 τὸ μόρασμα γὰρ κτλ). Moira has cast the lot of Clytemnestra and that of Orestes in this environment. But Moira is not even partly responsible for Clytemnestra’s decisions as she claimed (Ch. 910 f. Ἡ Μοῖρα τοῦτον, δ’ τέκνον, παραιτεί).24

In a wider sense Moira is the ‘apportionment’ of all that has happened, not only of past events25 but also of the whole structure of the universe. The original separation of the elements into their parts, into Sea and Earth, Day and Night, was itself Moira. The goddesses ‘the Moirai’ were, like the Erinyes, born from the womb of Night (E. 321 and 962; cf. P.V. 516). They are guardians of the way things are, that is of the Dike of the universe which is unalterable, impersonal and implacable; and the Erinyes punish offenders against the rules of Moira and Dike, the two goddesses which give them their authority (E. 333 f. and 931). Aisa is evidently synonymous with Moira (Ch. 911 and 927). Moira or Aisa and their agents apportion good and evil to men as it were in a lottery (E. 310). Solon put it concisely in the lines:

Μοῖρα δὲ τοι θυντοίς κακῶν φέρει ἦδε καὶ ἔσθλον,  
δώρα δ’ ἀφυκτα θεών γλίνεται ἀθανάτων.

As a man cannot alter his individuality and his environment, so heredity is a part of anyone’s moira or apportionment. In some cases heredity may restrict the choice open to an individual, because he inherits a particular dilemma. Orestes is in such a position. He is drawn onwards by a variety of powers: the fortune of his father (the ‘aisa’ of Agamemnon), the dead man’s desire for revenge, the demands of Justice, daughter of Zeus, who speaks through the oracular response of Apollo (E. 618 f.), and the Erinyes as the agent of the family apportionment with its cry of ‘blood for blood’. These powers are all vividly portrayed in the Choephoroe in prayer and in narration (18, 148, 244, 283, 382, 394 f., 400 f., 640 f.). The family apportionment has a further personification in the form of the Curses, the Arai, sent up from the wrathful dead (Ch. 405 f.), and the Erinyes identify themselves with the Arai (E. 417). The family apportionment appears itself as a Curse on the house (Ch. 692), and the Chorus speak of the πόνος ἐγγενῆς (Ch. 466). In the latter part of the Oresteia, where the πόνος ἐγγενῆς is so powerful, the feeling may be uppermost in us that Orestes has little choice. But we should remember that his own wishes coincide with the wishes of the gods as he says himself:

πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰς ἐν συμπίνουσιν ζυμερῶι,  
θεῶν τ’ ἐφτημαί καὶ πατρὸς πένθος μέγα κτλ. (Ch. 299–304).

Here too we are shown a case where the choice of a man and the desire of the gods coincide, συμπίνουσιν, and make the sequel almost inevitable. The day when murder will avenge choice in men. Calchas, for instance, has a glimpse into the future and tells of what will happen—τοιόδε . . . μόρασμα (A. 136)—and the Chorus looks forward to the appointed day of the future (Ch. 464–5; cf. A. 68 and 766 with a more general context).
murder is approaching in accordance with the will of Orestes,\textsuperscript{26} the decrees of Justice and the wishes of all the powers which have been invoked—it is 'the day of apportionment which has been long in coming' (τὸ μόρημα μὲνει πάλαι Ch. 464).

The involvement of a whole family in a series of crimes which all offend against the right order, that is against the relationship laid down by Moira, and also against the moral sense of Justice for which Zeus stands, raises in the most acute form the problem of individual freedom. We have seen that Agamemnon, Clytemnestra and Aegisthus are portrayed as individuals who choose of their own volition to commit a δυσσωμεῖς ἔργον. Their acts coincide with the purposes of Zeus, and those of the last two coincide with the wishes of the Erinyes. Orestes, however, is portrayed as a man who is not brought by his own hybris and thrasos to commit a δυσσωμεῖς ἔργον. Indeed he is ἔσσωμεῖς so far as Apollo, the mouthpiece of Zeus, is concerned. But his act, though it may be represented as morally justifiable, offends against the relationship laid down by Moira and arouses the anger of the Erinyes, the ministrants of Moira's rights. Is he to be saved by Apollo or is he to be punished by the Erinyes? The climax of the Oresteia comes when Zeus persuades the Erinyes to accept his wish, namely the release of Orestes from their punishment; and to become the Eumenides, the well-wishers of mankind. It is only in the final chorus, when 'Zeus, who beholdeth all, is at last reconciled with Moira' (Ε. 1045) that we see that Zeus is indeed the centre of man's hopes in the universe (Ἴγ. 163 f.).\textsuperscript{27} Zeus works within the framework of Moira, but he does so intelligently and benevolently for the betterment of man; and he has persuaded the Erinyes to accept his benevolent purpose. Man will continue to suffer (for suffering is part of his 'moira'); but Zeus will use man's suffering to teach man the wisdom which lies in that quality of moderation known as σωφροσύνη.\textsuperscript{28}

The chief obstacle to our understanding of Aeschylus' ideas is our concept of 'fate'. We tend to think of 'fate' and 'free-will' as incompatible opposites, mutually exclusive and never co-existent; and there is therefore a tendency to read our ideas of 'fate' and 'determinism' into the vocabulary of Aeschylus. Thus to translate Moira not as 'apportionment' but as 'fate' is the beginning of error.\textsuperscript{29} 'Fate' with its Latin derivation has a finality which implies fatalism and despair; we see the idea becoming established in the civil wars of the Roman Republic and in the disillusionment which set in when the Principate became an autocracy. But Moira has an entirely different milieu and meaning. So have the words εἰμαρμένη\textsuperscript{30} and μῶρημα, which derive from the same root as μῶρα, namely μείρομαι 'to be divided' or 'to be part of a whole'. This 'being a part of a whole' cannot be cancelled out. The elements are parts of the cosmos; men and women are parts of humanity, of nations, of

\textsuperscript{26} A. W. H. Adkins, Merit and Responsibility, 130, emphasises the freedom of Orestes' will. 'But in the Eumenides Orestes makes no attempt to defend himself in these terms, and Apollo does not advance the plea on his behalf (sc. that Moira urged Orestes on): Orestes' will was not forced.' I think that this may be correct; but the issue in the Eumenides is rather whether the pollution of Orestes is indelible (Ε. 652 f.) or can be purified.

\textsuperscript{27} See Fraenkel, ii 114, 'the hymn is a corner-stone not only of this play but of the whole trilogy'.

\textsuperscript{28} See Fraenkel, ii 105. The lesson is for men and women in general. The theory is more acceptable at a time when the group is judged to be more important than the individual. The individual bearer of a tragic action may or may not survive to learn the lesson; Oedipus does survive and stresses the lesson (ΟC 7–8). Denniston-Page, 85 f., discuss the case of Agamemnon as an individual.

\textsuperscript{29} It is so translated, for instance, in A. W. H. Adkins, op. cit., 17 f.; Italic, Index Aeschyleus s.v.; and Fraenkel, ii 463.

\textsuperscript{30} The trouble caused by translating εἰμαρμένα as 'fate' in A. 913 is shown in Fraenkel's note in ii 413, which begins by quoting Karsten and Meineke 'quae fato constituata sunt non pendent a mortalium arbitrio'. When Clytemnemestra says τὰ ἀκκ. ἡμιν γνωλικης ἡμὴν τριγείρη φιλοί δικαιος σὺν θεόις εἰμαρμένα she means that her thoughtful vigilance will with the gods' help deal justly with all else which has been apportioned to her and Agamemnon, that is to say with the situation in which they are now placed. Commentators find similar difficulties at A. 1025 f., when μῶρα μῶρως is taken by Paley and others as 'the appointed law of fate (did not hinder) fate'.
families and of married pairs; body, mind and soul are parts of a human being. Moreover, the parts bear a certain relationship to one another and to the whole, which makes for unity and order. This relationship is the orderly way, δική. A breach of it causes ἄδικεία. These are not moral but factual relationships which are ἄναγκαια, products of ἄνάγκη. The consequences of abusing these relationships are also ἄναγκαια. Moira also apportions to us our individual endowments, which cannot be rejected by us. These gifts or lots of Moira are called πεπρομένα (from πορέω) and πότυοι (derived from the same root as πίπτεω). Cassandra affords a good example of the interrelationship of these words. She is caught in the net of apportionment (A. 1048 μορφώσεων ἄνγεμαντων), must bow to its necessity (1071 ἄνάγκη), accept her lot (1136 κακόστυμοι τύγχα) and have the same portion as Agamemnon (A. 1313).

The general conclusion to which we have come is that Aeschylus believed men to be free in making some decisions and that at the same time he recognised the limitations imposed upon men by their ‘moira’ or portion, in terms both of identity and of circumstance. The language of the plays shows his deep interest in degrees of personal responsibility or, if we prefer to put it so, of causation both in god and man. At one point Zeus is described as παναιτίος (A. 1486); the meaning is ‘fully responsible’ as is apparent from the case of Apollo.31

αὐτὸς αὐ τούτων οὐ μεταίτως πόλη ἀλλ’ εἶς τὸ πάν ἔπραξας ὡς παναιτίος. (E. 199–200)

Apollo is not just ‘jointly responsible’ μεταίτως, in the sense in which Agamemnon addresses the gods as ‘jointly responsible’ for his home-coming (A. 811 τούς ἐμοὶ μεταίτους). Moira is alleged by Clytemnstra to be ‘partly responsible’ (Ch. 910 παρατία). Apollo is ‘liable to responsibility’ (E. 465 ἐπαιτίους and E. 467 in the Oxford text; Thomson reads μεταιτίους in 465). The net is ‘co-responsible’ (A. 1116 ἔντατία). Aegisthus is ‘responsible’ (Ch. 69 αἰτίουs), Clytemnstra is not ‘un-responsible’ (A. 1505 ἄναίτιος); and the chorus wishes to be ‘un-responsible’ for the killing of Aegisthus (Ch. 873). Similarly Aeschylus stresses deliberate, willing action by the use of ἑκὼν and action under compulsion by the use of ἄνάγκη, e.g. in the matter of slavery (A. 953 and 1071). This is clearly defined in E. 550:

ἐκὼν δ’ ἄναγκας ἀτερ δίκαιος ὄν.

The most memorable use of ἑκὼν is that by Prometheus

ἐκὼν ἑκὸν ἡμαρτων, ὥν ἄρησσομαι. (P.V. 266).

The Chorus applies the word to Aegisthus when he claims that the Erinyes and Justice took part in the killing of Agamemnon (A. 1613):

οὐ δ’ ἄνδρα τόδε φής ἑκὼν κατακτανεῖν;

The characters whom Aeschylus depicts in the Oresteia are the final proof of his belief in the freedom of man in making some crucial decisions. For they are bold, confident and decisive persons—even the wolf-like Aegisthus, whose ‘wide-eyed mind will never be deceived’ (Ch. 854), and it is part of their heroic stature that they act on their own responsibility.32 They are making the προαρθέων which illustrate personality in the Aristotelian sense.

The limitations which are imposed upon man by the nature of circumstance are sometimes cosmic and sometimes personal. The condition of human life is a part of this cosmic

31 This is of course different from being responsible for all things: ‘the cause of all’ or ‘who causeth all’, as Lloyd-Jones and Thomson translate it.
32 Orestes does not just shelter behind the oracles of Apollo, powerful though they are (Ch. 297 and E. 594). He faces the fact that he would have to act, even if he disbelieved the oracles (Ch. 298 f.). He accepts responsibility for the killing of Clytemnstra (E. 463 f.). In the same way Orestes and Electra take the initiative in calling upon the spirit of Agamemnon; and the ghost of Clytemnstra appears not to urge on men (as the ghost of the king does in Hamlet) but to urge on the Erinyes.
condition which is due to Moira, 'apportionment'. The gods too, if they are wise, work within the limitations of the cosmic condition. Prometheus did not do so when he gave fire to man in his self-will (P.V. 542); therefore his gift was an ἄχαρος χάρος 'a thankless favour' (P.V. 545). Asclepius made a similar mistake in raising a man from the dead (A. 1022 f.), and Apollo used deceit to secure the salvation of Admetus from death and upset 'the ancient dispensations', τῶς παλαίσα διανομέας (E. 723 f.). Zeus, however, works within the limitations of the cosmic condition. In the same choral ode in the Prometeus Vincus 'the plans of man', particularly those inspired by the gift from Prometheus, will not transgress (successfully) τῶν Διὸς ἀρμονία 'the harmony of Zeus' (P.V. 551). I take this phrase to be the cosmic condition within which Zeus works. The word ἀρμονία is well defined by W. K. C. Guthrie: for 'to be a harmony meant that all its parts were organised in the correct order and proportion for the best performance of its function'. In the Orestia too Zeus is represented as working with Moira. He ended the activities of Asclepius in order to avert damage to the system of μοῖραι, that is to the apportionment of the world-order (A. 1024 f.). Zeus coincided with Moira and Dike in the first two plays, as the opening words of the litany in the Choephoroe show (306 f.):

άλλ᾽ ὁ μεγάλαι Μοῖραι Διόθεν
tî̄de teλευτάν,
ǥ vom dikaiou metabaîνει.

The discord which develops between the children of Zeus (Apollo and Athena) and the Furies is resolved by the inspiration of a common purpose, which will guide the collaboration of Zeus and Moira in the future. The last words of the Eumenides answer the opening words of the litany in the Choephoroe.

When a god or man flouts the limitations of the cosmic condition, he is involved in necessary consequences, ἀνάγκαι. Prometheus sees that his act in giving fire to man has made him subject to the invincible power of ἀνάγκη (P.V. 105). He has thereby become yoked to ἀνάγκαι which take the form of torture (P.V. 108):

θυητοὶς γὰρ γέρα
porōn ἀνάγκαις ταῖοδ᾽ ἐνέζευγμαι τάλας. (P.V. 107–108)

The freedom of action which he exercised in giving fire to man has involved him in the necessary consequences. Cassandra and the Trojan women are involved in the necessary consequences of the acts of other people which brought Troy to ruin and them to slavery. Cassandra is yoked to this necessity (A. 1071), and the Trojan women have received from the gods 'a necessity which encompasses the state' (Ch. 75 f.). Any generation which has experience of war knows the nature of these necessities. Agamemnon too by his decision to kill his daughter, like Prometheus by his gift of fire to man, 'put on the yoke of necessity' (A. 218); for he flouted the limitations of personal life, the proper relations between father and child. So too Clytemnestra flouted, by her actions of adultery and murder, the proper relations between husband and wife (E. 217 f.). Their acts involve not only themselves but also innocent persons in the necessary consequences. The image of the pregnant hare (A. 135 f.), the comparison of Orestes to the hare (E. 252 and 326) and the pathos of Cassandra bear poignant testimony to this truth. The involvement of the innocent is the tragedy of the human situation. It is the core of many plays, from the Orestiea to Hamlet. The full impact of it is conveyed not by any literary analysis but by the experience of seeing the Orestiea played. For, if we are to learn anything from Plato and Aristotle who saw Attic tragedy on the contemporary stage, it moved men with pity and fear. It was above all an

33 For the phrase see also A. 1545 and Ch. 42. 34 Twentieth Century Approaches to Plato 27 (Semple Lectures, Cincinnati, 1963).
emotional form of drama. It also contained religious and intellectual ideas. The Oresteia—"the masterpiece of masterpieces" as Goethe called it—excels in emotional force and in profundity of religious ideas. Its effect on us today is due to the fact that the picture of human freedom and of its limitations is true to life.

N. G. L. Hammond.

University of Bristol.
ON STRATEGY AND ORACLES, 480/79

On the basis of Labarbe’s new arguments in favour of July 21st rather than August 19th as the date of the full moon occurring about the time of the Thermopylae campaign, which involves our acceptance of a gap of something like five weeks between the Persian arrival in Attica and the battle of Salamis, R. Sealey has recently revived (Hermes xci (1963) 376–7) Munro’s view that the Greeks had placed a regular garrison on the Acropolis in 480, so enabling it to hold out against the Persian assault for a considerable period and delaying any further military or naval operations. The validity of Labarbe’s arguments has now been challenged by C. Hignett, Xerxes’ Invasion of Greece, 449–51 (cf. A. R. Burn, Persia and the Greeks, 403–5), who also meets, 212 f., most of the arguments originally put forward in support of the same thesis by Bury (CR x 1896). Hignett himself explains the delay before Salamis, on his view a delay of some three weeks, in terms of the unwillingness of the Persians to enter the Salamis strait, coupled with their recognition that it was impossible to by-pass it. The Acropolis is held to have resisted, rightly I believe, for only a few days, a resistance to be explained by its natural strength rather than because of any garrison placed upon it. The dismay attributed to the Greeks by Herodotus (viii 56) upon the news of the fall of the Acropolis, however, still appears to Hignett a difficulty needing explanation and he suggests that Herodotus’ emphasis upon it may be no more than a transitional device leading up to the next act of the drama (203).

But if the emphasis of Herodotus here cannot be regarded as sufficient basis for revising his account (viii 51) and that suggested by the epigraphical Themistokles decree as to the nature of the defence of the Acropolis, should it on the other hand be explained away as nothing more than a literary device? Is the Greek dismay so surprising? It is all too easy to assume that everybody in 480, Athenian and non-Athenian alike, had accepted Themistokles’ interpretation of the famous wooden walls oracle simply because subsequent events justified that interpretation rather than any other. But it may well be that those few Athenians who remained behind on the Acropolis were far from alone in relying—hoping against hope and encouraged by each additional day the citadel, even though without a regular garrison, held out—on the more obvious interpretation and that there were many in the Peloponnesian fleet, in particular, who relied upon it, at least in the sense of finding little comfort for themselves in any other. Even the mass of Athenians who had evacuated their city needed the additional encouragement of the untouched honey-cake (Herod. vii 41) and faith came more easily, no doubt, to those who had no real alternative but to believe, unless of course they were willing to surrender or flee to the west; for, clearly, not all the Athenians could shut themselves up on the Acropolis. Already the wooden walls of the Athenian fleet had been sorely battered at Artemision; though Pindar in retrospect might write

δότι παῖδες Ἀθηναίων ἐβαλόντο φαῖνών
κρηπίδθ᾽ ἔλευθεριας

(fr. 77, ap. Plut. Mor. 867C),

Herodotus records that half of their ships had been damaged and represents flight as having been determined upon before the news of the fall of Thermopylae. If not earlier, it might now be felt by many of the Greeks that Themistokles’ interpretation of the oracle, having been put to the test, had been proved unreliable, thus necessitating perhaps the insertion in the eleventh line of a precise reference to Salamis at this juncture (cf. Hignett, 441–3, contra Parke and Wormell, The Delphic Oracle, i, 171, cf. Burn, 357) or else confirming the gloomier interpretation of that line (Herod. vii 142.3) which Themistokles had combated. And yet

1 This article has benefited by suggestions, both as to excision and addition, from D. M. Lewis.

2 See supplementary note on the date and possible significance of these oracles.
the urgency with which the Athenian envoys had sought that better oracle indicates how vital it was for some glimmer of hope to be offered not only to the Athenians themselves, if they were to continue the struggle, but indirectly also to the Peloponnesians, if they were to be persuaded to fight anywhere north of the Isthmus. As long as the Acropolis held out, even if Themistokles’ interpretation was now thought to have failed, that glimmer of hope remained—an absurd hope, no doubt, but why should we suppose that the Peloponnesians serving in the fleet were less likely to be swayed by the irrational before the event than was Herodotus (e.g., viii 77) after it?—that through some miracle the literal interpretation of the oracle would be justified and so save them from putting that of Themistokles to the test once again at Salamis. The gods, after all, had intervened once, at sea, before ever the Persian fleet had reached Artemision, if not again in destroying another squadron sailing round Euboea (doubtless by Hignett, 386 f.; cf. now, J. F. Lazenby, Hermes xci (1964) 279 f.), and now, if ever, it should have been true that ‘the Greeks believed in their oracle not because they were superstitious fools, but because they could not do without believing in it’ (Dodds, The Greeks and the Irrational, 75). Thus, the fall of the Acropolis struck no military blow of significance, but that it struck a severe psychological blow need not be doubted.

So far from suggesting that the panic among the Greeks arose from the collapse of a predetermined Acropolis–Salamis line, Herodotus (viii 40.2) represents their fleet as only putting in at Salamis at all upon the request of the Athenians after the fall of Thermopylae in order to carry out the evacuation of their population. The implication seems to be that otherwise they would have withdrawn as far as some such harbourage as Pogon where the rest of their naval force was assembled (viii 42); they had made a similar withdrawal after the Tempe operation (vii 175). Here too Munro rejected Herodotus’ account. Yet I believe that he, with others, overrates the possibility of a ‘scientific’ plan of defence, determined well in advance, in the conditions of 480 B.C. The question ought to be asked, how early could the Spartan commanders-in-chief firmly determine on any defensive position, particularly in view of the uncertainty as to the attitude of the local population in the several areas which might be proposed. Conversely, of course, this attitude would depend to some extent on an indication that the commanders-in-chief were prepared to protect areas north of the Isthmus (Lazenby, 268–9), but Herodotus clearly does not regard this as the decisive factor in the case of the Phocians and Thessalians (viii 30), a passage the more impressive precisely because of his tendency to treat kindly Athenian allies (cf. re the Phocians, vii 218), —and the relations of Athenians and Boeotians (to name no others) were probably at this time scarcely better. At any rate, the Greek force is sent to Tempe—where there was no parallel position which could be taken up by sea—when rather unexpectedly it appears that the majority of Thessalians are not behind the Aleuadae, without any prior investigation as to whether there was another way round to the south (Herod. vii 172–3). Later, the attitude of the Boeotians, whatever their eventual behaviour, was still in doubt at the time of the sending of a force to Thermopylae. Herodotus (vii 205) implies that the Thebans were still at that moment members of the Hellenic League (cf. Brunt, Historia ii 143) and the sending of Leonidas’ force is represented as a means of testing the reality of Theban allegiance. But presumably in this case it was thought that there was likely to be enough local resistance in any event to make Thermopylae tenable, though once again there was no time, or at least no trouble taken, to find out about another way round (vii 175.2). Even as late as 479, and within the Peloponnese, Mantinea and Elis appear to have been uncertain in their loyalty, probably because of internal political divisions, and arrived too late for the battle of Plataea (ix 77).

It may be objected that the allegiance of the Athenians could hardly be in doubt, since they had been foremost in setting in motion the defence of Greece (Herod. vii 139.5). Yet the Spartan leaders of the League, remembering how they had been called upon for help in 490, would surely also remember the fact of, or the allegations about, a shield signal, and
how Miltiades, the chief architect of that victory, had been condemned following upon his Parian expedition (which the combined evidence of Ephorus, FHG 70 Fr. 63, and Nepos, Milt. 7, not necessarily an inference from the πρόδιασιος attributed to Miltiades by Herodotus, vi 133.1, suggests was anti-Persian in purpose) in the next year. Nor need we think them so dull as not to ponder the significance of the resort to ostracism in the 480’s, whether or not this institution had been invented in this decade to deal with potential medisers (so, Hignett, Hist. Ath. Const., 185 f.); the majority of these ostracised in these years are probably rightly regarded as such, but who was to know by how big a majority of votes they had been ostracised, particularly if only a quorum of voters was required and not a fixed minimum of votes against a particular person (cf. Raubitschek, Classica et Mediaevalia xix (1958) 82–3: if, as there argued, all our evidence, including Philochorus, can be interpreted as in keeping with this view, the question turns largely on whether Theophrastus obtained the correct information and whether, unlike Philochorus, he stated it without ambiguity)? Might not the pendulum quickly swing back the other way? Or who could be sure that the expressed purpose of the recall of the ostracised, as given by the final lines of the Themistokles decree ὅπως δὲ ἀντι νονοὶ τε ἀνατρεῖς Ἀθηναίοι διοίγησιν τὰ ... would not turn out to be no more than a pious hope? Might not their recall serve an opposite purpose in an emergency? If not medism, at least with their large fleet a hurriedly decided escape to the west remained a possibility, allowed for by yet another interpretation of the oracle (Herod. vii 143-3). Even the resistance party, on the usual interpretation of the ostracism of Aristides, was divided as to how that resistance was to be effected. In general, the history of Athens ever since the overthrow of the tyranny must have made it all too clear that the will of Athens, as of others, to resist depended not a little on the vagaries of internal politics.

It is scarcely fanciful, then, to suppose that this uncertainty in Athens’ attitude would be emphasised and exaggerated in stories circulating outside Attica at the time Herodotus was writing, stories welcome to, even if not invented by, the enemies of Athens in the Peloponnesse and the Empire. We find little in Herodotus, of course, to suggest this, except in so far as anti-Themistokles stories can be regarded as anti-Athenian; nothing comparable to the stories which he is ready to tell against the Corinthians, for instance, in which ἤ ἄλλη Ἕλλας did not believe (viii 94.4). But this by no means proves that such stories did not exist or that there was no basis for them, since it is clear that Herodotus was concerned to redress the balance which had swung unfairly against the Athenians in his own day (viii 139.1). In Plutarch (Aristides 13), indeed, there is a story of intended treachery at Platea which should not be rejected out of hand in view of its circumstantial detail (cf. Burn, 525–6, contra Hignett, Xerxes’ Invasion, 320–1, and, in a review of both, E. Will, Rev. Phil. xxxviii (1964) 79 n. 1). The evacuation of Athens could in a hostile tradition, no doubt, be represented as a last-minute panic decision, with little heroic about it—such, indeed, it almost appears in Plutarch, Them. 9.3, in the interest of Themistocles, and in Aristotle, A.P. 23.1, in the interest of the Areopagus; and it may be that it was to give the lie to such misrepresentations that documents like the Themistokles decree (concerning which my views are nearer to those of its original editor, M. H. Jameson, Hesp. xxix (1960) 198 f., xxxi (1962) 310–5 and Historia xii (1962) 385 f., cf. also D. M. Lewis, CQ xii n.s. 61–6, A. E. Raubitschek, BICS viii 59–61 and M. Treu, Historia xii 47–69, than to those of the sceptics) were produced, representing the official Athenian version of the war in the fifth century, rather than to point a moral to Philippiseis in the fourth. The Themistokles decree would underline the fact that the Athenians had resolved to evacuate their city long before it became inevitable, whilst documents such as the Kyrisilos decree (Lycurgus, in Lecor. 122; Demosth. xviii 204) would emphasise, as does Herodotus (ix 5), that only individuals of no great importance favoured medism in 480–79—and were summarily dealt with.

But if Athens was less of one mind in 480–79 than the Athenian patriotic tradition would suggest, it is appropriate to ask what would have happened at Athens in the summer of 480
if the Athenian fleet had been battered even more severely than in fact it was at Artemision. Must not the Spartan leaders at least have allowed for the possibility that in such a case there might be a revulsion of feeling against those who had advocated bold policies (as perhaps there had been after the defeat at Ephesos in the Ionian revolt—cf. Burn, 201—but there is no lack of more certain instances) and that the Athenians would use their remaining ships, no longer to resist, but rather to evacuate their population to the West? Even as it was Themistokles threatened that the Athenians would do precisely that when there was the risk that the Salamis position would be abandoned (Herod. viii 62.2), which could well be taken to indicate that Themistokles was genuinely afraid that his political opponents would exploit the situation in order to effect what had all along been their policy—in this sense the threat need not be dismissed as ‘plus oratoire que réelle’ (Labarbe, La Loi Navale, 119 n. 1). The reference to a particular town, Siris, as destined to be colonised by the Athenians suggests that here was no idle warning, conceived of on the spur of the moment in order to persuade Eurybiades. On the other hand at an earlier date the passing of the Themistokles decree, however vague as to vital details with regard to the evacuation (cf. Treu, 66, arguing that this was deliberately so), would have suited Themistokles’ purpose in making it clear that any plan of evacuation looked no further than Troezen and Salamis and Aegina (but the services of the latter at this crisis might conveniently be forgotten when the decree was edited later in the fifth century). Against this background, too, it makes sense that Mardonius should still believe even in 479 that Athens might be won over to Persia (Herod. vii 136 f., ix 4–5); Hignett, Xerxes’ Invasion, 407, seems to me to underestimate this possibility before Salamis, as well as afterwards, in entirely rejecting the historicity of Sikinnos’ message—for what, then, did Sikinnos receive his wealth and Thessian citizenship?

Finally, H. D. Meyer, Historia xii (1963) 405 f. (cf. Brunt, 141) has reminded us how insecurely based in terms of any oath of military allegiance was the hegemony of the Hellenic League as compared with that of the Peloponnesian League. If then Sparta had committed herself to taking up a position by sea at Salamis before ever Athens had actually carried into effect the evacuation decree and before it was clear that Athens’ continued will to resist depended upon the maintenance of that position, she could well have undermined the confidence of the Peloponnesian members of the Hellenic League in her leadership; for in insisting that Sparta should lead by sea as well as by land they must surely have expected that the fact that Athens had made by far the major contribution to the confederate fleet would not be allowed to influence strategy unduly in her favour.

On the oracles, Herodotus, vii 139–45

Both Burn, 357, and Labarbe, 120, would date these oracles to the period immediately after the retreat from Tempe, whilst Hignett (cf. now, Lazenby, 265–6) is prepared to accept Herodotus’ implied date (viz. some time previous to the first meeting of the Hellenic League, vii 145) only with the reference to Salamis deleted,—a deletion which Labarbe argues for even with his later date. The chronology proposed by Burn and Labarbe would, indeed, suit my argument as to the Athenian sympathies behind Herodotus’ account, since it would show Herodotus by implication assigning these oracles to a point in time which, whilst incorrect, was calculated to impress upon the reader the odds against which Athens resolved to resist Persia in 481, and this would contrast more sharply with Herodotus’ omission of any reference to the oracle given to the Spartans in this context, although that oracle, too, was a prophecy of doom and is elsewhere (vii 220.4) explicitly stated to have been delivered του πολέμου... αντικα κατ’ αρχις ἐγειρομένου. This latter oracle, of course, is almost universally (but cf. Burn, 393–4) regarded as post eventum, but since Herodotus accepted it as authentic, the present point is not affected. Moreover, it would be pertinent to ask what business had the Athenians to be consulting about resistance in the spring of 480, after they had already
joined with Sparta in initiating the defence of Greece, which should have indicated that they had made up their minds on that question, in the previous autumn.

It seems to me, however, that there is nothing unreasonable in assigning both oracles, including the reference to Salamis in the second, to the time which Herodotus implies, since I believe that Themistokles, knowing that an invasion was coming long before the autumn of 481 (Herod. vii 22, 138.1), may well have formulated a strategy in advance of the formation of the Hellenic League which he regarded as the best strategy for Athens, whether such a League was formed or not, and that this was already known at Delphi to involve the evacuation to Salamis. Labarbe, indeed, argues for a stage when Themistokles was thinking in terms of ‘une stratégie exclusivement navale (sans qu’il fut question d’évacuer le territoire)’, o.c., 121 n. 1, but I doubt whether there was ever such a stage in his intentions, even when the Hellenic League became a reality; for once Athens had decided, having built a large number of triremes, to use them as her means of salvation against Xerxes, she could not hope to raise a force to resist by land as well, and it would have been folly (so Themistokles may reasonably have thought) to assume that there would be an adequate non-Athenian force to protect Attica whenever the Athenians might need it—the events of 490 could in themselves have underlined that fact, whilst the fair chance that the Boeotians, following the principle of action attributed to the Thessalians and Phocians (Herod. viii 30) would medise if the Athenians did not, must have suggested that there was little hope of indefinite resistance at any point north of Cithaeron; for that conclusion Delphic insight (as in the second oracle) was scarcely needed. In view of Themistokles’ reputation for shrewdness we may conjecture, too, that he calculated that if the Athenians made it quite clear from an early date that they did not propose to resist Xerxes in force by land, then the Spartans would be more quickly and effectively stimulated to take thought as to how he was to be resisted on land somewhere, even if only at the Isthmus. This, at any rate, would offer a better long-term hope than a mere 2000 men such as had been sent to join the Athenians at Marathon (Herod. vi 120), even if these should arrive in time. Again, it seems to me that it would be far more in point for the Athenians to decide ἐτέρας (ναῦς) τε ἐδει προσαναπηγέεσθαι, to supplement those already built for the war against Aegina, early in 481, adding perhaps, contra Herod. vii 144.1, a further 100 to a similar number originally intended for the latter, rather than, as Labarbe, o.c., 110, would assume, at a point in time so late that no more than a score of ships could be added. The idea of a bold policy of committing everything to resistance by sea was not new, having been hinted at by Hecataeus, Herod. v 36, 125, and put into practice by the Thasians, who had been devoting their mining revenue to the building of triremes since 494/3 (H. Bengston, Historia ii (1954) 485–6, cf. Herod. vi 46), though also surrounding their city with a wall; the evacuation to Salamis was to be the Athenians’ alternative to the building of a wall.

In advocating a policy of evacuation early in 481 as a necessary consequence of the adoption of a naval programme, Themistokles may have had, since a crisis produces strange bed-fellows, the backing of those who favoured total flight and saw the triremes as a means of securing evacuation, not to Salamis, but far to the west; and this coalition could have led to the ostracism of Aristides in 482/1 (for this date cf. Raubitschek, Historia vii (1959) 127–8) since he perhaps, whilst favouring resistance, wished to give Athenian hoplites a greater part to play and so (he hoped) induce hoplite support from the Peloponnese to protect Attica. Thus, his ostracism may have been due not to his objections to the original adoption of a naval programme at Athens but rather to its implications, as Themistokles saw them, in face of Xerxes’ invasion. But, when it came to seeking the support of Delphi for a policy of evacuating Athens, it looks from Herodotus’ account as if those leaders who favoured other policies were sufficiently influential to prevail upon the Pythia to anticipate what we may assume was a carefully ‘loaded’ question devised by Themistokles, including a reference to Salamis (I find it difficult to believe, with Labarbe, o.c., 119, that both oracles were delivered.
under Themistokles' influence in view of the details of Herodotus' account). Even the second reply may have been intended to approve the policy of flight as much as resistance by sea, but with reference to Themistokles' proposal to evacuate to Salamis, it was quite possible for the Pythia to suggest that, if this were done, casualties would occur on or around the island—putting the matter as vaguely as does the oracle itself—since as Burn, o.c., 357, argues in connection with a different chronology, Salamis would become a military objective of some consequence. We need not suppose that Themistokles had already decided that Salamis should be the scene of a major sea-battle (that would depend in part upon what allies Athens eventually acquired), much less that the Pythia foresaw such a battle; as soon as the χρησιμολόγοι at Athens, however, interpreted the last lines as indicating a sea-defeat off Salamis, Themistokles would have no alternative but to admit the idea, but in the sense of a defeat for the Persians, not the Athenians. The vagueness as to the date of the prophesied casualties at Salamis, as opposed to the precision as to the place, emphasised by Labarbe, o.c., 113 f., is understandable if the reply was given as early as suggested. All that the Pythia need be intending to say is that an evacuation to Salamis would not prevent the Athenians having to face the Persians in the long run—and scarcely without some casualties; whether the reference which the older men saw to the ἱππός enclosing the Acropolis was intended may be left an open question.

It was natural, however, that once the Hellenic League was formed many Athenians would question whether the sacrifice involved in Themistokles' strategy was now really necessary and would delay evacuation; more would be expected of Athens' allies than Themistokles had ever thought it prudent to expect. Hence the expedition to Tempe, an expedition which was probably unwelcome to Themistokles (Plut. Them. 7, 1–2, cf. Labarbe, 120, Burn, 344), though the Athenian contingent was commanded by him; hence, too, the Athenian expectations on the fall of Thermopylae (Herod. viii 40.2). It was perhaps partly because Themistokles had never counted on decisive resistance to Xerxes by land anywhere north of the Isthmus that he enjoyed his brief hour of popularity at Sparta (Herod. viii 124.2–3).

Queen Mary College, London.

A. R. Hands.
LUTE-PLAYERS IN GREEK ART

(PLATES XVI, XVII)

The primary purpose of this article is to publish two terracotta representations of lute-players in the British Museum. The subject is rare, but not quite so rare as might be supposed from the scarcity of literature about it. It has, therefore, seemed worth while to add a list of the examples known to us—a list which does not claim to be exhaustive—and to discuss briefly some of the problems which they raise. We do this in the hope that it may stimulate further investigation of a neglected theme.

Between lutes and lyres there is a difference of principle which could hardly be more fundamental. The strings of the lyre are relatively numerous, but, in default of a fingerboard, fret-board, or neck, against which they could be firmly pressed (or 'stopped'), the possibilities of obtaining more than one note from each string, in so far as they existed, must have been limited as to the number and quality of notes obtainable. The lute has few strings, but they are stretched over a solid neck, or a prolongation of the sound-box, against which they can be pressed so as to shorten the string-length and produce notes of higher pitch than those of the open strings; each string can thus provide a number of notes of approximately equal quality. Lutes and lyres were both common in Asia and in Egypt. In Greek lands the lyre predominated, and no examples of the lute are found in art before the fourth century B.C. The examples known to us are mostly terracottas.

(i) Only one of these terracottas can be dated securely to the fourth century and no later. This is not a free-standing statuette, but a gilt terracotta appliqué of a kind made in Tarentum for the decoration of coffins. It is part of a set recently acquired by the Museum für Antike Kleinkunst in Munich. Other examples from tombs at Tarentum date these objects to the last thirty years of the fourth century B.C.

Next comes a group of statuettes in the early Hellenistic, so-called 'Tanagra', style of about 330 to 200 B.C. Three of the players are women.

(ii) PLATE XVI 1, 2 show a girl playing a lute. The provenience of this piece, now in the British Museum, is not known, but technical considerations would suggest that it was made in Cyprus. The strong frontality of the pose, the hair-style, and the manufacture

R. A. H. was responsible for archaeological details in the article, the literary and musical discussions were the work of R. P. W.-I.

1 Notably, Th. Reinach, 'La guitare dans l'art grec', REG viii (1895) 371-377, figs. 1-4 (to which his article in Daremberg and Saglio, s.v. 'Lyra', adds nothing). H. G. Farmer, 'An early Greek pandore', J. R. Asiatic Society 1949, 177-179, pl. 13, is mainly concerned with a Byzantine example: he mentions, but does not describe or illustrate, the two pieces from the British Museum—(ii) and (v) below. Brief articles in RE., s.v. 'Saiteninstrumente' (1 A 1765 f.—Abert, 1920), s.v. 'Pandura' (xviii. 3. 559—Wegner, 1949). The Greek evidence is discussed in some general works. E. Biernath, Die Gitarre seit dem III Jahrtausend vor Christus, Berlin, 1907 (unillustrated and unimpressive). K. Schlesinger, The precursors of the violin family, London, 1910. F. Behn, 'Die Laute im Alte(ter) und früher Mittelalter', Zeitschrift f. Musikwissenschaft i (1918) 89-107: a useful article, consisting of 27 illustrations with full comment (the illustrations include examples (viii) and (xiii) below). C. Sachs, The history of musical instruments, New York, 1949, 136 f. H. Panum, Stringed instruments of the Middle Ages, London, 1940 (revised and edited by Jeffrey Pulver, from Middelalderens Strengeinstrumenter, Copenhagen, 1915), 188 ff.: informative and copiously illustrated, but to be used with caution: the 'paraphonic monochord' of Ptolemy (p. 190) is a chimera (cf. I. Düring, Ptolemaios u. Porphyrios über die Musik 243 n.1).

2 Both terms are here used generically. Lyres include kitharas. Some writers confine the term 'lute' to later varieties with a broad sound-box.

3 Cf. CQ n.s. vi (1956) 169 ff., esp. 183-6.

4 See n. 23 below.

5 For the possible survival of an ancient lute into modern times, see App. B.

6 AD 1954, 286, fig. 19, and refs.

7 Uncatalogued (originally in the Weber Collection). Registration no. 1919.6-20.7. Ht. 0.17.
of the base in one piece with the body (instead of the more common strip of clay attached separately) are all early signs and suggest a date between 330 and 300 B.C.

(iii) A rather better piece of the same kind comes from Alexandria, and is now in the Alexandria Museum. 8

(iv) Better still is a third example in the Louvre, said to come from Tanagra. 9 (Plate XVI 3, 4.) A draped woman, perhaps a Muse, sits on a rock and plays a lute (the upper part of which is missing, though the left hand is partly preserved). This figure somewhat resembles the Muse on the Mantinea base (xiii), though, as will be seen, the type of the instrument is different.

Figures of Eros playing the lute, another Early Hellenistic subject, are rather more common. To judge from their style, the six following pieces were all made between 330 and 200 B.C.

(v) Plate XVII 1 shows a piece in the British Museum from Eretria. 10 The whole upper part of the instrument, with the player’s left hand, has broken away, but the pose and the surviving sound-box leave no doubt of what is intended.

(vi) An example in the Louvre from Myrina. 11 (Plate XVII 2.)

(vii) An example in the Louvre from Cyprus. 12

(viii) An example in Stuttgart from Alexandria. 13

(ix) An example in the Collection Fouquet from Lower Egypt. 14

(x) There is another figure in Alexandria of a boy—or perhaps an Eros—in Oriental costume, playing the lute. 15

(xi) One more terracotta from Egypt may be mentioned, although it is evidently somewhat later in date, perhaps as late as the first century A.D. It represents a grotesque dwarf and comes from Memphis. 16

In addition to these terracottas, we have the following two examples.

(xii) On a Campanian squat lekythos from Canosa is a female figure in relief. She stands on an Ionic capital and is apparently playing a musical instrument, which can only be a lute. To her left and right are painted figures, Nike and Athena respectively. The vase, now in the British Museum, is attributed by Professor A. D. Trendall to the Braniciki Painter, a member of the Rhomboid Group, and dated c. 320 B.C. 17 The workmanship of the plastic figure is extremely poor, and no reliance can be placed upon the details of the instrument.

Our final example is from a sculptured relief.

(xiii) One of the Muses on the Mantinea base is playing a lute. 18 The middle part is badly damaged, but the nature of the instrument is unmistakable. (Plate XVII 3).

* * * * *

What do we learn from these representations about the character and technique of the

8 E. Breccia, Terrecotte figurate . . . del Museo di Alessandria i (1930), pl. F2, no. 83.
9 CA 574. REG viii (1895) 374, fig. 2.; G. Kinsky, Geschichte der Musik in Bildern (1929) 14 (5).
10 Cat. no. C 192. Ht. 0.12.
11 MYR 696. S. Molland-Besques, Catalogue raisonné des figurines et reliefs en terre-cuite grecs et romains, ii, Myrina (1963), pl. 71 d. REG viii (1895) 376 fig. 3.
12 Winter, Die antiken Terrakotten, iii, pt. 2, 293, fig. 7 (drawing, not photograph).
13 Expedition Ernst von Sigglin, ii, pt. 2, pl. 422; 2; Kinsky, op. cit., 14 (5). F. Behn, Musikleben im Altertum und frühen Mittelalter (1954), fig. 52.
14 P. Perdrizet, Lettres cucin grecques d’Egypte de la Collection Fouquet (1921), pl. 37, no. 241. Closely similar to the preceding and possibly from the same mould.
15 Breccia, op.cit., pl. 18, no. 151. (no. 84, the fragment of a lute-player, is not illustrated.)
16 Perdrizet, op. cit., pl. 63, no. 454.
17 B.M. Cat. of Vases iv (1896), no. G 21. The attribution and dating have been courteously communicated to us by Professor Trendall.
18 REG viii (1895) 374, fig. 1. G. Fougère, Mantinea (1898), pl. 3. Kinsky, op. cit., 14 (1). M. Wegner, Das Musikleben der Griechen, pl. 32 b; Musikgeschichte in Bildern ii 4 (Griechenland), fig. 67. (The last two titles are abbreviated in later references as Musikleben and M. in B.)
instruments represented? The first thing to observe is that they are of two different types, distinguished by the shape of the sound-box.

**Type A.** In the less common type, of which there are three examples, the sound-box is roughly spade-shaped; the lower end is straight; the distinction between sound-box and neck is clearly marked. In the best examples—(v) and (xiii) (Plate XVII 1, 3)—the sides of the sound-box converge slightly towards the neck and then curve sharply inwards to meet it (this is lost on one side of (xiii)). The sound-box of (v) is somewhat narrower in proportion than that of (xiii), but recognisably of the same type. The workmanship and condition of (i) are poor. If, as it would appear, the instrument is completely shown, sound-box and neck are of approximately equal length. In (xiii) the proportion of neck to sound-box is about 2:1. In (v) the sound-box only is preserved, but from the position of the left arm (and the general proportions of the figure) it seems unlikely that the neck was longer—or substantially longer—than the sound-box.

**Type B.** In all the other examples the sound-box ends in a bluntish point. Its widest part is near the end, and it then tapers into the neck, the line being continuous on each side without any clear demarcation between sound-box and neck. The instrument as a whole could be described as club-shaped. (Plates XVI 1–4, XVII 2.)

In some cases (of both types) the neck is shown to widen out slightly at the end opposite the sound-box, e.g. (iii), (vi), (xiii). (vi) has a raised band at the end; (xiii) has a raised band 1 cm. wide at a distance of 1.5 cm. from the end. There is never any sign of tuning pegs (still less of a bent-back peg-box, as in later lutes): it would seem that, as with most early eastern lutes, the strings were simply ligatured. There appears to be an indication of frets in (viii), but not elsewhere. There is no indication of strings, except in (ii), where the incised lines are probably original and intended to represent strings (four or perhaps five), and possibly in (viii), where, however, the traces of lines parallel to the instrument are seen on the neck only.

The instrument is most commonly held horizontally. The position of the hands varies little: the left hand should be thought of as stopping a string, the right hand as plucking it (in (iv) and (v)—Plates XVI 3, 4, XVII 1—it has just been plucked). It is not always clear whether a plectrum is being used, as was the case with Oriental lutes. The plectrum is certain in (vi) and (xiii) (where the relevant projection is much too prominent for the end of the thumb). On the other hand, there is no plectrum in (iv) or (v), and probably none in (iii), (viii) or (xi). (Note that this is not a distinction between Type A and Type B.)

In Type B, a small projection or knob is visible at the end of the sound-box in examples (iii), (vi), (vii), and (x). It is possible that the strings were fastened to this knob before passing over a bridge to the neck. It is on the whole more likely that it is a residual feature, going back to the primitive lute in which the sound-box was pierced by a long stick. At that early stage the strings were fastened to the projecting end of the stick, but in more sophisticated instruments the function of ‘tail-piece’ is taken over by a bridge attached to the top of the sound-box. Such a bridge or tail-piece is clearly indicated in (iv), (v), and (vi).

Finally, as to the depth and section of the sound-box, we ought not perhaps to expect too much information from terracottas and reliefs. In terracottas the back of the sound-box tends to be amalgamated with the body of the figure. By a happy chance, however, in (iv), which is of careful workmanship, the instrument is held away from the body of the player, so that a good profile view is obtainable from above and below (cf. Plate XVI 4). Doubt-

---

19 There seems to be a vertical ridge slightly right of centre which is probably devoid of significance.

20 Panum, *Stringed Instruments* fig. 176, shows the lines continuing to the end of the sound-box, but the picture seems to have been ‘touched up’.

21 We owe this suggestion to Mme. M. Duchesne-Guillemin. A similar projection is to be found in two published Byzantine lutes: Farmer (see n. 1), pl. 13; *BCH* lxxxvi (1962) 693.
less all Type B instruments were similarly shaped. As to Type A, (v) indicates the depth at the sides, but tells us nothing of the vault. In (xiii), however, the triangular end (recessed by 3–4 cm.) represents depth. The kithara played by a Muse on one of the other sides of the Mantinea base (Plate XVII 4) has a similar recessed triangular base, which is also shown (or implied) in representations of kitharas on coins and in terracottas. It seems reasonable to suppose that the sound-box of the Type A lute was vaulted like that of a kithara, with a central spine. (The evidence for kitharas is examined in Appendix A.)

* * * * *

Two distinct types of lute, then, were known in the Greek world during the late fourth century and after. The relations of these types to earlier Oriental and Egyptian lutes, and their subsequent history in Roman and medieval times, both in Europe and in Asia, are matters which we must leave to qualified organologists. But there are two further questions on which something must be said: the question of nomenclature, the question of the date of introduction.

Having distinguished two types of instrument by the difference in the shape of the sound-box, are we in a position to name them? Or to name lutes in general?

It is commonly assumed that the pandoura (pandouros, pandourion) was a lute; and, although the evidence could be more specific, we need not doubt that this is correct. There are three principal passages.

(i) In Athenaeus iv 183 f it is stated that the 'so-called pandorous' was mentioned by Euphorion and by Protagorides; and that Pythagoras 'who wrote about the Red Sea' said that the Troglodytes made the pandoura of the laurel which grows in the sea.

(ii) Pollux iv 59 ff. has a long section on stringed instruments which contains the following items: μονόχορδον δὲ, Ἀράβων τὸ εὐρύμα. τρίχορδον δὲ, ὅπερ Ἀσίων πανδοῦρων αὐτόμαξων ἔκεινον δὲ ἤν καὶ τὸ εὐρύμα. Both instruments were presumably of the lute-type. What authority Pollux had for a one-stringed Arabian lute we cannot say. The Greeks were familiar with the monochord kanon as an instrument of acoustical research and must have recognised that, since both were based upon the principle of the stopped string, there was a kinship between it and the lute. The equation is made, if confusedly, in the next passage.

(iii) Nicomachus, harm. enchir. ch. 4 (243, 13 ff. Jan): μέσα δὲ αὐτῶν (i.e. between wind and stringed instruments) καὶ οἶδον καὶ οἰκουμήθη τὰ τε μονόχορδα φαινεσθαι, τί δὲ καὶ πανδοῦρων καλοῦσιν οἱ πολλοί, κανόνας δὲ οἱ Πυθαγόρης. One MS. has πανδοῦρος for πανδοῦρων with good bibliographies. Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, s.v. 'Laute' (viii 345ff.): the section on 'Die aussereuropäischen und antiken Lauten' is by H. Hickmann (full bibliography). Musical instruments through the ages, ed. A. Baines, Pelican Books, 1961, is informative and well illustrated.

22 Some attempt is made in (vi) to render this shape at the lower end, but it soon amalgamates with the human body. It may be that we get a good picture of the profile in an unexpected quarter. πανδοῦρα is glossed in Suidas (s. vv. 'πηκτίς', 'πανδοῦρα') as μάχαιρα κρεοκόπος. Cf. Zonaras: πανδοῦρων μάχαιρα σφακτική. References for μάχαιρα, in the sense of chopper or cleaver, will be found in B. A. Sparkes, 'The Greek Kitchen', JHS lxxii (1962) 132; and his pl. 8.6 (there is a clearer picture in P. Devambez, Greek Painting, The Contact History of Art, London, 1962, pl. 68) shows how this implement might have acquired the nickname of pandourion (in the same way that the nickname of sambuke was given to a siege-engine because of its shape—see n. 34). In other examples of cleavers, however, the top is more strongly curved, and the comparison would be less obvious.

23 In addition to the general works mentioned in n. 1: F. Behn, Musikleben im Altertum und früher Mittelalter, 1964. The New Oxford History of Music i, passim, VOL. LXXV

24 There is a reference back to 182 e: οἱ νῦν, φησίν (sc. Euphorion), καλούμενοι ναρβλαστεῖ καὶ πανδοῦραται καὶ σαμβοκταῖ καυρὸν μὲν οἴδει κρατάντες ὄργανον. In the passage quoted, Euphorion gives evidence for the antiquity of the sambuke, but nothing further is said about the pandoura (or pandourios).

25 From what date? It is often assumed that the use of the kanon as an instrument of research goes back to Pythagoras or the early Pythagoreans, but B. L. van der Waerden has argued (Hermes lxxviii (1943) 177) that it dates from Strato.

26 It is not clear on what grounds the various instruments mentioned, including the trigonon and the plagianos, are regarded as intermediate between wind and strings.
The name, however spelled, is here applied to a monochord, not, as in Pollux, to a trichord.

However unsatisfactory this evidence may be in detail, it seems to establish for the pandoura (or pandourosoi) both its lute-character and its exotic origins, which Pollux places in Assyria (the monochord coming from Arabia) and Pythagoras on the shores of the Red Sea. It is associated with Egypt by Martianus Capella (ix 924). The name, like those of most Greek musical instruments, is undoubtedly non-Greek, and attempts have been made to give it a Sumerian derivation. Later derivatives, e.g. tanbur, mandoline (from mandora), relate to lute-type instruments.

One name is perhaps enough, but it would be agreeable if we could find another. The names are known of a considerable number of exotic instruments. Scholars of the Hellenistic period were interested, but, to judge by the discussions in Athenaeus iv and xiv, not particularly well informed. There are reasons for believing that many, if not most, of these instruments were varieties of harp. The name pektis (πηκτίς) was certainly given to a harp, identical with or closely similar to the magadis, but it was also given to the syrinx and may have been given to a lute. The word is glossed by Hesychius as πανδούρων παλτήρων σώρευς, and we find similar glosses in Suidas and Photius. The question is open. There is a rather stronger, if not an overwhelming, case for regarding the skindapsos as a lute. The evidence is as follows:

(i) Pollux iv 59. A long list of stringed instruments begins with lyres, continues with harps (though some are doubtful), and ends with skindapsos. This might be a reasonable position in which to place a lute, if lute it is. However, the pandoura comes later (v. supra).

(ii) Athenaeus iv 182 f cites from Aristoxenus (fr. 97 Wehrli) a list of exotic instruments (ἐξωτικά ὀργάνα). In this list σκινδαψος comes between κλεφύαμβος and τὸ ἐνεαχρόδον καλούμενον. The latter cannot be a lute, and we have no reason to suppose the former is. There was of course no bar to mentioning a lute between harps (if they were harps).

(iii) Athenaeus xiv 636 b. The list cited from Phillis of Delos is probably derived from that of Aristoxenus: it has the skindapsos in the same position.

More informative is a short passage specifically on the skindapsos in Athenaeus iv 183 a–b, with quotations from Matron, Theopompus of Colophon, and Anaxilas. None of them, however, is free from difficulties. To take the last first:

(iv) Anaxilas (Luofoi fr. 267):

The speaker is presumably the lyre-maker himself.

Three of his instruments are of the

Sopater (ap. Athen. iv 183b) calls the instrument δύχοςος, but this is not conclusive, since the reference may be to stringing in 'double courses' (cf. Jan, Saitestoniste na 134; Riemann, op. cit., 93).

Which is what Euphorion seems to have done in the passage cited in n. 24.

The lists are identical, except that Phillis has ἐμμηκον between σαμβικα and τριγκωνα. It may be supposed that it has dropped out of the quotation from Aristoxenus.

Speaking Doric? Cebet, to mend the metre in the second line and to fit εξηντυμαν, reads βαρβίτος τριχόρδος πακτίδας ... σκινδαψος. This does not affect our problem, but τριχόρδος (or τριχόρδοι) may. It cannot be an epithet of βαρβίτος nor yet of πακτίδας if those are harps, which is more probable
lyre-type: barbitos, lyre and kithara. The pektis is most probably a harp; the skindapsos could be a lute; τριχόρδος is problematic.

(v) Matron:

οἰδ' ἀπὸ πασαλόϕων κρέμασαν, ὀθι περ τεταύνωτο
σκινδαφός τετράχορδος ἀνηλακάτῳ γυναικός.

That the skindapos is here described as having four strings is the most positive evidence we possess for calling it a lute. It is not conclusive, since a very small harp might perhaps have had no more.\(^{34}\) However, the following passage indicates that the skindapos was not a small instrument.

(vi) Theopompus:

σκινδαφὸν λυρόεντα μέγαν χείρεσι τινάσιον
δέξων προμάλου τετυγμένον αἰξήνειος.

So the skindapos was large, but it was also ‘lyre-like’\(^{35}\). Was it then a lyre-type instrument after all? Hardly, if it had four strings. The case for regarding the skindapos as a lute depends greatly on this one epithet in Matron, but it is by no means negligible.\(^{36}\)

By way of names, then, we have pandoura (which is virtually certain), skindapos (which is quite probable), pektis (which is possible),\(^{37}\) but small grounds, if any, for assigning them to either of the two types of lute which we have distinguished. The skindapos alone carries epithets which might assist an identification. It was large; and of all the representations we have reviewed, perhaps the Mantinea lute (xiii) alone deserves the epithet μέγας. But we have no reason to suppose that the other Type A lutes were larger than those of Type B.\(^{38}\)

It was lyre-like. Now there would seem to be no obvious point of comparison between the Type B lute and the lyre,\(^{39}\) but the sound-box of the Type A lute was, as has been argued above, vaulted upon the same principle of construction as the kithara, and the epithet mighth

(but see above). If it is a substantive instrument, the gender seems improbable, and we should perhaps suppose that an original τριχορδο has been assimilated to its surroundings. Pollux iv 60 (v. supra) equates trichordon with pandoura, so that the lyre-maker’s list may in fact include two kinds of lute. On this passage see Riemann, op. cit., 91.

\(^{34}\) From Athenaeus xiv 633 f we learn that the sambuke was a high-pitched instrument (which is confirmed by Aristides Quintilianus de musica 85. 10 ff. Teubner); and, if the text is right, that it had four strings, being employed by the Parthians and the Troglodytes. We have no certain example of the sambuke in art, though the small harp with boat-shaped sound-box in Behn, op. cit., fig. 127 may be a claimant. (The boat shape may have a bearing on the vexed question of the siege-engine of this name referred to in the following sentence of Athenaeus and described at length in Polybius viii ch. 4, B.-W. ii 336, 25-337, 29.) A harp of this size is likely to have had few strings. It is conceivable that there has been some confusion in the text of Athenaeus and that the latter part of the sentence relates to the pandoura, associated with the Troglodytes by Pythagoras (v. supra), who is also cited as an authority here. However, the following sentences continue to deal with the sambuke.

\(^{35}\) In the second line, one wood or two? No authority is very specific about the πρώμαλος: it is coupled with the ἱρεία in Ap. Rhod. iii 201; its twigs or leaves can provide a couch (Athen. xv 673 c); Hesychius glosess as μύρικη ἢ δύσος; other references are non-committal. Kaibel emends ὀξύνων to ὀδυνών—a word normally applied to objects made of plaited osiers, as no musical instrument could be, though willow-wood might be a possible material.

\(^{36}\) According to Aelian, NA xii 44, the instrument was of Indian origin, which would consist with its being a lute.

\(^{37}\) And perhaps trichordon or trichordon (see n. 33).

\(^{38}\) The epithet may distinguish one skindapos from another rather than the skindapos as such from smaller instruments: a large skindapos?

\(^{39}\) We hesitate to complicate the issue by referring to three sarcophagi of the Roman period—two in the Louvre and one in the cathedral at Agrigento—which show an instrument very similar in shape to our Type B lute, but with a relatively large number of strings, held upright against the shoulder and played, apparently, without ‘stopping’, like a lyre or (Sachs) zither. Cf. Panum, op. cit., 212 f., figs 185-7; Sachs, op. cit., 137, pl. 8 B. There is, however, no earlier evidence for this type.
have been prompted by this resemblance. Clearly, however, the evidence admits of only
the most tentative hypotheses.\textsuperscript{40}

* * * * *

From the evidence of the terracottas alone one might conclude that the lute was probably
not employed in Greece before the time of Alexander the Great and was perhaps introduced
as a result of his conquests. One literary witness may suggest a slightly earlier date.
The skindapsos is mentioned, among fourth-century writers, by Aristoxenus, Matron and
Anaxilas.\textsuperscript{41} Aristoxenus was born about 360 B.C.; we cannot date his περὶ ὀργάνων (or his
death). Matron is thought to be contemporary with Alexander. Anaxilas, however,
burlesques Plato, who died in 347; according to Webster,\textsuperscript{42} his Κύρξ is to be dated before 350,
his Ευανδρία 350–340, his Νεότιτις 340–330. There seem to be no grounds for dating the
Λυροποίοι,\textsuperscript{43} but there must be some probability that it is earlier than the conquests of Alex-
ander. He mentions the skindapsos,\textsuperscript{44} and the skindapsos may be a lute.

The pre-Alexandrian introduction of the lute would be settled, if a date in the middle
of the fourth century were accepted for the sculptures on the Mantinea base. Not many
scholars perhaps would now place it so early.\textsuperscript{45} We do not wish, however, to enter into the
details of this controversy, except insofar as the representations of musical instruments on the
reliefs might have a bearing upon the question of date. (i) There is the lute. (ii) There is
the type of kithara held by one of the Muses.

(i) The fact that all other examples of lute-type instruments are later than 330 B.C. does
not prove that this example is itself so late. Nevertheless, the earlier the date the more
surprising perhaps to find this new-fangled instrument in the hands of a Muse of all players
and at Mantinea of all places. Too much weight should not be put upon the first point,
since the Muses sometimes disconcert us by their choice of instruments. They play the
harp, the syrinx, the tambourine, and perhaps also the krotala.\textsuperscript{46} An obscure archaic
sculptor called Lesbothemis\textsuperscript{47} is said to have made a Muse playing the sambuke, apparently
a small harp of high pitch\textsuperscript{48} and regarded as exotic. But that was in Mytilene, close to the
Asiatic sources of corruption. Mantinea, however, was famous for the strict classical
tradition of its school of music; and one modern writer is prompted to speak of 'cette Arcadie
musicale où les innovations modernes n'avaient pas apporté la discorde!'\textsuperscript{49}

Krotala: if the four females attending on Apollo on a b.f. amphora, Copenhagen 3241, are Muses
(Wegner, Musikleben pl. 28a, Register 219, contr. M. in B, p. 50 ad inf.). The same question arises on a b.f. lekythos, Paris MNB 910 (L 27), cf. Haspels, Black-figure Lekythoi pl. 32. 2.

46 But see n. 22 for a possible link between the
pandoura and Type B.

41 There seems to be no evidence for the date of
Theopompos of Colophon.

42 CQ n.s. ii (1952) 13 ff., esp. 19, 19, 21; Studies in
Later Greek Comedy 44, 61, and Chronological Table.

43 Or the Auletis, which (fr. 27) also satirises the
'new' music.

44 See also n. 33.

45 Cf. A. W. Lawrence, Classical Sculpture 254;
Later Greek Sculpture 102 (and references). Most
recently, H. Hiller, Marburger Wincklemann-Programm
1962, 54 ff., n. 17, who argues for 330–325 B.C.

46 Harps: e.g. Terpsichore on a r.f. amphora,
British Museum E 271 (Wegner, Musikleben pl. 19;
M in B fig. 22); volute krater by the Sisyphus Painter,
Munich 3268 (Wegner, Musikleben pl. 22; see Register
203-4 for other examples).

47 Athenaeus iv 182 f, xiv 635 a (Overbeck B.
2083).

48 See n. 34.

49 L. Laloy, Aristoxène de Tarente 7 ff. Cf. G.
Fougères, Mantinée 347 ff. On the strictness of the
Mantineans, see Plutarch, de mus. ch. 32, §§ 329–30
W.–R., with Reimach's note; cf. Philodemus, de mus.
xi 77 fr. 9 (I xiv 2 van K.). From Polybius iv 20 we
learn that the Arcadians were still concerned to give
their children a sound musical education in the second
century B.C.; if Philoxenus and Timotheus have now
been added to the curriculum, this is the normal
process by which the revolutionaries of one generation
become the classics of another. From the anecdote
in Xenophon, Anabasis vi 1. 11, one gets the impression
perhaps that the Mantineans were traditionalists!
toxenus went to Mantinea to study about 340, did he find that a sculptor had already honoured a local cult by placing in the hands of a Muse a type of instrument recently imported from Asia to be the butt of comic poets.\textsuperscript{259} The point is subjective and not to be pressed, but the later the date the happier one will feel.

(ii) Two types of kithara are exemplified on the reliefs. The instrument held by Apollo is in all respects that of the professional kitharodes, familiar from countless vase-paintings of the archaic and classical periods and still seen on coins and in terracottas of the Hellenistic age. It is natural enough that a Muse should play a simpler form of kithara than the god; and in the fifth century it might have been the so-called ‘cradle-kithara’ with rounded base (played by a Muse on a volute-crate by the Sisyphus painter—Munich 3268—and elsewhere). The type represented on the Mantinea base (plate XVII 4) is more like a greatly simplified version of the kitharodic instrument. Its most striking feature is its rectangularity. The sides of the sound-box are straight and at right angles to the base, and the line is continued into the side-pieces. The lines must have been straight to the strict frontal view, for, when we observe a marked curvature of the left-hand arm and a slighter corresponding curvature of the right-hand arm, there can be no doubt (in view of parallel cases) that this is a conventional representation of the third dimension, indicating that the front of the instrument is not in one plane, but curves over at the top in such a way that a plumb-line from the yoke would fall well away from, and forward of, the base. It is easy to understand that, when fashion or convenience brought the yoke forward in relation to the sound-box, curvature in the one plane was sacrificed to curvature in the other.\textsuperscript{51} This combination of forward curvature with frontal rectangularity may have been common in the Hellenistic period to judge by terracottas and some other evidence.\textsuperscript{52} But it is found already in the fourth century: on two Apulian vases in the British Museum (F 309 and F 399), dated 370–360 and 350, respectively, and—rather later—on a Gnathia bell-krater in Naples (late fourth or early third century).\textsuperscript{53} Such fourth-century evidence as we have seen comes from Italy, but the terracottas show that this form of kithara was known in Greece at a rather later period.\textsuperscript{54} Its presence on the Mantinea relief can, no more than that of a lute, provide conclusive evidence of date.

\textit{Appendix A: on back-views of the kithara}

On the Mantinea reliefs both the lute and the Muse’s kithara have a recessed triangle at the base of the instrument, which is clearly an indication of the shape of the sound-box. This agrees with other monumental evidence.

The great majority of our representations of kitharas are on vase-paintings—and are front-views, i.e. they show the side on which the strings pass over the flat upper surface of the sound-box. This is also true of lyres, but the back of the tortoise-shell is sometimes shown,

\textsuperscript{56} One can hardly say that he was running short of instruments. The fourth side of the base, with three of the Muses, is unfortunately missing, but it need not have contained more than one instrumentalist.

\textsuperscript{51} In the classical kithara the strings are fastened to a holder or tailpiece near the base and then pass over a bridge on their way to the yoke. The function of the bridge is to keep the strings from contact with the sound-box. If the yoke is brought forward, a bridge is no longer necessary; and it would seem that the former bridge now takes on the function of tail-piece.

\textsuperscript{54} Terracottas: e.g. in the Louvre CA 708 (with a close similarity to the Muse’s kithara), 799, 2297;\textit{MYR} 85, 178, 303. A coin from Brundusium (\textit{BICS} x (1963), pl. 9.6) of c. 150–100 B.C. A fresco from Herculaneum in Naples (cf. \textit{The New Oxford History of Music} i pl. 12). A statue of Apollo in the Vatican (cf. Behn, \textit{op. cit., fig. 112}). See further Jan, \textit{Saiteninstrumente}, n. 47. (A thorough study of kithara-shapes from the fourth century onwards is much to be desired.)

\textsuperscript{55} Naples, Museo Nazionale, 80084 (Wegner, \textit{M. in B. fig. 70}).

\textsuperscript{54} Two lyres by the Meidias Painter—on a hydria in Florence (Devambez, \textit{op. cit.}, pl. 138) and on a pelike in New York (see n. 45)—might be interpreted as showing a forward curvature, but it seems more likely that they represent the same normal type as that shown in the Pronomos vase to the left of the poet.
and we know from our own experience what shape it is in three dimensions. When we see the back-view of a kithara, as on the breast-plate from Olympia,\(^{55}\) if the technique is purely linear, we cannot guess whether it is flat or vaulted. It comes, therefore, almost as a shock to see the great bulging sound-box shown in a profile view on a metope from Delphi.\(^{56}\) This is dated to the middle of the sixth century. It is not until much later that we find relatively plentiful evidence in reliefs, terracottas, and coins, which combine to give a consistent picture: a vault of moderate depth, a central spine curving over to a point (visible also on the front-view) in the middle of the top of the sound-box, a triangular base.

A good example is provided by a relief in the National Museum at Athens (1966), dated to the turn of the first century B.C.\(^{57}\) Apollo holds his kithara reversed. The triangular base is implied rather than seen, but the spine is well marked: the relief is highest at a point slightly below the apex, towards which the spine curves sharply over; from the spine the sound-box slopes smoothly away to left and right; there is a slight indication of depth at the edges. Terracottas vary greatly in the care with which the back of the kithara is represented, especially in front-views. A good example from the Louvre is MYR 636, where the kithara is held in the reverse position. The relief is shallow, but there is a distinct recession on both sides from a central spine, and the spine from near the apex towards the bottom.\(^{58}\) It may well be that the sculptors and mould-makers found it convenient to make the vault less prominent than it in fact was, but of this we cannot be sure. The examples so far given are Hellenistic, but the shape is taken back at least to c. 400 B.C. by the evidence of coins\(^{59}\) which show back-views of kitharas, with spine and triangular base. (The triangular base is seen on coins also in front-views, as on the Mantinea relief.) The vaulting is perhaps deeper in proportion than in the examples we have quoted, and its deepest point is considerably lower than the apex; otherwise the similarity is close. Good examples in the British Museum collection are: Lesbos Electrum 61–63 (322–24 Anson), of the late fifth or early fourth century; Methymna 12–13 (325–26 Anson), of the late fourth century; Methymna 10 (Guide, pl. 18.30), of c. 400; a coin of Tissaphernes (Guide, pl. 19.41), of c. 400. (It is salutory to observe that features which might otherwise be regarded as Hellenistic are dated back in this way.)

Appendix B

There is some evidence that a lute was discovered in corpore in an Attic tomb in the early nineteenth century, but it has apparently perished. (Magasin Encyclopédique, 1807, ii, 363 f.; Dilettanti Society, Unedited Antiquities of Attica, 4.)

In or shortly before the year 1806, Monsieur Fauvel, a French Consular official in Athens, discovered a tomb near Athens on the road to Eleusis. It contained a marble sarcophagus; in the sarcophagus was a wooden coffin with ivory embellishments, palmettes, etc., 'like those on the Erechtheum, but finer'; in the coffin was the skeleton of a woman wearing an olive wreath of gilt bronze. At her feet were a wooden comb and the remains of an instrument described variously as resembling a violin or a guitar of maple with sides of pine. The shape of the instrument was lost, but it was half an inch thick at the edges and at least a foot long.

There was also a pair of sandals; pieces of wood and bone an inch and a half long which fitted together; a vase and a plate of black glaze; and an iron strigil.

\(^{55}\) Wegner, *M. in B.* fig. 20.

\(^{56}\) Wegner, *Musikleben* pl. 3b; *M. in B.* fig. 31.

\(^{57}\) Some evidence for vaulting, and for triangular section (see below), in *Jan*, *Seiteninstrumente* n. 45.

\(^{58}\) Wegner, *M. in B.* fig. 29.

\(^{59}\) The same general shape can be discerned in the Herculaneum fresco (see n. 52), also a back-view.

\(^{59}\) For lyres and kitharas on coins, see L. Anson, *Numismata Graeca*, part vi, pls. 3–7. Examples will also be found in the British Museum *Guide to the Principal Coins of the Greeks.*
Can we date this tomb? The embellishments of the coffin can scarcely be before the late fifth century. It can probably be dated later still. In the fifth or the fourth century down to 330 a tomb as rich as this would almost certainly have contained figured pottery. Black glaze in a tomb of this nature suggests the third century or later. After the second century the pottery would probably have been red glaze. We are therefore left with a tentative date for the tomb, and therefore for the lute, in the third or second century B.C.\(^60\)

\[\text{British Museum, London.}\]
\[\text{King's College, London.}\]

\[\text{R. A. Higgins.}\]
\[\text{R. P. Winnington-Ingram.}\]

\(^60\) We wish to acknowledge with gratitude the help we have received from Dr E. K. Borthwick, Mme M. Duchesne-Guillemin, Mr G. K. Jenkins, Mme S. Mollard-Besques, Mr Michael Morrow, Miss B. Philippaki, Dr B. A. Sparkes, Professor A. D. Trendall, and Professor Max Wegner.
GREEK MOSAICS
(PLATES XVIII-XXII)

The curious art of mosaic had one period of splendour: the Byzantine empire; and that art was assuredly Greek. The Greek mosaics of my title, however, are the much more humdrum productions of an earlier age. In mosaic, even more than in other arts, it is hard to draw the line between Greek and Roman, but this provisional survey of early development hardly reaches a point where that comes in question. I am not concerned with Pompeii, and little with Delos, Pergamon or even Sicily; a trifle more with Alexandria; but primarily with the pebble-mosaics of the fourth century, though looking forward as well as back. The earliest pebble-mosaics are of a simple, decorative character; later they become much more pictorial and sophisticated. The later pieces are of the greatest interest to the art-historian, but may trouble the art-critic. Mosaic by its nature is essentially an art of decoration, and can only achieve real greatness in an aesthetic ambiance where purely decorative values are dominant, as they were in Byzantium; not in the Greco-Roman world, where, as in the Renaissance, half the artist's excitement comes from wrestling with the representation of nature.

Technically the pebble-mosaics of which I shall be speaking are all set in approximately the same way: a layer of coarse cement or plaster as a foundation, and above that one of finer quality into which the pebbles are pressed. Presumably the mosaicist, like the fresco-painter with his top coat of plaster, laid only so much of the fine layer at a time as he could adorn before it hardened; and as the fresco-painter normally worked down the wall, the mosaicist, I suppose, worked from one edge, moving backwards across the already hard surface of the coarse cement, laying the fine and setting the pebbles in it. In Renaissance fresco-painting the artist often drew a sinopia or outline of the composition on the under-plaster, to guide him as he painted the wet plaster with which he gradually covered it. Traces of such guides have been observed by the excavators under mosaic-floors at Pella. One would guess that it was normal practice, and that the mosaicist working on any but the very simplest pattern-design must also have followed a cartoon, but of what nature we have no idea.

This technique, pebbles set in plaster, does not in itself imply any decoration, and in fact plain pebble-floors of this kind are known, but the idea of making patterns with the pebbles goes back a long way. The American excavators of Gordion, the capital city of Phrygia, have unearthed pebble-patterned floors of the Achaemenian and Hellenistic periods, and also a much earlier one, in a large megaron of the eighth century B.C. The patterns there

This article is based on a lecture given to the Hellenic Society in March 1964. I have revised and corrected, but made no attempt to disguise the lecture-form, which seems suited to the tentative and provisional character of what I have to say. I have had help from many colleagues, and would like to mention in particular Dr Makaronas and Dr Petsas, who are most generous in allowing access to their excavations and finds at Pella, and supplied the photographs on pl. xx, 1 and 2. I had the great and most helpful privilege of being shown the excavations and finds by Dr Petsas and discussing them with him, and he has read this article in typescript and corrected some errors. I am most grateful to the late M. B. Cookson, Miss J. du Plat Taylor and Miss E. Macnamara for photographs of the Motya mosaic (pls. xix, 1 and 2; xxii, 3) and notes on it. I am also indebted for valuable references to Professor J. M. C. Toynbee and Mr E. Kerr Borthwick; and to the authorities of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, for the photograph of pl. xxii, 2, and permission to reproduce it. Pls. xviii, 1 and 2 are after AJA xxxvi pl. 4 and xxxviii pl. 28; pl. xxi, 1 and 2 after Brown, Ptolemaic Painting pl. 44.2; pls. xxi, 2 and xxxii, 1 from Museum postcards.

1 Olynthus viii 282 with fig. 29.
2 Petsas, in the forthcoming Proceedings of the 1963 Paris Congress (see below, n. 17.).
3 Plain floors: e.g. Athens, AA li (1936) 211 f., fig. 22.
4 Eighth-century floor: ILN 17/11/36, 859 fig. 11; AJA lxi (1957) 322, pl. 89 fig. 7. Achaemenian:
are a casual, disconnected agglomeration, as though the person or people laying the floor had made them up as they went along, not working to any overall design; and so I suppose it was: the first phase of the idea. At what date pebble-floors arranged in patterns first appear in Greece is a matter of uncertainty to which I shall return. There are examples from several cities; but it is best to begin with the only two considerable series of such floors that we have, and of those with the earlier and the only group defined by historical limits of date: those from Olynthus.

As a Greek city Olynthus dates from the Persian wars, but all the designed mosaic-floors there were found in the new town on the north hill, a finely planned extension of the small and rather poor place. It is evident that this new town was begun after Olynthus was made capital of a Chalcidian League, formed as an anti-Athenian measure under Macedonian influence in 432 B.C.; the whole city was destroyed in the same interest by Philip of Macedon in 348. After the destruction some areas of the ruined town may have harboured those familiar poltergeist of the archaeological scene, squatters; but there was certainly no serious reconstruction. One can safely believe that all the Olynthian mosaics of the new town were laid within those eighty-four years, which overlap the last quarter of the fifth century and the first half of the fourth; and these are almost the only fixed historical dates we have for any Greek pebble-mosaic.

The new town is a piece of careful planning, presumably on the lines recently laid down by Hippodamus of Miletus; and general use is made of a single regular house-plan, modified in various ways. In what seems the original form, most of the living-rooms lie at the north and look south through a colonnade—the pastas, after which this is known as the pastas-house—on to a courtyard whose southern wall is designed to contain the entrance. Wings flank the courtyard to east and west, and one of these often consists of a small anteroom and the dining-room, the andron, though this room or suite is sometimes placed elsewhere in the house. The andron has a broad plaster surround on which the couches stood, raised an inch or two above the centre level; and it is this central area of the andron which is most often adorned with a patterned or figured pebble-mosaic. That this type of house, which is often modified and is paralleled elsewhere, existed before it was used in the new town at Olynthus seems clear, but the decoration of the andron-floor is not a necessary feature of it. It does not appear in the great majority of the Olynthian houses; and it may have been a fashion that only came in after the first phase of building there.

Fifteen decorative or figured pebble-mosaics were found in the new town at Olynthus, eight in andrones, one in an ante-room, two in another pair of rooms linked like anteroom and andron, one in a pastas and three in courtyards. Two of the courtyards had the patterns in concentric bands round the altar which, dedicated to Zeus Herkeios, was the centre of any Greek house-court. The other had a scatter of casual patterns reminiscent, in principle though not in detail, of the much earlier floor from Gordion. Another different kind of casual design is found in the one example of a mosaic floor from the old town: a cross in a circle, set in an otherwise plain floor beside the mouth of a cistern, in a room of what appears to have been a public building. The same design, likewise set off-centre, occurs on the otherwise plain floor of an anteroom to an andron with very simple geometric decoration in a house excavated at Athens many years ago and recently uncovered again. It has been thought to date from the fifth century, as that at Olynthus probably does.

These, however, are scarcely part of the tradition we are concerned with. It is with the series of andron-floors from the new town that the history of designed mosaic seems to begin.

ibid. lviii (1954) 150. Hellenistic: ibid. lx (1956) 250, pl. 81 fig. 2.

5 Olynthus viii, The Hellenic House, passim; especially 141–51 with fig. 5.

6 List of mosaics from Olynthus: ibid, 290.

7 AJA xxxviii (1934) 510, pl. 31.

8 Olynthus ii 25f., fig. 59.

9 AM xix (1894) 508. It lies on the south-west of the Areopagus, and has now been cleared by the American excavators of the Agora.
Many of these also show only patterns, and the cross-in-circle or wheel probably a good-luck device, recurs, but as the centre of an overall, preconceived design. One of the smallest and simplest is in a free-standing house—most are in blocks—of not quite normal plan, which goes by the name of The House of the Comedian. This also has a mosaic round the altar in the court (Plate XVIII 1), in one register of which is found figure-work, simply and inexpertly composed: palmettes in three corners, the fourth omitted to make room for another figure, and the casual extension of the boundary-lines are naïve features. The house contained a hoard of fifth-century coins, and it is possible that the building is of that date and that the mosaic goes with it and stands at the beginning of the series.10 There are architectural features which link the house to a certainly later one, the Villa of Good Fortune, to which I shall return, but these may be due to the fact that both are large free-standing buildings, not part of the more usual blocks. Among the decorative bands is one of wave-pattern, which remains a regular feature of mosaic. The other court-mosaic from Olynthus consists likewise of concentric bands of pattern with one of figures—a battle of Greeks and centaurs; better, but very ruined.11

Other andrones have more elaborate pattern-decoration, some with animals in the entry-panel—a gap in the plaster surround, leading to the door, over which the mosaic of the centre is normally extended. One has also double sphinxes in the main border-frieze, a rather rare motive.12 It has been suggested, probably rightly, that these mosaicists were influenced by textile-designs. With the figured mythological scenes, however, one seems to detect another influence also. In one, Bellerophon on Pegasus attacks the Chimaera, while in the entry-panel a griffin pulls down a stag.13 Both motives are found in fourth-century vase-painting, and the character of the design—light figures on a dark ground and purely linear drawing—suggests that of red-figure vases, which may well have been one of the inspirations of this art. The preying griffin reappears in pebble-mosaics from other sites.

This is the only andron-floor from a house of normal plan which bears a mythological scene. The one parata-mosaic, a ruin, has a long frieze of animals and another, within a patterned border, of Nereids riding sea-monsters,14 a favourite theme in late fifth and fourth-century vase-painting. Commonly they carry armour, and are companions of Thetis bringing her son his god-made panoply as she does in the Iliad; and this scene is found, with Achilles and Thetis named, in a room of the largest and most elaborately floored house found at Olynthus, the Villa of Good Fortune.15 This is on an abnormal plan and lies away from the main residential area, not in a block but on its own, like the smaller but similar House of the Comedian in the same neighbourhood. The Nereid-scene, which is surrounded by three pattern-bands almost identical with those of the Bellerophon floor, adorned the anteroom to the andron, which itself bore an elaborate figure-design. They are shown together in situ in Plate XVIII 2. On the entry-panel (which covers the threshold and joins the ante-room floor), within an ivy-leaf border, is a pair of Pans confronted over a vessel whose form shows that this must be well on in the fourth century. The main design shows

11 A. vi. 3: Olynthus v 7, pls. iv A, 13 B; AJA xxxvi (1932) 19 fig. 1.
12 A i: Olynthus ii 42, figs. 120, 123. A. vi. 4 (animals in entry-panel): ibid. v 7–9, fig. 1, pls. v, 14 A; AJA xxxvi (1932) 19, fig. 2. A. vi. 6: Olynthus v 9, pl. 14 B; AJA xxxvi (1932) 21, fig. 3. A. vi. 8: Olynthus v 9 f., pl. 16 A. B. v. 1 (double sphinxes): ibid. 10 f., pls. vi, 15.
13 A. vi. 3: ibid. v 4ff., pls. i, iii, 12, 13 A; AJA xxxvi (1932), pls. 1, 2.
14 A. vi. i: Olynthus ii 80 ff., fig. 203; v 2ff., pls. ii and 2.
15 Olynthus v. 55–67, frontispiece and pls. 14–16 (mosaics of andron and anteroom in situ), 84–6. Mosaics: andron: AJA xxxviii (1934) 50ff., fig. 3 and pl. 29; anteroom: ibid., 50ff, pl. 30; 'room f' and anteroom: ibid. 503–6, fig. 2.
Dionysus in a car drawn by two leopards, an Eros flying above, a Pan dancing in front, surrounded by a narrow ivy-band outside which a cortège of satyrs and maenads takes the place of the innermost pattern-frame. The leopard or panther-car for the god, like the Pans to accompany him, is a motive which though known before, only becomes popular in the fourth century, especially on vases.16

This room is defined as the andron by the plaster surround for the couches; but one of several exceptional features in the house-plan is the existence of a second pair of rooms, one opening out of the other, without this feature but with mosaic floors, decorated with simple patterns (the wheel again) and inscriptions in praise of good fortune (‘Αγαθή τούχη and Εὔρυχα) and Aphrodite. The significance of the inscriptions and the purpose of the room are not clear.

In plan this building is evidently a derivative of the normal pastas-house, and perhaps shows how that type developed into a form common in Greece later: the peristyle house, centred on a court with a colonnade all round, not just on the north side. The second-century tessera-mosaics from Delos are in such houses; and it is in a palatial variant of the peristyle type that is found the one other series of pebble-floors comparable to that from Olynthus, likewise from Northern Greece: from the Macedonian capital of Pella.17 The dating of these is not established by such firm historical limitations as those so conveniently provided at Olynthus. The technique is more advanced than that employed in the Chalcidian city, and the style manifestly later. Architectural features of one of the buildings in which they occur have been thought to point to a date in the last quarter of the fourth century, and stylistic comparisons for some elements in the mosaics themselves are in harmony with this; but to the difficult question of absolute dating I shall return. The Pella excavation is still in progress and unpublished, though excellent preliminary reports have appeared.

The figured floors at Pella show basically the same decorative scheme as that employed at Olynthus: the figures in light-coloured stones (mainly greyish-white and yellow-brown) standing out against the dark and relatively undifferentiated background. At Olynthus a purple-red and a green are also used in pattern-floors; in the figure-scenes at Pella the differentiation of colours is more pictorial, and a brick-red is used for details; but in both the general effect is much like that of red-figure vase-painting, modified by the very different technique. In even the most loosely painted red-figure, the line dividing reserved figures from black ground is sharp. The necessary pointillisme of pebble-mosaic blurs this precision; but while at Olynthus, though the pebbles are selected within quite a narrow range of size, little further care seems to have been spent on their matching and arrangement, at Pella they are tightly packed, concealing the plaster more completely, in a way that could only be achieved by a careful grading and matching. Smaller units are used for areas of more detailed drawing, and this leads to a kind of modelling with the pebbles. The technique is beginning to develop a style of its own; and this characteristic—the definition of forms by lines and groups of graded stones—has a future in tessera-mosaic. Moreover, in some cases parts of the contour are emphasized by leaden threads, used also for inner markings. This usage has a marked resemblance to that of the relief-line in red-figure, likewise employed for the principal inner divisions and to contour parts of the figures. I have been guilty of referring to these threads as of bronze.18 Since bronze would need to have been cast first in the

---

16 Metzger, Représentations 136–9, nos. 57 f.
18 Greek Painting, 170.
required forms, its use for contours would imply a very precise cartoon to be rigidly followed by the floor-layer, while the malleable lead gives no such definite indication.

The technical character of the Olynthus mosaics is clearly seen in the publications.\textsuperscript{19} I illustrate (Plates XIX 1, 2; XXII 3) some details from a less well-published floor at Motya,\textsuperscript{20} the Carthaginian city at the western tip of Sicily. It decorated a colonnade on two sides of the court of a house which appears to have been destroyed when the Greeks of Syracuse, under Dionysius I, sacked the place in 398/7 B.C. It has been suggested that the house was then unfinished.\textsuperscript{21} In any case, from the style of the lotus and palmette border, the floor cannot have been laid very long before; so that it must be approximately contemporary with some of the Olynthian mosaics, which it resembles in technique.

The new technical features described bring the mosaics of Pella closer to red-figure vase-painting than those of Olynthus and Motya; but in most cases they are accompanied by others which remove them farther: the more pictorial polychromy, and other things perhaps more significant. The ‘modelling’ by graded stones is accompanied by some (though very discreet) use of true modelling by shading; and equally discreet but definite suggestion of a spatial setting. At Olynthus the dark ground reaches, in all cases, from top to bottom of the field, like the black background of a vase. In most of the examples from Pella it stops in an irregular line a few inches from the bottom of the scene, giving place to a lighter, variegated area indicating the ground on which the figures stand or move. The first attempts to suggest pictorial space had been made long before; but the definition of a clearly defined three-dimensional stage for the action of the figures by a sharply foreshortened flat ground-space seems, like the use of shading, to show mosaicists moving away from the ambience of textiles and vase-painting and nearer to that of the wall and easel-painter.

I spoke of a ‘series’ of mosaics from Pella comparable to that from Olynthus; and there are indeed to date five big floors and two thresholds with fine figured decoration as well as several with only patterns. All the figure-pieces, however, come from only two buildings: the one already mentioned as having architectural features that suggest the late fourth century, and another very similar. These have been thought, from their size and elaboration, to have been something more than private houses: public buildings, perhaps, or official residences; but this is so far conjecture. They are known, from the order in which they were found, as Building I (that for which a date has been suggested on architectural grounds) and Building II (5 on the plan, Archaeology, xvii (1964) 76) which cannot be far removed from the other in time.

Building I is about 160 feet wide by over 300 long from north to south (one end is cut by the modern road). It has two colonnaded courts. The figured mosaics found in this building were in two andrones lying to the west of the courts: one, which I shall discuss later, reached (across a figured threshold) from an anteroom between the courts, the other immediately to the south of the first and reached (again across a figured threshold) through an anteroom to the west of the southern court. Both anterooms have patterned floors.\textsuperscript{22} To begin with the southern suite: on the threshold between anteroom and andron was a panel of a griffin pulling down a stag; and in the centre of the andron floor a large group of Dionysus riding a leopard.\textsuperscript{23} (Plate XX 1). This, the first of the series to be discovered and still, it seems to me, the most beautiful, remains by some chance the least well illustrated. The design

\textsuperscript{19} See particularly the photographs illustrating two articles by Robinson in AJA xxxvi (1932) 16–24, pls. 1–4; xxxviii (1934) 501–10, pls. 28–31.

\textsuperscript{20} Whitaker, Motya, 194–202, figs. 24, A and B. See also below, p. 84.

\textsuperscript{21} K. Ziegle in RE xvi, 403 s.v., ‘Motya’.

\textsuperscript{22} Visible in the photograph Archaeology xi (1964) 77, which gives the layout. Cf. the plan, ibid. 76, and photographs ibid. 83 and Archaeology xi (1958) 248, top; BCH lxxxvi (1962) 813, fig. 27; SMA 14: Pella, fig. 1. See also the forthcoming Proceedings of the 1963 Paris Congress (n. 17 above).

\textsuperscript{23} B on plan in Archaeology xvii (1964) 76. Arch. Delt. 1960 pls. 40 a, c (details), 41–2; BCH lxxxii (1958) pl. 52, top; details, ibid. 763, figs. 14 f.; Archaeology xi (1958) figs. on pp. 252–3 (top); ibid. xvii (1964) 76, fig. 7 (detail of underside); SMA 14: Pella, fig. 3; ILN, l.c., 199 figs. 13–15.
differs from the others at Pella in having no indication of ground. This absence of an indicated depth is accompanied by an avoidance of foreshortening and a calligraphic purity of contour which all work in the same sense. The technique, however, is fully developed, with close setting of graded stones and much use of leaden thread for details and contours. The result is the most 'red-figure' of all mosaics—the effect is really very like that of the finest fourth-century vase-drawing. The shadow of the beast's neck is shown cast on the arm of the rider, yet there is no modelling by shading though such modelling had certainly long been practised by Greek painters, probably before they indicated cast shadows. Its absence here, and the presence of the shadow, are a matter of what the mosaicist felt appropriate to his technique, not of how far illusionism had advanced in contemporary painting.

The threshold-picture resembles the similar scene from Olynthus but is of far finer quality, sharing with the main picture the use of close-set, graded stones, but not of leaden threads; and the main floor has other technical refinements which are unique. The god's eye has been removed, and was presumably a precious or semiprecious stone. This has parallels in other Pella floors, but there the treatment of the foliage in the hair has none. Here, instead of pebbles, are small beads, of a material not yet certainly identified, on which a green colour had been applied; and the thyrsus-end was the same. There were also (besides the leaden threads defining the shoulder-curls) terracotta curls in the hair—these made in the given shape beforehand, but since they do not define a contour they do not necessarily imply undeviating reproduction of a cartoon; though it seems safe to assume that a floor like this could not have been made without a fairly precise one. In these, as in all the Pella mosaics, the background is a blue-black, the main body of the figures white, with details in grey-blue and brown-yellow and a discreet use of brick-red.

The idea of mounting the god on a panther or panth is rare on Attic vases of around 400 B.C., and there is a scatter of examples through the following century, astride or as here saddle. Some are very like this, though the god is generally more fully clad. Always he is beardless, as normally at this time, but here he seems to me a peculiarly Apolline Dionysus, though I cannot lay my finger on what makes him so.

The griffins of this threshold and the Olynthian one, popular in early archaic art, become rather rare in late archaic and early classical but return to favour in the fourth century. They are frequent, generally fighting Arimasps, on Attic vases of that time, especially in one group which seems to have been produced during the second and third quarters.

The other threshold-picture in this house, to the Northern andron, shows the same technical character (except that leaden threads are used, as in the main pictures) but is more severely damaged. It shows a centaur and centaress facing each other. Centauresse are extremely rare in Greek art. Another fourth-century example is on a relief-panel decorating a black-glazed Campanian vase, and is no doubt a direct reproduction of Greek metal-work. There the centaress, who accompanies a young satyr, carries a drinking-vessel in either hand—an unusual motive, perhaps suggesting that she is a ministrant taking them round to the drinkers. The one on the mosaic was probably similarly conceived, as Mr Petras points out to me: the centaur drinks from a bowl, and she perhaps held a jug; but the damage makes the interpretation not quite certain. On an early archaic relief-pithos Medusa is shown as

24 Arch. Delt. 1960, pl. 47, bottom; BCH lxxxii (1958) pl. 52, bottom; Archaeology xi (1958), fig. on p. 251; ibid xvi (1964) 78, fig. 5 (detail); Balkan Studies i pl. 6. ILN, l.c., 199 fig. 16.
25 A chemical analysis of the material of the beads will appear in the Proceedings of the 1963 Paris Congress.
26 Metzger, l.c., nos. 50–6.
27 ARV 1462–71, Group G; and many examples in other groups.
28 Arch. Delt. 1960, pl. 47, top; detail of male centaur: Archaeology xvii (1964) 78 fig. 6.
29 Schroeder, Griechische Bronzerinner 9 fig. 5, and 10 no. 5; Beazley, EVP 251 no 4. Mr Shefton very kindly sent me photographs of a replica recently acquired by Newcastle.
30 Louvre, Encyclopédie Photographique 22, 56f.
a centaureass but the first of which we have knowledge in classical art is that painted by Zeuxis around the turn of the fifth and fourth centuries (and regarded as an innovation) in his famous picture of a centaur-family. Since we are told that Zeuxis worked for Archelaus of Macedon, who first established the capital at Pella, decorating his palace and painting him a Pan, we may guess at his influence here, though we do not know where or for whom the centaur-family was painted.  

The floor of the room behind the centaur-threshold shows a lion-hunt within a complex floral border. This is closely connected with a stag-hunt, the finest and best-preserved of the mosaics from the other building, and I shall discuss them together; but it is more convenient first to speak of the other two figured mosaics in Building II (5 on the plan, *Archaeology* xvii (1964) 76).

One, the smallest and poorest of the Pella floors, shows a combat of Amazons and a Greek.  

It has certain old-fashioned features which link it to Olyanthus; but not entirely the same features which make the Dionysus-floor of Building I seem also in a way old-fashioned. It shares with all the other room-floors from Pella except the Dionysus the stageground; and with the other mosaics from Building II a greater use of modelling by shading and a more elaborate grading of the stones in size. What gives it a rather old-fashioned look is partly the rather simple composition, all in one plane, which it shares with the Dionysus-floor; partly a coarseness, exaggerated by the bad condition but certainly present in the work; partly the character of the border.  

The Dionysus is unique at Pella in being framed only by a narrow band of white pebbles, in keeping with the fine simplicity of the whole. The largest and most elaborate of all these floors, of which I shall speak in a moment, has a maeander-frame, within a broad border of light and dark scale-pattern, equally unparalleled at present. The two hunting-scenes have floral frames of an elaborate and particular kind which I shall be discussing. Only round the Amazonomachy, the concentric pattern-borders and the mixture in the main one of palmettes and animals directly recall the usage at Olyanthus (plate XVIII 1). These mixed floral-animal borders are the precursors of the beautiful 'peopled scrolls' so popular in Roman architectural ornament, which have been studied by Professor J. M. C. Toynbee and Mr J. B. Ward Perkins, but the florals are not linked in a scroll. The floral borders of the hunt-pictures are scrolls, but unpeopled. The combination comes a little later.  

The inner border here is a cable: the first appearance in mosaic of a motif which has a long future in the tessellated floors of the Roman empire. The Amazonomachy is a favourite subject in Greek art from the archaic period; and this type of composition—adversary and protector meeting over a fallen figure—is also very old. In a form not much different from this it makes a leitmotiv in the design of the Amazon-battle on the Mausoleum frieze of the mid fourth century; but here the group is more static and the figures more heavily clad.

From the same building comes the largest and perhaps the most elaborately careful of all the pebble-mosaic we have. The Amazonomachy and the stag-hunt were both the

---

31 Zeuxis' centaur-family: Lucian, *Zeuxis* 3 (Overbeck, *Schriftenquellen* 1663). His sojourn with Archelaus Pliny *NH* xxxv 62 (Overbeck 1662, the Pan); *Aelian VH* xiv 17 (Overbeck 1654, the palace-decorations). See Rumpf MZ 126ff. Clairmont's assertion (*Yale Classical Studies* xv (1957) 175) that Zeuxis spent more than a decade at Archelaus's court is due to a misreading of Rumpf, i.e., where the dates (413–399) are those of Archelaus's reign. Within those limits we know nothing of the date or duration of the painter's visit.

32 I on the plan, *Archaeology* xvii (1964) 76. BCH lxxxvi (1962) 811, fig. 25 (without border), 812 fig. 26 (with border); *Arch. Delt.* 1961/2, pls. 246–50, 243, bottom; *Archaeology*, Lc., 80, fig. 10 (with border); also in colour (picture with part of border and one detail) in a calendar for 1963 issued by the Ionian Bank of Greece. SMA 14: Pella fig. 6 (with border);

33 *PBSR* xviii (1950), 1–43, 'Peopled Scrolls, A Hellenistic Motif in Imperial Art'.

34 See below, p. 88, n. 84.

35 γ on plan, *Archaeology* xvii (1964) 76. BCH lxxxvi (1962) folding plate 25–6 (without border); *Arch. Delt.* 1961/2, pls. 241–3 (top); *Archaeology*, Lc., 80, fig. 8 (with inner frame); SMA 14: Pella, fig. 4 (with part of border); *Balkan Studies* 4 (1963) pl. 14 (with inner frame). Two details in colour: Ionian Bank calendar, 1963 (see n. 32).
centre-pieces of andrones, with the normal raised plaster surround. Here, the broad pattern-
border reached the walls of the very large room, much longer than its breadth. The picture
alone, without the border, is more than twenty-five feet long and about eighteen wide. The
condition is bad, worse even than that of the Amazon-floor, though the technical
character is identical the quality of the work is far higher.

The subject is the abduction of Helen by Theseus, the names inscribed above the figures:
an ancient practice in vase-painting and wall-painting alike and used in mosaic already at
Olynthus. The central group is a ruin, but the equipage conducted by Phorbas, which the
hero is about to mount with his protesting burden, and at the other end the distressed duenna,
are in less bad condition. Helen is shown as a child, since this was her first adventure.
She was lifted from her father's house before her marriage to Menelaus, and was subsequently
rescued by her brothers. The group resembles an earlier one, on the sculptured frieze of
the Heroon at Gjölbaschi-Trysa, where a warrior makes off with a child of uncertain sex
wearing a Phrygian cap. Achilles and Troilus? On the mosaic Helen's companion is
named also. The inscription is slightly damaged, but can only have read Deianira. I have
searched in vain for any suggestion that Herakles' luckless wife could ever have formed part
of Tyndareus' household at Sparta. This must be another Deianira; or rather the artist, or
some earlier artist or writer whose work he is following wanted a name for Helen's com-
panion and picked on this one. A name with such positive associations is slightly surprising,
but I think I know why it was chosen.

Another of Theseus' adventures is represented in art more commonly than this and in
formally very similar terms: his abduction from Themiscyra of the Amazon queen Antiope.
In pictures of that too a chariot waits, driver in readiness, and the hero moves towards it or
steps into it, the girl in his arms. Antiope too has companions, but being Amazons they put
up more resistance. Amazons are often given names suitable to their nature. Deianira as
the name of Herakles' wife was interpreted 'husband-destroyer', but 'man-destroyer' would
be as good. I cannot find a case of Deianira actually used as an Amazon's name, but
Antianira occurs on a late fifth-century vase, Andromadia a century earlier, and very
common is Andromache, which one would have thought as sacred to Hector's wife as
Deianira to Herakles'. Antianira is shown fighting Theseus, and so more than once is
Andromache. antainevrou is used by Homer as a common adjective to describe Amazons;
and Mr Kerr Borthwick points out to me that Eustathius in his commentary on Homer
glosses it in the two passages where it occurs with δηνανεραί. I suspect that the name Deia-
nira has at some stage been transferred from a picture of the abduction of Antiope to one of
the abduction of Helen; and this is perhaps confirmed by the charioteer's name, Phorbas.
The Helen story was one in which Theseus and Pirithous were closely linked. They agreed
each to help the other carry off a daughter of Zeus; and when Pirithous, with an insolence
worthy of his father Ixion, chose Persephone, Theseus stuck to his bargain and accompanied
him on the disastrous expedition to the Underworld. Before that he had himself chosen
Helen; and in some of the not very frequent pictures of the attempt, Theseus' companion,
sometimes holding the chariot ready, is named, as one would expect, Pirithous. Only in

36 Benndorf and Niemann Das Heroon von Gjölbaschi-
Trysa pl. 22; Eichler Die Reliefs des Heroon von Gjöl-
baschi-Trysa pl. 10.
38 Androdamia: Bothmer, l.c., 125 no. 10 (ab-
duction of Antiope). Antianira: ibid., 162 no. 16.
Andromache: ibid., ff. nos. 1, 3, 8, 11, 25; 48 no.
166; 57 no. 179 bis (on all these fighting Herakles);
101 no. 112; 131ff. nos. 3, 8, 9 (on all fighting Herakles);
150 no. 38; 161ff. nos. 4, 12 (in battle against Theseus
and his companions); 186 no. 100 (fighting Theseus);
203 no. 161.
39 Γ 189 and Z 186. Eustathius's comments run:
403. 14: antainewrai de ἀρμακίνων ἁν τοῦ ἐξασσομένων
πρὸς ἄνδρας ὡς ὅλην ἰσόνηρον ή ἐναντιούμεναι ἄνδραις
καὶ ὡς ὅ τις ἀστέλει ἐχει δηνανεραί. 632. 54:
antainewrai de ἀρμακίνων ὡς καὶ προσαρτημένῃ ἐνα
ντιούμεναι ἄνδραις καὶ ὡς εἰτείν δηνανεραί ἐξει
σομέναις ἀμφότερα τὰ ἐν πόλεμον καὶ ὡς εἰτείν
ἰσοχρόνοι, ὅποιον τι δηλοῖ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἀντώνορος δώμα.
40 Ghali-Kahil, Enlèvements et Retours d'Hélène 305–
12, pls. 100–4 and p. 313 figs. 2–3.
this mosaic is Phorbas named in this connection; but we are told that Phercydes said that Phorbas was Theseus' charioteer and his helper in carrying off the Amazon.\textsuperscript{41} In one vase-picture of the abduction he is named, not indeed as the charioteer but as a companion of Theseus alongside Pirithous, who is named in two others also; and on one vase on which Theseus fights Andromache, Phorbas is shown fighting an Amazon Alexandre, another name susceptible of the same kind of interpretation.\textsuperscript{42}

This is a small point to labour at such length; but the repetition and interaction of a few established types, whether of figure or design, is a very marked and significant feature of Greek art which this illustrates rather clearly. I do not suppose the mosaicist was responsible for the transfer. This work, more than any other pebble-mosaic, has the air of being influenced by painting. The dark ground and the frieze-like composition whether or not they were found in wall-painting, are part of the mosaic tradition. The three-quarter chariot and team had long been a feature of painting, vase-painting and relief; but one need only compare the schematic rendering of the pards-car on the Olynthus floor to see how much more pictorial the Pella one is. It is in the chiaroscuro, however, that pictorial influence shows most clearly. The drawing is still predominantly linear, but emphasised by shading, on the bodies of humans and horses and most remarkably on Deianira's drapery—a very striking attempt to render the play of light and shade in the movement of wind-blown stuff. It is also notable that it is used on Deianira's skin. The ancient artistic convention distinguishing bronzed men from blanched women, which finds its extremest expression in the black and white of sixth-century vase-painting, is suppressed in red-figure, but is shown still alive when, in the late fifth century, experiments with shading begin. Shading is at first used on inanimate objects and the skin of men, not on women's skin. Rumpf, following a hint in Pliny, has shown the likelihood that it was Nikias of Athens, colleague of the sculptor Praxiteles in the middle or later fourth century, who first abandoned this distinction.\textsuperscript{43} This feature, and the naturalistic drapery-treatment, combine to suggest a pictorial model in the later part of the fourth century for the figure of Deianira.

I have spoken of this as the most careful and elaborate of the Pella floors as well as the most pictorial. It is also to my eyes the least pleasing. It does not, I think, suit the technique to be as pictorial as this, and there is something vapid and exaggerated in the figures; though if we had more of Theseus and Helen and less of Deianira, it might be more attractive.

The other two figured mosaic floors from Pella, one from each building, show hunting-scenes of very similar composition framed in floral borders of similar character. In the northern andron of Building I, across the threshold with the centaur-group, was a lion-hunt.\textsuperscript{44} This is a rare subject in Greek art, occurring in the seventh century under the influence of oriental works of art,\textsuperscript{45} and again when Alexander had conquered the East and emulated its monarchs by hunting the king of beasts himself. There was a celebrated bronze group at Delphi, the work of Lysippus and Leocares, in which its dedicator Craterus was shown coming to the aid of Alexander at grips with a lion.\textsuperscript{46} It has been suggested that the

\textsuperscript{41} Phercydes ap. Schol. Pind. Nem. v 89.

\textsuperscript{42} Present at the abduction: Bothmer, l.c., 124, no. 7, pl. 68, 4. Fighting Alexandre: kantharos, London E. 157, CVA iii 1 pls. 34-2; 35-1; Bothmer, l.c., 186 no. 100.

\textsuperscript{43} JHS lxvii (1947) 15; MZ 145. The Pliny reference is NH xxxv 130 (Overbeck 1823).

\textsuperscript{44} C on plan in Archaeology xvii (1964) 76; Arch. Delt. 1960, pls. 43-6; Archaeology xi (1958) fig. on p. 253 below (in situ, showing border); BCH lxxxi (1958) 764 fig. 16 (as found, but not showing border); ibid. lxxxi (1959) 705 fig. 23 (without border); the same

\textsuperscript{45} SMA 14: Pella, fig. 2; Robertson, Greek Painting 169 (colour, without border), 166 (colour detail); the same in Balkan Studies, l.c. pls. 7 and 8. Details: Archaeology xvii (1964) 78 fig. 4; ILN, l.c. 199, fig. 18; Enciclopedia dell'Arte antica V 209, fig. 295 and colour plate.

\textsuperscript{46} The finest example is on the Chiigi vase: Robertson, Greek Painting 49; Johansen, Les Vasos Sicomienos pl. 40. Earlier Protocorinthian renderings: ibid. pls. 23-1; 24-1; 29-2. See Johansen, ibid. 149; Payne, NC 116 n.9 (one Corinthian example of the end of the seventh century, ibid., pl. 24-4).

\textsuperscript{46} Plutarch Alex. M. 40 (Overbeck 1491; cf. 1490).
representations of lion-hunts which survive from the late fourth century were inspired by this group, but they may rather be parallel manifestations.

A group on one end of the Alexander Sarcophagus from Sidon has points in common with our mosaic.\textsuperscript{47} This tour-de-force of Greek painted relief-sculpture was almost certainly made for the last king of Sidon, Abdalonymus, who was put on the throne by Alexander, probably in 332 B.C. when he captured the city. We do not know how long Abdalonymus lived, but some of the reliefs on the sarcophagus have been convincingly argued to illustrate the wars of the Successors, and it must almost certainly be dated somewhere in the last twenty years of the century, or possibly in the very early third. One of the long sides is likewise given to hunting-scenes, but there the lion-hunters are on horseback. One of them is certainly Alexander himself, and the composition is often thought to reflect that of the bronze group at Delphi; but Plutarch in his description of that, though he mentions dogs as well as the lion, Craterus and Alexander, has no reference to horses, and it may well have been more like the mosaic, with its two Greeks on foot pitted against a lion; but I feel no assurance that there is any direct relation. On a much damaged relief from Messene in the Louvre, a lion strikingly like that of the mosaic in reverse is shown between a man on foot with a dog and another (Alexander?) on horseback.\textsuperscript{48} The other long side of the sarcophagus shows Alexander in battle, in an action so reminiscent of the Alexander Mosaic from Pompeii\textsuperscript{49} that one thinks the sculptor may have known the painting from which that was copied. He was certainly au fait with contemporary developments in painting, since not only is the whole elaborately and subtly coloured, but such purely pictorial devices are used as high-lights in the eyes.\textsuperscript{50} It may be that paintings rather than the bronze group inspired the resemblances between the reliefs and the mosaics.

Closer than any resemblances between the lion-hunts of the mosaic and the sarcophagus are those between the stag-hunt which is combined with the lion-hunt on the long side of the sarcophagus and that which forms the subject of the other andron-floor from Building II at Pella (Plate XX 2).\textsuperscript{51} There are substantial differences: the stag on the sarcophagus is bigger in proportion to the men and moves in the opposite direction; both hunters in the mosaic are naked but for cloaks, in the Greek tradition of heroic representation, whereas one on the sarcophagus wears Persian costume; but the action and postures of the three figures are sufficiently alike in the two to suggest the possibility of some common inspiration.

The two hunt-mosaics are very similar compositions, and both show the calligraphic device of flying cloaks which recall the combats of the Mausoleum frieze; but on the stag-hunt the modelling of the figures (which are over life-size) is more pictorial—by shading as in the Theseus floor. It is more discreetly used, however, as is the foreshortening and overlapping. The designer seems altogether more concerned to respect the limitations of his medium, and he has produced, I think, a happy compromise. After the Dionysus on the panther, this seems to me the finest of the Pella mosaics. It is also the first mosaic we have whose artist has signed it: \textit{ΙΩΝΗΣ ΕΠΙΟΝΟΣ.} We have signatures of third- and second-century Greek tessera-mosaicists, normally in the form \textit{ἐποίησις},\textsuperscript{52} which seems perhaps more suitable to the laborious technique, but both forms are used by sculptors and other artists without obvious reasons for the distinction.

\textsuperscript{47} F. Winter Der Alexandersarkophag (1912); \textit{KiB} 336f.; Bieber, \textit{Hellenistic Sculpture} 72f.; Richter, \textit{Sculp ture and Sculptors} figs. 176, 399f., 748. Possible relation to Delphi group, Bieber, Lc., 73.

\textsuperscript{48} Winter, \textit{KiB} 334-8.

\textsuperscript{49} Most recently, Andreae, \textit{Das Alexandermosaik (Opus Nobile) xiv, 1959} and Rumpf in \textit{AM} 187vii (1962) 229-41.

\textsuperscript{50} Reuterswérd, \textit{Polychronie} 61 (pl. 9).

\textsuperscript{51} A plan in \textit{Archaeology} xix (1964) 76. \textit{BCH} lxxvi (1962) pls. 27 (with border) and 28 (without), 810 fig. 24 (detail); \textit{Arch. Delt.} Lc. pls. 244-7; \textit{Archaeology} 17 (1964) 81 fig. 9 (with border and lozenge entrance panel), the same, \textit{SMA} 14: Pella fig. 5; \textit{Balkan Studies} 4 (1963) pl. 13 (with border). Coloured pictures of the whole (with and without border) and a detail: Ionian Bank calendar 1963 (see above n. 32).

\textsuperscript{52} See below p. 88.
The more pictorial character, with modelling by shading and by elaborately graded and grouped stones, is a feature of all the floors in Building II: Amazons, Theseus and stag-hunt; and sets them off from those in the other building. The excavators believe that the mosaics of Building II are later, and it may well be so; especially as one floor in this building (the Theseus) is clearly the most advanced of all in this respect, one in the other (the Dionysus) the most old-fashioned. Technically, however, there is another distinction which points the other way. Pebbles only are used in all the figured floors of Building II: the sharp linear definitions are single lines of black stones. In both the andron-floors of Building I and in the Centaur but not the griffin-threshold—in all floors of the building, that is, which show human or partly human figures—these lines are leaden threads; and in the Dionysus yet other materials are introduced. This looks like a dissatisfaction with pebbles as sole medium which might have led on to the development of tessera-mosaic; and in fact leaden threads are a regular feature of early tessellated floors. I would conclude that two ateliers were at work, one employed on each building, each with its own lines of development; and that no chronological relation can be postulated between them on technical and stylistic grounds. Study of the architectural character of the buildings may make it possible to establish a priority.

The scroll-border of the stag-hunt (within a wave-pattern) is one of the prettiest pieces of pebble-mosaic that we have (PLATE XX 2). That of the lion-hunt, which is in ruinous condition, was similar but simpler and less fine. Within the scroll there, is a narrow frame of bead-and-reel, illusionistically shaded to look like carved architectural ornament. Around the stag-hunt the scroll consists of two plant-forms, growing from opposite corners and each dividing at once into two branches which meet the branches of the other plant at the other two corners. They spring from sheaths of serrated leaves, the acanthus which is such a constant feature of Greek ornament from the late fifth century on, and such leaves appear again throughout the design; but these are not acanthus-plants. They proliferate into spiralling tendrils like those of the vine, and bear a wonderful variety of flowers—star and coronal and bell—and the final leafage of the meeting fronds crisps into the semblance of a conventional palmette. This is shamelessly unnatural history, but none the worse for that. I find it a ravishing piece of decoration.

One feature which helps to give this pattern its particular character (and is found also in the frame of the lion-hunt) is the three-dimensional spiralling of the tendrils—pictorial development beautifully adapted to a decorative purpose. We have met nothing comparable to this illusionistic scroll-work so far in mosaic; but, as Dr Petas has observed,\(^\text{58}\) it can be very closely paralleled in vase-painting: on the necks of the big Apulian volute-kraters and neck-amphorae, made no doubt in Tarentum and databl with some assurance to the second half of the fourth century, mainly perhaps the third quarter. Commonly on these, two plant-scrolls, with varied flowers and spiralling tendrils, frame a central motive: a stalk with pairs of acanthus-leaves supporting a flower from which rises a girl’s head. On one she is named Aura (Breeze), but whether that was always or commonly meant we do not know.\(^\text{54}\) The resemblance to the mosaic border is evident, but there is a further link, also noticed by Dr Petas. A fragment of pebble-mosaic floor was laid open by a bomb in 1918 at Durazzano, the ancient Epidamnus or Dyrachium; and before being covered in again it was drawn and photographed.\(^\text{55}\) The scroll-work is just like that of the Pella border, but arranged in the design of the Apulian vases to frame a girl’s head, originally no doubt rising from a calyx. The scale was monumental—the head over a metre high.

The relation of the vase-paintings and mosaics in this very particular style presents a

\(^{53}\) Forthcoming Proceedings of the 1963 Paris Congress (above, n. 17).

\(^{54}\) Good examples in Jucker, Das Bildnis im Blätterkelch figs. 126-8 (Aura, 127).

\(^{55}\) Ὀλυμπιακά χιλιάρχηδα (1922-4) Beiblatt 203–14, figs. 122–3 (Praschniker); Rumpf MZ 139 fig. 16. See also Petas in the forthcoming Proceedings of the 1963 Paris Congress (above, n. 17).
problem. The vases are all South Italian, the mosaics that we have in Macedon or Illyria. More likely, I think, than influence of one of these arts on the other is a fashion in painting which influenced both. That flower-painting was developed in the fourth century we know. Pliny tells how Pausias of Sicyon fell in love in his youth with his townsman Glycera, the inventor of plaing garlands of flowers. He imitated her inventions in painting, and they emulated one another in the elaboration and variety of their flower-work. Pictures in this style by Pausias were still extant in Pliny’s day, the most famous being a portrait of Glycera with a garland.\textsuperscript{56} The story as a story is not convincing, but it surely implies the existence of pictures ascribed to Pausias in which a great variety of interwoven flowers was introduced, as it is in the scrolls on the floors and vases.

Pausias seems to belong to the middle and second half of the fourth century. He and Melanthios and Apelles of Colophon who afterwards became court-painter to Alexander, were pupils of Pamphilos, head of the Sicyonian school but not himself by birth a Sicyonian. He came from Amphipolis, the Greek city in Macedonia which was captured by Philip in 357, nine years before the destruction of Olynthus. The artistic connexion with North Greece is interesting, in view of the Olynthus and Pella mosaics; and Sicyon is in fact one of the rather few places in southern Greece where designed pebble-mosaics have been found. These are not Pausias flower-pieces. They seem earlier; but the existence there of a mosaic-school would have encouraged the adoption by the craft of Pausias’s innovations. It is perhaps relevant that Pausias himself was concerned with the decoration of buildings: he was the first, Pliny says, to paint coffered ceilings and vaults.

The mosaics from Sicyon are all fragmentary. The most complete (rather more than half a floor) is composed on the circle-in-square principle found at Olynthus: round a central rosette a frieze of griffins attacking a stag; a main frieze of galloping centaurs; palmettes in the corners. The fragments from other floors show animals, and one a human figure. This last is in dark pebbles against a light ground, something much less common than the light-on-dark; but in the same way black-figure is used in some classes of fifth- and fourth-century pottery in Attica, Boeotia and South Italy, alongside the much commoner red-figure.\textsuperscript{57} In character and design these pieces resemble those from Olynthus more than those from Pella; nor do they make use of pictorial polychromy, chiarosuro, or materials other than pebbles. In the choice and grading of the stones and their close setting, however, they are decidedly more advanced than the Olynthian work and approach the usage of Pella. One would suppose that they fall between the two in time, and I have little doubt that it is so; but it might be argued that the rough technique at Olynthus is a matter of provinciality, in which case these could be as early or earlier.

The material which has come down to us is so scrappy that our notion of the development and usage of decorated mosaic-floors in Greece can only be quite conjectural at present. The accepted opinion seems to be that they were a Greek idea, developed during the fifth and fourth centuries; but recent finds suggest perhaps a slightly different picture. Patterned pebble-floors were known at Gordium from the eighth century;\textsuperscript{58} and it seems to me possible that they were something which the northern regions of Greece shared with or derived from northern Asia Minor; that, as Macedon became more closely integrated with Greek culture in the later fifth century, mosaic-floors adorned in a Hellenic figure-style were developed there; that those from Olynthus are among the very earliest we have; and that in so far as these are provincial, the metropolis from which they derive is less likely to be any of the great cities of southern Greece than Pella, first made the capital of Macedonia by the Hellenizing Archelaus, who reigned from 413 to 399 B.C. There is no reason to put any of the mosaics derived from the art of ancient Greece.

\textsuperscript{56} NH xxi 4; xxxv 125 (Overbeck 1760; other texts on Pausias, ibid., 1761–3; on the Sicyonian school, 1745–70); Rumpf, MZ 132.

\textsuperscript{57} Centaurs: JHS lix (1939) pl. 13 c; Enciclopedia dell’Arte antica v 209, fig. 294. Others Praktika 1935, 82 f. figs. 15–17. ‘Dark on light’: cf. Olynthus viii 287 n. 14; and below p. 86.

\textsuperscript{58} See above, n. 4.
from Olynthus earlier than his reign, nor any of those found in other parts of Greece, though one of these, and one from Sicily, are dated archaeologically to about that time. Moreover there is literary evidence, to which I shall return, that in Athens, even near the end of the fourth century, elaborate mosaic-floors seemed something of a foreign luxury. The one andron and anteroom actually found in Athens have only patterns of the very simplest description; and of the other pebble-mosaics from southern Greece, only two at Sicyon, and the single floors about to be described at Olympia and Sparta, show human or semi-human figures or have any mythological reference. The rest, like the Motya floor, are confined to patterns and animal-groups.

In southern Greece, besides Sicyon, single floors with pebble-mosaic decoration, complete or fragmentary, have been found at Olympia, Pellene in Arcadia, Sparta and the Argive Heraeum; two at Corinth, one complete the other a fragment; and the andron and anteroom at Athens. There are also the floor from Motya (Plates XIX and XXII 2), and a few other peripheral pieces to which I shall return. Of these only the Motya floor and the Corinth fragment can be dated on archaeological grounds. The mosaic at the foreign but evidently somewhat Hellenized city of Motya shows panels with animals framed by bands of pattern, like the Olynthus floors in technique and in detail; but the disposition and overall design I cannot parallel. The fragment from Corinth was not found in situ in a building, but broken up in the fill over a sixth-century pit, apparently closed during the laying-out of a new agora early in the fourth century, so that it cannot have been originally put down much after 400 B.C. It shows two griffins pulling down a horse, a theme found at Olynthus, Motya, Sicyon and Pella. The technique is more advanced than that found at Olynthus and Motya, more like that of the Sicyon pieces. If the date is sure it suggests that the Chalcidic and Sicilian mosaicists were in fact rather provincial; and we cannot therefore be sure that the floors from Sicyon are later.

Allusions to mosaic in the literature of this period are very nearly non-existent, but there is one sentence which certainly refers to the practice. Demetrius of Phalerum was made regent of Athens in 317 B.C. by Cassander of Macedon, and ruled the city in his master's interest until it was captured in 307 by a rival claimant to the Macedonian throne, his namesake the Besieger. During this period he was equally notorious for the strictness of his laws against every form of extravagance, and for his own untrammelled and undisguised indulgence in the practices he scourged in others. His menus plaisirs are listed in a passage of Duris of Samos, quoted by Athenaeus, part of which runs: 'And in his expenditure on dinners he outdid the Macedonians, and in his nicety Cypriots and Phoenicians. Showers of myrrh fell upon the ground, and flowery were many of the floors in the dining-rooms, prepared in patterns by craftsmen.' After the showers of myrrh, ἀνθίσα at first suggests actual flowers; and in a garbled version by Aelian, who does not give the authors' name and thinks the subject is Demetrius Poliorcetes, the floors prepared by craftsmen are not mentioned and instead there is a reference to flowers in season scattered under foot. This may be simply an elaboration of a misunderstanding, or a clause to that effect may have dropped out of Athenaeus's text by lipography; but in any case the sentence ἀνθίσα τε πολλὰ τῶν ἐδαφῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κατεσκευάζετο διαπεποικυμένα ὑπὸ δημοφυγίων is unexceptionable, and an unequivocal allusion to mosaic floors in andrones. If ἀνθίσα carries any of its basic meaning, one thinks of the Epidamnus fragment and the Pella borders, and even more of the
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splendid floor from a hall of the big house or palace at Verghina-Palatitsa, across the Macedonian plain from Pella, where the same floral elements are used in a formal overall design of great beauty.\footnote{AJA lx (1957) pl. 86, figs. 14–16; Archaeological Reports 1956 19, fig. 16; SMA 13: Vergina fig. 14 (Room E on plan, ibid. fig. 10).}

Duris is plainly a hostile witness, making the most of Demetrius’s extravagances; but he was a contemporary who knew Athens, and he must be taken seriously when he implies, as he certainly does, that elaborately decorated mosaic-floors were not a normal thing in Athens at the close of the fourth century, and were regarded, or could be regarded, there as a foreign extravagance. ‘He outdid Macedonians, Cypriots and Phoenicians’; and in this particular instance the archaeological evidence suggests that it was the Macedonians he was outdoing. Cassander’s creature was an admirer of all things Macedonian, and it is a fair guess that the δημοφυῖος who laid his ἀνδρόν-floors came from Pella.

It is just worth noting that if, as I think likely, a school of mosaicists was established in Sicily under northern influence a generation or two before, it could have been against a similar political background. Aristocles, whose portrait, standing by his victorious chariot, by Melanthios, Apelles and others, subsequently became a political issue, is described by later writers as tyrant of Sicily or in Philip’s time; and Demosthenes twice names him, in the speech On the Crown of 330 B.C., among those who had betrayed Greece to the Macedonians — he had been Philip’s man, as he was now Alexander’s.\footnote{De Corona xviii 48 and 296. On Aristocles see Cauer in RE; on his portrait Overbeck 1759 (Plutarch Aratus 13).} I could imagine that the adornment of the tyrant’s dwelling encouraged alike the growth of a mosaic school and Pausias’s experiments in ceiling-decoration. The evidence of actual remains strongly suggests that elaborate painted decoration was no part of the normal Greek house. There is the story of Alcibiades imprisoning Agatharchus ‘as in a king’s dwelling’ to decorate his house for him,\footnote{Andocides} but there I suspect (though this does not appear in the sources we have) part of the insolence which the story is told to illustrate lay originally in the very wish to have a private house so adorned. In this context I feel a slight reserve about the one passage which refers to mythological mosaics in an early or mid-fourth-century Greek private house: Galen’s amusing story of Diogenes the rich man’s guest.\footnote{Galen, De Prov. 8 (Kühn p. 18 ff). . . . τοῦ γὰρ τοίχου ἀπαντᾷ ἀξιολογῶς γραφάς κεκοιμησθαί, τὸ δ’ ἔδρασιν ἐκ ψηφών πολυτελῶν συγκειόμενα, θεῶν εἰκόνας ἔχον ἐξ αὐτῶν διατυπωμένα . . .} The philosopher spat on his host, and in answer to the protest explained that he could see nothing else dirty to spit on: ‘the walls were all adorned with noteworthy paintings, and the floor composed of costly pebbles, having images of gods formed of them.’ Galen, half a millennium later, obviously enjoyed writing the story up, and his word-picture suggests to me a house at Pompeii rather than one at Olynthus, Priene or even Delos; but there are gods on the ἀνδρόν-floor of the Villa of Good Fortune (Plate XVIII 2), and this detail may well go back to an earlier version.

Of the other decorated pebble-mosaics found in southern Greece (all from the Peloponnese) that from the front porch of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia is unique in adorning a temple.\footnote{Galen, De Prov. 8 (Kühn p. 18 ff). . . . τοῦ γὰρ τοίχου ἀπαντᾷ ἀξιολογῶς γραφάς κεκοιμησθαί, τὸ δ’ ἔδρασιν ἐκ ψηφών πολυτελῶν συγκειόμενα, θεῶν εἰκόνας ἔχον ἐξ αὐτῶν διατυπωμένα . . .} (The fragment of patterned border found at the Argive Heraeum was not in the temple but in one of the buildings about the sanctuary.)\footnote{Blouet, Expédition de la Morée i pl. 64; Doerpfeld in Olympia ii 10, pl. 105; Rumpf, MZ 123f. figs 11–12.} When uncovered and drawn by the early nineteenth-century French expedition, the Olympia floor was in good condition, protected by a marble paving laid in Roman imperial times. Only its ruins were unearthed and photographed by the later German excavators, and the last remnants can still be seen. There is nothing to date it externally, except that it was laid before the Roman pavement, and after the original building, since it is designed to take account of a large base, itself not original but of uncertain date. Two big figure-panels, with a male and a female Triton,
framed in pattern-bands—lotus and palmette, and a double labyrinth; more complex than those of Olynthus, but of the same traditional character—lay opposite the left-hand and central intercolumniations of the porch. The big base occupied the whole inner corner on the right; and in the narrow space in front of it was a mosaic-frieze with fish and birds. In this we see the same mixture of ‘red-figure’ and ‘black-figure’ techniques as in the fragments from Sicyon, here used to distinguish the dark sea with fish in it from the light air above where the sea-birds fly. The division between the two is shown by a conventional wave-pattern, such as is common in mosaic-borders; and this merging of traditional pattern-form with the representation of nature recalls the palmettes suggested by the meeting branches in the border of the stag-hunt at Pella. It is, I think, a peculiarly Greek idea.

Fish, much like these, are very popular in fourth-century vase-painting, especially but not exclusively in South Italian of the later part of the century. Rumpf has pointed out that closely similar ones are found in tessellated mosaic-panels of a pictorial character from Pompeii, which may be copies of fourth-century paintings; and that it is recorded of Androcydes of Cyzicus (whom another anecdote shows at work in 368 B.C.) that he was very fond of fish, and also painted them very well. A date in the second half of the fourth century seems indicated for the Olympia floor. If my view of figured pebble-mosaics as primarily a Macedonian taste is correct, the earliest likely date for the insertion of such a floor into the great temple at Olympia would be the period between Chaeronea in 338 and the launching of the Persian expedition in 334, when to patronise and impress the Greeks was part of Philip’s and Alexander’s policy, and to be impressed the main policy of many Greeks. The Philippeion at Olympia, the tholos with gold and ivory statues of Philip and his family, belongs to this time.

Similar subjects occupy the two remaining pebble-floors from the Peloponnese. That from Pellene has fish so like those of Olympia and the vases that it surely goes with them in date. The Sparta floor has in the centre a two-tailed Triton more baroque than those at Olympia, and in the surrounding frieze dolphins and a great variety of mythical sea-monsters, as well as a second frieze with Dionysiac subjects. It may be of the same date, but from the almost invisible publication I should rather think it later, perhaps contemporary with and influenced by early Hellenistic tessera-mosaics. Also Hellenistic are probably two mosaics with coarse, provincial-looking figurework from sites in South Russia; perhaps also one with elegant heraldic griffins from Assos in north-west Asia Minor. A coarse patterned floor from Tarsus, more reminiscent of the Phrygian pieces than of anything Greek, is archaeologically dated to the Hellenistic age.

There is one more figured pebble-floor (Plate XXI 1), of great importance because of its provenance: Alexandria. It was damaged and repaired in antiquity; the right-hand part of the design (a fight within a border of animals) is lost and has been replaced by vertical bands of tesserae. It is very small, less than two feet high, but is otherwise extremely suggestive of the Pella floors. The pebbles are graded and close-set. There is use of leaden threads, as in Building I at Pella, but a degree of shading more like the practice in Building II. Similarly, the movement of the surviving figure from the main field is very like that of one of the lion-hunters, but the animal-border suggests rather that of the Amazonomachy.

Alexandria was founded in 331/2 B.C. The most likely date for the rich building-programme at Pella to which the mosaics there belong is not, I suppose, during Alexander's
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eastern campaigns, certainly not during the troubles that followed his death, but rather in the period of Cassander's control, between 316 and his death in 297; though this is a question to which I shall return. Incidentally Cassander captured Epidamnus in 314 and held it for a few years. I take the Alexandria fragment to be of roughly the same date as the Pella floors or not much later. I suppose it is not inconceivable that it could be a few years earlier.

In her admirable publication of the Alexandria floor, Mrs Blanche Brown makes it, with a very similar tessera-mosaic (Plate XXI 3), the text for a valuable critique of pebble-mosaics in general, pointing out for how very few of them is there any evidence of date, and concluding that the technique continued in use in Greek lands throughout the Hellenistic age alongside the new tessellated floors. She places these two mosaics as classicising works of the first century B.C.; and though I disagree with her conclusions I owe a great deal to her study. The larger and finer tessera-mosaic (Plate XXI 3) is carried out mainly in two colours; a few pebbles are used among the tesserae; and there is much use of leaden-threads. The subject is a stag-hunt by three Erotes, within a border of animals like that of the pebble-floor, with subordinate ivy and cable-frames.

Mrs Brown’s argument is partly archaeological, partly stylistic. The find-spot of the little pebble-mosaic is not recorded, but that of the other was a house in Shatbi. This lay outside the city-wall, and during the third and second centuries was a cemetery area, becoming residential later. This certainly affords a presumption that the house with the mosaic should not be early, and Mrs Brown makes pleasing play with it, but it is not conclusive. The cemetery was in use for a century or two, and in that time must have spread from small beginnings. One can imagine what started as a country-house becoming engulfed in it; and the only archaeological fact actually recorded about the building is that it was three metres below a Roman road, which so far as it goes seems to favour an early dating.

On the question of style, to distinguish between classical and classicising is often difficult. One need only point in sculpture to the fine and much-copied head whose original some scholars believe to have been a contemporary portrait of Menander, others a contemporary portrait of Virgil. In that case I am with the early daters, and here also. Mrs Brown was writing before the discoveries at Pella; and I do not know if she would still adhere to her original opinion. Olynthus provided her point of comparison, and she rightly stressed the great differences in technique and style between the comparable works from there and the Alexandria pebble-fragment, which she saw, also surely rightly, as intimately linked to the tessellated floor. The discovery of the hunt-mosaics at Pella, however, entirely changes this picture, since both technically and compositionally they form a link between Olynthus and Alexandria. The translation of the strenuous hunters of Pella into Erotes is in Hellenistic taste, but not necessarily late Hellenistic. I feel in fact no doubt that these pieces show us the transition from pebble to tessera-mosaic, which I suppose took place during the first half of the third century. This is probably the earliest tessellated mosaic which we possess, and I doubt if the pebble-technique was long used in the Hellenistic age, except for simple patterns and in provincial areas.

Mrs Brown’s dating has already been criticised in just this sense in a most important article by Kyle M. Philips Jr., publishing a very early and interesting tessera-mosaic with Ganymede and the eagle from Morgantina in Sicily. Mr Philips believes that the transition from pebble to tessera took place in Sicily, and was conveyed to Alexandria by the luxury galley which was made under Archimedes’ supervision for Hieron II of Syracuse and sent by him to Ptolemy in Alexandria. Hieron reigned from 270 to 216, and we do not know which Ptolemy was the recipient, but since Archimedes (born 287 B.C.) was involved it can hardly have been made before the sixties of the third century; and may well be much
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later. This was adorned with miniature mosaics giving 'the whole story of the Iliad'. It may well be that Sicilian artists made the transition for themselves; but the anticipation of tessera-style at Pella, the close original connexion of Alexandria with Macedon, and the character of the two mosaics from Alexandria, combine to make me think that the change took place in the world of the Successors without influence from the West.

Among the extraordinarily scanty remains of Alexandrian art are a few more tessel-mosaics. The finest bears what is probably the earliest of the few signatures we have on a tesselated floor: ΣΦΙΑΣ ΕΙΠΟΙΕΙ. The decorative scheme, typical of Hellenistic floors, shows a rectangular emblema in the centre with a pictorial design (here a head of Alexandria, the signature by it) and a broad surround of pattern-frames. The scheme is common at Pergamon, as is also the curious crenellated pattern, probably of textile origin, which forms the outermost frame. By a careful comparison with the two nearest of the Pergamon examples, which are also the earliest—the excavators were able to date the buildings containing them to the first half and middle of the second century—Mrs Brown concludes that the Alexandrian piece is slightly earlier still, perhaps of the earlier second or late third century.

The only Greek mosaicist's name to be handed down in the literary tradition is Sosos of Pergamon, whose Unswept Room (ἀνόικος οίκος) and Doves Drinking were famous. One of the two earliest floors from Pergamon is that from the north-west room of 'Palace V', dated to the reign of Eumenes II (197–159 B.C.). The emblema of this had been cut away in antiquity, but a piece of the lower edge was left, with the signature: ΗΦΑΙΣΙΩΝ ΕΙΠΟΙΕΙ. Odd that in the careful removal of the emblema the signature should have been left—or not so odd? Not a mistake, surely. I'm afraid the connoisseur who bought it was told he had a genuine Sosos. Certainly this charming fragment is in the manner implied in the name of the Unswept Room: a piece of paper, or rather, since this is Pergamon, of parchment, held down by blobs of scarlet wax at the corners; but one blob is deemed to have come away, so that the corner has curled up. One of the borders of the same floor is a plant-scroll, this time peopled—one of the earliest and most charming examples of the genre—with tiny Erotes and insects. Not unlike these little figures in feeling, though the treatment is more pictorial, are the manokin cupids in a mosaic from Delos (detail, Plate XXI 2) each riding a dolphin and leading another on the rein as boys do horses so often on Attic vases from earlier centuries. They come from the corners of a patterned floor, signed by one Asklepiades, the most attractive of those on the island, linked to the tradition of Pergamon and Alexandria by a crenellated border, and looking right back through Vergina-Palatitsa to Olynthus in the overall design of circle-in-square. It is dated, like the other Delian houses and their decoration, in the second half of the second century.

Far less pleasing, and looking forward to a new tradition which we cannot follow, are two other Delian mosaics, related compositions of Dionysiac figures riding leopards. Both figures seem to be female; the more damaged and probably earlier of the two winged, the other (Plate XXII 1) not. Who precisely is meant is not certain, but the Dionysiac female votary riding a feline appears in Attic vase-painting at about the same time as pictures of the god himself in similar action, around 400 B.C. There is in fact a striking resemblance between the lion-rider on a large Attic plate of that time* (Plate XXII 2) and the unwinged example is discussed by Toynbee and Ward Perkins, L.c., 7 f. 85 Delos viii pl. 53; Mon. Piot xiv (1908) pl. 12 f. 86 Delos viii pl. 52; xiv 15, fig. 4 and pl. 3; Mon. Piot, L.c., pls. 14, 15; Brown, L.c., pls. 43. 1 and 2, and 42. 2. 87 Boston 10. 187; Beazley, ARV² 1337, Near the Pronomos Painter no. 10; Hahland, Vase um Meidias pl. 17. b; Metzger, Repräsentations pl. 19. 2.
figure on the Delian mosaic: shaggy beast, twisted self-conscious pose, heavy elaborate drapery, and the balancing act with the thyrsus. The lion on the plate is very unlike the run of vase-painting lions, and I suspect a late fifth-century picture of lying behind both the contemporary vase and the later mosaic, each artist adapting the original in his own way. That mosaicists in the new pictorial style sometimes copied earlier paintings directly is demonstrated by the Alexander Mosaic from Pompeii, which is probably of much the same date as the Delos floors.88

In looking at the not negligible but really rather horrible mosaic with the leopard-rider (Plate XXII 1) one thinks (or I think) with regret of the Dionysus on a leopard at Pella (Plate XX 1); and I want to close with another word about those early mosaics which have been my main subject: a word of warning.

I have put forward a view of their development which seems to me to fit the evidence; but the evidence is so incomplete that any conclusion must be quite tentative. On the questions of Macedonian primacy, the dating of the Alexandria pieces, and the transition from pebble to tessera, I hope I have made this clear; but I fear I have partly begged the question of the date of the Pella floors. The architectural character of Building I, and stylistic parallels in other media—vase-painting and relief-sculpture—do point to a date in the late fourth century, and such I believe to be the most probable. It seems to fit the likeness to and difference from the Olynthian material; but without more actual mosaics it can only be a conjecture. The gaps in the series are too big, and one cannot be sure where to place them. I said that Cassander's reign was the most likely historical period for rich building at Pella; but it is so only within the limits of the last quarter of the fourth century. Cassander founded a new capital, Cassandreia; he also founded Thessalonike; builders and decorators must have been busy at these two cities. The time when one would really expect big building at Pella is after Antigonus Gonatas had secured his kingdom and re-established the capital there in 277. I should expect mosaics in Gonatas's Pella to be tessellated, like the Alexandrian hunting Erotes (Plate XXI 3), but that is partly at least because of the schema I have myself constructed. If these pebble-mosaics did turn out to belong to his time, it would leave a very awkward gap indeed before them, apart from the other inconveniences. On the other hand a development from these of tessellated mosaic, in the middle and second half of the third century, leading on to Pergamene work of the second, would make perfectly good sense; on the scheme I have put forward the third century is very thinly covered.

Fortunately the excavations at Pella are still going on. Perhaps they will be able to distinguish a city of Antigonus from a city of Cassander; they may even find traces of a city of Archelaus. Then perhaps we shall see clearly, where now we can only make more or less plausible guesses.

Oxford.

Martin Robertson.

88 See above, n. 49.
ATTIC RED-Figure VASE-PAINTERS

I

Rather less than a century ago Morelli began a revolution in art-historical method by demonstrating that every painter has his formulae for rendering details—ears, eyes, hands, drapery-folds and so on—amounting to a personal system; and that, for attribution, a study of these minutiae affords a valuable check on, if not a sounder basis than, a general sense of style; or rather that the two together form the only sound basis. There is no rule of thumb. Formulae are the artist’s servants, not his masters. They appear and vanish, change and merge, according to the development of his technique and style, the influences he undergoes, the speed at which he is working, all the circumstances of his art; but in much of any painter’s work they will be found recurring; rarely, as a system, in another’s. Morellian method can only be effectively used by one who, like Morelli himself, is sensitive to works of art not only as aesthetic achievements but as expressions of personality; but without the tools of his forging it is impossible for sensitivity alone to make much headway. The study of Italian painting before Morelli was a chaos of unchecked traditions and conflicting hunches. Despite fine work by Hartwig, Furtwängler and others, the study of red-figure vase-painting remained much the same (without the traditions) until Beazley brought to it a rare combination of sensitivity to personal artistic style with Morellian discipline.

The problem was in important ways different from that which faced Morelli. Here there is no tradition of attribution, no written record or documentation beyond the comparatively rare signatures: those of painters, and the more equivocal inscriptions giving the name of potter or workshop-master. The attributions of earlier scholars had been largely to these names; and the pieces attributed generally works of quality. Beazley’s approach is radically different. It is true that the first of his great articles isolating artistic personalities, which appeared in this Journal for 1910, was called ‘Kleophrades’ and dealt with a painter of the first quality one of whose works bears a fragmentary inscription with the name of the potter Kleophrades followed by part of that of Amasis, probably as Kleophrades’ father. This work had attracted attention. Amasis was taken by Hartwig for the painter’s name, and he had correctly identified a group of works by the same hand, which formed the core of Beazley’s much longer list. Beazley’s second article, however, which appeared in the same journal the following year, ‘The Master of the Berlin Amphora’, dealt with a wholly anonymous figure whose artistic personality, which we now see as one of the greatest and most influential in the history of vase-painting—indeed he is one of the world’s great draughtsmen—had not previously been even glimpsed. Moreover, the list of his works was accompanied by one of inferior school-pieces, though Beazley later came to see most of these as poor work of the master.

A third great figure of the latest archaic style, the ‘Master of the Boston Pan-krater’, was isolated in the second part of the JHS for 1912; but it is significant that in the first part for that year appeared an article on the ‘Master of the Troilus hydria in the British Museum’, a painter of the same period but a clumsy hack, not in himself of any significance. In the same year the Römische Mitteilungen carried an article by Beazley on a leading figure of the early classical phase, the ‘Master of the Villa Giulia Calyx-krater’; and in the JHS for 1914 the greatest of classical vase-painters in red-figure and white-ground was revealed: the ‘Master of the Achilles amphora in the Vatican’. 1913 to 1916 saw articles on half a dozen other painters of relatively minor character; and in 1918 the Harvard University Press produced the great Attic Red-figure Vases in American Museums, where the history of the style is

traced from its beginnings to the end of the fifth century, and the work of more than seventy artists distinguished.

Since then there have been constant additions in books, articles and reviews, and the full lists have been issued three times. In *Attische Vasenmaler des rothfigurigen Stils* (1925) more than 170 artists and groups are distinguished; a further 300 or so were added in *ARV*² (1942), which includes work of the early fourth century; and in the present edition, where the history of the style is carried down to its end in the later fourth, the total is mounting towards 800, though this includes some very small or comparatively loose groupings.

The all-embracing character, the refusal to concentrate only on fine artists and fine work, is a fundamental element in Beazley’s extraordinary achievement. Near the end of the first volume of this book, on pp. 754–62, we find 179 ‘small, coarse white lekythoi’ attributed to the Tymbos Painter, or placed near him, or compared with him, or grouped as ‘Workshop and manner of the Tymbos Painter’ or as ‘Late products of the Tymbos Workshop, by various hands’. The nature of the distinctions is made clear in a note on pp. 753 f., which includes the words: ‘In dealing with these trifling objects, not the most delightful of one’s tasks, it is not always easy...’. Even such muted *cris de coeur* are rare (p. 1406: ‘the heartbreaking end of the red-figure cup’), but reading them one’s immediate reaction can hardly be other than ‘what waste that such unparallelled sensibility, application and knowledge should be devoted to such worthless material’. One is wrong, though, to think thus. It is by just this breadth of application, distinguishing the work of bad artists alongside good, school-work alongside that from the master’s hand, and the bad work of good artists alongside their masterpieces, that Beazley has, almost single-handed, transformed the study of Attic vase-painting into a true branch of the history of art, comparable to the study of any documented school of painting.

The prodigious breadth of Beazley’s knowledge of the field makes this one of those books of which one can almost say that no one is capable of reviewing it in detail throughout except the author; I at any rate cannot attempt it. I propose, therefore, first to go through the book noting points in which it differs from the first edition which seem of particular interest, or which particularly interest me, especially questions of connexions between painters; and then to consider more generally some lines of study which might take their start from this tremendous achievement.

II

The book (dedicated, like the first edition, to the author’s wife), begins with prefaces, the longer one to the new edition making generous acknowledgement to many helpers, among whom Dietrich von Bothmer is deservedly singled out. There is a list of contents, a useful feature not found in the first edition. The work is more elaborately divided: instead of 42 sections there are now 90 Chapters in 20 Books; four appendices (the new one of potters’ signatures), three series of Addenda; and in the third volume the same five indices as before but of course vastly enlarged. The Instructions for Use are likewise enlarged, and are essential reading. Here and in the Preface are references to the vast find of loutrophoros-fragments from the sanctuary of the Nymph of the Acropolis, to which only summary reference was possible in the text; e.g. in the Pan Painter’s list (p. 554): ‘46–78. Athens, Acropolis Museum, from Athens. Thirty-two fragments, or groups of fragments, from many vases.’

In the text there are in places rather more and fuller comments than in the first edition; still strictly subordinate to the lists, but adding enormously to the value of the whole as a history of the style. Several of these deal with pattern and potter-work which reveal sometimes unexpected connexions between painters. Potter-work and potters get in general fuller treatment than before: e.g., Chapter 3 (pp. 37–52 and 1621 f.), Eye-cups—a classified
list of all r.f. examples known to the author; pp. 98-105, classification of all vases with the signatures of potters Paidikos and Pasiades and work connected with them (painter-signature of Paidikos, p. 1700); pp. 107 ff., classified lists of vases signed by potters Kachrylion, Hermiaios and Chelis; Chapter 10 (pp. 122-35), lists of bilingual and red-figure cups signed by Nikosthenes and Pamphaios and a note on their connexion; pp. 675 ff., classification of lekythoi; and so on.

The book begins with a crux: one of the few matters of importance on which it is possible to disagree with Beazley's considered judgement—the question whether the red-figure Andokides Painter and the black-figure Lysippides Painter were one man or, as he believes, two. I think that they must have been one, but not—and this is important—for strictly stylistic reasons. In *ABV* x (Instructions for Use) Beazley wrote: 'The phrase "in the style of" is used by some where I should write "in the manner of": this has warrant, but I was brought up to think of "style" as a sacred thing, as the man himself.' Every list of a painter's works in Beazley is limited to those in which he can clearly see the one style. In some cases he has come to see that two lists in fact represent different phases of one man's style. To do this for the Lysippides and Andokides Painters is hard; but it seems to me that the difficulties of drawing in a new and tricky technique would be enough to distort a man's style as far as this; while to suppose them two raises problems of collaboration and training which I find more difficult than the stylistic one.

P. 6. Of Psiax it is noted that 'there are indications that he may have been a pupil of the Amasis Painter'. The Brachas vase, ascribed to Psiax (the Menon Painter) by Langlotz and H. R. W. Smith, is now for the first time listed by Beazley as 'certainly like him in several particulars'. It is also compared (p. 77) to a calyx-krater with the names of Andokides as potter and Epiktetes as painter (no. 90, noted as early and as having 'resemblances to Psiax').

P. 10. Goluchow Painter: 'Peters and Miss Bruckner date the painter somewhat later than I did: I keep him in this chapter because of his very primitive technique.' The Goluchow athletes do indeed seem influenced by the ideals of the Pioneers. The artist's jug-shapes have black-figure connexions (pp. 10 and 1618). One would guess him a black-figure painter (even if not, as Peters thought, the Euphiletos Painter) painfully experimenting in red-figure. By the late sixth century, however, even a black-figure artist whose red-figure is as poor as the Nikoxenos Painter's employs a far less primitive red-figure technique. The Goluchow Painter remains a problem.

Chapter 2, The Pioneer Group. Pp. 13-17, Euphronios. Important additions here and on p. 1619; but the Leningrad swallow-pelike is now withdrawn from him, and appears only on p. 1594, under the kalos-name Leagros, with the rubric 'might be counted as belonging to the Pioneer Group'. See also below, pp. 94 and 100. Pp. 22-5. Phintias. Three new signed vases, here (3) and on pp. 1620 (12 *bis*) and 1700 (12 *ter*). The signed Munich cup (12) is noted as 'very early, from the painter's monogram—pre-Pioneer', but no mention is made of H. R. W. Smith's observation, surely right, that it shows the painter under the influence of Psiax.

P. 32. Pezzino Group. An interesting new grouping 'somewhat akin to the earliest work of the Kleophrades Painter'.

P. 33, bottom. 11 hydriai which 'are the red-figure counterparts of the many black-figure hydriai of the Leagros Group'. Should not the Nikoxenos Painter's London hydria (p. 222, no. 19) be added?

P. 35, middle. Amphora, London E 253. Of this it was said in *ARV* 3 that 'in detail the drawing recalls the Cerberus Painter, but the total effect is very different'. Here: 'Many details recall the Euerigides Painter'; and on p. 1625: 'Other details would be unusual for him, but it may nevertheless be his.'

---

Chapter 4 (pp. 53-69). Oltos. Important additions on pp. 1622 f. On the pot-fragment in Boston (54, no. 6), now well published in CB iii, I take what Beazley there calls a closed palmette to be the shoulder and upper arm of a draped figure: cf. Ares on no. 3, the fragmentary amphora in Vienna University. I think it likely that the Boston fragment comes from that picture, giving part of the figure of Aphrodite, Eros hovering to crown her. The amphora is described, surely rightly, as 'the masterpiece of the artist's fully developed style,' the Eros as 'still early'; but I suppose the early appearance to be due in part to the illusion of the closed palmette, in part to this being a small subordinate figure from a large composition. If the suggestion is correct, it does nothing to invalidate chronological distinctions in the painter's work, only shows that it is sometimes possible to misinterpret the evidence.\(^2a\)


Chapter 8. p. 112. Thalia Painter. Important new grouping, continuing the Chelis Painter's style and centred on the delightful erotic cup, Berlin 3251 (7, now cleaned and well published in CV), but unfortunately rarely of that quality.

P. 115. New signature of Peithinos and important note.

P. 126, Nikosthenes Painter no. 24. The lovely Sleep and Death cup in London, his original name-piece, is returned to the artist, with an interesting note.

Chapter 13. pp. 163 f. Boardman's identification of the Cerberus Painter with Paseas is accepted. 'His nearest kin is Psiax.'

Chapter 14 (pp. 181-95). The Kleophrades Painter (Epiktetos II). The most interesting addition is on p. 1632: a footless bell-krater with lugs, one figure on each side, like the Berlin Painter's. Interesting note, but I suppose if the fragments by the Dikaios Painter (p. 31, no. 5) and the Hischyllos Painter (p. 162, no. 5) are really from bell-kraters, they are likely to have been footless too (and lugged; but many-figured, like the Oreithyia Painter's).

Chapter 15 (pp. 196-219). The Berlin Painter. Add to the literature, the beautiful lecture by Beazley, The Berlin Painter (Melbourne University Press, on behalf of the Australian Universities Research Council, Occasional Paper no. 6, 1964). The Vienna and Florence pelikai and the Acropolis skyphos-fragment are accepted as early works (nos. 109-10, 241); the Gorgos cup, with slight hesitation, as a still earlier (no. 242). Another cup-fr. from the Agora is also ascribed (no. 243). The most important addition is the great amphora in Basle (p. 163, no. 1 bis), but there is a great deal more of interest and quality. (See also below pp. 98-99). The pretty hydria in Madrid (11125; youth in Thracian garb, leading horse; BM pl. 23, 1) is omitted (p. 214). The works in the painter's manner are more elaborately classified. Of the queer hydria Louvre G 173, with Peleus and Thetis, listed with two others which 'must be, each in its way, imitations of the Berlin Painter', it is noted that 'some details recall the Harrow Painter'; and on pp. 1635 f. and 1705 two small oenochoai are described as 'careful copies of two vases by the Berlin Painter himself', and ascribed to the Harrow Painter. p. 218. The resemblance of the gorgoneion on the hydria London E 180 to those of the Berlin Painter is noted. Since I attributed the vase to the Painter himself, I have noticed a marked resemblance to the frontal satyr-face on Phintias's masterpiece the amphora (p. 23, no. 2) in Tarquinia (the provenance also of the London vase), best seen in Arias-Hirmer, pl. 95 below. This suggests that the Berlin Painter may have derived his concept of the gorgoneion (along with other things) from Phintias; and I no longer feel any confidence in claiming the London vase for his hand. This is a warning example of an attribution based on observation of detailed resemblances without due regard for the feeling of the whole.

Pp. 218 f. The Group of the Floral Nolans. Ten nolans, four lekythoi and two oenochoai with bands of pattern are 'more or less closely connected with the Berlin Painter',

\(^2a\) See my forthcoming article in Ὄττον ἕξη"
but also show links with the Dutuit Painter. Worth noting, perhaps, that the dotted spiral (not a very common pattern in any form) on the oenochoe in Munich, no. 16, is like that on the Berlin Painter’s name-vase; contrast, for instance, the Kleophrades Painter’s version on the Vivenzio hydra, and that on the oenochoe-fr. from the Agora, p. 495 bottom and below p. 95. In neither is it a true running spiral; and the interpointers are v-shaped on the hydra, tiny circles on the oenochoe.

Chapter 17 (pp. 237–42). Myson. His dependence on Phintias is noted, and his fathering of the Mannerists: ‘It is not easy to say where Myson ends and the Pig Painter begins’. To his three masterpieces two are added: a psykté (no. 77) and a cup (no. 83).

Chapter 18 (pp. 245–55). The Syleus Sequence. The close relation of these four painters was already noted in ARV; and it is now seen as ‘very likely that the Diogenes Painter is an earlier phase of the Syleus, the Gallatin an earlier still; and even the Painter of the Munich Amphora might be the nonage of the Syleus’. A most attractive idea. The hydra in San Simeon (ex-Holford) ascribed in BM (p. 20 no. 130) to the Berlin Painter as a very early work but omitted from ARV, is here (p. 248, bottom, no. 3) more convincingly placed as perhaps by the Diogenes Painter.

P. 296 f. Troilos Painter. On p. 1643 it is noted that shapes and patterns point to a workshop connexion with the Kleophrades Painter: ‘as to figure-work, the artist may have thought he came closer to the Kleophrades Painter than he did’.

Chapter 22 (pp. 313–34). Onesimos. Furtwängler’s conjecture that the Panaitios Painter was an early phase of Onesimos, which Beazley has always felt possible, he now accepts. The Eleusis Painter and the Proto-Panaetian Group (pp. 314–18) remain something of a terrain vague between Euphronios and Onesimos. Of the cup-fragments Berlin 2281 and Vatican, where part of the name Euphronios survives without a verb, described in ARV as ‘related to the Euphronios of the ἔρωμεν vases’, it is said here (p. 19) that they might be very late. They are in a bold manner which is as different as possible from that of the signed cup in Athens... and which closely approximates, in general character, to early Proto-Panaetian cups like London E 46 and Louvre G 77.’ They might perhaps have been mentioned again on p. 312, since it seems conceivable that this was the earliest of the ἐπιστήμων cups rather than the latest of the ἔρωμεν. (See also below, p. 100).

Chapter 23 (pp. 334–50). The Antiphon Painter. Noted that ‘his style derives from the earlier (“Panaetian”) style of Onesimos, and runs parallel to the later’ and that the two are sometimes rather close; also the difficulty of distinguishing sometimes his own work from that of his imitators.

Chapter 24 (pp. 351–9). Colmar Painter. The connexion with the coarse cups of the Bonn Painter (pp. 351 f.) is noted as so close that they may be the earliest phase of the Colmar, whose ‘developed style was formed under the influence of Onesimos (in both stages of that artist’s career) and the Antiphon Painter. He probably sat side by side with them in the workshop of Euphronios’.

Chapter 25 (pp. 360–7). The Triptolemos Painter. See below, p. 99.

Chapter 26 (pp. 368–424). The Brygos Painter and his Circle. Much important matter in notes on pp. 368, 391 and 400. The Alkaios vase in Munich Beazley is ‘now disposed to accept... as a very late work of the painter himself’ and includes it in his list (p. 385, no. 228). The difficulty is stressed of drawing a line between the late (‘weak Brygan’) cups of the master himself and those counted as school-pieces and attributed to a Painter of Munich 2676 (pp. 391–4). Apart from these and other painters, groups and pieces classed under Manner of the Brygos Painter, six artists are distinguished as forming his circle. The Foundry Painter (pp. 400–4) is the most important—‘an excellent artist; with his forcible, sometimes even brutal, style he often equals the Brygos Painter’. Of the Ariadne cup in Tarquinia, and the no less beautiful komos cup in London which goes with it, it is said (p. 405) that they are close to the Brygos Painter at his height, but hardly from his hand.
ATTIC RED-Figure VASE-PAINTERS

They might be by the Foundry Painter at the point in his career when he was closest to the Brygos Painter. 'The influence perhaps worked both ways; at least the gigantomachy on the outside of the Brygos Painter's splendid Selene cup in Berlin (p. 370, no. 10) reminds me of the Foundry Painter. The Painter of the Paris Gigantomachy (pp. 417–24) is noted as standing nearer to the Foundry Painter than to the Brygos. The other four artists of the circle are put together as 'mild Brygan'. Of the Brises Painter (pp. 406–10) it is noted (p. 368) that his Louvre cup (no. 8) with the signature of Brygos 'was evidently painted under the master's influence and indeed from his designs', but other pieces, such as the New York Theseus cup (no. 7) show him a good artist in his own right. The Dokimasia Painter (pp. 412 ff.) is good too. His name-piece (no. 1) has great charm; and it is suggested on p. 1649 that two excellent pieces in the Brygos Painter's list may really be his: the Castle Ashby fragment, no 16, and the komos cup, Berlin 2309, no. 46. His stature is increased by the calyx-krater with the death of Agamemnon and Aegisthus (p. 1652) now in Boston (63, 1246; Illustrated Handbook (1964), 67; Calendar 1965, figs. 42, 44). A pot-painter, the Hephaisteion Painter (pp. 297 f.) is noted as having 'some kinship with such members of the Brygan circle as the Dokimasia Painter'. Of the other two members of the 'mild Brygan' group, the Painter of Agora P 12 is noted as a good painter, near the Dokimasia; the Painter of Louvre G 265 as weak and inferior.

P. 400. A cup-fragment in Marseilles, compared to the Oxford Brygos (p. 399) and related work, is noted as 'somewhat nearer to the Brygos Painter than the others are'. Pp. 398 and 1650: a new cup with the signature of Brygos is ascribed to a Painter of the Fourteenth Brygos, perhaps working on the Brygos Painter's designs, and not far from the Painter of the Oxford Brygos.

Chapter 27 (pp. 426–53), Douris. Long and important introductory note, distinguishing the phases of his style, his collaboration with Python and occasionally other potters, and his imitators. Some of the later cups in the list are questioned as possible school-pieces, including such excellent work as the Munich Herakles and Athena (no. 185) and the New York naked women (no. 186). No. 241: unusual inscription, pleasingly interpreted. The Athens Athenodotus cup (ARV₁, 281 no. 25) is here omitted (see p. 1567 f., no. 13). The Thorwaldsen Group (p. 455) is noted as being near the earliest Douris.

Chapter 30 (pp. 483–95), Hermonax. This good painter, of whom we now have ten signatures, one on a cup-fragment with white interior (no. 132), has been lowered in stature by the withdrawal, on Pallottino's suggestion, of the most Olympian of all early classical vases, the Munich Erichthonios stamnos. It does seem to stand apart from his work, though a product of the same circle, looking as Hermonax does back to the Berlin Painter and on to the Achilles Painter and his companions. A stamnos-fragment in Heidelberg goes with it: Painter of Munich 2413 (p. 495); and the einochoe-fragments with actors, Agora P 11810 are compared. The delightful owl-cup, Stockholm G 2334, is related on p. 1655 f. to cups by Hermonax; it seems very likely that it is his work.

Chapter 31. p. 497, bottom: for the subject 'woman running with thyrsus and dolphin', cf. the woman with two dolphins in a thyiasos on an earlier cup, Vienna 137 (CV pl. 1.1; given by Beazley to the Nikosthenes Painter as an early work, BSR xi 18 (note from previous page); to the wider circle of the painter, ARV₁, 104 no. 1; omitted from the present edition.)

Chapter 33 (pp. 550–61), Pan Painter. Important additions: the loutrophoroi (p. 91 above); the Munich Perseus pelike (no. 85); and on p. 1659 three little pelikai of the class of the Vienna fishers and those already known to go with it (nos. 88–91). p. 560, Near the Pan Painter, no. 5, the Ariadne lekythos in Taranto: on p. 1659 a hydria 'appears to be by the same hand . . ., but has no connexion with the Pan Painter'.

Chapter 34 (pp. 562–88). The Earlier Mannerists. The later are now detached in a separate chapter (55, pp. 1106–25).

Chapter 35 (pp. 589–617). The Niobid Painter and his Group.

Pp. 589–95, Altamura Painter. Important additions, e.g., nos. 10 bis, dinos in Newcastle; 33 bis, bell-krater in London; p. 1660 bottom, no. 71 bis, oenochoe in Berlin. He is also now given the cutler oenochoe in Leningrad (no. 72), formerly thought an early work of the Niobid Painter.

The Froehner Painter, whose name-piece was once ascribed to the Altamura Painter but detached in ARV¹ as ‘by an artist very like him’, is now listed in another chapter (p. 510) as recalling the Altamura Painter, ‘but not so that he can be counted as belonging to the same group’.

Chapter 39 (pp. 677–89). Bowdoin Painter. Beazley is now inclined to accept Miss Haspels’s suggestion that the b.f. Athena Painter may be the same man.

P. 741, Manner of the Carlsruhe Painter. Of the Boston covered cup it is now said: ‘the outside resembles the later work of the Carlsruhe Painter. The inside is much finer, but I cannot say that it is not by the same hand as the outside.’ A covered cup-fragment from Delphi is compared.

Chapter 42 (p. 774), Hesiod Painter. The possibility is noted that not Hesiod but Archilochus is represented; but the painter has not yet, like the Amymone Painter in similar circumstances, had to change his name (Amphitrite Painter, pp. 830–4).

Pp. 774 f. and 778, Sotheby Painter and Painter of London E 356. These are now detached from the Penthesilean Group, though the second is still said to recall the Penthesilea Painter.

Chapter 44 (pp. 807–20) Followers of Makron. Important note. pp. 814 f. The Group of the Hiketes Mugs (ARV¹ 298, Manner of Douris IV) has been dissolved. One has been left among the followers of Douris (Chapter 43, p. 805 no. 77); one has disappeared; and the other two are grouped with a pyxis in New York not previously attributed and two cups from the old school of Makron list as the Painter of Philadelphia 2449: ‘The cups belong to the school of Makron, but the other vases cannot be said to have anything Macronian.’ A link between the followings of Makron and of Douris is provided by the Painter of Villa Giulia 50508 (p. 814).

Chapter 46 (pp. 837–58), Sabouroff Painter. Links of various kinds noted between this painter, the Achilles Painter (Chapter 50, pp. 986–1013) and the Trophy Painter (pp. 857 ff.).

Chapter 47 (pp. 859–76). The Pistoxenos Painter and his Group. p. 870, Tarquinia Painter no. 89. Noted that the sphinx in this rhyton (London E 787) is a weaker version of the same model as in the Sotades Painter’s vase, London E 788 (p. 764, no 8), which has the same provenance (Capua).

Chapter 48 (pp. 877–971). The Penthesilea Painter and his Workshop, pp. 879–90, Penthesilea Painter. Important additions, especially the huge Ferrara cup, no. 33; also the Ferrara Ganymede cup, no. 12, which gives us the only instance so far noted of collaboration between the master himself and another member of the workshop, the Spanelnopt Painter (pp. 891–9), a regular collaborator with other members.

Pp. 936–51. A Group of London E 777 is distinguished within the Penthesilean, including the Painter of Orvieto 191A, whose connexion (ARV¹ 609) with the Curtius Painter (pp. 931–5) is no longer mentioned. The Long-chin Group is detached from the Penthesileans (Chapter 63, pp. 1221 f.).

Chapter 49. pp. 982 ff. Note on owl-skyphoi, and list of vases of other shapes with related owls.
Chapter 50 (pp. 986-1013). The Achilles Painter. A fine appreciation and some interesting additions. It is noted on p. 1661 that the florals on his stamnoi 65 and 66 'may be said to be in the manner of the Niobid Group'. One may perhaps note that the fine Amazonomachy calyx-krater in Ferrara (no. 53) belongs in character with the 'big battles' (Bothmer, Amazons 161-74; it is no. 4 in his list), which are otherwise almost exclusively productions of the Niobid Group and its successor the Polygnotan. pp. 1012 f., Persephone Painter. Added, a magnificent loutrophoros (no. 12) from the sanctuary of 'the Nymph'.

Chapter 51 (pp. 1014-26). The Phiale Painter. Important additions, especially the two white calyx-kraters nos. 53-4 (surely early work) and a very fine white lekythos (no. 139 bis).

Chapter 52 (pp. 1027-64). Polygnotos and his Group. Important notes. On the name it is suggested, following Rumpf, that all three vase-painters who use it may have borrowed it from the great Thasian. This seems likely for the Lewis and Nausicaa Painters, the first of whom at least was probably too old to have been called after him, and both of whom seem to look for themes outside the vase-painting tradition, probably to wall-painting. The Polygnotos of this chapter, however, does this much less than the masters from whom he learned: the Niobid Group, the most 'Polygnotan' of all vase-painters. Is it not likely that he was the son of one of them, called after the great artist they so much admired? The supposed occurrence of the name on a vase of the Group but not by the Painter is now seen to be an uncertain reading (p. 1057, no. 99). On the group as a whole it is noticed that, although many hands can be distinguished, there is a large residue of unallotted vases, including some of the best; and that the Hector, Peleus and Coghill Painters form a very important sub-group (the Peleus Group; pp. 1035-42).

Chapter 53. p. 1079, Painter of London E 494: 'A fine artist, in spirit akin to the Achilles Painter and the Persephone Painter.' His name-piece, the splendid fragmentary bell-krater with Herakles sacrificing, has never appeared before in Beazley's lists, since it is his principle not to include any singletons which he cannot link to something else. There are a number of such pieces still outstanding; for instance from this time the Nolan London E 307 with a picture of a muffled woman and a monkey. The pot is rather clumsy and the reverse-figure unusually atrocious, but the strange obverse-picture is finely drawn and one would like to find other works of the artist.

Chapter 55 (pp. 1106-25). The Later Mannerists. Important note on these deplorable but sometimes interesting painters.

Chapter 56 (pp. 1126-42). The Washing Painter. Important chronological note. 'A great painter of loutrophoroi and nuptial lebetes', his full stature has perhaps only been revealed by the finds from the sanctuary of 'the Nymph'.

Chapter 57 (pp. 1143-60). The Kleophon Painter and the Dinos Painter. Interesting additions to the Kleophon Painter (pp. 1143-51) are the Copenhagen bell-krater with a dithyrambic chorus (no. 35) and—most important—the beautiful calyx-krater fragment from the workshop of Phedias at Olympia (no. 17).

Chapter 64 (pp. 1226-46). Classic Painters of White Lekythoi.

P. 1227 f., Bosanquet Painter: Buschor considered these vases to be early work by the Thanatos Painter, 'and indeed there is a close connexion'.

Pp. 1231-6, Bird Group. Important note on p. 1231; and on pp. 1687 f. eleven white lekythoi from a sarcophagus at Anavysso added: 'They appear to me to be by the Bird Painter—unusually fine work of his later period, setting him in a new light.' On p. 999 it is suggested that six vases in the Achilles Painter's list 'might be careful copies or imitations of him by an artist of the same character as the Bird Painter'. P. 1246, Torch Painter. Three vases from Eretria: 'Coarse; perhaps local?'

Theseus cup, Harrow 52, given to this painter in AV (426, no. 8) as a small version of London E 84, but detached in ARV1 (p. 660) and said to recall the Phiale Painter, is now omitted.

Chapter 72. Pp. 1353 f., Worst Painter: important note, if important is a word that can be used in this context.

Chapter 74. Pp. 1383 f., Group R. The wonderful fragment with a youth and girl published by Mrs Karouzou is added (no. 14). This rather untypical piece seems nearest to the beautiful lekythos in Vienna (no. 1). Early?

The Fourth Century. Long and important note on p. 1406. There is a great deal of new material in these chapters (77–90, pp. 1406–1528). Other valuable notes on pp. 1457, 1496, 1498 and 1510 f. The term Kerch, which tends to fall uneasily between a stylistic and a chronological interpretation, is avoided. The great calyx-krater from Al Mina in Oxford, with the punishment of Marsyas, which Beazley has characterized elsewhere as 'the finest, I think, of all late Attic vases, although I do not forget the beauty of the lebes in Leningrad',3 is omitted from this book on the principle mentioned above: the Leningrad lebes can be connected with other works (p. 1475, no. 1, the Marsyas Painter—called after a different and inferior Marsyas vase, ibid. no. 3); the Al Mina vase cannot.

Chapter 18. Pp. 1516 ff., Manner of the Jena Painter. On p. 1697 it is noted that the interesting oenochoai of the Class of Agora P 15840 must be placed not far from this painter. Appendix I (pp. 1529–52). Head Vases. P. 1529. Face-kantharoi: noted on p. 1697 that Kunze has rightly observed that these must be East Greek not Attic.

III

Where do we go from here? For in its essentials this task is done. It is true that in this, as in any study based on archaeology, the work is never finished, since new material is always appearing which has to be related to the old and may modify one's view of it. This maintenance work, at present being carried on chiefly by Beazley himself, will one day devolve on his pupils; and one thing we must do is to get to know this book inside out, so that we really understand both the styles of the artists and the principles on which those styles have been made clear. Only so shall we be able to order the new material as it appears. To take an example: Too late for reference in this book the excavator of the cave at Sperlonga published a work on the finds in which he illustrates two red figure vases.4 These he describes, correctly but cautiously, as 'di stilo nobile', adding that the first, which he calls 'oenochoe' (ad anfora), sembra il prodotto semplice ma tecnicamente perfetto di un buon maestro; and the second, which we can agree is a pelike, is di buona fattura. A student of Beazley can get closer than that; and I would hazard that the first is a small neck-amphora (Nolan or doubleen),5 a still early work of the Berlin Painter, the second by the leader of the early mannerists, the Pig Painter. If Beazley tells me that the first, though in the Berlin Painter's manner, is not from his hand, or that the second is not by the Pig Painter but (say) late Myson, or even early Leningrad Painter, I shall believe him because I know his knowledge of the field to be far wider and deeper than my own. If another follower of Beazley tells me the same thing I shall be inclined to back my own judgement, though he may be able to argue me out of it.6

There is no doubt that once Beazley's authority is withdrawn the subject will lie open to much more argument and uncertainty than at present. This does not matter; it is the normal position in all branches of art-history, and a healthy one. The important thing is that, by Beazley's almost unaided effort, the study of red-figure vase-painting has become a

3 JHS lix (1939), 35
4 G. Jacopi, L'Antro di Tiberio a Sperlonga (1963), 153 ff., figs. 152 ff., and 155 ff., figs. 155 f.
5 In the photographs I cannot tell whether the fragmentary vase is a Nolan or a doubleen; but the single row of ivy-leaves under the reverse picture occurs on at least four of the artist's doubleens. He may use it on his Nolans, but I do not know it.
6 Beazley now confirms both attributions.
branch of art-history where all the principal figures, and a great many minor ones, are clearly recognised by all.

There are, moreover, tasks other than ‘maintenance’ which arise directly out of his completed achievement, and to several Beazley himself points or leads the way. In Potter and Painter in Ancient Athens (1944), he wrote: ‘Now that the painters of nearly all important Attic vases, and most of the less important, have been determined, the whole material must be re-studied from the point of view of the potters; ... Then it will be possible not only to write the history of Attic vases from the point of view of the potters, but, in the long run, to shed fresh light on the painters with whom they collaborated’. (pp. 42 ff.). Bloesch’s great Formen attischer Schalen had already appeared in 1940, and considerable work has been done in this field since. Much more certainly remains to be done; but the difficulty of comparing one shape with another seems an insuperable bar to mapping out the field in potter-personalities as Beazley has mapped it in painters.

A connected subject is that of relationships between different painters. Beazley has done much on it already and indicated the lines of much more. Apart from its intrinsic interest, it has an important bearing on the difficult question of chronology. Di stilo nobile serves as an indication of date as well as style for the vases from Sperlonga, but the student of vases today normally puts a close date on them in years. In this book there are few dates nearer than a quarter-century, but dating to a decade is normal in the work of Beazley and of all of us. In this case the neck-amphora would be put c. 490 or 490–80, the pelike c. 480–70 or 470. This confidence is based on the facts that vase-painting, like the rest of Greek art, clearly shows a swift and steady development; and that in vase-painting we have an enormous bulk of material which represents every phase of this development, linking the few points which are fixed to historical dates and so allowing us to put dates in years on each phase. That this is basically sound I do not doubt; but it is a schematic arrangement, and the dates reached can only be even approximately true for the most advanced (which is not necessarily the same as the best) work of any moment. In the case of an artist like Douris or the Berlin Painter, whose style develops over evidently a considerable period and can be linked to the styles of others who came before and after, one can be comparatively confident that the dates one puts on particular vases are not enormously far from the truth. In both cases the range seems to be from about 500 to about 470–60. The Triptolemos Painter, on the other hand, a fine artist, paints always in the style we associate with the first two decades of the fifth century. Beazley in a most important article6 has shown that some of his works, which reveal neither development in style nor decline in quality, are linked with the works of other painters which can hardly be dated before about 470–60. In ARV² 360, he points to certain features which link other works of the painter with Douris, some of them with Douris’s earliest cups; so that it seems that we have here a good artist whose oeuvre spans approximately the same period as those of the Berlin Painter and Douris, but which on style we should have confined within narrower limits.

I suppose it would be generally agreed that the work of the Pioneers is contemporary with much that is more old-fashioned. Their influence can sometimes be seen in the later works of older artists, but surely there are others which are contemporaneous with them but do not show it. Beazley lists here (p. 35) among amphorae ‘which may be said to be of the same type as those of the Pioneer Group’ Olto’s Vienna vase mentioned above; and both this and the Tarquinia cup signed by the potter Euxitheos (who also worked with the painter Euphronios) must on style be contemporary with the Pioneers. In VA 15, Beazley says that the silen-cup in Boston (ibid. fig. 9; here p. 74, no. 46) shows that ‘Epiktetos, in his later days, was not insensible to the new mode in art’; and the same can certainly be said of Psiax, in his cup in New York (p. 8, no. 9). With Epiktetos it seems possible to go further. He worked with many potters: the calyx-krater painted for Andokides and the bilingual cups

for Hischylus plainly belong near the beginning of his career, not quite the beginning of red-figure. The cup for Python (no. 16) and the skyphos for Pistoxenos (no. 86) are certainly later; it seems to me possible that they are very much later. The Python cup has on one side a komos: revellers on couches, one drawn end on, the reveller in back-view. Just the same scheme is found on both exterior pictures of a cup by Douris (p. 432, no. 52) of his middle period (period 3, p. 424). This cup has been shown on stylistic grounds to be the work of Python, a potter with whom Douris regularly collaborated; the date seems to be about 490–80. The tondo of the Epiktetos–Python cup has two figures in movement, leaning slightly away from one another: a composition rare earlier but typical of early fifth-century cup-interiors. A good example is the two bearded revellers on another Douris–Python cup (p. 436, no. 96). It seems to me not unlikely that Epiktetos continued painting with little change of style well into the fifth century, and that when he decorated the cup for Python he was sitting in the same workshop with the mature Douris and imitated his compositions but not his style. Since the potter Pistoxenos is known otherwise only as working with early classical painters, I should guess the skyphos to be no earlier than the cup; but here I find nothing in the pictures to betray a late date.

If the work of the Pioneers overlaps that of earlier artists, there is also the question of their relation to later ones. Most of the leading painters of the early fifth century stem from them, but their own work is generally held to stop before 500, after rather a brief span. In the case of Euphronios we have the potter-inscriptions which are found on works of later style than the painter-signatures, so we say that he gave up painting in favour of potting; but can we be sure that that is the answer? On p. 1634 Beazley gives as an addition to the Berlin Painter’s work a neck-amphora with an Amazonomachy, of which he says ‘The composition resembles that of the volute-krater by Euphronios in Arezzo (p. 15, no. 6)’. He calls it ‘still early’, and one might date it c. 490–80. In composition—poses and disposition of the figures—it is almost identical with the Euphronios vase, both front and back, but with no florals dividing the two, and there is one extra figure helping to link them. Details—costume, shield-devices etc.—are different, and there is no resemblance of style. The two may echo some third original, but the fact of both front and back corresponding is slightly against independent derivation from a wall-painting or the like. The Berlin Painter may have copied a vase twenty years old more or less; but can one rule out the possibility that they are contemporaries—that Euphronios continued to draw in the manner of his youth while making cups for others working in a new manner?

Of the fragment in the Cabinet des Médailles with part of the name of Brygos, probably as potter, Beazley writes (p. 399): ‘This cup is much earlier than the other cups with the signature of Brygos, and has no connexion with them in drawing’, and adds: ‘In general character (and no more) the cup in the Cabinet des Médailles is akin to such others, by different hands, as Cabinet des Médailles 543 (p. 448) and Athens Acr. 208, from Athens (Langlotz, pl. 11): elaborate cups with something senile about them: the end of a mode, the last of the “Parade Cups” (Haspels in BCH 1930, 444–51).’ On p. 448 he writes of Cab. Méd. 543 as ‘akin to the very earliest works of Douris’. The Brygos Painter seems to have been a younger man than Onesimos, who seems to have been about contemporary with Douris; but I could easily imagine that the last of the ‘Parade Cups’ are not necessarily much, or at all, earlier than some works of the Brygos Painter.

Another factor which bears on our chronological precisions is the question, which quite often arises, whether two groups of vases represent the work of master and pupil or earlier and later phases in the career of one man. A master’s work does not end where a pupil’s begins. The Providence Painter, Hermonax and the Achilles Painter were all pupils of the

---

7 The two Douris cups are nos. 15 and 30 in Bloesch’s list of cups by Python, Formen attischer Schalen, 96–101. The Epiktetos–Python cup, ibid. 28, no. 13, is of a different and rare form not easily comparable.
Berlin Painter, and the Phiale of the Achilles. The activity of the Providence Painter may have begun before the end of the Berlin Painter's early period, and will have overlapped virtually the whole of his middle period as well perhaps as his late. Hermonax looks to have begun later, but he too will have overlapped some of the middle period as well as the late; and the first years even of the Achilles Painter's activity must have coincided with the last of the Berlin Painter's. The Phiale Painter will hardly have known the Berlin Painter, but his early work, like the white calyx-kraters, must be contemporary with far from the latest Achilles Painter, and he surely overlapped with Hermonax. These are clear cases because the personalities are all highly distinct: with others it is different. When Onesimos was thought to be a pupil of the Panaitios Painter, one had to imagine a considerable overlap of the two oeuvres: for one man to absorb another's style so completely he must surely have sat with him for some time—not perhaps many years, but enough to make a difference when one is dating in terms of ten years or, as is sometimes attempted, of five; for if they are one the second phase follows on the end of the first. So it is with the Nikoxenos and Eucharides Painters, Myson and the Pig Painter, the artists of the Syleus Sequence, and many others.

Without a documentation which we can never find, our picture of the chronology and relationships of Attic vase-painters must have always a strongly schematic character; but by work on these and similar lines one may hope to get closer than we now are to what actually took place; and all such lines of enquiry start from Beazley's prime and basic achievement in isolating the great and small artistic personalities which make up the art.

Martin Robertson.

Oxford.
HEPHAISTOS RIDES AGAIN

(PLATES XXIII-XXIV)

A small Corinthian phiale mesomphalos of which a few joining sherds were found at Perachora, had been decorated outside with animals in a rather perfunctory style, and inside with a figure-scene, a frieze with the figures’ feet towards the centre of the bowl (PLATE XXIIIa). The surface was finished differently inside and outside, a striking instance, as J. K. Brock points out, of variation in technique without chronological implications. Surface-finish and painted decoration together also exemplify how a change in the entire approach of Corinthian artists—both potter and painter, in this case—will often accompany a change of subject-matter. The filling-ornaments enhance the difference: outside, a rather dense filling of the usual solid shapes; inside, a dot-rosette only.

The subject of the inside picture is described as ‘three padded dancers, the one in the middle holding a horn’. Padded dancers are undoubtedly present, the best-preserved figure (on the right) is wholly typical, except for his excited gesture indicating that something unusual is afoot. But his neighbour is different. Nude, slim-waisted, strong-limbed, he comes striding in from the left, turning his head towards the quarter whence he came. He too has lively arms, their length expressively exaggerated; in his right hand he holds what could certainly be a misdrawn horn, though it should be said that padded dancers take better care of their drink.

Behind this figure there are indistinct traces of black with incision at the left edge of the fragment. Logically this should be another figure—a padded dancer, if the interpretation is right—but by itself it is not easy to make out. I confess that I cannot make it any part of a padded dancer of normal appearance, and challenge the reader to puzzle it out.

A dancer of normal appearance is not, however, what one expects, for this picture clearly belonged to the small number where padded dancers mix with other figures. It is to these that one must turn for a parallel. The most nearly similar constellation of figures may be found on a London krater with the Return of Hephaistos (see below).

The Corinthian vase-paintings with this subject have already a considerable literature.

The significance of the subject for the pre-history of Greek Drama is argued by T. B. L. Webster in a recent work; the present study, offered to him on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, that of padded dancers together with nude women). The difficulty in such cases is, first, to determine whether the intruding figures may after all be intended for padded dancers; secondly, to distinguish between intrusion and mere juxtaposition.

Payne in NC 142 (with nn. 6 and 7) summarizes the discussion; of later studies, F. Brommer’s survey (JID ii (1937) 198 sqq.) remains the most important for Corinthian as for other periods. Recently M. Delcourt (Hephaistos ou la légende du magicien, 1957) has examined the monuments afresh in the course of her fundamental study of the god’s cults and myths (pp. 90 sqq.). Ph. Bruneau in BCH lxxxvii (1963) 509 sqq. is not concerned with the Corinthian material. Cf. also the following notes.

1 Perachora ii 266, no. 2361, pl. 109. Pl. xxiii reproduces, with the kind permission of the Managing Committee of the British School at Athens, a photograph which T. J. Dunbabin placed at my disposal.

2 For comparison Brock refers to a lost vase, probably a companion-piece of the Athens amphoriskos (see below). Other padded-dancer vases with dot-rossettes (aryballoi): H. Payne, Nekrokorinthia (abbreviated NC in the following), pl. 37. 7–8; CV Oxford ii pl. 6. 22. The pyxis in Berlin, NC no. 876 (Antike Kunst, vi (1963) pl. 22), which combines padded dancers and a women’s dance, has dot-rossettes in the latter scene.

3 As regards the iconography of padded dancers generally I must refer here and in the following to my forthcoming conspectus of the material in Symbolae Oloosenses (abbreviated SO). On conventions in rendering their costume, v. also Acta ad archaeologiam et artis historiam pertinentia (Inst. Rom. Norv.), i (1965), last section of my article; in the following I cite this article as Acta.

4 SO, nos. 215–240 (including ten examples of one type, that of padded dancers together with nude women). The difficulty in such cases is, first, to determine whether the intruding figures may after all be intended for padded dancers; secondly, to distinguish between intrusion and mere juxtaposition.

birthday, owes much more to him than either the dedication or a reference to his researches can express.

* * * * *

The addition of the Perachora fragment brings the total of Corinthian ‘Returns’ up to four. A review may be in order, especially as two of the vases can now be illustrated better than before.

(1) Krater, London 67.8-5.860 (SO no. 227). Plate XXIIIb.7 Procession moving to the right; in front of it, two padded dancers confronted, stationary, in their usual pose. They put their hands forward, and one of them holds a horn; a filling-object, another horn, sets them off from the procession. Hephaistos on his mule (one foot apparently deformed) is followed by Dionysos; each has a drinking-horn, and Hephaistos turns to his brother. Three lean, nude youths move about them. One is at the head of the train, in a knee-running attitude, turning to prod the mule with a kentron. The other two bring up the rear, and one carries a wine-skin and a jug.

(2) Phiale fragment, Perachora 2561 (see above). SO no. 227b. Plate XXIIIa. The left-hand figure here, if I am not mistaken, corresponds to the knee-runner of the krater. The padded dancer has turned to face the procession.

(3) Amphoriskos, Athens N. M. 664 (SO no. 227a). Plate XXIV.8 Procession, and with some indication of clothes: two bring up the rear, the third is shifted from before the mule to beside it, and all carry objects associated with wine.9 As on the krater, Hephaistos (beardless, side-saddle, two crippled feet) is followed by a solemn long-robed figure, but this is a woman with a scale-patterned shawl and not Dionysos.10 Her profile is incised, the drawing altogether more elaborate than in the other figures. A tree separates the train from the two phallic figures before it (near a handle) who have the shape of padded dancers and resemble them in costume, though there are no belts; the man on the left has red dots and a patterned yoke on his chiton, and the contour of his body is incised. Their beards are shaggy, that of the right-hand figure very big; his companion has shaggy hair also. They stand about in no typical dance-posture. The right-hand figure puts out his hands, the other (with head turned towards the procession) gesticulates and holds two objects which seem intended for a cup and a stone.

The new fragment, as far as it goes, strengthens the connection between the version of the krater and that of the amphoriskos. Salient points are: (a) the emphatic division of the scenes into a procession and a stationary group before it; (b) the presence of three ‘lay figures’ moving about the two (superficially similar) main characters, like revellers about a carnival float; (c) the tendency on the part of the stationary figures to put out their hands in a drawing, is that the raised hand of the ὄφωνος is clenched about some small object, impossible to interpret (grape or ?); his gesture is thus analogous to that of the man holding a bunch of grapes, he is not ‘pointing the way’ (Loeschke, op. cit., 515 sqq.; Schnabel, Kordax (1910) 57). He might be thought of as pulling the lady’s hair. The implications would be interesting—cf. the plate, BCH bxxvi (1962) pl. 5 (SO no. 225); or the Protoattic ‘Aigisthos’ Krater (Matz, Gesch. d. griech. Kunst i pl. 211)—but the possibility seems a very bare one.

7 Old no. B 42. From Nola. NC no. 1176; H. Walters, History of Ancient Pottery i pl. 21, 1 (before cleaning). I am greatly indebted to Dr. Ann Birchall for her help in having the vase cleaned and providing new photographs; one is reproduced here by courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum.

8 NC no. 1073. Published by G. Loeschke, AM xix (1894) 510 sqq., pl. 8; the extensive literature surveyed by L. Breitholtz, Die doriehe Farce, etc. (1960) and by Webster in Pickard-Cambridge, op. cit., List of Monuments, no. 98; add Delcourt, Hephaistos, 94, fig. 3. For the splendid photographs and leave to reproduce them I am indebted to the generosity of Mrs Semni Karouzou.

9 A detail which did not appear clearly in the old drawing, is that the raised hand of the ὄφωνος is clenched about some small object, impossible to interpret (grape or ?); his gesture is thus analogous to that of the man holding a bunch of grapes, he is not ‘pointing the way’ (Loeschke, op. cit., 515 sqq.; Schnabel, Kordax (1910) 57). He might be thought of as pulling the lady’s hair. The implications would be interesting—cf. the plate, BCH bxxvi (1962) pl. 5 (SO no. 225); or the Protoattic ‘Aigisthos’ Krater (Matz, Gesch. d. griech. Kunst i pl. 211)—but the possibility seems a very bare one.

10 I doubt if it is possible to argue, with Graef (Hermes 1901, 95), Bronner (JdI 1937, 199 n. 1), Herter (Vom Dionysischen Tanz zum kosmisben Spiel (1947) 47 n. 46) and Webster (in Pickard-Cambridge,
front, a well-attested but not a common feature of the dance performed by the padded men.11 The remaining Return picture in Corinthian shows how different a scheme was possible, though it too has points of contact with (1)–(3).

(4) Mastos, Paris, Musée Rodin 503 (SO no. 228).12 Very badly damaged and repainted: apparently there are two versions of the subject (obverse and reverse), but little reliance can be placed on one of them as it now appears—all that is certain is that it had padded dancers. On the other side, on the extreme right (in front of the procession) a pair of padded dancers; then the mule-rider. Both his feet are sound; he seems to carry a wine-skin; under his mule lies an object that may be another wine-skin, or all that remains of a figure. He is followed by a padded dancer, the least damaged figure of the vase. The left-hand part of the field is taken up by a kline whence a bearded figure surveys the revels.13

In date the mastos is certainly the latest of the four vases.14 The order of the others is not chronological. The London krater is a mediocre product probably of the latter half of Middle Corinthian, in type very like another scholars' favourite, the 'Dümmler Krater', which should be of similar date.15 Both the fragment from Perachora and the Athens amphoriskos are likely to be earlier. The amphoriskos, as a special vase done in a special manner, is difficult of comparison with other Corinthian amphoriskoi, most of them very slovenly.16 Its companion-piece (?), since lost, was found with the companion-piece of the Paris 'Pholos Kotyle',17 and there is more than this fortuitous connexion between these two well-known vases. Both belong to a strain of Corinthian painting of which the keynote is illustration—rare figure-subjects in a lively manner, rich in pointed detail; measured against

op. cit., 171) that the painter thought of this figure as male. The strongest objection is hardly the dress (NC 142 n. 5)—as Professor Webster pointed out to me, it might suit an effeminate as well as a woman—but the fact that a distinction in the eye-shape was at least attempted. Corinthian painters do not always distinguish male and female eyes, but where a distinction is found it must have some purpose. Also, the incised contour seems like a reminiscence of outline-technique.—The scale-pattern of the shawl has been thought to furnish a clue, but this also is doubtful. In earlier art such cloaks were common (e.g., Matz, op. cit., pls. 172, 206, 211). Conceivably in sixth-century art they would lend a solemn, old-world air; but on a jug about contemporary with the amphoriskos (Perachora ii no. 2066, pl. 77) two women in a sacrificial procession wear cloaks with a scale-pattern border, so not even this is certain. Less relevant for comparison are monuments where scale-pattern may be a stylisation of hair (as Higgins, Brit. Mus. Terracottas ii no. 1664), for whatever the garment on the amphoriskos represents it is not 'a skin' (Webster, loc.)—it has the modish cut and arrangement of, e.g., Iole's cloak on the Eurytios Krater (NC pl. 27).

11 Acta Archaeologica (Copenhagen) xxxv (1964), beginning of my article; cf. SO.
12 CV pl. 7, 4–6 and 9; Jdl 1937, 214 sqq., figs. 14–15; F. Brommer, Satyroï (1937) 25, figs. 15–16. I am grateful to the Keeper of Musée Rodin, Mme Goldscheider, for leave to examine the vase as closely as could be done without taking it to pieces and cutting it; the modern paint has flaked since the publication, and a little more can be discerned than formerly.

13 A reclining figure occurs with padded dancers on three other vases: the plate in Athens, BCH lxxxvi (1962) pl. 5; London bowl, AFA lv (1961) pls. 8 and 12; and the Tydeus Painter's amphoriskos in London, NC pl. 36, 1 and 5 (SO nos. 225, 224, 240).
14 Cf. Hopper in BSA xlv (1949) 249. Shape and patterns suggest a Late Corinthian date. The pottery is good, it seems in the tradition of the best MC cups and kotylai; the style of the drawing on the other hand is crude, and hard to date on its own merits. It may have affinities with certain poor aryballoi, the probable upper limit of which is late MC and which may well continue into LC I (v. my article in Acta Archaeologica xxxv, last part).

15 For the Dümmler Krater (NC no. 1178; SO no. 226) see J. Bouzek in Tepk. Studies presented to G. Thomson (Prague, 1963), 61 sqq., the first photographic publication. Both may well be products of one workshop—perhaps the Medallion Painter's; shape and drawing show them to be later than that master's Copenhagen krater (AFA lv (1961) pls. 11–12).

16 Payne, in NC 314, regards the shape as very early, and this may be right, though there is hardly an unbroken line of development.

17 See Arch. Zeitung 1859, pl. 125; cf. NC nos. 942, 1073A. For the Pholos vase (NC no. 941) see now P. Devambez, La peinture grecque (1964) pls. 61 and 64.
the hard-won formal conventions of other work at this time, their manner sometimes seems deliberately gauche (contrast, e.g., NC pl. 31, 5—a third vase associated indirectly with the old find).

The fragment from Perachora, too, seems to have affinities in this quarter.

The pictures have something of the spirit of an earlier age when dot-rossettes were common. In the Middle Corinthian phase there are many signs of a revival of interest in Transitional and earlier art. At least one leading decorater shows this dependence; a good many other pictures—many with feminine subjects, several on amphoriskoi—are palpably archaising. Old paintings being more likely models than old pots, naturally the trend affects some subjects more than others—witness the difference between inside and outside of the Perachora fragment. There is no need to assume the existence of an old painting showing, specifically, the Return of Hephaistos, for if a manner, derived from a particular model, invaded representations of one subject, it might spread to related ones.

There is no doubt, however, that certain points are more intelligible on the theory that one prototype, of whatever date or medium, underlies the early paintings of the Return. We must try to account for the differences, and see whether comparison will aid interpretation. Webster applied this method in observing that the two phallic figures on the amphoriskos must be padded dancers, despite abnormalities, because of the analogous scenes with dancers in London and Paris. The two little men in fact have many features that are rare individually among padded dancers, but collectively associated with that subject and with no other. The approach accords with the character of the 'school' or trend with which we have associated the vase: spurning conventional formulae of description, the painter made amends—to the confusion of scholars—by overloading his dancers with the more recherché attributes of their tribe.

The difference among the vases in one respect is so consistent that it amounts to a bond: every figure that is bearded on the amphoriskos, is beardless on the krater, and vice versa. The point affects the central figure of the tableau—Dionysos in one case, a woman in the other. Which is likely to be the original version, supposing an 'original' to have existed? The Perachora sherds agree with the amphoriskos. Hephaistos' iconography would admit either version. As for the long-robed figure, on the lectio difficilior principle the lady must take precedence. Altogether it looks as if the painter of the London krater saw a bearded figure, changed it into a bearded one, and changed the others to correspond. This he might do because the beards in the original were not clear to him (supposing a prototype that was old, or foreign, or in a different medium); or because he could not make sense of what he saw; or as a deliberate innovation.

18 The Chimaera Painter: AJA lxiii (1959) 363 (P. Lawrence), and Acta Archaeologica xxxii (1961) 173 sqq. (I. Ström, who pushes the argument too far by suggesting a Transitional date for the painter); cf. Antike Kunst vii (1964) 77 sqq. (J. L. Benson).

19 This seems the natural interpretation of the fact that good painters affect clumsiness in dealing with certain subjects: thus on the amphoriskos CV Norway i pl. 4, the drawing of the bull is straight, while the procession is done in a manner that must be artificial, very stiff and naive with scant incision. Is not this seventh-century art seen through sixth-century eyes? To the bibliography given in connection with the Oslo amphoriskos should now be added I. Jucker, 'Frauenfets in Korinth' (Antike Kunst vi (1963) 47 sqq.), a thorough discussion of vases with such subjects, especially bottles, and their theme which is, she suggests, a festival of Artemis. The Corinthian Heraia would be another possibility in view of the part played by children in the pictures (cf. Nilsson, Griechische Feste 57 sqq.); but surely the manner may have come to be considered appropriate for the representation of 'feminine' cults and festivals altogether. It is most frequent on vases of 'feminine' shapes and use (cf. Jucker, op. cit., 54 sqq.). Dot-rossettes, eventually dissolving into the 'hailstorm' type of filling, are common in connection with it; note that silhouette-style animals ('alterreumelnd') Jucker, op. cit., 54) are also much exposed to hail. So are round-shielded warriors, a type that grows frequent in MC; and one aryballos in Syracuse (11825) has a frieze of silhouette padded dancers with hailstorm filling.


21 Examples in SO of phalloi, stone-throwing, shaggy hair and beard; there are also parallels for the variant rendering of costume and attitude.

22 Jdl 1937, 204; Delcourt, Hephaistos, 96.
It is, of course, possible that both painters saw a bearded Dionysos. The type was too unfamiliar to be readily adopted, so the one gave the god a beard, the other turned him into a woman. The youthful type of Dionysos is not attested in Archaic art. But since Greek gods reflect the character of their cults and worshippers, it is probably true that Dionysos, a women's god, was in permanent danger of turning sissy; it may also be relevant to recall that seventh-century art on the whole avoids beards. In many ways this is a tempting guess. But as a working hypothesis, it has the disadvantage of forcing us to suppose both vase-painters 'corrupt' in their rendering of a lost original, a high-handed way to treat our only evidence.

Myths are not real. If one adds that artists could, in the last resort, only visualise myth in terms of human activity, the truism continues but the statement may not be quite superfluous; padded dancers are a case in point. To ask: demons or menschliche Nachahmer? is as good as a confession of belief in the demons; the valid form of the question is: men, or dämonische Nachahmer? For we know that if demons were visualised in this form, it must be because some human activity was reinterpreted in terms of myth. The suggestive force of Greek mythology will influence our reasoning, with its axiom that human practices (and pictures, too) grew from mythical prototypes—but it was myth that originated from what men did. In dealing with early representations of a story which clearly had a background in ritual, this point of view is not irrelevant. While the Return was probably the subject of a lost poem, it is also probable that ritual inspired both the poem and its earliest representations in art.

The mystic lady of the Athens amphoriskos may be best sought along this line of inquiry. The point of the story in cult is the summoning of a divine magician, to free the deity of the fruitful earth: it is these two whom, in cult as opposed to poetry, one would expect to take pride of place. As Webster has suggested, the part of Dionysos may have arisen out of an East Greek cult-variant. The extension, by the way, follows a folk-tale pattern (A seeks to influence B, but has to act through C, D, E... until X finally succeeds), so that this variant would particularly readily lend itself to primitive poetic treatment.

To suppose the amphoriskos version based on a religious rite witnessed, no less than on a poem heard, is one way of accounting for the otherwise puzzling presence of the female. Scenes from cult were common in Corinthian painting, and a likely source of imagery for a 'new' myth. We may imagine that the two deities were represented by images carried or wheeled, a tableau whose traditional aspect could account for the resemblance of the pair on the amphoriskos to that on the krater; it is worth noting that Hephaistos comes first, which, taken literally, seems to mean that he is thought of as bringing and not as brought.

23 The earliest instance may be the Ferrara bellkrater (c. 460 B.C.), Webster, *Griechische Bühnenaltertümer* (1963) pl. 1, AV 10. I am grateful to Professor Webster for discussing this question with me: he thinks that a bearded Dionysos *Melanaios* may be the subject of the Protoporithian plastic vase in New York, Richter, *Handbook to the Greek Collection* (1953) pl. 24a (cf. Robertson in *BSA* xliii (1948) 23 n. 1) and this indeed seems possible.

24 The objection that padded dancers (supposing them to have been present in the original) are not attested at Corinth till the Transitional period, and then only once (Kraiker, *Aigina* no. 423, pl. 32), may be only apparent. The seventh century is rich in grotesques that sometimes resemble the dancers and may be related to them in meaning (see further in SO), and the abnormal appearance of the dancers on the amphoriskos could be taken to mean that the models were of this sort—though the stylistic explanation given above seems simpler.


26 Thus H. J. Rose, himself, at an unguarded moment wrote, '[Artemis Brauronia] appeared on occasion in bestial shape... By a very common tendency of all manner of religions, her worshippers were attracted into their deity's outward form' (Ancient Greek Religion, 85). The limitations and exceptions to my thesis are obvious.


28 L.c., and *Greek Art and Literature* 700–530 B.C., 63, referring to Picard's excellent article in *BCH* lxx (1946) 455 sqq.

29 So also the (lost) Chalcidian vase, Delcourt, *Hephaistos* fig. 4, unlike other Return scenes where both gods are shown together. A highly important monument for comparison is the amphora *ABV* 96, no. 9; a goddess on a mule-cart brought to the assembled gods by Hephaistos.
On this theory the ultimate ‘prototype’ was no work of art, but a cult procession at Corinth whose theme was readily associated with that of the new poem—though it is likely that a well-known painting of such a cult scene was an intermediary. To the painter of the amphoriskos, the ‘liberated deity’ of the procession simply became the Hera of the myth. The alteration by the painter of the krater would have the purpose of removing the anomaly, bringing the familiar sight more strictly into line with the literary version.

Some sixth-century representations might be classed as ‘carnival pictures’. They are not identical in subject among themselves, or with the Corinthian ‘Return’ scenes, but they may still legitimately be expected to shed a little light on the hypothetical Corinthian procession. In such pictures, we usually see figures of three kinds—the image of the god; a company of demons immediately surrounding him (for present purposes it is immaterial whether they were thought of as invisibly present, or were represented in some way in the procession); and human participants in the train. It is possible that what we have called ‘lay figures’ in the Corinthian processions, represent the last-named category; but hardly very likely, because (a) they are next to the gods, and (b) they carry Dionysiac attributes. If they are demons, they aspire to the name of ‘Peloponnnesian satyrs’ which has often, since the Athens amphoriskos was first published, been given to the padded dancers.

The latter class of figures must be closely concerned in the myth (rite), for they are never absent. On the mastos in Paris (4) they surround the figure on the mule; an East Greek carnival picture shows a dwarfish padded dancer standing on the prow of the god’s ship, holding two phallus-sticks. For the rest, they are kept apart and seem to await the procession rather than to take part in it. In the case of the amphoriskos the ‘awaiting’ has been held to be of a sinister kind: lying in wait behind a tree to pelt the procession with stones. There is no trace of such a meaning in the other scenes. In the composition the tree serves the same purpose as the suspended horn on the London krater—but the filling-object was hardly chosen arbitrarily in either case. That the setting is the earth—no more the sea, nor yet Mount Olympus—is a possible meaning of the tree, though it is difficult to see why it should call for emphasis. In Attic red-figure a small stylised palm-tree often indicates a temenos, and this would make excellent sense here if the picture is inspired by a cult-procession. The dancers would then be waiting at its goal.

The connection of padded dancers with Dionysos is taken for granted. It has not, I think, been observed how strong is the iconographical evidence which links them with the other god of the myth: they are shown lame in the same ways as he. Hephaistos’ lameness I believe Mme Delcourt to have correctly explained as a magician’s attribute (though Greeks may quite early have rationalised it in the same way as Wilamowitz and others); and a promising theory with regard to the double affinity of the dancers with Hephaistos and with Dionysos seems to be that their primary association is with a rite, which was one of fertility-magic. Hephaistos would then be, as it were, the mythological extension of the rite, Dionysos (or any power of fertility) of its purpose. Such perhaps was the primitive background, too primitive, one may feel, for Periander’s Corinth; and the light-hearted literary

---

30 See JHS bxviii (1958) 6 sq.; cf. Pickard-Cambridge, Dithyramb 82 n. 3, and pl. 4.
32 JHS bxviii (1958) 6, fig. 2. Comparison with the Florence cup, ibid., fig. 4, suggests that the Oxford dancer may have boarded the float in a burst of high spirits.
33 Webster, Greek Theatre Production 133.
34 AM 1894, 514 n. 1; Delcourt, Hephaistos 94.
35 P. Jacobsthal, Orna mente griechischer Vase (1927) 95 sqq.
36 Acta, n. 10; further in SO. I call both versions ‘lameness’; Mme Delcourt would no doubt claim that seen in NC fig. 44A, for her homme retourné (op. cit., 190), but I can see no evidence that the two versions were regarded differently at this date. The existence of two versions argues for an original difference in the meaning.
37 Delcourt, op. cit., 121 sqq. On p. 228 Wilamowitz, with his practical view of a cripple’s duties in primitive and warlike communities (NGG, 1895, 236 sq.), gets an undeserved sneer.
form of the myth, the jollity of padded-dancer scenes generally, suggest that there was little serious religious purpose left in the proceedings. Brommer’s doubts, whether we should recognise Hephaistos in the picture on the mastos, seem to me justified: the god was unlikely to be given a wine-skin to carry, ‘satyrs’ are not present, the whole scene is just as likely to represent impromptu revels bearing a loose resemblance to the solemn procession. This festival had become available, one might say, for the infusion of a new content.

An attraction of the hypothesis lies in that it suggests a possible span from ‘Homerica laughter’ to Classical Comedy.

In the scanty state of our knowledge about the ecclesiastical calendar of Corinth, it is hazardous to attempt to put a name to the festival which may have inspired the early ‘Returns’. A spring festival is indicated. One important such was the Eukleia, whose goddess is usually identified with Artemis. In later times, images of Artemis and of Dionysos Ἀσάωσι stood side by side on the Corinthian Agora. If we like we may see, in the contrasting pictures of London krater and Athens amphoriskos, a memory of the passing of an old cult-practice from the region of Artemis into that of the all-conquering Bacchus.

* * * * * *

In conclusion a detail of the picture on the amphoriskos may be briefly considered: the red dots seen on the chiton of one figure, and on the apparently nude thigh of another. Webster ingeniously explains them as a way of representing hair. In this way padded-dancer pictures, where such dots sometimes occur, are associated with later satyr pictures (with their distinction hairy/smooth) and with the plastic vases in the shape of fat men (whose dots ‘appear to be on a chiton which leaves arms and legs bare’). In one picture where red dots apparently stand for woven or embroidered pattern on fine clothes, and where we have pictures of ‘spotted’ dancers in very similar style for comparison, the pattern-dots look different—smaller and denser.

You spotted snakes with double tongue,
Thorny hedgehogs, be not seen!

Corinthian snakes run to big spots, red or incised. Hedgehogs, on the other hand, have little incised dashes, or, in the plastic version, little black dots—like other plastic-vaso animals (furred) and the plastic-vaso fat men. Incised dashes mark the hairy garment of a strange figure on an aryballos in Brussels. The bristle of boars is another kind of hair that regularly appears in Corinthian vase-paintings, either as small white dots, or as white or incised dashes. For showing a surface to be hirsute or prickly, these are the obvious methods. Spots resembling those of snakes and padded dancers seem to occur, among furred animals, only on panthers (incised) and deer. Passing to the aviary one finds them better represented: they

38 Jdl 1937, 217 sq.
39 bis Cf. Pausanias iii 22, 2.
39 Nilsson, Griechische Feste 237 sq.; cf. RE s.v. ‘Eukleios’.
39 By 322 B.C. this seems to have been a theatre festival (Xenophon, Hell. iv 4, 3; Diod. xiv 86)—the bθαρτρων in question hardly that to the north of Apollo’s temple, judging by Xenophon’s account, but located in the Agora (unless his ‘agora’ can be taken to refer to an area adjoining the North Stoa, and not equivalent to the ‘Agora’ of the excavations).
41 Bulletin of the John Rylands Library xxxvi (1954) 561; Greek Theatre Production 135.
42 Monuments Piot xi (1944) pls. 3–4: contrast, e.g., Furtwängler, Sammlung Sabouroff pl. 48. 1 (SO nos. 201, 202).
43 For a black-figure hedgehog, see the Amphiaros Krater (NC no. 1471); a good conspectus of Corinthian plastic vases in BCH lxxvii (1963) 431 sqq. (J. Ducat).
44 CV i pl. 1, 26 (NC no. 1258).
45 Random examples: boars on two Louvre aryballoi, E 522 (unpublished?), A 455 (NC no. 544; CV viii pl. 18, 13–14) have bristle-dashes all over, incised and white respectively. Two in Scandinavia have white dots on the face only—Oslo (CV i pl. 1, 6–8: dots largish), Gothenburg (Symbolae Olausenian xxx (1953) fig. 4).
46 NC 70 (with n. 5). Red spots on birds are frequent; see, e.g., the Medallion Painter’s usage, AFA bxv (1961) pls. 1–14. His later work is close in style and date to many ‘spotted’ dancer pictures.
are common especially on the necks of geese and swans, less often they spread to other parts of the birds (breast, covert) or to other species (monsters).

However plausible from other points of view, the interpretation of red spots as hair thus has little warrant in normal Corinthian practice. This makes it tempting to seek another explanation of the ‘spotted’ dancers; and it is interesting to note that they seem sometimes to have an equivalent in dancers whose chiton consists of black and red stripes. Neither variety has a strong correlation with other unusual traits of padded-dancer iconography; both are found on alternate figures in artistically superior paintings, where they have an obvious rhythmic-decorative value. It therefore seems that they confer no special status on the dancers who have them, but express rather a quality of padded dancers in general—the stress on this being optional, so that it might be used for artistic variation.

From the use of red spots on birds one might conclude that they are sometimes a stylisation of feathers; but applied to the winding necks of the water-birds they suggest ‘snakiness’, rather than plumage, and I think that even in the ornithological sector they are as likely to stand for πουκίλλα. The leopard, the snake and the spotted deer are, of all beasts, not only the ones that are most consistently described as πουκίλλα, but also the pre-eminently Dionysiac ones. The red spots on padded dancers thus appear to constitute another link with the god of dappled things.

Πουκίλλος is an adjective of character, not only of hue. It seems not to have gained the status of a concept with clear religious implications; but often it forms part of the picture of the weirdly cunning, the seer, the ecstatic—like flute-music, it goes with a murky part of the human mind, and something of the uncanny clings to it. Most sublimely its associations are brought into play by Pindar where he describes the birth of Iamos (Ol. vi 39–57) and then—in what has been called preziöse Eingangsworte, at the next rise of the poetic wave—his own inspiration for the πουκίλλος ὑμνος (82–7). There is kinship between the poet and the seer. There is no need to press further associations evoked by the notion of πουκίλλα; suffice it to say that it accords with our view of the Corinthian padded dancers, and enriches that picture a little.

The reinterpretation of the spots, and consideration of the Return pictures generally, seem to weaken the case for an equation of these beings with satyrs. On the other hand it is becoming increasingly probable that we should see in them the exponents of a fertility-ritual of early origin, its religious significance possibly dulled by time, but the connection between dancers and festival as firm as ever. That the setting was favourable for the evolution of some early kind of performance akin to Classical Drama, is hardly in doubt; that something of the sort did evolve, it may be possible to show on the basis of a larger material.

University of Oslo.

Axel Seeborg.

47 Acta, n.8; further relevant material in SO.
48 If this is correct, the contrast mentioned above (n. 42) is to be explained either as due to the (slight) difference of style; or there is a distinction between the general notion of dappledness and the specific one of sumptuously patterned clothes.

49 They range from motley fools to the ‘coat of many colours’ (which has, it seems, only the authority of the Septuagint).
THE HOPLITE REFORM AND HISTORY

I have tried to analyse elsewhere the archaeological evidence for Greek armour and weapons, and their possible effects on tactics, in the critical period of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. There, I was of necessity concerned with the monumental evidence, and did not look far beyond it. But there are historical implications which should be faced and also, I think, some further historical support for the conclusions there reached.

The conclusions were briefly these. The equipment of arms and armour, which modern writers tend to group together as the 'hoplite panoply', was originally a motley assemblage. Certain of its components—the long iron sword and spear—were part of the equipment of most warriors of the era, and of many periods before and since. Other items resemble those used by Mycenaean warriors some five centuries earlier: these include the bronze plate-corset, the greave and (an optional accessory) the ankle-guard. I cannot believe, with some scholars, that such advanced and costly products of the bronze-smith had been produced continuously throughout the Dark Age that followed the fall of the Mycenaean civilisation; and indeed for at least 400 years there is no evidence of any kind that they were. Rather, they were revived or readopted: the corset apparently under the influence of the metalworking cultures of Central Europe and Italy, the greave and ankle-guard spontaneously, although the Epic tradition had never forgotten their earlier use. Other items again, the closed helmet of the type that the Greeks called Corinthian, and the large round shield with arm-band and hand-grip, were Greek variants devised as an improvement on foreign models, principally the metal open-faced helmets and round single-grip shields used by the Assyrians, Urartians and other Eastern peoples. The combination of all these elements together was an original Greek notion; as was later association with a novel form of massed infantry tactics, the phalanx.

This brings us to the question of chronology. The adoption or readoption in Greece of each of these elements of the panoply, with the exception of the greave, can be shown to have taken place decidedly earlier than 700 B.C., though not probably earlier than c. 750. This conforms with the likeliest date at which the foreign models, whose influence we have posited, would become accessible. The European metal-workers would be encountered at the beginning of Greek colonisation in Italy (c. 750), the Oriental perhaps with the new onset of the Assyrians on the Mediterranean seaboard under Tiglath-Pileser III (745–727). On the other hand, the full equipment is first definitely shown together, on one man, on Protocorinthian vases of c. 675 B.C.; and the massed tactics of the phalanx are first convincingly represented, also on Protocorinthian, hardly before the middle of the 7th century. There may, of course, be other uncertain factors at work here: the tendency of the Greek artist to portray nudity where it would not occur in real life, and the great difficulty for the vase-painter of depicting the phalanx at all. But the chance statements of contemporary poets, and the evidence of the only relevant grave-group, both support the prima facie evidence of the artists: that the adoption of the 'hoplite panoply' was a long drawn out, piecemeal process, which did not at first entail any radical change in tactics.

This conclusion has, after all, a certain historical plausibility. Since there was no true precedent, but only partial parallels, for the new developments, it would have been extraordinary if the hoplite had sprung fully-armed from the head of some unknown genius, and at once taken up his position in the phalanx. Rather, we should expect that the different improvements in armour, coming as they did from a variety of sources and not all at the same moment, would be adopted, as occasion offered, by the warrior class of the period. This class was the aristocracy; and its methods of warfare are known to us, not only from Homer (whose evidence is usually ambiguous), but from the occasional remarks of poetic

aristocrats like Archilochos, from the researches of Aristotle and other later writers, and from the military scenes of the contemporary Geometric vase-painters, predominantly Attic and Argive. In such battles, the horse apparently played a considerable part, though its purpose may more often have been to serve as a transport animal, rather than as a charger in true cavalry warfare of the kind to which Aristotle refers. But to judge from the vase-paintings, infantry battles were commoner. In these the warriors on either side were armed with shield, sword and spears, but were for long without metallic protection for the head or body. The spears were predominantly used as javelins, and the engagements partly fought out at a distance, with archers, by the late eighth century at least, also taking a part.

Thus far, the picture of pre-hoplite warfare conforms to some extent with the Homeric descriptions. But one other feature appears often enough in the vase-paintings to be taken as characteristic: this is the beached warship, sometimes with an amphibious battle taking place at the point of landing. This cannot be entirely of heroic or mythological import, nor relevant only to Attica; it therefore suggests a form of warfare in which raiding, by small parties of warriors, was a familiar tactic. Such raids will also have been possible on land for mounted men; and it may be that the Greek aristocrats of the late eighth century fought strategically, as they often did tactically, at long range, making armed forays of an offensive character against the territory of other cities. Whether they ever, in the battle itself, fought in a series of individual duels between rival champions, such as the Homeric poems portray, is far more questionable. The literary requirements, which may largely explain this picture, would not operate on the battlefield.

What would one expect to be the impact, on such a pattern of warfare, of the purely technological advances made in the later eighth century? Surely, that each improvement would be adopted by the aristocrats of the day, as far as possible within the existing mode of fighting. Thus there is the tradition that Timomachos the Aegid, captor of Amyklae in the mid-eighth century, wore a metal corset which was carried in processions in later days (see note 2 above). The horseman, infantryman and marine would benefit alike from having a metallic helmet, corset and greaves. They would also theoretically benefit from having a larger and more protective shield, also faced with metal; but here arose the complications of weight and manoeuvrability. The Assyrian infantryman had gone into battle with a large, round, bronze-faced shield which he held in the time-honoured way, by a central handle, supported in some cases also by a strap passing round his neck. The Greeks, less robust or more ingenious, devised a new method of overcoming the weight of such a shield: the central arm-band, with the hand-grip shifted to the right-hand edge. It has been claimed that this simple improvement entailed a sweeping change in tactics, but this is an exaggeration. There are many later parallels in history for the use of such multiple-handled shields, without any such formation as the phalanx being entailed. Certainly it would be hard to protect one’s right-hand side with a shield so held; but so would it with any type of shield, save the long-extinct leather body-shields of the Bronze Age. One would expect the aristocrat, at least when fighting on foot, to make use of such a shield even in an era of missile-warfare. He could let go of the hand-grip to hold his spare javelins; and he would often have a horse (and no doubt a squire) at hand to relieve him of its weight before and after the fight.

Finally, emboldened by this protection, the warrior would tend to close the range at which he engaged. Having thrown his javelins, he would close with the sword; alternatively, he would exchange his two or three javelins for a single, heavy, thrusting-spear which would

---

2 Aristotle, Pol. 1289b 36-40, 1297b 16-28; fr. 611, 51; cf. Strabo xiv 643: Plutarch, Mor. 760-1. Note also the metal corset of Timomachos the Aegid (Aristotle fr. 532 (Rose), in Schol. on Pindar, Isthm. 6 (7). 18; cf. on Pyth. 5. 101).

3 On this question see Kirk, BSA xliii (1949), 144-53.

4 E.g. the Romans and Dacians in Trajan’s day: Cichorius, Reliefs der Traiansskulptur, pls. 69 etc. The shield of the later Medieval knights: R. W. Oakeshott, The Archaeology of Weapons, figs. 132-3.
become his main weapon. All this could happen without any wider change in man-power, or in the general attitude to warfare.

Thus far, this has been a hypothetical argument: but it can be supported and illustrated, at almost every stage, by the evidence of archaeology or, more rarely, of contemporary literature. First one may make a general point: namely that, with the rather higher dating now provided for the introduction of many of the improvements, it follows that they were present in the Late Geometric era, the very period in which the painters are portraying the old, pre-hoplite style of warfare. Their presence is occasionally indicated by these artists; and the hoplite shield is unambiguously shown on two vases of the Late (but not the very latest) Geometric style. In both cases it is carried by warriors who are following each other in a repetitive file round the vase; it is not yet shown being wielded in battle, and this may be significant. Possibly a distinction is to be drawn between such decorative subjects and the true battle-scenes; conceivably the latter are all intended to represent episodes from saga or mythology. It has been argued that both the chariot and the predominant type of shield (the 'Dipylon' form) in such scenes are merely heroic property, and do not correspond with contemporary usage. But it would be unwarrantable to dispose of the whole body of contemporary pictorial evidence on such grounds. Even if the subject-matter of all these scenes were legendary, it would be extraordinary if the artist's depiction of them were not in some way coloured by his experience of contemporary warfare. We thus have evidence that the tactics of the Geometric battle-scenes could be, and were, combined with the use of the hoplite shield, and of the metallic helmet and corselet.

For the last two items, there is conclusive evidence from another source besides the paintings: the Late Geometric grave discovered at Argos in 1953. The warrior buried here was a young man of substance; he may also, if the iron axes and huge fire-dogs in the shape of warships mean anything, have been a ship's captain or marine, as the excavator suggested. He wore a bronze helmet of early type, new to Greece but very soon to become obsolete with the development of the Corinthian helmet, and a superbly made bronze cuirass of the type which Greek hoplites wore for some two centuries afterwards. It might seem rash to conclude that he was an aristocrat; but the unparalleled nature of the find for its period, and the other indications of wealth, make this a natural inference. In addition, the connexion of the horse with a prominently drawn helmet, almost certainly metallic, is established by a small group of paintings, of Argive as well as Attic provenance. In these, the helmeted warrior is shown either actually mounted, or holding the heads of one or two horses.

The next stage in the evidence is represented by the scenes on a number of vases, mainly Corinthian and Attic, of the first half of the seventh century. Here again there is ambiguity in the evidence. It has been claimed that certain features of these scenes are romantic survivals, while others are based on up-to-date observation; and that the scenes themselves, according to the presence or absence of these features, are sometimes legendary, sometimes contemporary in subject-matter, or else a mixture of the two. I have no wish to ridicule such a theory, which in part at least is well-supported. But it seems better to make certain objective observations about these scenes:

(i) Only a very few of the latest scenes in the group (all Corinthian) unmistakably

5 BSA xlii (1947), pl. 19A (Benaki Museum): lii (1957), pl. 3A (from Eretria, in Athens): Early Greek Armour 62. To these we may now add a sherd from the Kerameikos, AA 1953, 649, fig. 5.

6 Webster, BSA 1 (1955), 41–3 and From Mycenae to Homer, 169 f. on the shield: cf. Early Greek Armour 58–60, and 159–63 (chariot).

7 BCH lxxxiiii (1957), 322–86.

8 Attic: AM xvii (1892), pl. 10; Robinson, Harcum and Iliffe, Greek Vases in Toronto, pl. 9. 120.

9 Argive: Titans i, pl. 15, 51; Argive Heraion ii, pl. 37, 4; JHS lxiv (1954) pl. 8, 3; BCH lxxviii (1954), 413, fig. 4; and another unpublished sherd from Argos, shown to me by Prof P. Courbin.

9 See especially Miss Lorimer, BSA xlii (1947), 80–108. This view was rightly criticised by Roland Hampe, Ein frühbritischer Grabfund, 82–3.
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portray men operating in a close-packed formation that can be called a phalanx. In the main, the warriors are either alone, or engaging in a series of individual duels, or in a more or less loose formation, often with variegated equipment. It should be stressed that even uniform equipment and fairly close formation are not peculiar properties of the hoplite: New Kingdom Egypt, seventh-century Assyria and pre-hoplite Greece all show examples of these features.\(^{10}\)

(ii) Of the scenes in which spears are carried, a majority give two spears to each warrior. This is most easily intelligible if one or both spears are to be thrown; and two even later Corinthian vases do clearly show twin spears with thongs attached for this very purpose.\(^{10a}\) The Classical hoplite, on the other hand, had only one spear, for thrusting.

(iii) A majority of the scenes show the warriors wearing something less than the full hoplite equipment: in particular, either the corset or the hoplite shield is definitely absent in many cases.

(iv) The modes of fighting differ: in particular, one group of Attic vases shows warriors engaging in single combat with long swords.\(^{11}\) This again is not hoplite practice, unless we are to imagine that these warriors have broken their spears.

I believe that these pictures are in fact the documentary evidence of a transitional stage in the development of Greek warfare. In this stage, there was as yet no crystallised formation or form of tactics; indeed, there was no standardised panoply, either of armour or of offensive weapons. Instead, the familiar tactics of the previous century were being gradually modified—for instance, there is now an overwhelming concentration on hand-to-hand fighting. But the equipment remains much the same as in the last generation, except that the helmet has been improved and the greave is now often present. It may also be possible to recognise glimpses of this kind of warfare in two contemporary poets. The use of the javelin, perhaps in conjunction with the hoplite shield, is twice indicated in the surviving poem of Kallinos of Ephesos; while the sword-duels (see (iv) above) may be recorded in Archilochos' prophecy that an imminent war in Euboea 'εὐφέων . . . πολύστονον ἐσσεται ἔργων', where the prospective participants are also referred to as 'lords'.\(^{12}\) Here there is no mention of the spear (except in the traditional epithet δούρευροτόμου), although we know from other fragments that Archilochos fought with the hoplite shield and spear.\(^{13}\) Furthermore the mounted warrior, though not yet a common figure in Greek art, is less rare in the early seventh century than in the late eighth.\(^{14}\) He is seldom equipped as a true hoplite at this date, and may well represent a survival of the aristocratic 'cavalryman', who now probably used his horse mainly for transport.

It therefore seems unnecessary to believe that a radical change in the warrior class, with its social and political implications, had yet taken place. This would only occur after—if very soon after—the adoption of the phalanx. But it is an equally fundamental question, what the scope and effects of such a change would be when it did happen.

In seeking an answer to this question, we are fortunately not confined to the world of early Greece, with its extremely thin documentation. The superiority of hoplite equipment and tactics was such that they came to be adopted, in emulation of the Greeks, by several other peoples. Of these the Carians perhaps take first place chronologically, but their case

---

10 Cf. Myres, Homer and his Critics, 183 and pl. 6.  
11 CVA Berlin i, pls. 28. 1; 44. 2: BSA xxxv (1934-5), pl. 52 a: Hampe, op. cit. fig. 37, upper rig. l.  
12 Kallinos i 5, 14; cf. 10. Archilochos fr. 3.  
13 Frr. 2 and 6.  
14 CVA Berlin i, pls. 42. 4; 44. 2; Welter, Aus der Karlsruher Vasensammlung (Bausteine i), pl. 1. 2 (all Attic). Artemis Orthia, pl. 92. 3 and 104. 1 (Lacanian). To these we may add many terracotta figurines of mounted warriors, such as Tityn i 83 fig. 20; Perachora i, pl. 100. 166; Argive Heraeum ii, pl. 48. 245.
is not an enlightening one.\textsuperscript{15} The literary tradition, such as it is, is misleading; there is no evidence, nor is there ever likely to be, from artistic representation; while actual finds of armour have yet to materialise.

Far more rewarding is the study of the two stages whereby the new form of warfare first passed from Greece to Etruria, and then from Etruria to Rome. Part of its value lies in the fact that the nature of the evidence is so different from that in Greece. Admittedly there is much useful information here also to be gained from pictorial evidence, especially in Etruria. But in the case of Rome there is a literary account, diffuse if incoherent, and this account includes just enough about Etruria to confirm the natural inference from the archaeological material.

Before examining this, however, I think it is worth making a few observations on the whole subject of hoplite warfare. Sometimes the fundamentals stand in greatest danger of being overlooked.

First, the entire concept of a hoplite army must always be based on a qualification of wealth: the wealth necessary for the individual soldier to pay for his own panoply. This point has of course been made by many commentators, ancient and modern. In the state of society in which the system was invariably adopted, this qualification could be assessed primarily in one commodity only, landed property. The hoplite phalanx must, for a time at least, be recruited largely from the ranks of the farmers. These would hardly be mere smallholders; in a country as poor as Greece, one would judge that only a fairly substantial landed proprietor could afford a panoply which was not only intrinsically valuable, but which (particularly in the case of the Corinthian helmet) required exceptional skill in the bronze-smith and a considerable amount of his time.

There is also the question of an upper limit to the property qualification of the hoplite class. Can we believe that, from the first, the aristocrats and men of exceptional wealth took their place in the phalanx beside their supposed inferiors? Any answer to this is largely dependent on the function that is allowed to the cavalry before and after the hoplite reform. The position, at least as far as Athens was concerned, was made clear by the researches of W. Helbig at the beginning of this century.\textsuperscript{16} The Athenian ἄμφοτεροι, by a deft compromise, were able to keep their horses (and servants) and yet serve in the phalanx. The horse was used only for transport, and on the battlefield the aristocrat, already accoutred as a hoplite, dismounted and took his position in the line, leaving his horse to a squire.

Such an arrangement need not necessarily have gone back to the very beginnings of the phalanx, especially if there had been true cavalry warfare in the preceding period. Aristotle assures us that, in Euboea and Ionia at least, there was; and certainly, in some of the more backward areas of Greece, cavalry warfare was traditional and remained in use down into the Classical era. When Helbig applied his theory of mounted hoplites to early Rome and other more primitive communities, he was understandably challenged.\textsuperscript{17} Nevertheless, it seems that Helbig was probably right in the main about seventh-century Greece. Neither in the monumental evidence, nor in contemporary literature, is there an instance of a Greek warrior going into action on horseback; while our one articulate aristocratic warrior of this period, Archilochos, certainly fought as an infantryman and almost certainly in hoplite equipment (see above).

If farmer and aristocrat stood side by side in the phalanx from early on, there would clearly be a degree of interdependence between the two classes. Of the farmers one can perhaps say more. For one thing, they would have no vested interest in war; on the con-

\textsuperscript{15} See JHS lxxiv (1964), 107-8.


\textsuperscript{17} Helbig, Abh. Bayr. Ak. Wiss. (philos.-philol.)
trary, it would be a double menace to their property, possibly leading to its devastation and certainly requiring their own absence from it. Nor had they, to judge from the evidence available, any tradition of service as a military unit. To say that they had a positive interest in maintaining the status quo would be an exaggeration; it is most unlikely, for instance, that the old system provided for any efficient protection of their property. But it remains difficult to see in the hoplite class a driving force for military or political innovation, let alone revolution.

The second general point is an even more obvious one: that fighting in a hoplite battle, if on occasion glorious, must almost always have been unpleasant. The soldier was well protected, it is true; but this made marching and fighting, under the Greek summer sun, a gruelling experience for him, and it also ensured that any wound he did receive was likely to be an agonising one, not necessarily bringing a quick death. We have it on the authority of many contemporary vase-paintings that the two thrusts habitually used with the hoplite spear were directed at the throat and at the groin. Tyrtaios gives a grim picture of the effects of the latter. In steeling himself to this ordeal, the hoplite had to bear in mind that, accidents apart, the battle would continue relentlessly until a sufficient number of soldiers, on one side or the other, had been so disabled. The one attraction of this form of warfare to the ordinary hoplite will have been that a single engagement usually gave a clear-cut result and ended the campaign.

These factors in combination will have produced an inevitable strategic effect: under the new system, offensive warfare became far less attractive. The hoplite who would willingly fight at his city’s frontiers, or under her walls, might well baulk at a speculative foray into neighbouring territories. It will be observed that the seventh century is none the less a period of great expansion for many Greek states; but there were other military instruments besides the hoplite citizen militia for this purpose. In the first place, there were already mercenaries: such use of Carian hoplites and, less securely, of Thessalian cavalry and Cretan archers, is attested for this period. Secondly, there were warships, a necessary accompaniment of colonising ventures overseas: Thucydides dates the first Greek naval battle to c. 664 B.C. Naval warfare at this time may still have been partly conducted on the old lines, with a fighting deck carrying marines armed as hoplites, and several contemporary pictures show ships of this type; but the new tactics, in which fast, undocked longships were manoeuvred to ram, were already being introduced, and these would make small demands, if any, on the hoplite class.

Lastly, there remained a traditional warrior class in the shape of the aristocracy. We have seen (pp. 112-114 above) that there is evidence for its continued activity in warfare after the introduction of hoplite equipment; only with the sharp increase in man-power, required by the adoption of hoplite tactics, would its supremacy in this field be affected.

The conclusion that I would draw from all these considerations is that there was not, and could not be expected to be, an enthusiastic rush to arms on the part of the more substantial property owners, the future ‘hoplite class’. Even if the bait of political power had been held out from the first—which is perhaps improbable—this would hardly be enough to launch a voluntary movement which ran so entirely against historical precedent. Here again we may cite Tyrtaios: there are clear indications in his poems that the Spartan army in the Second Messenian War needed constant, not to say desperate, exhortation to duty. This army, it is clear, fought in hoplite equipment; although its organisation can correspond only than mercenaries.) Cretans: Pausanias iv 8. 3; 10. 1 (conquest of Messenia); iv 19. 4 (Second Messenian War).

18 Fr. vii:vii, 21-5 (Diehl, ALG3). See R. Nierhaus
JdI liii (1938), 90-114 on this theme.
19 Cf. Adcock, The Greek and Macedonian Art of War, 7 f.
20 Carians: Archilochos fr. 24 Bergk (40 Diehl), Hdt. ii 152. Thessalians: Plutarch, Mor. 760-1. (These are perhaps semi-professional allies, rather
21 Fr. vii:vii and viii, passim.
22 Kirk, BSA xliii (1949), 119-23 with references.
with a rudimentary version of the phalanx.\textsuperscript{25} The case of Sparta is indeed the best-documented of all. The stage of confused tactics and reluctant hoplites, of which Tyrtaios is witness, is succeeded (it is now clear) by the stage of the lead hoplite-figurines found in such quantities at Sparta and the Menelaion.\textsuperscript{26} These cheap, mass-produced dedications, a sign of a unified and self-conscious hoplite class, have at last been put in their correct place chronologically, and probably do not begin before c. 650 B.C.\textsuperscript{27}

Such a conclusion will almost certainly involve the question of the rise of tyranny. As Professor Andrewes’ study has shown, the hoplite reform and the path to power of the early tyrants are subjects which impinge on one another in several cases.\textsuperscript{28} But the relationship of the two events may have to be reconsidered. For instance, since it is particularly from Corinthian vases that we infer the appearance of the true hoplite phalanx at about the middle of the seventh century, can we believe that Kypselos in c. 655 gave political power to an established hoplite class? And could Pheidon of Argos, whether his rise comes in the mid eighth century or (as most scholars believe) in the early seventh, have used the phalanx, drawn from a trained hoplite class, as an instrument for re-establishing the power of the monarchy against that of the aristocracy? And finally, to tread on still more dangerous ground, can the wording of the Spartan Rheta be taken as a guarantee that a full hoplite assembly is envisaged? If so, the date of that controversial document may have to be placed lower than the latest estimates would have it,\textsuperscript{29} since political recognition of the hoplite class will hardly have preceded its vindication in war.

I will leave these questions to those better equipped to answer them, and pass instead to the rather less troubled waters of Italy, where the notion of the hoplite phalanx was among those ideas which migrated in the wake of the Greek colonists and traders.

* * * *

The story of the adoption of hoplite equipment by the Etruscans is less complex. There is very little literary evidence: almost the only tradition worth noting is that the people of Falerii and Fescennium used Argive shields and other hoplite arms, a fact sometimes attributed to their being descended from Greek settlers.\textsuperscript{30} But a large corpus of representations of warriors, covering much of the sixth and fifth centuries, seems to give an almost unanimous verdict, that the archaic Etruscan warrior had adopted part or all of the Greek hoplite panoply. These representations embrace a wide range of art, and to them we may add a number of actual specimens of hoplite armour found in Etruria; but many of these last lack secure dating contexts, as indeed they do in Greece itself. The process of borrowing did not apparently begin before 650; perhaps the best evidence of this is the fine series of Etruscan shields of single-grip, pre-hoplite type, ultimately derived from the Near East, which begins in the eighth century and continues only down to about the middle of the seventh.\textsuperscript{31} It is regrettable that the considerable numbers of hoplite shields and


\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Artemis Orthia} pls. 183, 191: \textit{BSA} xv (1908–9), pl. 7, etc. An example was found at Tegea, \textit{BCH} xlv (1921), 429, no. 377, fig. 42.

\textsuperscript{27} Boardman, \textit{BSA} liii (1963), 1–7.

\textsuperscript{28} \textit{The Greek Tyrants}, 41–2 (Pheidon as possible creator of the Argive hoplite army); 49 (Kypselos as champion of the Corinthian hoplite class); 72–3 (the Rheta as the enfranchisement of Spartan hoplites). Cf. Huxley, \textit{BCH} lxxxii (1958), 588–601 and \textit{Early Sparta} 30—a similar conclusion but a very different chronology for Pheidon; \textit{ibid}. 49 (the Rheta): Wade-Gery, \textit{CAH} iii 551 on Kypselos.

\textsuperscript{29} See most recently W. G. Forrest, \textit{Phoenix} xvii (1963), 157–79 and G. L. Huxley, \textit{Early Sparta} 41–52, who both arrive at a date around 675 B.C.

\textsuperscript{30} Dionys. i. 21: cf. Pliny, \textit{Nat. Hist.} iii 51.

\textsuperscript{31} On these see A. Akerström, \textit{Der geometrische Stil in Italien} 102 ff., 113 ff.; 119 ff.: E. Kunze, \textit{Studies presented to D. M. Robinson} i 736 ff.

The Hoplite Reform and History

Greaves\textsuperscript{33} found in Etruria are not better documented, but at least their Greek inspiration is evident. A recent find may help here: a shield-facing with bronze blazons and other decoration, found at Fabriano in Picenum. In a very full publication of this find,\textsuperscript{34} Stucchi has argued that it is Attic work of the mid seventh century. Almost certainly it is a hoplite shield, and possibly of Greek workmanship; but I do not think that the animals are as close to Attic models as Stucchi does, nor that a dating closer than to the late Orientalising period is possible. Mr J. Boardman suggests that it could be from an Etruscan or West Greek workshop.\textsuperscript{34a} Fabriano is not far outside Etruscan territory; but if this is a stepping-stone on the way to Etruria, it is on a most unexpected route from Greece.

By comparison with the actual examples, the representational evidence is profuse. I can only hope to give a selection of it here, and it may be that I have omitted some important monument: but I do not think that the conclusions will be affected. This evidence has one great limitation, that one cannot always be sure that the appearance in Etruscan art of figures in Greek armour is not simply due to the pervasion of Etruria by Greek artistic models and motifs. The example of Greek hoplite-figures, executed in materials closely comparable to their own, could have inspired artists who had never seen them in real life. But the evidence allows a \textit{prima facie} inference, that several of the Etruscan city-states adopted hoplite equipment (as distinct from tactics) during the late seventh or the early sixth century.

It is possible to make some differentiation in the quality of this evidence. Of the early vase-paintings, for instance, two similar, late seventh-century amphorae in the Villa Giulia in London\textsuperscript{35} show warriors with pattern shield-devices clearly copied from Greek models, most of which represent hoplites.\textsuperscript{36} They thus offer only the most indirect evidence that the Etruscan artist had ever seen a hoplite. Of similar date, but rather less ambiguous, is the oinochoe from Tragliatella with the scene of the Trojan Game,\textsuperscript{37} in which the armed dancers and the horsemen carry shields with bird- and animal-blazons, a sure mark of the hoplite type. These are strange circumstances in which to find the hoplite shield first represented; yet this, in any way, adds to the strength of the evidence. Neither the style nor the subject-matter of the scenes on this vase is likely to owe as much as usual to Greek prototypes, and the blazoned shield may therefore quite possibly be present in Etruria before 600 B.C.

Such a conclusion is also supported by the less explicit scene of a hoplite duel on a bronze relief from the Tumulus of Castellina (Montecalvario).\textsuperscript{38}

Greater certainty is possible with early sixth-century works: first, the find of bronze figurines made at Brolio in Northern Etruria in the last century, which includes three warriors which form a natural group.\textsuperscript{39} These evidently served as supports to an object of furniture: they are distinctly Italian in style, and their pose, with the sharp turn of the head, is original. Yet they are wearing Greek helmets, of a form somewhat rarely seen in art: the so-called 'Illyrian' type, actually of Peloponnesian origin. The very slight development of the cheek-piece would date such helmets in Greece some way back in the seventh century,\textsuperscript{40} but the Brolio figurines are normally placed just after 600. In addition, the figurines show, on their left arms, the unmistakable remnants of the arm-band and hand-
grip of the hoplite shield. Now too representations in stone begin, with a fragmentary statue from Chiusi, perhaps as early as the Brolio bronzes, of a warrior wearing a roughly-carved Corinthian helmet and carrying a hoplite shield with a Gorgoneion device. This substantial piece of sculpture is perhaps even better evidence for Etruscan practices.

If we can identify Etruscan hoplites here, we may the more confidently detect them in many later representations which are more directly reminiscent of Greek models, though not always finer in execution. Outstanding among these is the fully-accoutred bronze warrior forming the handle of one of the cauldrons found with the Loeb tripods (apparently near Perugia). Here we see not only the Corinthian helmet and hoplite shield, but also the corset and greaves. Also from the middle and later sixth century are examples of relief sculpture; in stone, such as the famous Avle Feluske stele which portrays a man partly equipped as a Greek hoplite although he also carries a double axe, and a head and another stele from Orvieto which show Corinthian helmets, in bronze, as on one of the later reliefs of the Montelevone chariot; and, most commonly, in terracotta. Hoplite armour is also present in a wider range of art before the end of the sixth century—for example, on Etruscan black-figure and incised bucchero vases, and in aryballoi in the shape of a helmeted head.

It is one of the stone funerary reliefs which provides perhaps the first instance of Etruscan hoplites ranged in a formation which could be an attempt to portray the phalanx. This again is of the second half of the sixth century. But the most impressive evidence for the Etruscans having adopted the phalanx is literary: the repeated tradition of the Romans that they had learned from the Etruscans the technique of fighting χειλάκασπιδες καὶ φαλαγγέον. This is a key passage for the whole question. No date is indicated for the event, which theoretically could have happened at any time from the sixth century to the fourth, when Rome went over to the manipular army on the Samnite model. Fortunately, however, there is supporting evidence on the Roman side which will enable us to determine closer limits.

For Etruria, the evidence summarised above shows that, beyond reasonable doubt, the Etruscans adopted the equipment of the Greek hoplite by the early sixth century. Indeed, from the presence of the Graecizing shield at Fabriano and the disappearance of the earlier Etruscan single-grip shield, I should be inclined to place the change rather earlier than 600 B.C. It is conceivable that it could be connected with the migration of Demaratos of Corinth and his retinue. The Etruscans also adopted the hoplite phalanx, probably during the sixth century.

This being so, it is worth noting two consequences. First, the change to the new equipment will have occurred during the period when the archaic monarchies were still in power in most or all of the Etruscan states. Secondly, it occurred in a society with a pronounced and lasting oligarchic trend, based on gentilicial lines, and there is no evidence that it was in

41 AM xxi (1896), 1–10, pl. 1: Riis, Tyrrehenika 114 A4.
42 AJA xii (1906), 297, fig. 2, pl. 12: Riis, Tyrrehenika 127, 132.
43 The grave may have been a slightly late arrival, but not nearly so late as was thought by G. Karo (Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. ‘ocrea’, 147), and by E. S. McCartney, MAAR 1 (1917), 151–2, who misunderstood representations on terracottas.
44 M. Pallottino, The Etruscans 141, fig. 4.
45 O.W. von Vacano, Die Etrusker, Werdem und geistige Welt, 165, fig. 69: Riis, Tyrrehenika 102, no. 3 and n. 3.
46 L. Goldscheider, Etruscan Sculpture, pl. 81.
47 E.g. Andrén, Architectural Terracottas from Etrusco-Italic Temples, pl. 24. 88 (Tuscania); pl. 25. 91 (Poggio Buco); pl. 36. 124 (Civita Castellana); pl. 141. 492 (Satricum); pl. B. 2–3 (Caere). Commonest of all are the mounted hoplites (see above, p. 114, n. 17): ibid. pl. 5. 10–12, 8. 22 and 13. 45 (Caere); pl. 24. 87 (Tuscania); pl. 57. 188 (Vignanello).
48 E.g. Beazley, Etruscan Vase-painting, pl. 3. 3–4.
49 E.g. Marta, L’Art Étrusque, figs. 319, 321.
50 E.g. von Vacano, op. cit. 61, fig. 22 (Caere).
51 Stud. Etr. iv (1930), 101–2, pl. 10.
52 Diodor. 23. 2; Ined. Vat. iii (Hermes xvii (1892), 121): cf. Athenaeus vii 106.
53 See Blakeway, JRS xxv (1935), 129–49.
any way compromised by the transfer of power to the aristocracies, which in most cases took place about the end of the sixth century. This is a very singular fact, as has been observed recently by Momigliano.\textsuperscript{54} For if the hoplite system could be organised and maintained within an unregenerate oligarchic society in Etruria, by what right can it be assumed that its adoption in Greece had far-reaching and almost immediate social consequences?

We may also perhaps point to another analogy with Greece: the repeated evidence that the ‘panoply’ could be assumed piecemeal or only in part, and the pronounced time-lag between the first evidence for the equipment and the first evidence for hoplite tactics. Even against the misty landscape of Etruscan history, these facts seem to emerge unmistakably.

* * * * *

Roman hoplites are a different story again. It is true that there is some archaeological evidence of the same kind as in Etruria; and that, for the pre-hoplite period, there is abundant proof of Roman dependence on Etruria in things military.\textsuperscript{55} For later times, there are again the architectural terracottas: we have noted that one of the Etruscan examples was found at Satricum in Latium (n. 47), and Rome itself has produced others.\textsuperscript{56} But it is precisely because they are so Etruscan in style, and almost certainly from the hand of Etruscan visiting artists, that their value as evidence is limited. We cannot infer that the equipment and tactics of the hoplite had passed to Rome simultaneously with the artistic influence which led to their being portrayed. It is usual, therefore, to turn to the literary evidence for enlightenment of this question.\textsuperscript{57}

It is equally usual to connect the adoption of hoplite tactics with the Centuriae reform attributed to Servius Tullius. Here one enters hazardous ground. In the first place, it is most unlikely that the details of the Centuriae reform, as recorded by Livy and others, all go back to the original Servian scheme; and secondly, even if Servius can be credited with introducing hoplites, the dating of this king is at the moment the very nucleus of a profound controversy.\textsuperscript{58} But provided that Servius really did initiate a scheme, however rudimentary, of military classes based on property qualifications,\textsuperscript{59} he can hardly be dissociated from the adoption of hoplites in Rome; and we may therefore pose the problem as a choice between two alternatives. Either Servius was king, in accordance with the traditional Roman chronology, some time in the sixth century, a period, on any account, of deep Etruscan influence on Rome, when it would have been natural for military advances to be taken over from Etruria in the way which Roman tradition remembered (p. 118 above). Or, according to Gjerstad’s view, based not only on archaeological evidence, he reigned in the first half of the fifth century, which is much nearer the time at which independent evidence suggested to Nilsson (n. 57) that the hoplite reform occurred. As a matter of fact, Nilsson’s evidence is far from conclusive: he points to the creation of the tribuni militum consulari potestate and of the censorship in the mid fifth century. But the first of these reforms is now generally admitted to have been a political device to buy off Plebeian aspirations; while the second is hardly a sign of the original institution of a property census, which may have existed for some time within the sphere of other magistrates’ duties.\textsuperscript{60} Nilsson also cites the case of the Dictator, A. Postumius Tubertus, who in 432 or 431 B.C. put to death his own son for leaping forward from his place in the line to engage an enemy;\textsuperscript{61} but this event, even if historical (which our

\textsuperscript{54} JRS liii (1963), 119–21.
\textsuperscript{55} See E. S. McCartney, MAAR i (1917), 121–67.
\textsuperscript{56} E.g. Andrén, op. cit., pl. 107, 382; pl. 105, 377, which is identical with examples from Velletri, ibid., pl. 127, 445–6. Cf. also pl. 120, 424 from Segni.
\textsuperscript{57} As Nilsson, JRS xix (1929), 1–11.
\textsuperscript{58} See most recently Momigliano, JRS liii (1963), 95–121; Gjerstad, ‘Legends and Facts’, Scripta Minora (Lund), 1960–1, 2.
\textsuperscript{59} See Last, JRS xxxiv (1945), 30 f., especially 34–5 and 42–4.
\textsuperscript{60} I am most grateful to colleagues in Edinburgh, particularly Drs T. J. Cadoux and P. G. Walsh, for discussion of these points.
\textsuperscript{61} Diodor. xii 64: cf. Livy iv 29.
ancient authorities doubted), would be only a *terminus ante quem* for the establishment of hoplite tactics.

Another piece of evidence much quoted in this context is the tradition that the Fabii went to war as a gens, with their clientes, against the Veientes and were annihilated at the Cremera in c. 477 B.C.\(^2\) For Nilsson, who rejected any connexion of military reform with Servius Tullius, this was evidence that the hoplite system had not been adopted at that date. This seems at first sight a fair inference, even though the value of this story is to a slight degree offset by the fact that in the traditionally yet earlier battle of Lake Regillus, the Romans were said to have fought in the phalanx.\(^3\) Momigliano however (n. 54) uses the Cremera incident to support a different view: that the Servian hoplite reform, enacted in the sixth century, had been allowed to lapse after the king’s death, and was reinstated only when the Romans had learned, from such misfortunes as the Cremera, of the indispensability of hoplites.

This is a possible reconstruction, if the lapse was a temporary, administrative failure, unconnected with equipment or tactics. The advantages conferred by the hoplite reform were too obvious for it to be annulled or abandoned by the state; and they would have been doubly so to the Romans who were continually confronted with Etruscan hoplites. Momigliano’s own observation, that the Etruscans combined hoplite tactics with an aristocratic system of nobles and clientes, goes far to show how the Fabii could have used hoplites at the Cremera. Men *equipped* as hoplites could and did take part in the warfare of gentilicial factions: we have seen evidence for something much like this in Greece, and indeed Alkaios himself is a witness of it.\(^4\) It may even have been possible to muster a phalanx from one’s own entourage, and this, again, would be desirable when confronting hoplites as the Fabii were. Some social distinction might still be preserved by the nobility serving as mounted hoplites (see p. 114 above).

I would accept the tradition that Servius was responsible for a military reform, and that this was designed to provide a citizen hoplite army. It also seems less difficult, on balance, to date him within the sixth century, though I cannot believe that his traditional dates (579–534) correspond in any way with the historical reality. From this it will follow that the introduction of hoplites in Rome was an extended process, allowing of such irregularities as the Cremera expedition in the early fifth century, and perhaps only systematised in the great period of constitutional reform that began with the Decemviral legislation.\(^5\) What Servius’ exact contribution was, one can hardly tell; but it was evidently an attempt to define the classes from which hoplites and other troops could be recruited, by some kind of property qualification. On this account, the hoplite system will first have been launched in the regal period, by a king in his capacity as head of state; and further, this will have happened before, or at the most during, a period of pronounced aristocratic ascendancy in Rome, in which a hoplite class as yet plays no recognisable part.

\[^2\] Livy ii 48–50.
\[^3\] Dionys. vi 10. 2.

\[^5\] Compare the conclusion of K. Hanell, *Das altrömische eponyme Amt* 197–8.
considerable period after it. This phase could only be terminated by the growth of a substantial class of land-owners who had proved their worth by fighting in the phalanx. Yet the adoption of the phalanx did not inevitably have this sequel even then: we have no evidence in Etruria that the supposed social upheaval happened at all, and we have no grounds for thinking that it happened immediately in Rome. We cannot therefore assume that it followed at once on the adoption of the phalanx in Greece.

I do not think that this interpretation is contradicted by what Aristotle says in the Politics about the development of constitutions; indeed there are details in his account which hint at roughly the sequence of events that we have inferred. Aristotle says that the hoplite ‘democracy’ succeeded a phase of cavalry supremacy.66 We can hardly identify or date this phase with precision, but I have suggested above (p. 113) that it continued for a time after 700 B.C. In the previous sentence Aristotle makes a telling comment, that hoplite warfare is ineffective without organisation; and this is recalled at the end of the passage when he uses the same word (σοφοναίς) in a difficult phrase, best understood as meaning that the middle class were ‘deficient in organisation’ (including presumably military organisation). These remarks seem to presuppose a phase in which hoplites existed, but had not yet been organised, either tactically as a phalanx, or politically as a party.

The second conclusion is closely bound up with the first: that there would be no spontaneous movement on the part of the prospective ‘hoplite class’. In Etruria we can infer, and in Rome we can be virtually certain, that the adoption of hoplite tactics took place, for purely military reasons, at the behest of the heads of state, who could apply compulsion to a possibly reluctant body of men. This is very much the pattern that we see in a remarkably late case of introduction of hoplites in Greece, the reorganisation of the Achaean army by Philopoemen in the third century B.C.,67 and we see it again, many centuries later, in the Capitularies of Charlemagne.68

Charlemagne was expressly concerned, as the creators of the hoplite phalanx must have been, with the provision of metal body-armour and the infantry to wear it, and it may be worth looking more closely at his dispositions. First, in a series of ordinances (the earliest apparently in A.D. 779), he made it an offence to export mail-shirts from the realm. Later, in the Capitulare de Exercitu promovendo of 803, military service and provision of equipment is generally enforced for a wide range of land-owning Franks: all who possess one mansus of land or more.69 The enforcement is much stricter for the nobility and richer land-owners; as one descends the scale of wealth, groups of two, and then of four, men are to combine to equip one of their number, the others being exempt from actually serving. The Capitulare Aquisgranense of 805 supplements this: each man who owns more than 12 mansi (about 95 acres) is to provide his own mail-shirt alone.

The Capitulary of 807 extends this arrangement. The lower limit for compulsory service is brought down to half a mansus or its equivalent in goods, and the obligations of the next higher class are slightly increased. The Capitulare Bononiense of 811 provides, among other things, for the requisitioning of spare mail-shirts by the king. Finally, the Capitulare Aquisgranense of 813 makes it compulsory for all the household men of counts, bishops and abbots to have their own metal helmet and mail-shirt.

The features that I should like to stress are these: the prevalence of land as a qualification, other property being introduced only for the additional lowest class of the Capitulary of 807: the comparatively high land-qualification (nearly 100 acres) for independent commoners providing their own equipment: the fact that it took a powerful and efficient king over thirty years to achieve a satisfactory proportion of heavy-armed infantry: and, in general, the

---

66 Pol. 1297b 16–24: cf. 28.
67 Pausanias viii 50. 1.
68 See Oman, History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages 77–82.
69 A mansus apparently equalled 12 ingenia, or just under 8 acres.
atmosphere of compulsion and penalty which pervades these Capitularies and explains their existence.

It seems likely that the hoplite phalanx also owed its inception in the Greek cities to the action of the heads of state, whose foremost aim was the defence of the realm. Later on hoplites could and did partake in political struggles and win political rights, but it is in no case certain that they established their political or military leaders as tyrants.70 By the time of Solon, it is clear that the Zeugitai, to be identified with the Athenian hoplite class, formed a distinct group and had earned the political power that he gave them. It is also possible that they represent the disappointed δῆμος who had wanted a tyranny.71 But Solon's poems are our earliest explicit evidence for this state of affairs; and his reforms suggest that in Athens it was a recent growth.

On this account, then, the Greek hoplite entered history as an individual warrior, probably in most cases an aristocrat. The adoption of the phalanx meant that he was joined by men, for the most part substantial land-owners, who had come not to seek a way to political power nor by any wish of their own, but because they were compelled to. These men, however stout-hearted as warriors, are not likely to have become, all at once, a revolutionary force in politics, even in Greece. The political rights which they came to possess could have been acquired gradually and peacefully, τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὁπλοῖς ἰαχνοτάτων μᾶλλον, as Aristotle says. They must have had political leaders, but I doubt whether we can number the early tyrants among them. Hoplites, in short, were an instrument before they became a force.72

A. M. SNODGRASS.

University of Edinburgh.

70 Kylon of Athens was evidently not such a leader, since he required Megarian help to seize the Acropolis in c. 632 (Thuc. i 126). See also pp. 115-116 above.
71 So Andrewes, The Greek Tyrants 35-6, 87-91. We may disbelieve, along with the rest of Chapter iv of the Ath. Pol., the claim that Drakon extended rights τοῖς ὁπλα παρεχομένοις.
72 Prof. A. Andrewes and Mr John Boardman have given me much helpful advice on this subject, though they can in no way be held responsible for what I have written. The article is substantially in the form in which it was delivered to the Hellenic Society in November 1964.
PAINTED MYCENAEAN LARNAKES
(PLATES XXV-XXVIII)

Nearly ten years ago the first specimens of a new group of painted Mycenaean sarcophagi, or larnakes, began to become known in Greece. They attracted immediate attention, and some disbelief. The group has not yet been studied as a whole, or evaluated as a relic of Aegean art, for the circumstances of discovery and dispersal have made close examination difficult. The scenes of mourning figures painted on them have considerable interest, however, and it seems timely to put together what is known about them in spite of the incomplete evidence. Once the larnakes become better known it will be a pleasurable task for scholars to relate them as harmoniously as possible to neighbouring monuments of Aegean painting and to the late Mycenaean environment which produced them.¹

Until the discovery of these Greek larnakes, scholars rightly believed that the practice of using clay coffins for burial was essentially a Minoan one, not Mycenaean. The great number of larnakes on display in the Herakleion Museum in Crete demonstrates how widespread larnax-burial was in the Late Minoan period, apparently gathering momentum after the destruction of the Cretan palaces. While the earliest terracotta larnakes known in Crete are as old as the latter part of the Early Minoan period, they were not used extensively among the middle classes until the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. The first preserved wooden coffins of Crete are found in chamber tombs of sea-captains and soldiers who died in the late fifteenth century. Perhaps they adapted the custom from Egypt in an age when relations between coastal Crete and the Nile Valley were particularly active. One of the coffins in the harbour cemetery of Katsaba near Knossos was painted blue; otherwise there are no traces of rich surface elaboration in the Egyptian fashion. As far as one can tell from the rotted condition of wood in the Aegean climate, the Minoans did not use external face masks, or gilding, but made simply carpentered containers for simple inhumations.²

Most surviving Cretan larnakes of the Late Minoan age are made of rough thick clay painted in the colours of vases, red or black on a buff ground. Very few are polychrome. Stone coffins were extremely rare; the limestone Hagia Triada sarcophagus of about 1400 B.C. is the best known example. Cretan larnakes exist in two principal shapes, no matter what the material: the bathtub, which is generally oval, often tapered and sloping toward the foot, and rests flat on the ground; and the gabled chest which is rectangular, usually tall and thin, standing on four square feet, with a lid, a clear imitation of a wooden box. Both types may have a profusion of handles applied at various points on the body and the lid to strengthen the clay, as on storage pithoi. The bathtub is normally found in palaces and houses as a real piece of domestic furniture although it is also funerary; the chest type is found almost exclusively in tombs and tends to have the more interesting decoration. Most Cretan chest larnakes are found with their lids, and are painted with abstract designs or patterns of flowers, birds, sea life, and occasional religious motifs such as horns of consecration and double axes, but not with human figures. The body of the dead is deposited directly inside the larnax with the knees drawn up; minor gifts like vases or a string of beads or weapons may be put in too; the larnax is then set in a chamber tomb without particular orientation; the tomb may contain several or only one. The larnax may be reused over the years as a bone-repository.

¹ It is a pleasure to thank many persons who have offered information about the larnakes and have suggested new perspectives on their significance: among them, St. Alexiou, E. Borowski, D. von Bothmer, H. Cahn, K. Deppert, R. Hampe, R. Lullies, Sp. Marinatos, N. Platon, J. Porter, L. Talcott, the late J. Threpsiades, E. Vanderpool, C. Vermeule, F. Whitmore, and W. Young.
By contrast, coffins of any kind had been of the utmost rarity on the Greek mainland or in Mycenaean colonies abroad until the new group was discovered. The Cretan habit seemed not to have affected the Mycenaeans. The first traces of wooden coffins or biers in Greece are contemporary with those in Crete, rotted remains being noted in late fifteenth-century burials at Dendra-Midea and Prosymna in the Argolid where metalwork and armour also display close links to Crete, especially Knossos. But the remains were ambiguous, for one cannot easily tell from discoloration marks in the dirt of damp chamber tombs whether a wooden article was a bier, a slight coffin, or even a table. Normally the Mycenaeans buried their dead directly on the bare earth floor, at the most providing them with a thin wooden bier covered in stucco or painted, a temporary catafalque on which the body must have been carried processionally to the tomb. Terracotta larnakes like the Minoan ones were not fashionable. The Mycenaeans used larnakes of the bathtub type in domestic quarters, although not often; these bathtubs may be either plain, or painted in white on dark, or in a polychrome scheme like the great bath at Pylos. Smaller versions of these tubs were occasionally used for the burial of young children; an infant's weight would not make them too awkward to carry. Fewer than a dozen funeral larnakes of any type have been recorded until now in Mycenaean excavation literature from thousands of tombs. Almost all belong to the thirteenth and early twelfth centuries. Four are stone, two from Kephallenia, one from Pylos, and one from Cyprus; the others are plain terracotta. Only two are painted with figures—a fragmentary bathtub from Mycenae decorated with an octopus inside, a horse and chariot outside, perhaps not ever used funerarily, and a fine sherd from Tiryns with remains of a horse and chariot.3

The new group of painted mainland larnakes represents, therefore, a dramatic departure from normal Mycenaean burial custom, with considerable interest for the religious and the artistic history of the Late Bronze Age in mainland Greece. The group consists of at least ten, perhaps twelve or more, whole and fragmentary larnakes of the chest type. Seven are established in European and American collections and museums; three are in official possession in Greece. Because they are so unusual, some scholars have called them forgeries, and others have believed them to be Cretan although of a type hitherto unknown in Crete, imported into Greece whether in Bronze Age or modern times. The facts, so far as they are known, support neither of these views.

According to the most reliable reports, collated from a number of sources, the larnakes were found in an olive grove at one edge of the huge ancient necropolis of Tanagra in Boiotia. The story attached to No. 3, that it came from an official excavation site in coastal Attica along the Sounion road, seems to have been a product of intelligent fantasy. The larnakes began to appear on the scene at the time of the construction of a new military airfield in the valley between Tanagra and Schomiatari, about 1956. As early as 1946 rumours circulated in Athens of a tomb near Tanagra whose dromos was lined with painted slabs, perhaps a distortion of some preliminary glimpse of the larnakes in situ, but active investigation did not

---

3 Wooden biers or coffins in Greece: Dendra-Midea, A. W. Persson, New Tombs at Dendra (1942) 111; Prosymna, C. W. Blegen, Prosymna (1937) Tombs 10, 26, 29, 42.

Stone larnakes in Mycenaean burials: Kephallenia, LH III B-C context, Sp. Marinatos, Praktika 1951, 186 (Parisata); Ephemeris 1933, 79, fig. 22 (Kontogena); Pylos: C. W. Blegen, A.J.A lviii (1954) 31; Cypriote-Mycenaean, from Nikaia near Larnaca, information courtesy of V. Karageorghis.

Terracotta larnakes: Prosymna: clay tub, C. W. Blegen, Prosymna fig. 10 no. 1 and fig. 101 no. 1206; Mycenae: A. J. B. Wace, Chamber Tombs at Mycenae (1932) 9, 139, 184; Thebes: A. Keramopoulos, Delion iii (1917) 92; Attica: G. Mylonas, Agios Kosmas (1959) 61; Naxos (Grottes) information courtesy N. Kontoleon; Assarlik: J. Paton, JHS viii (1887) 70 and E. J. Forsdyke, BM Catalogue of Vases i 1 (1925) nos. 1110–1116; Rhodes (Malyos): G. Jacopi, Annuario xiii-xiv (1930-31) fig. 59, T. 71 (fragments of two). The painted bathtub larnax from Mycenae was noted not to be funerary, or at least the context did not justify a decision, E. W. French, BSA liv (1961) 88. The painted fragment from Tiryns water-channels is illustrated though not discussed by N. Verdelis, Delion 18 (1965) Chron., pl. 85a.
begin for another ten years. It is most unfortunate for Mycenaean studies that none of the larnakes was discovered in the course of regular excavation; since they were excavated at night under unscientific conditions by untrained men, the chief of whom have since died or departed, there is practically no information about the kind of tomb in which they were laid, whether any had lids, the condition and number of skeletons inside them, or the presence of small finds such as vases, weapons, or beads which one might expect. The following information is sketchy and tentative. (See also Addenda.)

There are three or four distinct areas within the greater limits of the Tanagra grave field which have produced Mycenaean vases. These seem to be separate burial grounds of limited size. The one whose tombs contained the larnakes, not far from the modern village of Bratzi, has at least ten chamber tombs which remained intact and uncollapsed until recent years. The tombs had dromoi between eight and ten metres long, running almost level into the hill and then taking a sharp plunge down to the chamber. The larnakes seem to have been placed well inside the chamber; one tomb had at least three of them. The chambers were not fully cleared, but may have been rectangular with slightly vaulted roofs, to which they owe the courtesy title of 'tholos tombs'. Well-defined piles of bones were seen on the earth floor as well as in the larnakes ('they kept the men and women separate in those days'), pushed into the corners. Perhaps the larnakes represent a late fashion in family tombs which saw more orthodox burial in earlier generations. There were a few vases both on the floors and inside the larnakes. Naturally no record was made of the particular context of a vase inside the tomb; all were sold separately and have disappeared without a trace, affording no clue to the date of the larnakes. They were 'good handsome pieces of the usual kind'; one sketch from memory looked like a III B stirrup jar with stripes around the lower body; one small thirteenth-century askos was published with No. 3 as though belonging with it, but it may well have been dealer's stock. One larnax skeleton had a necklace of steatite beads with a centrepiece of an engraved steatite gem; the man entranced with making a wax impression of the gem ran away with it, and the other beads were used in a horse-collar as protection against the evil eye. It is certain that there were more larnakes than have survived as far as this catalogue, for some broke in the removal process and the pieces were thrown away in disgust. There was no evidence for any lids, and perhaps all the larnakes were simple open boxes. The lack of lids and applied handles is in marked contrast to Minoan types, and it seems safe to say that the surviving larnakes are products of a very local and idiosyncratic workshop.

The loss of all archaeological context makes it difficult to understand the role of a group of unique painted larnakes at an unknown site inland in eastern Boiotia. Most innovations of the late Mycenaean world are concentrated at harbours where ships returning from east and south were natural carriers of such innovations as cremation, iron, and foreign souvenirs. Yet a sheltered site like Tanagra enjoyed the double favour of rich agricultural land and easy access to the many harbour-beaches of the Euripos, and the evidence of provenience is perfectly clear as far as it goes. Exhaustive examination of the technical composition of the clay, from small samples of two of the larnakes, is also strongly in favour of a Boiotian origin, preferably Tanagra itself, and is against the theory of importation from Crete.4 Before

---

4 A sample of clay from one larnax was tested by both X-ray diffraction and by spectrochemical analysis in the research laboratory of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, in May 1964. Extracts from the report of William J. Young follow.

'Examination 64.64. A sample of clay was removed, ground in an agate mortar, and divided into two parts. One half was mixed with collodion and centered in the beam of an X-ray spectrometer and an X-ray diffraction chart made. The 'd' spacings of the chart were calibrated and compared with the "d" spacings and patterns of clays from objects purporting to have been found in Athens, Crete, Cyprus, the Kabirion in Boeotia, Plataea, Salamis in Attica, and Thebes; and from objects certified as excavated in Athens, Cyprus, Dramis, Eretria, Eutresis, Knossos and Tanagra.

'The other half of the samples was inserted in a drilled carbon electrode, situated in an arc gap, and an arc struck at 150 D.C. volts, and an optical emission
turning to the problems of origin, influence, date and significance, a brief description of the surviving monuments.

Most of the larnakes are decorated with mourning figures in panels. These are usually women, but men appear on four (Nos. 5, 6, 8, 9). There are no representations of children, monsters or animals, except one bird (No. 5). The figures are generally in profile but sometimes experimentally frontal. They are commonly isolated by lines, checkerboard bands, plant designs, but sometimes have the aspect of a procession (Nos. 4, 6). One larnax has a simple decoration of flowers (No. 2); one of pure abstract pattern (No. 12); one has abstract sides but figured ends (No. 8). Horns of consecration provide mild religious overtones on two of them (Nos. 5, 8). Painted and incised borders make an emphatic frame of architectural type. The background is often cluttered with plant or spiral filling ornaments. The members of the group are closely interrelated in composition and style. The hand of individual artists may perhaps be recognized on pairs or triads. Nos. 1, 5, and 10 seem closely connected; Nos. 3, 4, 4a, and 9 are almost surely by one painter.

The larnakes are all slightly different sizes, ranging from about 0·40 to 1·10 m. in length. All were made in sections which may have been pressed flat against a board. The clay is coarse, lumpy, filled with impurities such as gravel, mica, and vegetable fibre; it is difficult to clean from incrustation and rootmarks. There seem to be traces of hair or textile inside Nos. 4 and 5. Most of the larnakes have holes bored through the bottom in long rows, and holes through the corners just above the legs—to help the heat penetrate the thick clay during firing, and also to provide free sanitary drainage for the corpse. The technique of manufacture was essentially the same as for large vases. The larnakes also share patterns and colours with standard mainland pottery. The paint, which is really a clay engobe, is generally dull red or flaky black, sometimes a handsome bichrome combination of the two (Nos. 1, 5) on a rough buff ground which is sometimes covered in a pale slip tending to flake away. The smaller larnakes must have been used for infants or as bone-boxes.

No. 1 (Plates XXV, XXVIa; Fig. 1).

The largest and in many ways the most interesting of the group is a larnax belonging to a private collector in Germany. It has been on public exhibition in the Staatliche Kunstatmlungen of Kassel. 5

Dimensions: 1·065 m. long, 0·61 m. high (0·68 m. with the legs), 0·305–15 m. wide. Coarse reddish buff clay with a strong admixture of grit. Thin pale slip, dull red and black paint. The inner floor crossed by four flat strips. Holes bored over each leg, and in a row of six down the centre of the floor; an eleventh, out of axis, not quite bored through. The larnax was sawed in eight pieces for export and put together again with moist clay. Re-touching on the back, the nose and eye of the painted end, and on some of the patterns and framing bands, the total less than 5 per cent.

This larnax is longer and thinner than most Cretan examples, with stumperier legs. Its strongly incurving sides illustrate the difficulties met in firing such great pieces (Fig. 1b). The fabric is rough and the painting rather careless, but original and vigorous, perhaps by two different hands.

The painted decoration covers the two long sides and one end; the other end is blank spectrographic analysis made in juxtaposition with samples from the above sites.

On close analysis, the samples compared in their X-ray diffraction pattern and spectrochemical analysis most closely with the samples from Tanagra, Boeotia, and next most closely with clay originating in Eretria, Euboea.

A sample was also tested by infra-red and ultra-violet rays, and by microscopic examination, and proved without any doubt to be ancient. The incrustation and rootmarks were judged to be of types not yet within the capabilities of forgers.
except for the border of the panel. The corners and the centres of the sides are emphasised through solid strips of red and black checkerboard pattern, thus dividing the figures from one another and giving the impression that they are seen in the window or door of some architectural setting. Rows of discs above the heads on the back side and end reinforce this impression, for they derive from the regular short-hand for the beam-ends in palace façades used in Minoan and Mycenaean fresco work.

The front shows two thin, tightly-drawn women, each isolated in her framed panel, small and withdrawn in relation to the available space (Plate XXVa). Each panel has a triple border of straight lines; the one on the left is further enriched by an outlined red wavy border. There are two sickly spiralling plants as filling ornaments. On the right panel the frame is plain, the plants doubled and more emphatic in scale and outline. Both women stand in the rigid frontal pose unusual for a Mycenaean artist, long bodies confronting the spectator flatly but heads turned in profile to their left. The faces are extremely schematic, circular on elongated triangular necks, dominated by a huge round eye with bordering curves like eyebrows above and below. A rain of red paint-drops like blood or tears falls from the cheek to the bosom of the dress. Their hair is dark and cropped short. Their stringy arms are bent at the elbow, their hands are clasped above the top of their heads in a classic gesture of mourning. Both women wear the long mainland robe which rises high at the neck and falls straight and foldless with a slight flare to the ankles. It has short sleeves and a wide belt. The two costumes are cut alike but coloured differently: dark red with a pale border outlined in black at the left, light with red embroidery at the breasts, waist, and on the skirt at the right. Both women have attachments which blow straight out from their robes at hip level, looking like a pair of tails or flames. This feature is common to many of the larnakes and
occurs also in a few other Aegean religious scenes. It has never been clearly interpreted. It may be a shorthand version of the floating animal tails worn by persons performing the ceremony on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus (Fig. 2d); similar reduced animal tails are worn in fresco scenes of worship at Tiryns and Pylos. Perhaps it represents locks of hair cut off in mourning and attached to the girdle. This larnax illustrates a welcome stage in its representation between the Hagia Triada sarcophagus and late survivals in Crete after the Dark Ages. A well-known figure of a female on a Geometric vase from Fortetsa (Fig. 2e) is a direct descendant of the type; her ‘tails’ have sometimes been interpreted as snakes, lowered from where the old Minoan snake goddesses used to wear them, but the larnax in Germany shows that such tails are not alive, whatever else they may be.

Fig. 2a–e

(a) Larnax from Milatos. (b) Larnax from Vatheianos Kampos. (c) Larnax from Episkopi. (d) Hagia Triada sarcophagus. (e) Fortetsa pithos.

The women on the back are surprisingly different, much fleshier and executed in a looser, more vibrant outline (Plate XXVb). Their full white arms and long curling pale hair offer an effective counterpoint to their wizened sisters. Their robes are light, rippled and particoloured red on buff with black accents at the neck, breasts, and floating tails. The woman at the left wears a false décolleté with a blouse drawn thin over her pebble breasts; at the right the neckline is high and the whole robe is covered with horizontal waves of colour. Their gestures are more specific than before: one hand pulls at the hair, the other seems to beat at the forehead, like mourning women in Homer who tear out their hair and scratch bloodily at their cheeks. These women are turned to their right so that they move in the same direction as their opposites in a double procession—curiously, toward the blank end of the larnax (Fig. 1a). Disc beam-ends frame them above and below. The framing borders are again asymmetrical, an extra border on the right of wavy vertical stripes between bands; the same degenerate flowers are sprinkled on the ground, four in each panel.

The end away from which the mourners are moving contains a most interesting single figure floating in air or flying away from earth, in checkerboard and beam-end framework (Plate XXVIa). It is apparently female with pale skin, supernatural rather than human. Her straight robe of red and white is not blown by the wind as she moves, but her arms curve up in a broad arc and fan out into little leathery wings which are drawn back as she flutters towards her right and looks back over her left shoulder. Her head is crowned with a flat cap or diadem from which three half-discs jut up at the rim and a three-tailed plume rises in the

---

*St. Alexiou, Kretika Chronika xii (1958) 285, pl. 14 fig. 3; J. Brock, Fortetsa (1957) 125, pls. 77, 163; Sp. Marinatos, AA 1933, 307.*
air. The thick bare feet seem to push her up reluctantly; their disproportion is no more disconcerting than other awkward elements in the whole design. She wears the same broad tails as the mortal mourners. This is perhaps the first representation in Aegean art of a winged human figure, and so is of great interest for the early development of Greek religion. After the Dark Ages the convention of winged gods or monstrous beings becomes increasingly familiar, but the larnax in Germany takes the convention back to that moment just before the Dark Ages when important elements in mythology and cult were being formulated for the first time. The picture may show the soul or psyche of a dead woman leaving her body (infra).

The catalogue of the other larnaxes in the group is exceedingly uneven in information.

No. 2.
A small larnax, perhaps for a child, said to have been sold in Paris in 1956 or 1957, with a purely naturalistic design of plants. 7

No. 3 (plates XXVIb, XXVIIa, b).
A larnax sold in 1958 at auction in Basel, later in the Niarchos Collection. 8
Dimensions: 0.51 m. long, 0.36 m. high, 0.26 m. wide. Red-brown clay, white slip, dull black paint. One end and the bottom of both sides broken away. Corners strongly articulated with four jutting pilasters instead of feet: the box rested flat on the ground. Rough, poor surface. Paint slightly retouched. The askos illustrated resting upon this larnax in the auction catalogue apparently does not belong to the same tomb or even the same region of Greece, although it is probably consonant in date.

This charming example, half the size of No. 1, is decorated with files of mourning women who are all moving in one direction, toward the missing end. As now preserved there are three women moving left on one side, four women moving right on the other, and a single figure in the short end that survives. The pilasters are painted with checkerboards; plain bands frame the long sides. This time the women are painted consistently. They are outlined without solid blocks of colour accent. They are tall and firmly fleshed. Their remarkable faces show them to be cousins of the people on the Warrior Vase from Mycenae (fig. 44a)—sloping foreheads, jutting bestial noses, overshot lips, well-marked puffy mouths, receding chins, necks like a pillar of salt. Their eyes are more oval and tilted than on No. 1 and have contracted pupils. They wear flat caps with a ridged upper rim and crowned with a long plume which floats down behind their shoulders. Their own hair does not show, for the large buns at the napes of their necks are probably ears. Their robes are again in mainland style. They have a broad collar, a triangular dickey over the breasts, a full fold or kolpos falling in a rippled V toward the belt, a flaring skirt with diagonal flounces meeting at a centre seam. The women raise their arms high and lightly touch their long fingers to the tops of their heads. They are not strictly isolated from one another, but each is marked off by filling ornaments, a double triangle hanging down from the upper frame, and a rough ivy leaf floating at waist level.

The rumour that this larnax came from the Vouliagmeni or Vari district of Attica is flexible. Compare Nos. 4, 44, 9.

No. 4 (plate XXVIIc). 9
A fragment of the side-panel of a larnax from the same source, probably once a pair

7 See also larnaxes Nos. 11 and 12; it is not clear whether two or three painted larnaxes, exclusive of No. 3, reached Paris between 1956 and 1961. The report of No. 2 comes from a reliable source, but it does not seem to have been exhibited or photographed.
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8 Munzen and Medaillen AG Basel, Auktion xviii (1958) no. 74, pl. 18.

The fragment shows two women and part of the skirt of a third. The woman at the right edge has turned back to face the others, an unusual composition on these monuments. One might restore two more women at the left, but a single one is more likely; a four-figure composition is the maximum known so far. The usual checkerboard pattern frames the right end; the alternate squares have not been painted solid. The women wear the same costumes as on No. 3, except that they have no kolpos. The skirts are preserved far enough down on this larnax to show the broad hem from which vertical frills hang down to the ground. The women’s hands are lifted in a formal gesture of grief, but do not touch the head. The heads are sketched with the same kind of flat plumed cap as on No. 3, and the same unforgettable profiles. There seems to be an attempt to portray stunned astonishment or bereavement.

Nos. 3 and 4 are almost certainly by the same artist, and No. 4a must belong to the short end of one of them, from the breaks more likely to No. 4.

No. 4a (Plate XXVII).10

A fragment which has passed through various Swiss collections and is to be exhibited in New York in 1965. The preserved dimensions are 0·265 by 0·275 m. The fragment has the top moulding of the narrow end panel, and the figure of a mourning woman preserved to just below the hips.

This mourner is a sister of those on Nos. 3 and 4. She has the same profile, headgear, and hair, and essentially the same costume except that her waist is girdled by a broad double belt. As on No. 4, there is no kolpos. The presence of two floating ivy leaf ornaments below the elbows repeats the motif on the long sides of No. 3. Costume, shape, paint, and poor condition link this fragment perhaps more strongly to No. 4.

No. 5 (Plate XXVIII).

The front and parts of the side-panels of a larnax formerly on the market in Switzerland Dimensions as known: 0·69 m. long (maximum), 0·43 m. high, about 0·33 m. wide. Back and floor missing. Probably on four legs. Brick-coloured clay, grey at the core; poor pale red slip, dull red paint with many black accents. There may have been holes through the corner pilasters.

This is an interesting piece with close relations to vase-painting. There is an architectural row of disc beam-ends along the upper border, red with black centres; plain bands along the lower border, two uneven vertical bands at the right and one at the left. The principal bands are incised as well as painted.

In this framed scene two warriors move to the right, followed by a giant bird. All are walking through a field of flowers which function as dividers inserted with hasty abundance. There is a row of tendril-spirals underfoot, from which tall waving plants spring up to separate the warriors from each other and from the bird; a row of crude running spirals intrudes between the front warrior and the frame; two papyrus blossoms bend inward behind the bird’s tail. The figures are painted in heavy outline; solid colour is used only for the men’s thin arms and legs. Black accents are confined to minor details: the bird’s upper collar, the ruffled edge of his wing, the plants underfoot and in the sky, the beam-ends overhead, each with a red central dot.

It is perhaps incorrect to call the men warriors since they carry no weapons, but their legs seem to be greaved with the kind of tasselled linen legging familiar in Mycenaean palace frescoes. They wear short tunics of slightly different modes: the front man has one with

10 Photograph courtesy of a Swiss collector.
plain vertical and horizontal seams; the second, one with upward pointing chevrons embroidered on the skirt. The tunic reaches from the neck to just above the knee, and is cut narrower than on most fresco men. The hair dress is correspondingly varied. The first figure wears his hair long and combed back to float behind his shoulders; the second wears it cropped close and curly, and sports a little beard along the jawline. Their eyes are large ovals, their noses beaked, their figures arch in a typical debutante slouch which is emphasised by their limp, attenuated paws and long thin legs. The bird following them is huge in proportion, just launching into flight although his rubbery wings would never lift him off the ground. He is enriched with interior markings: two multiple collars around the neck, a large spiral at the shoulder, a spiral column in a panel at the belly, a few triangular feathers on the tail. He has a scissor bill and large claws.

Like No. 3, this larnax apparently had jutting corner pilasters. No feet are preserved. The ends are decorated with abstract motifs set in incised frames. One has a single palm tree flanked by the same kind of arrow-headed plants as on the front. The other has three tiers of three horns of consecration with a row of black-dotted red spirals above and a row of vertical stripes below. Each horn has a single wavy line rising from the centre hollow; in the top row right and the centre row left the horn is replaced by an entire block of vertical wavy lines. One preserved pilaster is decorated with a similar stack of horns, five superimposed singletons in rectangular frames. On its narrow edge are two tall strips joined by diagonal wavy lines, as on the end of No. 8. Another pilaster has looping connected spirals.

This larnax is the only figured one in the group without overt reference to mourning or funeral themes. The horns of consecration provide a symbolic religious context, stacked as though on the façade of a shrine. The horns and plants are shared with No. 8. The whole scene is strongly reminiscent of thirteenth-century chariot kraters which have similar stick-like figures in tunics (Fig. 4d), intrusive birds, plants, and spirals (Figs. 5b, c). Chariot kraters too have been invested with funerary significance by some scholars and may sometimes have functioned as cheaper substitutes for larnakes (infra), so that the absence of direct, conventional mourning gestures here does not divorce this larnax scene from suitability for the grave. It is also possible that the bird stands pictorially for the soul or psyche of the dead, like birds who perch on biers in Geometric art.

Nos. 6 and 7 (Figs. 3a, c).

Two larnakes on the European art market in 1959. The larger of the two was then in fair condition; the smaller was slightly damaged with a leg and corner broken away. Exact measurements not available. No. 6, the larger, was over 1·0 m. long, like No. 1; No. 7 was about 0·55 m. long, the size of Nos. 3 and 9. Both were of rough, light buff clay with dull black paint heavily incrusted and flaked.

Both these larnaxes are decorated with files of marching figures in long robes. They raise their hands and touch the tops of their heads. The drawing of the figures on No. 6 is flat about the chest, and the faces are thin and jutting; the mourners seem to be men in elaborately decorated robes. The figures on No. 7 are very obscure but give the impression of being women much like the women of Nos. 3 and 9. The corners of the larnakes are painted with crooked checkerboard designs whose squares are only rouged out, as on Nos. 4 and 4a, not filled solid. The centre of one long side on No. 6 is divided by a set of vertical stripes with heavy cross-pieces, a design fortuitously reminiscent of a standard. The figures are particularly elongated, with small heads and arms, and long flaring skirts. Their costumes are embroidered with interesting arrangements of spirals, and wavy lines outlined in blocks of short fringes. Since the larnakes were not cleaned and the drawing difficult to see, close analysis is not possible here, but the thin and crudely energetic style seems linked to the style on the fronts of Nos. 1 and 5.
Nos. 8, 9, and 10 are three larnakes acquired by the Greek Archaeological Service in Athens. The first two were collected by the late esteemed Dr J. Threpsiades shortly before his death in September 1962. The impression conveyed in some of his obituary notices, that the larnakes came from his excavations at the Mycenaean island-fortress of Gla in Boeotia, is false. Fragments of tile from Gla were stored inside them in his office, and the labels may have misled observers, but the larnakes came from the same two sources as all the others. The third larnax was acquired by Dr N. Platon in the winter 1962–63. Both Ephors kindly permitted the taking of notes and measurements. The group will be published shortly by Dr Platon with excellent watercolours by Miss A. Platon, so that there is no need for elaborate description of them here. A preliminary discussion of their iconography in relation to terracotta figures of mourning women will be given by Dr Iakovides in _AJA_ lxix (1965).

No. 8. (fig. 3b.)
Dimensions: 0·68 m. long, 0·40 m. high, 0·28 m. wide. The sides curve in markedly, as on No. 1. The glaze-paint is a brilliant clear red, resembling the best Rhodian or Argolid vases of Late Helladic III B. Six holes in the floor and one over each leg.

The two long sides of this larnax are covered with abstract patterns; one, a well-drawn flower design with strong vertical accents of snaky plants as on No. 5, and filling ornaments of double circles; the other, an arcade or net pattern of the kind familiar in the vase-painting repertory of fourteenth- and thirteenth-century vases, also used for some of the painted plaster floors in the palace at Pylos. The religious interest is concentrated on the short ends. One has two horns of consecration painted one above the other in simple outline, divided by a row of discs or beam-ends. The other end has the most charming figure of any larnax (fig. 3b). It is a male mourner in outline, standing between two pillar-strips joined by diagonal wavy lines, from which swoop the same kind of ‘tails’ as on the dresses of the mourners in No. 1. This motif and the motif of horns of consecration are employed together in similar fashion on No. 5. The man wears a stout long robe banded with red; his desiccated arms sweep upward in a broad circle; his flexible fingers try to pluck out hair which scarcely exists. This is a true egg-head. His mouth is open in a cry of angry grief, a gash nearly to the back of his skull. The chinless neck merges comfortably with the portly outlines of the body. He is the most discouraged Mycenaean to last beyond the Bronze Age.

No. 9.
Dimensions: 0·52 m. long, 0·36 m. high, 0·28 m. wide. Surface in poor condition. Red-brown clay, buff slip, flaky black paint. Horizontal holes, single or double, through
the top of each square leg; vertical holes in the corners; thirteen holes in the floor in three cross-rows. Heavy incised and painted framing bands.

Miss Platon's watercolour shows that the mourners on the long sides are stout men, two on each side facing each other across a broad checkerboard panel. They wear ankle-length robes spotted with tear-drop patterns and crossed by emphatic diagonal borders. Their heads are covered by little round caps; once the top flops over like a nightcap, once there are fringes at the back of the neck. The men raise one arm high in a gesture of salute while resting the other at breast level. Fillers of concentric semicircles cling to the frame. The ends are painted with single mourning women whose costumes and hair are like those of Nos. 3, 4 and 44, including the kolpos and the diagonal stripes on the skirts. This larnax is almost surely by the same artist. Perhaps the prominence of male mourners suggests that the dead person was also male, but this is not a fixed rule among the larnakes any more than in life. The robed and portly figures recall scenes on chariot kraters, the soft fringed helmet-caps and eager blobs of faces are links with the Warrior Vase; the concentric semicircles seem characteristically early III C.

No. 10 (fig. 3d).
Dimensions: 0·68 m. long, 0·46 m. high, 0·30 m. wide. Buff clay and slip, clear red paint. In good condition. Thirteen small holes in the floor, in a row.

On the long sides there are two women divided by a centre block of seven vertical bands, as on No. 6. There is a single woman on each end (fig. 3d). They are drawn in the manner of the strange figure on the end of No. 1, with long straight robes to the ankle decorated with vertical wavy lines of embroidery and heavy seams at the neck. They wear a similar round cap or polos, ornamented with three discs across the front rim and with a triple plume on the crown. They touch one hand to the forehead, raise the other towards the ear and the back of the head. There are two rows of disc beam-ends all around. The filling ornaments are plants, rather like those on No. 1; this larnax may be by the same artist, or by one of the two if No. 1 is a joint piece. The women are equally small for their space, and also float frontally above the ground line. Their straight dresses are enriched only by wavy lines, vertical and diagonal; two of the six wear necklaces.

Nos. 11 and 12 (see also No. 2).11
Two (complete?) larnakes said to have been in Paris very early, 1956 or 1957. No. 11 was extremely small and almost square, about 0·30 m. in each dimension, with two figures of mourning women in black outline, rather in the style of No. 3 according to reports. No. 12 is said to be nearly 1·0 m. long, like No. 1, and to be decorated with a diagonal network pattern as its only ornament, in black paint on the usual buff ground. These two larnakes do not seem to have been on public display anywhere.

There may be other larnakes in the group, not known to me, and more information could certainly be collected as they reach a wider circle of observers. A tentative analysis suggests that Nos. 1, 5, and 10 were made by the same artist, perhaps 6 and 7 as well; that Nos. 3, 4, 44, and possibly 9 were produced by another hand; that No. 8 is a singleton. They share a community of design and basic motifs such as checkerboards, beam-ends, and degenerate Mycenaean plants and spirals as filling ornaments. They are all made in practically the same fashion, derive from the same kind of workshop, and serve the abnormal burial tradition which created them. Minor variations in size, polychromy, bored holes, pilasters, feet, and texture of clay are no greater than in comparable groups from Crete. (See Addenda.)

11 See note 7. The description of No. 11 with two of No. 12 is hearsay.
Date. The range of choice is not great. By prevailing criteria of stylistic chronology the larnakes can scarcely be earlier than the middle of the thirteenth century nor later than the first third of the twelfth. At first the tendency was to make them very late, even Sub- mycenaean, perhaps because of their crudity, or the resemblance of No. 3 (the first known) to such figure studies as the Warrior Vase from Mycenae. The Warrior Vase is not, of course, the last gap of Mycenaean art; it is generally dated to Late Helladic III C:1, and whether that means 1200 B.C. or 1170 B.C., it is a good strong period of painting. Not much has been done with the figure style of this age, and indeed the new larnakes are the largest single group of figured monuments from the late Mycenaean world, but there are fragments of scenes with human actors from Perati, Mycenae, Tiryns, and Iolkos which offer some standard for comparison.

Many faces and patterns on the larnakes find good parallels on thirteenth-century chariot kraters and in palace frescoes of the period before c. 1220 B.C. They have not been really influenced by the Close Style, either in its fine-grained Argolid version or in its splashy Levantine version. The profusion of filling ornaments in some scenes may recall the Close Style, but similar birds, plants, spirals, waving or flamelike lines, and double circles had been in use in Crete from shortly after 1400 B.C., in the crowded pictorial vases of LM III A. They are an ingrained element in that final manifestation of palatial energy, continuing in much Late Minoan III B pottery, and are not specific signs of lateness. This style first makes its way to Greece in about the second quarter of the fourteenth century; large kraters covered with birds and plants occur on both the east and west coasts, Mycenae and Koukounara. These designs are conservative, just as chariot kraters are conservative, or motifs in palace frescoes. Yet the larnakes make a general impression of lateness, in their sketchy or hasty execution, their combination of original iconography and jamming together of older patterns. A date shortly before the end of the thirteenth century, in the transitional age Late Helladic III B-C, would seem not far off.

A select list of the decorative patterns on the larnakes which are also familiar in vase-painting helps establish a generally consistent picture and chronology. These patterns, as analysed and dated by Furumark in *The Mycenaean Pottery*, are not of course always confined to the phase for which he finds them characteristic, but at least offer a rough external check.

*Mourning woman* (Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10): *MP* Motive 1 no. 10, LH III B; no. 28, LH III C:1.

*Slouching man* (No. 5): *MP* Motive 1 no. 25, LH III B.

*Man in long robe and cap* (No. 9): *MP*-Motive 1 no. 8, LH III B.

*Bird* (No. 5): *MP* Motive 7 No. 26, LH III B; no. 44, LH III C:1.

*Horns of consecration* (Nos. 5, 8): *MP* Motive 36, perhaps no. 4 (with axe), LH III B.

*Palm tree* (No. 5): *MP* Motive 15, nos. 11, 13, LH III A:2–III B (cf. fig. 5b).

*Disjointed spirals and plants* (No. 5): *MP* Motive 49 no. 19, LH III B; Motive 46 no. 58, Motive 48 no. 3, LH III C:1.


*Multiple stem* (Nos. 5, 8, 10): *MP* Motive 19 nos. 6, 37, or Motive 12 no. 29, LH III A:1.

Furumark does not illustrate III B specimens of this design, but it occurs on III B cups and alabastra in a simplified form without a leaf.13

*Mycenaean flower* (Nos. 3, 5): *MP* Motive 18, fig. 43, LH III B; Motive 15 no. 13, III B.

*Papyrus* (No. 5): *MP* Motive 11 no. 38, LH III B, Motive 18 no. 32, LH III B.


12 Cf. *BSA* xlvi (1952) 81, fig. 5, no. 40 (Euboia); *BSA* lvi (1961) pl. 23 a (Lakonia).
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Tricurved arch (No. 8): MP Motive 62 no. 15, LH III B; III B on painted floors at Pylos and Tiryns.

Hanging triangle or zwinkel (No. 3): MP Motive 61 A no. 1, LH III C:1.

Dotted circle (Nos. 1, 5): MP Motive 48 no. 26, LH III C:1.

Dotted spiral (Nos. 5, 10): MP Motive 51 no. 27, LH III C:1.

Wavy border (No. 1): MP Motive 65 no. 5, LH III A:2.

Wavy line (No. 5): MP Motive 53 nos. 21–22, LH III C:1.

Concentric semicircles (No. 9): MP Motive 43 no. 17, LH III B; no. 6, LH III C:1.

Obviously the larnakes form a closely connected group which does not cover a time span of many years; the chronological range for similar patterns on pottery is naturally greater, and the correlations cannot be exact. Yet the time-limits are clear: the majority of patterns derive from the Late Helladic III B and earliest III C periods, with a few memories from the latter part of the III A period. These larnakes, and those in Crete, seem to preserve older forms of patterns, as though influenced by the conservative repertory of fresco painters. The heaviest concentration of parallels is in the III B, thirteenth-century, phase; a comparison with largely unpublished patterns on walls and floors in the palace at Pylos would help confirm a date in the closing years of the thirteenth century.

Relation to Minoan larnakes. On Crete the series of painted larnakes begins about 1400 B.C., Late Minoan III A:1, with the Hagia Triada example in limestone. It continues into the Late Minoan III C period. Most examples are III B. The superior elaboration of scene, figure-drawing, and colour on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus separates it from the rest of the series; in a sense it provides a partial model for some aspects of the mainland series, but that model was not much used in Crete itself. The mainland group adapts the theme of the human funerary procession, the flat plumed cap, the long robes hanging straight or flaring slightly at the hem, the marked contrasting seam, the curious floating locks or tails which emerge from below the extended arms of the figures on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus but are not closely attached either to the robe or to the head (FIG. 2d). It has always been a point of interest that the painter of the Hagia Triada sarcophagus used a mainland costume rather than the traditional Minoan one of open bodice and flounced skirt. The symbolic fantasies of chariots drawn by griffins and wild goats on the ends are also more Mycenaean than Minoan, and reoccur on chariot kraters or in excerpts on gems and ivories. The elaborate architectural and disc-rosette framework is another prototype element transmitted to the later mainland larnakes, and watered down or simplified in them.

It is strange that the richly developed iconography of the Hagia Triada sarcophagus should have had so little influence on the masses of later larnakes in Crete. Among the hundreds of known examples there are perhaps only four with human figures of any kind. Most are painted with naturalistic or abstract patterns. Some of these reappear on the mainland larnakes: birds, horns of consecration, swaying flowers, spirals, rows of discs, blocks of checkerboards. Common Cretan motifs which have as yet no counterparts on the mainland are the octopus, nautilus, double axe, and beasts like bulls, griffins, and sphinxes.

The four known Cretan larnakes with human figures are (FIG. 2):

1. From the Zafer Papoura cemetery at Knossos, Tomb 9, painted with a chariot moving left and, on the other side, 'traces of a beardless man throwing a lasso which twists around the curved horns of a Cretan wild goat'.\

There are 'egg' patterns below, perhaps an indication of waves or rocks, and wavy lines on one short end. The paint is red on buff, 'altogether of the rudest kind'. The only surviving vase from this tomb, a stirrup jar, seems early III B.

2. From Milatos, a late III B–III C chamber tomb (fig. 2a). This larnax is slightly larger than the mainland ones (1.15 × 0.51 × 0.83 with lid). Six holes are bored through the floor. The long sides are painted in a careless foliage pattern, and one side includes two fish posed above wavy lines representing water. Such marine motifs are suggestively common in Minoan funerary imagery. One short end has a curious representation of a human figure. It is nude and floats in air above a single fish. The figure is turned toward the right. It has two ruffled lines above its arms, very poorly drawn but not unlike the ruffled wings of the supernormal figure in the same position on the end of No. 1 (infra). The figure also holds a double curved object suspended in its left hand, now almost completely obliterated; this was interpreted by Sir Arthur Evans as a figure-of-eight shield, by Dr Alexiou as sea rocks. Because the figure wears no garment, Evans was persuaded it was male; this is more convincing, perhaps, than its interpretation as a crude goddess with arms upraised in a moment of epiphany, but much depends on its relation to the iconography of the mainland larnax.

3. From Vathianos Kampos near Nirou Khani (fig. 2b). Lidless, with four handles. There are four holes at the inside corners over the legs. Coarse gritty red clay, careless painting in dark red-to-black paint on a buff slip. On the long sides, designs of nautilus and papyrus. The interesting short end has an isolated human figure, floating in air as on the preceding, dressed in a long plain robe with diagonal stripes. Its thin arms are bent straight up at the elbow, not touching the head. The face is too spoiled to indicate sex; the feet are no longer clear. The frame is formed by two vertical red stripes on either side, and an incised line within that; the incision on the left went crooked and crossed the painted elbow at a slant. This has been taken for a spear, but Dr Alexiou is surely right in identifying it as part of the incised frame, executed with extreme carelessness.

4. An unpublished larnax from Episkopi in the Hiera Petra Museum. This will be published soon by Dr Platon. It is the richest and most astonishing of all Late Minoan larnakes (cf. fig. 2c). A riot of figured scenes with mythological or ritual elements covers the larnax in six panels on the body and four on the lid. It is a huge piece, 1.32 m. long, 67.5 m. high to the lid, the lid itself 0.37 m. Before publication little can be said about it, except that in style and subject it is quite divorced from the mainland group, but indirectly related to the fantasies of chariot kraters. It is executed in a supple and firmly outlined style. The painter uses both reserve lines and solid blocks of reddish black on a grey-buff clay. He tends to compose in isolated panels within which there are tiered or registered scenes. The scenes include men driving a chariot over waves and an octopus, hunters with leashed dogs chasing wild goats or hunting them by spear among palm trees, quadrupeds (partly horse, partly bull in blood) either addorsed or running in the company of hunting dogs. Some of the figures carry flowers, fans, and vases; some are fully armed with javelins and swords. A profusion of handles and two protomes enrich the lid. There is no overt symbol of mourning or funeral ceremony beyond what the chariot and marine themes may allude to; the narrative seems pastoral, military, and obscurely ritualistic.

With this unfortunately brief survey of the known figured Cretan larnakes, the paradox emerges more clearly: Crete was certainly the source for the idea and for the forms of the new mainland larnakes, but not primarily for their painted decoration. The direct line of inspiration does not emerge clearly from any single source, and the Cretan elements complicate the analysis because all of them date from the 'Mycenaean' period in Crete, a field which has yet to interest many scholars. Except for the Episkopi larnax, all the figured Cretan specimens are even more provincial and awkward than the Greek examples, and are contemporary with them or even later; they provide neither prototypes nor good parallels.

---

15 Prehistoric Tombs at Knossos (1906) 98; St. Alexiou, Kretika Chronika xii (1958) 218. A smaller companion piece has eighteen holes bored through the floor.

16 Alexiou, op. cit., pl. 11, fig. 2; Chr. Zervos, L'Art de la Crète (1956) fig. 778; Sp. Marinatos, AA 1934, 247, fig. 1.
The other connexions of the mainland larnakes to Crete must be speculative. They were not made in Crete and exported to Greece: the clay and decoration are clearly not Minoan, and such large, friable pieces do not travel well in any case. They must have been manufactured very close to Tanagra where they were found. They must have been made for a group of people who had the tradition of larnax burial, and have been decorated by craftsmen trained in the Mycenaean schools of design. Little is known yet about the movements of populations in the late thirteenth and twelfth centuries, except that most legends of dispersal date from the years immediately surrounding the Trojan War. Simultaneous innovations in weaponry, cremation, dress, jewellery, and the use of iron and of foreign seals confirm such traditions of high mobility in an age which had lost its economic stability with the destruction of the mainland palaces. It is by no means impossible that a group of people who had been accustomed to using larnakes settled in eastern Boiotia during the disturbed conditions of the latter thirteenth century; several partial occupations by alien tribes are recorded for the province. But unusual burial customs need not signify strange blood. Graia (Tanagra ?), Mykalessos, and Hyria were counted as pure Greek when they sent contingents to Troy (Iliad ii 496). It is clear from the British excavations at Lefkandi on Euboea opposite, from the rich undug mound of Drahme, from the bronzes of Anthedon, from the Tanagra larnakes and the numerous Mycenaean antiquities scattered all through the large ancient cemetery of Tanagra, that this part of Boiotia should be examined as closely by archaeologists as it has been by grave-robbbers. Now there is no standard by which to judge odd artefacts appearing on the market. No one will be surprised if eastern Boiotia produces evidence of Mycenaean culture as imposing and idiosyncratic as in other major provinces; larnakes may prove to be part of local custom. Certainly the tradition of their manufacture in excellent quality continued at Tanagra in the archaic and classical periods. It might take no more than the whim of one man to be buried in a painted larnax, perhaps a man who had visited Crete and admired the practice there, to set a fashion in a closed community of fine craftsmen. Or, the most energetic painter, of No. 1 and its relatives, may have been an itinerant who caught the fancy of the town, and who created most of what survives in a matter of months.

The larnakes have many links with earlier Mycenaean art, synthesising themes and fantasies which appear in diluted ways in other media. They are sophisticated, not first stumbling efforts. They may be the survivors of a larger body of Mycenaean funerary art than we are aware of from current evidence. Even if they depend on an initial Minoan inspiration, they are not Minoan in style or subject, and their pictures have been modified by thorough awareness of Mycenaean frescoes and pictorial vases. Mainland influence was clearly at work in drawing the finished product aside from pure Minoan tradition.

The style of painting: sources and relationships. In style the larnakes have many characteristic Mycenaean features. These are expressed on a scale and in a manner intermediate between the frescoes of the later mainland palaces and the pictorial vases of the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries. Since the larnakes survive from a class of objects which is not yet really familiar to students of Mycenaean art, it is not always easy to judge where the weight of influence upon them lies, but there is scarcely an individual detail which cannot be matched in either wall-painting or vase-painting, except for the winged figure on the end of No. 1.

There is no simple relationship between the larnakes and Mycenaean palace frescoes. The larnakes' painted scenes are not direct reductions or copies of subjects on palace walls, since palaces were not decorated with funeral motifs. The larnakes illustrate a static and repeated, conventional ceremony without strong narrative drift, and this necessarily distinguishes their themes from major palace fresco cycles which offer continuous series of related figures who join in large-scale action with a marked narrative undertone. Even ceremonial scenes in frescoes are cast in terms of a broad panorama of persons bringing gifts or para-
phernalia to a definite objective. The isolation and empanelling and lack of goal so typical of the larnakes is instinctively alien to the fresco tradition.

The two standard fresco designs which seem to have influenced the larnakes most strongly are representations of architectural façades and procession frescoes. Architectural motifs like checkerboard walls and disc beam-ends on entablatures are painted at every major Mycenaean palace, and even in private houses at Mycenae. These elements have been vastly simplified on the larnakes, particularly in the discarding of rosette-and-triglyph patterns usually included in the frescoes, but the basic ingredients are present on almost every one of them. Architectural design is partly the natural way to emphasise the straight frames of the scene on a rectangular larnax panel, as on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus; partly also it may reflect the artists' desire to put the figures into some sort of domestic environment.

The procession fresco is a natural prototype for the ceremonial processions of mourners on the larnakes. It is the only kind of fresco to deploy files of figures on a single ground line in ritual action. The two forms of procession, the religious one of palaces and the funerary one of larnakes, must have looked quite similar to a painter who watched them. The ceremonial palace version was rooted in a far older Minoan and Egyptian scheme, and must have cast its inherited light on the newer composition of mourning for the dead. The procession fresco in the Kadmeion at Thebes would have been the closest one for Tanagra painters to copy; it is interesting that the Theban procession clearly moves in two directions around the walls of its room towards a goal which does not seem to be represented, and that this is characteristic of the organisation of processional women on larnakes Nos. 1 and 3.\(^7\)

Like the processional at Thebes, Tiryns, and Pylos, the larnax figures move upon a uniform level without overlapping and without deliberate landscape, in a flat and linear conception which makes no attempt to deepen the stage on which the actors walk inside their frame. The majority of other standard subjects in palace wall-painting employ a scattered-field system of timid perspective with overlapping groups of figures co-ordinated from top to bottom of the available space.

The differences between the larnax scheme and the fresco scheme are very clear, however. In the frescoes, figures are usually shown in true profile with their feet upon the ground, and are shown in motion. In the larnakes they are as often shown with frontal, static bodies and only the heads in profile. This more hieratic pose may not be entirely deliberate—it may be primitivism—and yet it also distinguishes the larnakes from the mass of pictorial vases where profile figures move in a consistent narrative direction, generally to the right (cf. fig. 5), and the frontal stance is unusual. The larnax figures tend to float above the groundline, which is also true of Minoan larnakes and is unlike either frescoes or pictorial vases. While there is no scenery, the painters employ the flat, irrelevant filling ornaments of vase decoration to break up the blank ground (they never use waving ground-dividers as fresco painters do), and on No. 5, so different in many ways from the rest of the group, seem to imagine a pastoral landscape unusually fully.

The larnakes are further separated from fresco painting by their colour, and their costumes. The two-tone colour scheme of dull red and dull black on buff (1 and 5) is a flirtation with polychromy which has not the ambition of the full fresco palette of the Hagia Triada sarcophagus, but is yet consciously superior to even the best pictorial vases where colour contrasts are achieved purely through dilution of the glaze. Only the Warrior Vase and the Painted Stele of Mycenae seem to join the larnakes in an intermediate group of 'bichrome' fabric.\(^8\)

The costumes are intermediate, too. People on the larnakes usually wear a long straight robe, decorated with subdued geometric patterns at the seams and hem. It is neither the

---


\(^8\) Dr. Platon reports a larnax from near Canea (Ta Dramia) with red and blue pigments, representing clumsy monsters or bulls.
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Minoan court fashion of the frescoes nor the enveloping, Dalmatian-spotted robe of pictorial vases. The garment on the larnakes is perhaps the closest of the three types to what people really wore on the mainland in the late thirteenth century, women adapting an ankle-length version of the male tunic which was cut differently at the chest and girdled in at the waist to give them some sort of figure. Some people in procession frescoes of the late palace period wear a similar long embroidered robe, which first appears in Crete on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus and in the Camp Stool frescoes at Knossos, and is conventional in Greece for scenes of outdoor action such as the Tiryns hunt, but is not generally admired by mainland fresco artists. It is, however, the regulation garment for female terracotta figurines, for a few mainland goddesses like the one on the gold ring from Tiryns, and for the type of mourner represented by the ‘priestess’ on the Warrior Vase. On the larnakes it seems another suggestion of iconography being controlled by real life and observation, as well as being easy for painters without great technical command. The elaboration of embroidery would be no more taxing than drawing filling ornaments.

The headdress of the many larnax figures is also unusual. The plumed cap, plain or with discs, rarely appears in frescoes, but is fairly familiar on ivories and gems for representations of sphinxes and hierophants. It seems to be restricted to ceremonial scenes of a certain type; it is used on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus, on the Priest-King fresco at Knossos, on the Sphinx Gate fresco at Pylos, and in a loose, sloppy form on a few pictorial vases from Cyprus. The cap is worn by both men and women on the larnakes, and by the winged apparition or soul on the end of No. 1; it is not necessarily sacral, but emphasises the hieratic qualities of the mourning rite. (The men on Nos. 6 and 9 may wear soft helmets rather than caps.)

The larnax faces are cruder and less practised than in most frescoes. Their basically different convention is more related to facial types on pictorial vases, although they surpass the bulk of these in fullness, energy, correctness, and above all in allusion to emotion. The small scale of the larnakes encouraged caricature, but of another kind than the naive exaggerations of chariot kraters. In both media the painter wished to emphasise the nose and chin, as the most jutting features by which the head attains individuality, but a desire for fluency on vases led to shorthand schematic patterns with huge beaks, while on the larnakes one notes a much broader and more expressive style. For all their rudeness they essay the capture of both dignity and grief, qualities nearly non-existent in earlier Aegean painting. Even the circular tearful faces on No. 1 or the gashed and angry oval of the mourner on the end of No. 8 do not inspire laughter or repulsion by their naïveté; one sympathises with the painter as he gropes towards some new concept which had no model in the traditional repertory of the Mycenaean world.

Perhaps all through the Mycenaean age there had been circulating a fashion for quick sketches of the human face, on vases and other small surfaces, to a greater degree than we are aware of. Painters who were relatively untrained would fall back on primitive or childlike conventions which strike the modern observer as ‘late’ in terms of stylistic development but which need not be late at all in historical terms. Several vases of the mid-fourteenth century exhibit more rudeness of drawing in unusual scenes than vases made one hundred years later; the Circus Pot from Mycenae is a familiar example (fig. 4e). Even in frescoes there is a caricature element incipient in many figure studies; a drooping Amarna face at Tiryns illustrates the kind of veering away from Minoan conventions which may become grotesque when reduced to a smaller scale but which is individual and unforgettable (fig. 4g, f).

19 The plumed cap is briefly discussed by A. Evans, *Palace of Minos* ii 777; A. Furumark, *The Mycenaean Pottery* p39; the best fresco example: the Sphinx Gate from Pylos, C. Blegen, *AJA* lxvi (1962) pl. 40, fig. 12; a good example on a chariot krater, Louvre AM 625, E. Pottier, *BCH* xxxi (1907) 230, figs. 8 and 9.


21 Fig. 4g after G. Rodenwaldt, *Tiryns* ii pl. 4, no. 6; Fig. 4j after A. Furtwängler and G. Loeschke, *Mykenische Vasen*, 67, fig. 37.
The larnax painters' ambition to portray the human being in the grip of confusion and despair deprives them of the support of facial types in frescoes where sad emotions are not wanted; the reduced, unexpressive squiggle of chariot krater profiles offers no potentialities; again, the larnakes are intermediate and experimental.

Relations between the larnakes and pictorial vases are in some ways close, closer than with frescoes. The idiom of the vase-painter is recognisable in such larnax features as panelled and isolated figures, outline drawing, a profusion of meaningless filling ornaments, flat drafty surface effects without perspective or modelling. Like vases, larnakes have a limited and definite area to be decorated, and a series of stock motifs to do this with. Many motifs are shared equally among larnakes, vases, and frescoes: the spirals, degenerate plants, checkerboards, nets, concentric circles and wavy lines. These are even more profuse on Cretan larnakes as though to compensate for the lack of figures on them. Common Cretan motifs which do not appear in the mainland group are the nautilus, bull, griffin, sphinx, and double axe; there is more variety in Cretan floral designs of lilies, papyri, and ivy than on the mainland, although colonial pictorial vases are often covered with rich fleshy versions of them. The patterns on the mainland larnakes, both naturalistic and abstract, are always subordinate, rather weak and desiccated. When they are used as principal subjects, as on Nos. 2 and 8, they have more the quality of wall-border designs in houses than of vase decoration. But since there are no original patterns on the larnakes, everything being taken over as useful space-fillers from other fields of painting, it is natural to find artistic links with the only class of Mycenaean vases to combine human figures and conventional abstract design.

Chariot kraters, and a few vases of other shapes, arrange series of human figures in standard poses; it is possible that they share a function with the larnakes as well as an aesthetic. These large and presumably expensive vases circulated widely in colonial and mainland circles from the early fourteenth century to the late thirteenth; most of the famous ones are classified as early. Their scenes are so conventional that they must have satisfied some general Mycenaean demand which did not alter much with the passing years. The chariot is usually drawn by two horses towards the right, through an elementary landscape of plants or spirals (fig. 5). Sometimes birds and fish intrude, especially at the ends of the scene or under the handles. Two, three, or four persons may ride in the chariot; others may accompany it on foot. Those who ride usually wear a long spotted robe; those on foot are more often shown in the athletic nude. Excerpts from games such as belt-wrestling, boxing, or javelin-throwing may flank the chariot or appear as centrepieces, without the chariot. Abundant, sketchy filling ornaments often separate the persons in procession, just as on the
PAINTED MYCENAEAN LARNAKES

larnakes. Occasionally, little representations of vases are used as floating fillers. No two kraters are alike, but the nature of the scene does not vary profoundly from piece to piece.

Larnax No. 5 is the most like standard chariot kraters, except of course that it has no chariot. The long-legged men in their field of blossoms are comparable to the soldiers and grooms who march beside chariots (fig. 4a); the bird following them is shared with many kraters (fig. 5b); the beaky profiles, slouching gait and weak action are also characteristic on vases. Both the larnax and the majority of chariot kraters are so mute in their narrative, one is not sure who the actors are, where they are going, what their purpose may be, or why so much fertile nature surrounds them. This lack of specific detail contrasts in the strongest way with Mycenaean fresco painting, where even the most conventional figure is frozen into such an obvious pose, or given such an indicative prop (reins, a spear, a leash, a table, a pyxis) that with common sense or moderate scholarly equipment one can read the scene as though it were written out. Fresco painting is essentially narrative, and since the narrative differs each time it is necessary to give the audience proper clues to the action. But the larnakes and the kraters perhaps reflect a repeated motif or rite which does not need to be ‘read’, because it is a standard transcription of a scene familiar in real life.

For the larnakes, the scene is clearly the mourning of the dead, in the house or at the tomb. The individual but undramatic iconography of the chariot kraters has, by contrast, opened them to a variety of interpretations.22 The three most current are (1) that they give excerpts from daily life in the heroic military vein, princely retinues riding in the country; (2) that they illustrate Mycenaean myths and heroic narratives from lost oral poetry with an eastern tinge; (3) that they illustrate the cortège of the dead toward the tomb, with extracts from the funeral celebrations afterwards. This last seems the most likely in view of their lack of convincing narrative colour, although some of the vases may of course reflect genre and mythological prototypes as well. But if some of them at least are funerary, they fall in line with a whole range of Aegean funerary art, from the chariot compositions on the Shaft Grave stelai and the ends of the Hagia Triada sarcophagus to the relics of the chariot cortèges discovered in the ‘Homerical’ royal burials at Salamis in Cyprus. In this case their stylistic affinities to the larnakes are more readily understandable.

The larnakes are later than the bulk of chariot kraters, apparently made in a generation when a newer kind of monumental painting was supplanting them. This new painting is best seen on the Warrior Vase, whose blood-relationship to larnax No. 3 was recognised immediately the latter came on the market. The obvious parallels in human profile, female costume, and gesture of mourning were noted in the catalogue above. Like the larnaxes, the Warrior Vase has a more solid and energetic style than most chariot kraters; it surpasses the larnakes in fullness of detail and mass of subdued colour. It shares with Cretan larnakes the flourish of a plastic bull’s head protome at the handles, and with superior chariot kraters the great bird under the handle arches. Its figures move faster and with more purpose than on the larnakes; it avoids their random filling devices (except for one irresistible set of concentric circles), and, as in frescoes, joins the actors in a common movement without isolating panels and frames. On many grounds one would connect the Warrior Vase with earlier fresco painting, although no true parallels for its figures and composition survive from Mycenaean palaces and its subject is not a palatial one; yet, like the larnakes, it is a more practised, sophisticated work than most painted vases, and the sources of its style are partly in the major arts. The mass of contemporary pictorial sherds from Mycenae and Tiryns highlight the urge toward fresh vistas in painting at this period.

The Warrior Vase is so closely connected with the painted funeral stele from a tomb at

Mycenae that Tsountas and Rodenwaldt judged them to be by one hand. Here again the breath of the frescoes stirs, in the colours, the solid forms, the charming animal frieze of stags and hedgehog, the warriors marching in procession toward the right to a goal which somehow needs no statement for the audience. They cast their hunting javelins at a mark, javelins like the weapons of the Warrior Vase, yet the stele does not represent a simple hunting scene; its presence in the tomb connects it directly with a phase of the funeral ceremony, most likely spear-throwing at the funeral games as on some chariot kraters and later on Geometric kraters. It is difficult to view either the stele or the Warrior Vase as historical documents or genre interludes; they join the larnakes in an experimental field of funerary art. These monuments, hovering stylistically between wall-painting and vase-painting, are new artistic statements of mixed heritage, not far from 1200 B.C.

Themes in the painting. Nearly all the larnakes are ornamented with variations on a single theme, the picture of the mourner. The mourner may be man or woman. He may appear by himself, in symmetrical pairs, or in procession. He is seen making characteristic gestures of grief, clutching his head, thumping his brow, pulling at his hair. A woman may shed great tears (No. 1), a man may howl (No. 8). No doubt these gestures had become a formal crystallisation of instinctive expressions of anguish, long traditional in real Mycenaean graveside ceremonies. They are transferred to the world of Greek art now for the first time. This expressive imitation of real life gives insight into the new confidence in direct observation, and the interest in interior emotion, which make the late period of Mycenaean art so singular and refreshing.

The gesture of grief with arms to the head should be distinguished from the better-known gesture of arms upraised and outspread, of the type so ably analysed by Dr Alexiou for Minoan deities. On the Greek larnakes, only the winged apparition on the end of No. 1 raises her arms in this way. Most of the others, the mortals, touch their heads like mourners in Geometric and archaic painting. Minoan larnax painters three times used the scheme of outspread arms, both for winged and for ordinary actors (Fig. 2), but these occurrences seem not to have affected the mainland group. The mainland gesture, conversely, is not Minoan at all, but it reappears in a small group of mainland terracottas representing mourners. Other terracotta figurines adapt the Minoan gesture of upraised arms, of course, both in the common thirteenth-century Psi-type and in more ambitious sketches of goddesses, especially those riding on monsters, but the much rarer type of mourning woman is purely a mainland creation, like the larnax scheme. It takes the form both of individual figures and of rows of women mounted on the rims of bowls. Their flat caps and long straight dresses casually striped with paint repeat the costume of the larnax woman, and, like the larnakes, they seem to reflect the innovations of the end of the palace period which include new types in art and more direct observation of real life. The terracotta mourners come from coastal sites which lay open to foreign fashions in the era of the Sea Peoples, sites like Perati, Naxos, Ialysos, and Argos which also yield new forms of tombs and new burial customs like cremation. Their relation to the larnakes has recently been analysed by Dr Iakovides.

The motif of mourning represented by the larnakes and the terracottas is not entirely new in this late period, although in them the search to formulate the rites and emotions of death

23 Chr. Tsountas, Ephemeris 1896, i, pl. 1; G. Rodenwaldt, Týrns ii 186; A. Furumark, The Mycenaean Pottery 453. Though reused in the door packing, there is no reasonable doubt that the stele was designed (twice) for funeral display.
24 St. Alexiou, Kretika Chronika xii (1958) 179 ff.
25 Sp. Iakovides, AJA lxxix (1965) and Ergon 1961, fig. 11 (Perati); N. Kontoleon, Ergon 1960, figs. 216-217 (Naxos); A. Majuri, Annuario vi-vii (1926) 174, fig. 101; 143, fig. 65 (Ialysos); cf. British Museum Catalogue of Vases i, 1, A 950. Virtually the same type is popular in seventh-century Attic graves, e.g. on the gaming-table from Vari (V. Kallipolitis, Delton xvii (1963) pls. 53-55a) or in the Stathatos Collection, BCH lxxix (1955) pl. 12.
is successfully completed and the formula lasts with little iconographic change through the archaic period. Three other examples seem relevant. Perhaps the earliest occurs on a chariot krater from Hagia Paraskevi in Cyprus (Fig. 4b) where a woman raises her arms in a very similar gesture of grief behind the departing chariot. This vase is usually dated in the late fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{26} Also in the fourteenth century, perhaps, comes the famous Window Krater divided between Nicosia and London. Here a series of women is set in an architectural framework as on the larnakes, the strong barred horizontals and verticals which represent a house or palace also acting as dividers for the figures, like the definite framed panels on the larnakes (Fig. 5a).\textsuperscript{27} The women gesture in farewell to the chariot cortège which moves off to the right. They do not overtly mourn, but seem to be placed in a similar relation to the chariot group as the woman at the left of the scene on the Warrior Vase (Fig. 4a) is to the file of processional soldiers. On the fourteenth-century vases the gesture of mourning or farewell is explicitly connected with the chariot cortège; on the Warrior Vase and stele, and the larnakes, all made near 1200, the gesture remains but the chariot has gone. These monuments were created in a period when the chariot was no longer widely maintained, after the fall of the palaces, and when the chariot kraters had already gone out of fashion. They emphasise a different moment of the mourning ceremony, or one carried out in different terms, but the presence or absence of the chariot is not critical for their interpretation as funerary monuments.

The Warrior Vase, and the earlier chariot vases, are not always thought of as funeral vases; in a real sense, the discovery of the larnakes has cast some light on this aspect of their iconography. The larnakes and the painted stele are obviously pieces of funeral painting; the stele and the Warrior Vase are from a single workshop and have similar subjects; the Warrior Vase has close relations both to the larnakes and to the whole series of pictorial vases which it grandly concludes. Its interpretation as a scene of departure for war has been generally popular, although vague and diluted.\textsuperscript{28} It is just as convincing as an excerpt from the ceremonies surrounding important burials. The woman who touches her hand to her head like the larnax women also wears a diadem or cap of some sort, as they do; the soldiers march in solemn file and, on the other side, cast their spears like the soldiers on the painted stele. The spear-contest seems to have been part of the traditional funeral games; it is also shown (Fig. 5c) on some chariot kraters. The woman is left behind in the house, as in Homer. On the larnakes, the architectural framework seems similarly domestic, to remind us that Bronze Age females are to be imagined looking out of windows or standing in doors, not far from their nests. So too for the Window Krater. A case was made earlier for many

\textsuperscript{26} A. Furtwängler and G. Loeschke, \textit{Mykenische Vassen} fig. 17; A. Furumark, \textit{The Mycenaean Pottery}, Motive 1 no. 10; Type 55 no. 7; MMA: CP 1405.

\textsuperscript{27} V. Karageorghis, \textit{JHS} lxxvii (1957) 269.

\textsuperscript{28} E.g., A. Furumark, \textit{The Mycenaean Pottery} 451 ff.
chariot kraters being painted with funerary scenes;\textsuperscript{29} it remains to suggest how they work. In standard compositions it would be the dead man himself carried in the chariot—shown upright, to give us a better view of him (as on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus or some later Dipylon kraters) but clearly armless and in his shroud to emphasise that he is no longer active in life. Figures on foot represent friends and servants who march to the tomb; the athletes engaging in boxing, wrestling, and spear-throwing are competitors in the funeral games. The miscellaneous filling ornaments like vases suggest the gifts placed in the tomb. The birds, fish, and trees may allude to the landscape through which the cortège passes, may have more specific symbolic value in suggesting the continuity of life though individuals die, or may simply allow the painter to retreat to familiar designs when the effort of painting ceremony becomes exhausting.

Those who do not care for such interpretations must find it curious that, without them, so little funerary art has survived from Mycenaean culture although so much labour and expense were lavished on the dead. Almost the first examples of genuine mainland art, the carved stelai of the Mycenaean Shaft Graves, are likely to be funerary in their designs as well as their function of marking the tumulus, showing the chariot races at the funerals of kings.\textsuperscript{30} The chariot scenes on the short ends of the Hagia Triada sarcophagus certainly have funeral connexions. Its strange lack of influence upon later Minoan sarcophagi, and its nexus of links to the Mycenaean sarcophagi, are well explained in Nilsson's terms: that its mixed imagery was the result of Minoan craftsmen drawing on formulas of divine cult to illustrate the burial themes demanded by a Mycenaean patron, because there were no ready funeral models in Crete.\textsuperscript{31} Its architectural framework, straight seamed mainland costumes, tails, and flat plummed caps are clear influences on the iconography of the Tanagra larnakes; its chariot themes link it to chariot kraters which begin to be made at the same time, near 1400 B.C. It is interesting to note that two of the four known Cretan larnakes with figure scenes of the Mycenaean period include the chariot as part of the composition, and that the fragmentary painted larnax from Mycenae connects the chariot with octopus and flowers as on many chariot kraters and as on the Episkopi larnax; the Tiryns chariot-larnax fragment is another recent link.\textsuperscript{32}

The excavations of Dr Karageorghis at Salamis in Cyprus have shown that Mycenaean burial forms such as the tholos tomb persisted there until the seventh century, and that chariot cortèges were an integral part of the funeral ceremony.\textsuperscript{33} The chariot was armed with sword, javelins, quiver, and drawn up before an elaborate funerary table set with food and coloured cloths; the teams of horses were slaughtered in the dromos. The only recorded horse burial in Greece, in the dromos of the Marathon tholos tomb (not far from the Tanagra larnakes) did not seem to include the chariot, but after all the Salamis chariot only exists in negative, holes in the earth with metal fastenings where the wood rotted away, and one wonders if excavators of mainland tholoi may have smashed such delicate negative traceries through not expecting them. With the association of chariots and funeral ceremonies proven for some parts of the Aegean world, one would not be surprised to find the association reflected in paintings found in tombs.

The larnakes are not directly affected by funerary interpretations of either chariot kraters or the Warrior Vase, except that such interpretations offer them some contact with familiar aspects of Mycenaean art; they are not created ex nihilo. Their iconography is indeed almost predictable, partly suggested by lingering awareness of a convention of funerary painting

\textsuperscript{29} Chariot vases as funerary, \textit{H. Lorimer, Homer and the Monuments} 48.
\textsuperscript{30} G. Mylonas, 'The Figured Mycenaean Stelai,' \textit{AJA} lv (1951) 134.
\textsuperscript{31} M. Nilsson, \textit{The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion} 441.
\textsuperscript{32} See note 3 above, end.
which was going out of fashion, partly shaped by the curious imaginative power which produced so many novelties in the age following the destruction of the mainland palaces. After the larnakes and the Warrior Vase, the subject of the farewell and ceremony linked with death does not seem to be preserved again until the great Dipylon kraters of the eighth century, where compositions of grieving figures, marching men with spears, chariots, birds and plants and stags as filling ornaments, may illuminate the continuity of an ancient and simple rite depicted in ancestral terms.

The choice of a mourning figure, weeping tears (No. 1) or crying aloud in anguish (No. 8) was a natural one. No. 5, with its men marching through a landscape, seems controlled by the iconography of the older processional; Nos. 3 and 4 combine the processional with the mourning gesture. On the whole, the larnakes are less tinged with cult or organised religion than one might expect. Corresponding pieces in Crete make rich use of the furniture and symbols of cult: horns of consecration, double axes, perching birds, altars, bulls, and half-divine monsters like sphinxes and griffins. Perhaps the octopus and the palm tree were also associated with this sphere of imagery in the Minoan mind. But from the array of pictorial possibilities the mainland painters select only the horns of consecration, and only on two pieces, Nos. 5 and 8. No. 5 also employs the bird and the palm tree, in a vague way not strongly indicative of cult. The horns of consecration are not treated as cult objects, perhaps, so much as architectural patterns, for on both larnakes they are arranged in rising tiers with beams between, as though on a façade; they are not joined to any mortal figure or worshipper. Mainland artists seem usually to have regarded horns of consecration as architectural elements; palace roofs at Pylos and Gla were decorated with limestone horns, and frescoes showing palace façades normally include them, but they do not have any role in the few cult scenes which can be recognised in mainland painting. How far they conveyed an imagery of death to the Mycenaevans is hard to tell. It is interesting that the only sarcophagus of this period in Cyprus, a fragmentary limestone chest, is carved with horns upon the end too.\(^{34}\) The stacked horns on the Tanagra larnakes may be understood in three ways, perhaps simultaneously: as a decorative pattern, as an allusion to the architectural setting given by the painted frames and discs, and as establishing a serious ceremonial atmosphere in which the postures of grief unfold with new dignity.

The nature of the ceremony must also be responsible in some measure for the two curious details of costume noted in the catalogue: the flat plumed cap, and the 'tails' attached below the hips of some women. These caps and tails are first seen together on the Hagia Triada sarcophagus (FIG. 2d), and must be transmitted through lost media to the mainland larnakes as the proper equipment for women engaged in public funeral rites. The cap is more common in Aegean art than the tails. It is usually associated with goddesses and sphinxes. The most elaborate representations of it are the earliest: the Priest-King's rim of blowing lilies may have given rise to a shorthand transcription in later painting which produced a serrated edge or rows of discs. Sometimes the plume in Mycenaevan art seems to be a misunderstanding of the long clubbed pony-tail of bareheaded women on gems and rings, but on sphinxes and a few chariot krater human figures it is clearly attached to the cap and not to the head.\(^{35}\) Another version without the plume is perhaps represented on the Minoan terracotta idols of Kannia, Gazi, and Karphi; some of these figures wear three half-discs on the front rim, as on the caps of larnax No. 10 and the winged apparition on the end of No. 1.\(^{36}\) The women on Nos. 3, 4, and 4a wear the kind with the serrated edges; the men

\(^{34}\) Larnax from Dhekelia, near Larnaka; cf. note 3 above. The pictorial sherd from the Athenian Agora representing horns of consecration flanking a double axe on top of an altar seems to be unique in Mycenaevan vase-painting, and is probably directly inspired by the many Minoan versions of this theme, cf. S. Immerwahr, *Archaeology* xiii (1960) 8, fig. 7

\(^{35}\) See note 19 above.

on Nos. 6 and 9 seem to have a flat, round version. Possibly the cap is ancestral to the polos fitted out with discs which is worn by some early Geometric terracotta goddesses. There seems to be no important difference between the role of the mourners who wear it and those who do not; they are not divinities, but ordinary mortals engaged in public ceremony invoking divinity. As for the tails, they seem less likely to be manufactured equipment, or cloth, than locks of hair cut off in mourning and tucked into the girdle; they are not drawn in such a way as to inspire confidence in diagnosis, but seem reserved for funeral contexts both in Bronze Age art and in such survivals as the Fortetsa figure in later ages (fig. 2e). Perhaps their stiffness on the larnakes is best accounted for by Achilles' words:

οὐ θείμας ἐστι λοετάρα καρπήατος ἄσσουν ἱεόσθαι,
πρὶν γ’ ἐνὶ Πάτροκλον θέμεναι πυρὶ σήμα τε χέβαι
κείρασθαι τε κόμην.

(Iliad xxiii 44).

Dead Patroklos was covered with such locks from the mourners, and Achilles' own yellow tress was laid in his hands (xxiii 135, 152).

The most interesting picture on the larnakes is the winged apparition on the end of No. 1. The wings grow from elbow to wrist along the right-hand curve of the arms. They are formed of ruffles of skin, not feathers. They look like the leathery flanges of bats or lizards, or the fins of fish. The way the wings curve up in an open arc gives a superficial resemblance to the posture of the goddesses with upraised arms. The painter is probably more interested, however, in rendering a figure in flight, soaring in air, than he is in Minoan religious convention. The rendering is certainly an experiment, even if the idea which inspired it was already established in Mycenaean minds; as far as our knowledge goes, this is the first winged human being in Greek art. Apart from her wings she resembles the living larnax-women, in face, cap, dress, and tails.

It is a departure from the common rules of Mycenaean art to portray the supernatural in human form, or to attempt its physical rendition at all, even through symbols. Divinity usually appeared only in those minor arts most strongly tempered by Minoan influence—gold rings, gems, ivories, cheap terracotta figurines.Appearances in painting are extremely rare; the wizened goddess on a throne, on the Homage Krater in the Louvre, or the scarcely visible Shield Goddess on the painted pinax from Mycenae are special examples. The figure on the larnax is something else again, so curious that some German scholars were led to doubt that the monument was genuine. It is genuine of course; the painting is only a thing we have not been conditioned to see in our limited gallery of Mycenaean art.

Three possible interpretations of the winged being recommend themselves. It may be a goddess in epiphany, responding to the grieving cries of the mourners. It may be a winged spirit of death come to fetch the soul of the dead. Or, and perhaps most likely, it may be the soul itself, the eidolon or psyche, fluttering in the neighbourhood of the buried flesh. In classical painting the eidolon is often shown in exactly this manner, a replica of the living person but with a small pair of wings, hovering over the mound tomb. Homer has the same imagination of it, fluttering and fluttering, the winged insubstantial counterpart of the living person; Homer certainly did not invent the idea, and there is no historical reason against his deriving it from the concepts of the latest Bronze Age. The bat-like wings seem especially close to Homeric fantasy, and different from classical bird-wings with feathers. When

---

37 Cf. V. Müller, Der Polos (1915); H. Palmer, Archaeology vi (1953) 96.


Winged warriors on a Zakro sealing may be human, are more likely male counterparts of the Zakro "eagle-women" (D. Levi, Annuale viii–ix (1925–26) 175, nos. 175, fig. 213, pl. 17).
Homer describes the psyche in flight from the body, it cries with the thin noise of a bat or fledgling (ἡυτε κατώς ὁχετε τερμιμία ιλιαδ ἡκία 100; γυνώσα τε μεμονήν τε 106), and this evidently Mycenaean idea is made explicit in the 'late' simile of Odyssey xxiv 5 where the suitors' psychai follow Hermes squeaking like bats who dash back and forth when one of their company has fallen from the chain in a corner of the dark cave. The classical eidolon more often wears broad wings with articulated rows of coloured feathers.

One fragment of supporting evidence for understanding the winged being as the soul is the curious representation on the Cretan larnax from Milatos (Fig. 2a). The rude drawing seems clearly to show a naked male figure with double ruffles rising by his shoulders, sometimes thought of as hair, now with the discovery of larnax No. 1 more likely to be wings. If two such pictures survive from the thirteenth century, one male and one female, the difference in sex can be explained better by matching the image to the sex of the deceased, than by thinking that the Cretan creature represents a male god or death-spirit, the Greek one a goddess. Other interpretations cannot be excluded yet, however. After the Dark Ages there is an increasing illustration of winged beings of indeterminate sex, not always easily identified with known gods or mythological creatures. Larnax No. 1 seems to be the first expression of a convention which was beginning to form itself on the Greek mainland before the Dark Ages, and which was to intensify its appeal to the Greek mind with passing generations. The larnax is thus a document of some importance for those scholars who believe that a direct heritage of art as well as of thought was preserved through the Dark Ages to help form a new idiom in the Geometric period.

It is to be hoped that much more can be learned about the mainland painted larnakes in the near future, and that they can be analysed with more precision and confidence. After the Pylos frescoes, they are perhaps the most significant monuments of prehistoric mainland painting to be discovered since the war. They belong to a period of Mycenaean art about which we are relatively ill-informed. They are creations of a generation which experienced many adventures abroad, and was open to many cross-currents of cultural influence from Crete, Anatolia, Cyprus, and the Levant. They crystallise momentarily a series of experiments among late Mycenaean artists, experiments which are germinal for later times and which have already departed from the rather conceptual, unemotional conventions of earlier palace painting. These experiments gain added meaning because they were in a real sense the nearest background for later Greek knowledge about the Bronze Age past.

The larnakes confirm the existence of new burial customs in Greece at the end of the Bronze Age. They suggest the possibility of exploring the Tanagra region for further evidence of idiosyncratic Mycenaean culture. They provide new types in painting; they essay the frontal figure, the human being in tears and in despair, the matching of inner experience with outward pose. They open a small window onto a lost expanse of late Mycenaean religious belief and ceremonial rite; they offer a rare glimpse of Bronze Age beliefs about the nature of body and soul and the character of the after life. From the standpoint of earlier and later art they are not beautiful (Mycenaean art seldom is), but they try something new in a manner which partly survives the destruction of Mycenaean culture. In all their awkwardness, they rise to impressive levels as the artists struggle to create, without traditional models, original scenes of ceremonial grief.

E. D. T. Vermeule.

ADDENDA

Early in 1965 the village of Tanagra (Bratzi) was proved beyond doubt to be the site of an extensive Mycenaean necropolis. About one hundred and eighty tombs have been cleared since 1950; many have been intact. Larnakes were reportedly found in twenty-five
or thirty tombs, concentrated in the southern sector, one to three larnakes in each tomb. Every tomb with larnakes also had skeletons lying on the earth floor or packed in shallow pits; larnax-burial was not an exclusive or alien custom to the people. One larnax may have had a gable lid and one a flat plaque cover. The larnakes seem to have contained single skeletons (which is surprising in view of their cramped dimensions) still wearing the jewels of their funeral costume. There were no tomb gifts inside the larnakes. The abundant intact pottery of the tombs was spread on the floors outside, among the other bones. Most vases had simple bands; none had Close Style octopods. A few bronze swords and knives were recovered, although metal was rare. There were a number of carved gems, carnelian and steatite, and ornaments of blue glass-paste. Major points of interest still to be looked at are: (1) the site of the Mycenaean city; (2) the physical setting and use of the larnakes; (3) the unusual quality of Mycenaean art in this unexplored region.

No. 13.

A complete larnax, now whitewashed and used as a tub for potted flowers in the village of Bratzi.

Dimensions: 0.71 m. long, 0.47 m. high, 0.35 m. wide. This larnax is the only known one in the group to have handles, one thick round handle at the top centre of each side. It stands on square legs and has no pilasters. It was apparently an undecorated larnax, not worth selling, with panels marked out by incised borders and perhaps red lines. There are at least two holes in the floor, none through the legs.

Stirrup jar. (See Arch. Rep. 1964–65, fig. 20)

Reportedly from the floor of a chamber tomb which also contained a larnax, therefore a rough chronological guide. 0.09 m. tall. Fine buff clay and slip, clear chestnut paint. Low sharply biconical shape, flat shoulder, spreading concave foot, sunken conical disc with raised nipple.

Bands on lower body. N-pattern at edge of shoulder; two bands framing five lines in shoulder zone. On shoulder, flanking the spout, triangles of parallel lines hanging from an open circle; in the rear, three panels filled with solid triangles, single on the sides, and double in the centre with a pendant fringe.

Late III B or early III C. The pattern is peculiar and points again to the probability of unusual local Mycenaean styles in eastern Boiotia.
THE DICTAEAN HYMN TO THE KOUROS

I. Text and Translation

'Iω μέγιστε Κούρε,
χαίρε μοι, Κρόνειε
παγκρατέσ, γὰν ὃς βέβακες
daιμόνων ἀγώμενοι:

5

Δίκταν ἐς ἐναυτὸν
ἐρπε, καὶ γέγαβι μολπᾶ.
τὰν τοι κρέκομεν πακτισί
μείζαντες ἀμ' αὐλοῖον
καὶ στάντες ἀείδομεν τεὸν

10

ἀμφὶ βαμὸν εὐερκή.

'iω μέγιστε[τε] Κούρε,
χαίρε μοι, Κρόνειε
παγκρατέσ, γὰν ὃς βέβακες

daιμόνων ἀγώμενοι:

15

Δίκταν ἐς ἐν[αυτὸν
ἐρπε], καὶ γέγαβι μολπᾶ.
ἐνθα γάρ σε, παῖδ' ἀμβροτον,
ἀσπίδ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]

pαρ 'Ρέας λαβάντες τ'πολα

20

κ[]

'iω μέγιστε Κούρε,
χαίρε μοι, Κρόνειε
παγκρατέσ, γὰν ὃς βέβακες

daιμόνων ἀγώμενοι:

25

Δίκταν ἐς ἐναυτὸν
ἐρπε, καὶ γέγαβι μολπᾶ.

(Three verses missing.)

30

— ὦ ζας καλᾶς ἄδσ.
[iω μέγιστε Κούρε,
χαίρε μοι, Κρόνειε
παγκρατέσ, γὰν ὃς βέβακες
daιμόνων ἀγώμενοι:

35

Δίκταν ἐς ἐν[αυτὸν
ἐρπε, κα]γέγαβι μολπᾶ.
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]β]ρόνον κατήτος,
καὶ βροτὸς Δίκα κατίχε
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]ἐπ' ἐξω

α φιλολόβος Ειρίνηα.
[iω μέγιστε Κούρε,
χαίρε μοι, Κρόνειε
παγκρατέσ, γὰν ὃς βέβακες
daιμόνων ἀγώμενοι:]
M. L. WEST

45 Δίκταν ἐς ἔναυτόν
ἐρπε, καὶ γε]γαθὶ μολπᾷ,
ά[λλ' ἀναξ θόρ' ἐς στα]むια,
καὶ θόρ' εὔποκ' ἐς [ποιμνα,
κέσ λαί]α καρπῶν θόρε,
κέσ τελεσφ[όρος οίκος]
ιω μέγιστε Κούρε,
χαίρε μοι, Κρόνειε
παγκρατέε, γῶν ὡς βέβακες
[δαμο]μων ἀγώμενος·

50 Δίκταν ἐς ἐν[αυτόν]
ἐρπε, καὶ γέγαθι μολπᾷ.
[θόρε κές] πόλης ἀμών,
θόρε κέσ ποντουπόρος νάας,
θόρε κές ί[έως πο]λείτας,

55
θόρε κές θέμιν κλ...ιω μέγιστε] Κούρε,
χαίρε μοι, Κρόνειε
παγκρατέε, γῶν ὡς βέβακ[ες]
δαμο]μων ἀγ]ώμενος·

60 Δίκταν ἐς ἐν[αυτόν]
ἐρπε, καὶ γέγαθι] μολπᾷ.

Io! Greatest Kouros,
hail, son of Kronos,
master of all, who to earth art gone
with the powers in train, now come again
to Dicte at the year's wend
and hear with gladness our refrain!

We thread it with harps
and blend it with pipes
and sing as we stand
round thy altar wall:

Io! Greatest Kouros, etc.

For here they took thee, child immortal,
the shield[ed ...
took thee from Rhea, and [danced

...

Io! Greatest Kouros, etc.

...

... of the fair day's light.

Io! Greatest Kouros, etc.

... abounded all years,
and men were the servants of Righteousness,
[and ... was ...] en out (?)
by prospering Concord.

Io! Greatest Kouros, etc.
O [lord, spring up in the wine-j]ars
and spring in the fleecy [flocks,
and in the crop]s of the fields spring up
and in the [house of ful]filment.
THE DICTAEAN HYMN TO THE KOUROS

Io! Greatest Kouros, etc.
Spring up in] our towns and peoples,
spring up in the seafaring ships,
spring up in the y[oung of the pe]ople,
spring up in the ... order.
Io! Greatest Kouros, etc.

II. NOTES ON TEXT AND LANGUAGE

1. K. Latte, *De saltationibus Graecorum* 44, notes the possibility that κορέ was originally written, representing κώρε. There are instances in the hymn of ε and ο representing secondary ε and δ (cf. on 5, 30, 38, 50), though we also find καρηξε in 38. This orthography must go back to the original written text, and helps to date the composition, being found in a few Cretan inscriptions of the third century B.C. but not later (Bechtel, *Gr. Dial.* ii 680 ff.). Before the fourth century, η and ο were not used at all in Crete, so that if the hymn were as early as the fifth century, as Wilamowitz asserts (Griech. Verskunst 502) without giving his reasons, we should expect either ε and ο throughout or a uniform transliteration, not the distinction that actually appears in the hymn. For original η, ω (also for η < ae and oe, ω < eo) and ε, o for the contraction of ee, oe, and for ε, o lengthened by compensation. The usual dating of the hymn to the fourth or third century thus receives confirmation.1

If κώρε was originally written, it may as well have represented κώρε as κώρε. But κώρος is the normal form in choral lyric (Pindar, Bacchylides, Tragedy), and suits the language of this hymn, which is in general literary Doric koine.2

3. Here and again in 13 the stone has ΠΑΝΚΡΑΤΕΚ, in 53 perhaps ΠΑΝΚΡΑΤΕΚ, in 33, 43 and apparently 63, ΠΑΝΚΡΑΤΕΚ. The character Ν or Ν is not TI corrected to Ν, as Bosanquet supposes (BSA xv (1908/9) 343), but Ν corrected to Π.3 The tau-like form of gamma is seen by itself in 33 ΠΑΝΚΡΑΤΕΤΑΝ[ΟC, 34 ATΘΜΕΝΟC.

After παγκράτες the stone has ΠΑΝΟC with upsilon afterwards inserted between Ο and C. In the two other places where the word is preserved, 53 and 63, it has ΠΑΝΟΥC. This has hitherto been interpreted as γάνος, ‘almighty brightness’, or γάνος, ‘lord of all that is wet and gleaming’ (Murray, BSA xv (1908/9) 358). The latter is simply not Greek, apart from the fact that γάνος would be an Atticism. The former might be possible as Greek, though it is significant that the redbearer of the article γάνος in LSJ had to create a special section to accommodate this passage. The decisive objection to it (an objection that applies equally to γάνος) is provided by the structure of the whole invocation in lines 1–6. Reading γάνος, we have (i) χαίρε μου with a series of vocatives; (ii) an abrupt statement, without connexion: ‘you have gone (or come)’—we are not told where; (iii) an abrupt appeal, again without connexion: ‘come to Dictae’. By taking παγκράτες as masculine vocative and dividing γάνος, I avoid the difficult noun, supply the essential qualification of βέβακες, and restore the whole ephymnion to normal invocation structure with its typical relative clause following the vocatives.4 How well γάν suits the sense will be seen presently. The insertion of γάν on stone, but by way of an intermediate pen- or stylus-written copy. Then it was apparently sketched out on the stone in some way, and the engraver slavishly followed the partly cursive lines of this sketch without understanding. See Bosanquet, BSA xv (1908/9) 346–8.

1 Latte, 45 n. 1, takes it as an unexampled symbol for the nasal gamma.

2 The relative clause often refers to the place where the god is or may be. See Norden, *Agnostos Theos* 168 ff.
of the ϒ was perhaps prompted by the misreading of a rough breathing above ΟΓ in the hand-copy.

βέβαιος: a Hellenistic form. See Powell, Collectanea Alexandrina 162.

4. ἄγωμενος: this contraction of εω to ω is a peculiarity of East and West Cretan. (Buck, Greek Dialects, 3rd ed., 40 and 171 f.) The normal Doric would be εω or ευ. This is the clearest example of a Cretan dialect form in the whole poem.

5. ες: so the stone here and in 15, 55 (front), 65 (?); ες in 35, 45 and 55 (back). Probably ες (from ευς, perhaps still pronounced with a nasalised vowel by the poet) is original, ες an orthographical modernisation.

6. ἐπει: common in poetry in the general sense 'come' or 'go', but also normal Cretan usage, e.g. in the treaty between Hierapytna and Lyttos, GDI 5041 (s. iii–ii) ὃ δὲ κόσμος τῶν Ἱεραπυτνιτῶν ἐπεί ἔστη Λυττοῦ ἐς τὸ ἀρχεῖον.

γέγαθα: simplified from *γέγαθ-θν.

μολπα: the stone has μολπα here, 16 front, 46, 56 front and back; μολπαν 16 back, 36, 66. The accusative (genitive plural is ruled out by τῶν in 7) is much rarer than the dative with γνῆ. The false addition of final ν is probably connected with its disappearance in pronunciation in Hellenistic times; it is often omitted in inscriptions and papyri.

10. The stone has ΟΥΕΡΚΗ on the front, ΣΥΕΡΚΗ on the back, the bow of Θ being squashed like that of an epsilon, not rounded like that of omicron. οὐερκῆ, accepted by Powell, has parallels in Cretan, such as οὐεργέτας, οὐλεθέρος. But it is unlikely that a provincialism like this would have been admitted by the poet; ευερκῆς was familiar from Homer, Pindar, etc. Cf. εὖποκα in 48. οὐερκῆ perhaps reflects the pronunciation of the stonecutter.

17. A similar case is perhaps to be recognised here. The stone (back) has not άμβρωτον but ΑΜΟΡ ΤΟΝ. άμορτος looks like a Cretan form for άμβρωτος (<*η-μμοτος). μορτος for βρωτος was known to Callimachus (fr. 467), and appears in the proper names άργυρομορτος (Lesbos), Κλεόμορτος (Syrus), Χαρμορτος (Aeolian, Polyb. xviii 38). The metathetic forms ποτη, 'Αφροδίτα, indicate a Cretan preference for ρ over π. The metre allows either άμορτον or άμβρωτον. There are two possibilities: (i) the poet wrote the normal poetic form, and άμορτον is due to the stonecutter, whether or not it was a form familiar to him: he read the (cursive) Β before him as an O, and, bewildered, left a gap of one letter between P and T where he saw an O; (ii) the poet wrote άμορτον, the man who sketched out the poem on the stone wrote αμβρωτον and then corrected it to αμπρ[Πτον, and the stonecutter just carried out the letters as they were, ignoring the erased one. For the front of the stone, where αμ[ ends the line, αμβρωτον should perhaps be inferred, since αμπρωτον would be a false syllabic division; though in the case of γαν(ν)σ we find both γαν[οσ (33, 43) and γα]νουσ (63).

18. The length of the lacuna can best be estimated from the front copy, where the eleven letters βρωτον αμποδ + n are missing between the beginning of the stonecutter's line and πάρ Ἄρας. In the two preceding lines, in which the letters are of similar size, the equivalent space contained, respectively, 25 (or 26) letters and 23 letters plus 2–3 letters' space. So n should be 14 or 15. The reference is evidently to the shield-bearing Kouretes; but attempting to restore the actual words missing is Spielerei.

19. ἰπολα: Bosanquet's ποδα is fairly probable, but ἰπλα is another possibility.

20. The lacuna is here of indeterminate length, and supplementation is again unprofitable. Powell's κρούντες ἀντάχον does not accord with the metre in any of the other stanzas.

30. καλάς ὁς: no other interpretation of these letters seems possible. ὁς is presumably genitive, not accusative plural: I know no instance of the word in the plural. ὁς is written for secondary — ὅς (from — ὅς). Bosanquet's supplement τ]άς may be right; cf. 40 ἄ φιλολόφος Ἔρημα.
37, 39. The lacunae represent the beginnings of two successive lines on the stone. In the three preceding lines and one following line, the supplements are certain, being parts of the refrain. For these four lines (abcd) the following equations can be formulated, where \( n \) represents the number of letters missing in verse 37:

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) \quad n + 12 &= 23 \\
(b) \quad n + 7 &= 17 \\
(c) \quad n + 3 &= 11 \\
(d) \quad n + 19 &= 29 
\end{align*}
\]

It is reasonable to take 10 as the value of \( n \). The number of letters missing in verse 39 is approximately \( n + 4 = 14 \).

Murray’s interpretation of κατηχος as an adverb formed by contraction from a stereotyped κατα Φερος through καταΦερος and καταδεης (p. 360) is hard to improve on.\(^4\) Bosanquet’s βηρων is fairly certain, and his Καιροι δε attractive, though rather short, even allowing for the width of omega.\(^5\) Perhaps καρποι δε.

38. βεροτος: it is uncertain whether this represents βεροτος or βεροτος. So with ποντοπορος in 58. -ς (written -ους, not -ως) is normal in choral lyric.

39. The letter which I transcribe as a xi is usually taken as a zeta. Its form, \( \overline{a} \), is certainly that of a xi, though different from the xi written in 8 (front and back) MEIZANTEC.\(^6\) If ξω is right, the letter before \( \Pi \) must have been a short vowel, and iota is the only one that fits the preserved trace. \( \pi \eta \) presumably represents a verb. \( \eta ρηπη \) might do; for this aorist in a transitive sense cf. Nic. Th. 724.

47. The lacuna represents the end of a line on the stone, and can only be calculated approximately. But neighbouring lines that can be supplemented with certainty yield the following equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
&n + 6 = 21 \\
&n + 3 = 19 \\
&n - 10 = 5 \\
&n - 10 = 5 \\
&n - 9 = 8 
\end{align*}
\]

Which suggest fairly unanimously that \( n = 15-16 \).

At this point, apparently, the chorus turns from narrative to prayer, and Wilamowitz’s διλαδ is exactly what is wanted.\(^7\) He continued with βον βορι ες ποιμαινα, which is unacceptable: ποιμαινω βοων is no more Greek than ‘flock of cows’ is English.\(^8\) The flocks must come in 48, therefore they cannot come here. Xanthudides’ δεμαινα is bizarre. Murray’s σταμαινα is much the best proposal. βορι ες must have preceded it, and my αναξ, while not certain, adequately fills the remaining gap. The supplement amounts to 16 letters on the assumption that the two elided vowels were written.

48-49. The lacuna here is the \( n \) of 47 minus three = 12 or 13 letters. Murray’s κες λαμαι (amended by Latte to λα\(i\)α) is very probable. It leaves six or seven letters to be

\(^4\) The form \( H_TOE_\) for ερος on an Aetolian inscription, \( IG \) g\( \lambda \) (1) 2. 11, 31, 32, is probably to be interpreted as θεος; so Buck, Greek Dialects 19 and 54.

\(^5\) Unless one assumes indentation of the first word of the stanza, which is not found in the other places where this falls at the beginning of the line (7 front and back).

\(^6\) Against Murray’s supplement \( \deltaηρευε ζηο \) is the fact that \( \pi \) is preceded by the top of a vertical. There is no other instance in the poem of elision between lines; this is also an objection to Wilamowitz’s \( δηςπη ας ζ\(i\)α \) (p. 500.).

\(^7\) Denniston, Greek Particles 16, gives some parallels.

\(^8\) ‘Freilich redet man sonst von βοων δηλων.’
filled by the noun that εὐποικα qualified, so that ποίμνια (Murray) is preferable to πώεα (Wilamowitz). The assonance with σταμνία which it gives is a typical feature of an incantation.

Before εὐποικ the stone has θοριμ, where ́ is perhaps the corruption of an apostrophe.

50. κές: perhaps elision, κές, rather than crasis, κές (for κήσ). Cf. Cretan κέρσειας, Buck, Greek Dialects 80. On the back of the stone it is twice written καίς.

The maximum length for the lacuna is about nine letters. τελεσφόρος is certain; the noun can only be guessed at, but Wilamowitz’s οἶκος is very attractive. He compares Hesych. τελεσφόρος οἶκος: τοῦ γεγαμμέκοτος καὶ τεκνίσαντος, though of course the gloss cannot derive from this actual passage.

57. The supplement is Murray’s.

πόλης: an epicism.

58. ποντοφόρος is Powell’s correction of ποντοφόρος, which is unparalleled. The confusion of π and φ is common in the Imperial period. The corruption may have been aided by τελεσφόρος above. νᾶς is monosyllabic, and might as well have been written νᾶς. For the ‘etymological’ spelling cf. Hes. Th. 981 βοῦν.

59. The lacuna is of some six letters. Bosanquet’s supplement is hard to improve on.

60. The whole lacuna, including ῥω μέγαστε and a space before it, is about 15 letters long, and the space before and after the refrain is elsewhere (10–11, 16–17, 46–47) about three letters wide. Bosanquet’s κλιατίν (debut -άν) is rather too long. The metre is uncertain: this stanza is in iotics a minore (but see below), and this catalectic line may have scanned ρο — — — (as Eur. Bacch. 71, Cyc. 502), or ρο — — — (as in Catullus’ galliambics, e.g. 63.14 uelit exules loca, 35 tetigere lassulae), or ρο — — — (as e.g. Eur. Bacch. 385, 536). Murray’s καίλάν would do, but if the letter after κ were alpha, one ought to be able to see something of the crossbar. Perhaps κλιήναν (Wilamowitz), or κλυτάν (κλυτα) Θέμα Quint. Smyrn. 12.202).

57–60. There are several suspicious features about this whole stanza:

(i) The metre, iotics a minore, with anaclasis in 57 and 59 and catalexis in 60, is intelligible, but differs from the iotics a maiore of all the other stanzas.

(ii) From the point of view of sense, 57 and 59 go closely together, and 58 is an interruption.

(iii) The monosyllabic scansion which has to be assumed for νᾶς is unparalleled.

(iv) The structure of the clauses θορίμ κές ... is unlike that in 47–50, where we have [θορίμ ́ ...] καὶ θόρε ... ἐς[... κές ...] θορε, κές ...

All these difficulties could be dealt with by the assumption of a dislocation in the text, such as the repeated θορε might easily have caused:

κές πόλης ἀμόνια θόρε
κές νός πολιτας θορε
κές θέμι (κλεινναν) θορε
κές ποντοφόρος νᾶς.

Besides the dislocation, one would have to assume that an extra θορε was erroneously added before κές πόλης, and that whatever word followed θέμι was replaced by something shorter. Latte (p. 46) avoids all but the second difficulty by supplementing simply κής in 57 instead of θορε κές, assuming an abnormally large space beforehand.

III. Interpretation

It is well known that the Zeus who was born in a Cretan cave was originally not the Hellenic Zeus but a pre-Hellenic vegetation- or year-spirit of the same general type as the
Semitic Adonis or the Egyptian Osiris. He was represented as a bearded youth;9 he was reborn every year,10 and he also died.

This god was identified by the Greeks with their Zeus long before Hesiod. But he retained his individuality, and his worship in Crete preserved many of its peculiar features. Our hymn, which comes from the site of the temple of Zeus Diktaios at Palaikastro, is a unique document from a comparatively late stage of that cult.

The god is addressed as 'son of Kronos', and is evidently thought of as Zeus. But the name Zeus is avoided. There may be no significance in this; but it may have been felt that it was not quite proper to call him Zeus. Instead he is called 'greatest Kouros'.

The birth of this Kouros was attended, according to myth, by the Kouretes. The name Κουρήτης means no more than κούρας.11 They are of the same nature as he, but he is primus inter pares: the greatest Kouros.12 Like him, they are nature-spirits. They grew as trees;13 they haunt mountain caves and wooded glens.14 When they dance wearing their armour, all the flowers bloom.15 They are τροφέες καὶ αδήτας ὀλέθνες, ὀφρυττόμοι, φερέκαρτοι.17 They nourish and protect the flocks and herds.18

Except for the fact that they are male, the Cretan Kouretes are closely similar to the Greek Nymphs, who are often called Κόινας.19 These too are nature-spirits, dwelling in springs, groves, caves and mountains. They are forever dancing,20 and they nurture both men and beasts.21 They were born together with the Kouretes, according to an early source,22 and they are invoked together with them in the treaty oaths sworn by Cretan towns.23

9 Et. magn. 276.19 s.v. Δίκτη... ἐν τῷ ἄλλῳ ἡ ἀγαλματίδιον ἐν ὁλοκλήρωσιν. Compare coins from Phaistos (s. v.-iv; Head, Hist. Num.2, 473) showing a boy labelled ΦΑΙΣΤΩΝ sitting in the branches of a tree, with Hesych. Γεγεννάμενος ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ Κρηταῖς. (κρητικον. col.) Welchanos, who is known to have been worshipped in classical times at Knossos, Lyttos and Gortyn, in other words in the areas round Mt. Ida and Mt. Lasithi, may have been the original 'Minoan' name of the Cretan Zeus. His festival the Welchania fell in the spring, cf. Inscr. Cret. I. xvi. 3.2 (Knossos), I. xvii. 11.2 (Lyttos); A. B. Cook, Zeus ii. 948. It is possible that he is identical with the Eteuscen Velyans (but hardly with Latin Vulcanus); see W. Meid, Indog. Forsch. lxvi (1961) 250–66.

10 Ant. Lib. 19 (from the Ornithogony of 'Boios') ἐν Κρήτῃ λέγεται εἶναι λευρὸν ἀντρόν μελίσσων, ἐν ὃς μελιζωθεῖται τεκεῖν Ρέεν τὸν Δία, καὶ κακὰ ἐστίν. οὐδὲν παρέλθει οὗτος θεόν οὐδὲ θεντί. ἐν ὃς γράφων ἀφρομισθεῖν ὀρᾶται καὶ ἐκατὸν ἐκ τοῦ πληθύνου ἐκείνου ἐν τῷ ἄτομον πύρ. τούτο ἐν γίνεσθαι μελιζωθεῖν ὃταν ἐκβασθῇ τὸ τοῦ Δίας ἐκ τῶν γένεσιν αἷμα. The 'blood' that 'bubbled up' was perhaps the sap that returns to vegetation in the springtime; while the fire that blazed forth from the cave I imagine to have been annually contrived by priests as a sign to the worshippers that the god was born again.

11 Cf. Homerics κούρητες Ἀχαίων = κούροι Ἀχαίων. The QD, Ἀρχαίκος τὸ Κρήτην ἰσότητας ἔνωσεν. The very early inscriptions on Thera (IG xii.3 354, 355, 371) is perhaps to be identified with him. Thera had particular connexions with Crete from the Bronze Age on. From Thera the cult was carried to Cyrene, from where we have dedications to the Κορής in the fourth-third

century, one of them, significantly, to the 'Koures of Crete' (SEG ix 108 Κούρας Κρήτης). The place name Mel. adesp. 67 (b) 7 δεδομένος ἀναβεβαιοτιστάσαι. Cf. the Euhemeristic account of them in Diod. v 56 κατοικεῖν ἐστὶν τῶν ἄδων τῶν συνοικισμοὺς καὶ φυσικογνώσις τόπους... διὰ τὸ μέπω κατακεκαίθαι οἰκιών εὐρήθαι. Ορφ. Hymn. xxviii 13.

13 Ibid., 14.

14 Ibid., 25.


16 Orph. Hymn. 51.12–13 αἰτιολ αἰτιο.rel δαιμόνια δαιμόνια... οὐλοδερέμεις αὐξάνοντοι τε. Cf. Hes. fr. 198 Rz. οὐρείαν νεύμαθεν θεοί ἐξερέθησον καὶ γένος ἀτέλεσιν Σατύρων καὶ ἄμφως γενέσις Κορητής τε θεοὶ φιλοπαίγμονες φρειάστηκες. GDI 5041 ὁμιόν τάς Ἐστιν καὶ Ἰτύθα Ὀρίστον... καὶ Ἀρεὰ καὶ Αρρυθεῖα καὶ Κορήτας καὶ Νεύματα καὶ θεὸς πάντας καὶ πάςας.
It was from among these nymphs, the βαθύκολποι κούραι Ὀκεανοῦ, that Persephone, the
greatest Kore, was carried off by Aidoneus.24 She, like the Cretan Kouros, was a nature-
spirit who vanished below the earth in the winter months and returned in the spring.25
Originally she has been said to die and be reborn. In classical times she was not
actually said to die, but her descent to the realm of Hades and her marriage to him amount
something as near death as classical Greek religion allowed a deity to suffer.
This feeling that a god could not be said to die also affected the cult of the Cretan
Kouros. The tomb of Zeus in Crete was very famous from Euhemerus onwards; but it is
only the tomb that is spoken of, not the death, which ought to have been the greater
paradox.26 This state of affairs fits very well with what we find in the Palaikastro hymn.
The Kouros has not died, he is not being reborn, he has ‘gone to earth’ and is now being
called to return to Dicte ἐς ἐνιαυτῶν.27

δαίμονος ἄγομενος is almost certainly to be taken with βῆβακες, not with what follows:
Δίκταιν is the emphatic word that begins the new clause. Who are the δαίμονες who have
followed the Kouros to earth? One thinks first of the Kouretes who form his entourage;
as nature-spirits, they are likely enough to disappear with him, returning in time to prepare
for his advent. In themselves, the words suggest that all the gods departed with him; and
perhaps the Kouretes are all the gods concerned in this religion. The Nymphs do not
disappear in this way, as far as I know; the Kore leaves them picking flowers in the meadow.
But their lives are intimately bound up with the lives of trees. When the tree dies, they
die;28 and the tree’s vernal leafing and annual unleafing brings them joy and grief.29

The mythical armed dance of the Kouretes is without doubt the projection of an annual
ritual dance intended to promote fertility and growth.30 It will have been executed by
mortal kouroi, perhaps very young ones, who may have been called Kouretes themselves.31
In one interesting version of the myth, the Kouretes dance round a tree in which the
Zeus-child’s cradle is suspended.32 There is probably a connexion here with the prepe-

Persephone was reared in a cave of the company
of nymphs, according to Porphr. de antro Nympharum 7.
25 Nilsson’s contention that it is in the summer
months that she disappears (Arch. f. Rel. xxxii (1935)
105 ff. = Opuscula Selecta ii 576 ff.) goes against the
explicit statement in Hymn. Dem. 401 (cf. 455), as
well as the passages from late writers quoted by
26 The references are collected by A. B. Cook,
Zeus ii 940-43 with i 1173. In Alcidamas’ Mousieion
(Pap. Flinders Petrie i 25, cf. Certamen line 100 Allen)
the tomb of Zeus appears as something in the same
class of unreason as ‘the King of France’. Hesiod
proposes a puzzle as follows:
Μοῦδ’ ἐγὼ καὶ τ’ ἀπάντα καὶ τ’ ἀπόσαμα πρὸ τ’ ἀπάντα,
τῶν μὲν μηδὲν ἀδεία, ὁ δ’ ἄλλης μνήσαται αὐθός.
—a programme that Homer fulfills by declaring
οὐδ’ ἄμφετ’ ἀμφι τῶν τέμπους κανανεῖτις ἵππω
ἀμέτρα συντετάγμων ἐρίζοντες περὶ γῆς.
So again in Certamen 121-3:
(puzzle) ἰησοῦν δεκαπενής ἐν ἱλατολέον
(solution and counter-puzzle)
ς’ ἄρρεν ἰησοῦ γεννήτηρ κατατεθεῖτο...
(solution) παύσις ἔπεθομος, Συνεργόνος ἀνθείειοι.
In Call. Hymn. i 8-9 the death is inferred from the
tomb:

Krήτης ἀλ’ ἄνεσται· καὶ γὰρ τάροι οὐ ἀνὰ σεὶ
Krήτης ἐκείνην τ’ ὁδεῖν ὁδεῖν, ὅσιοι γὰρ ἀθεῖ.

ἐνιαυτός probably does not mean ‘year’ here,
but the day that marks the end of a year, as often.
So Latte, 47 n. 3. Differently in Arat. 34

ἀισθανόμεθα καὶ ἐπεκαύων εἰς ἐνιαυτῶν
Δικταιῶν Κορητῆς ὅτε Κρόνων ἐκθέοντο.

28 Hymn. Apht. 264 ff. with the note of Allen—
Sikes—Haddiady.
29 Call. Hymn. iv 84-5

ὁ σώματα μὲν χαίρονταν, ὅτε δράων ἀμβρός ἄδεια,
ὁ σώματα δ’ αὐτὸ κλαίοντα, ὅτε δράων μικρὸν φύλλα.

30 Armed dancing for this purpose is attested.
Cf. Frazer, Golden Bough (2nd ed., 1900) iii 123 n. 3.
31 Epimenides, the wonder-worker and priest of
Zeus and the Nymphs (cf. Theopomp. 115 F 69), was
called Κορήτης and said to be the son of a nymph Balte
or Blaste (Plut. Sol. 12.4; Myronianus FHG iv 454, fr. 1).
32 Hyg. Fab. 139-3 Iuno autem Iovem in Cretensi
insula delituit, at Amalthea puere nutrix eum in cumis
in arbore suscipit, ut neque caelo neque terra neque
marum intineretur, et ne peperit vagitus exaudiertur. impuber
conovaeut, eisque chlora aenea et hastas-dedit, et tussit eos
circum arborem euntes crepare; qui Graece Curetes sunt
appellati. Compare the representations of Welchans
in the branches of a tree, on the coins mentioned
above.
sentations in Minoan art of dancing before a sacred tree. There are differences that cannot be ignored; the Minoan dancers are mostly female, and do not wear armour. There is, however, a signet ring in Copenhagen which shows a female figure, apparently a goddess, being adored by four smaller figures, of whom two are male and have figure-of-eight shields behind them; one might speculate that they have just been dancing, and have thrown aside their shields on the epiphany of the goddess. The Kouros and Kouretes of classical times have another Minoan counterpart in the young armed god who sometimes appears on monuments beside the universal goddess. I would also identify as the Kouros the god armed with spear and thunderbolt who is shown emerging from the crown of an enthroned goddess’s head on a relief pithos from Tenos (AJA lviii (1954) 240 and pl. 46, assigned to the late eighth century).

The dance may have been accompanied by a hymn of invocation, the ancestor of the hymn we have; and by the same token, our hymn, sung by a choir standing round an altar (verse 9), may have been preceded or accompanied by a dance executed by others. The βομος ευφρατος which is the focal point of the ceremony perhaps derives in a direct line from the walled-in tree which was the object of worship in Minoan times. For all we know, it may still have been crowned by some set-piece of living vegetation.

In verse 17 the chorus embarks upon a myth, which apparently extends to verse 40, twice interrupted by the refrain. The ἔνθα with which it is introduced refers to Δίκταω in 15 rather than the βομος in 10, with continuity of sense between refrain and stanza as in 6-7: in the rest of the poem, the sense runs on from stanza to stanza without regard to the refrain. The god is reminded that this is the place of his original birth, when the Kouretes took him from Rhea and performed their armed dance round him. Most of the next stanza is lost. The reference to (a, the) καλα άδειος in the last line is obscure: it may mean ‘fair Dawn (Daylight)’ in general, or a particular fair dawn in the past. At any rate we are still in narrative, as the past tenses in the following stanza (37 ff.) show. This stanza describes the age of peace, prosperity and righteousness that followed the god’s birth. The picture is influenced by the Golden Age of Hesiodic tradition, but the idea that such an age ensued upon the birth of the Kouros is a reflection of the fact that his annual rebirth is a precondition of fertility and prosperity, with which peace and righteousness are inseparably linked.

The description of that age concludes the myth, and forms the basis of the following appeal. Just as your birth then, O greatest Kouros, led to prosperity and peace, so spring up for us now, that we may enjoy those blessings this year too. The word which I render ‘spring up’, θόρη, can be used of gods being born; cf. Η.Herm. 20 δς καὶ έπει δ δ μυτρος άπ αθανάτων θόρη γνώσα. It is the springing up of the

---

24 Nilsson, 260, fig. 140. I am warned that the ring may be a forgery: cf. Biesantz, Kretisch-Mycenische Siegelbilder, 1954, 120 f.
25 Or the singers themselves may have begun to dance in the later part of the hymn. So H. Jeannaire, Couroi et Courètes (1939) 432 f.
26 Wilamowitz, 501. According to Nonnus, D. iii 61 ff., it is at dawn that the Korybantes, who for him are identical with the Kouretes, begin their dancing:

(177) και πατάγω κελάδωντι φαιλομαράγων Κορυβάντων πρώισι έρπετο Κάδμος.

---

27 For the association of Dike and Eirene cf. Hes. Th. 902 (where they are both Horai), Op. 225 ff. βιον κατός would fit better if κατός could mean ‘throughout the year’; cf. Οv. Mct. i 107, 116–19, for eternal spring as a feature of the Golden Age. But κατ’ έτος regularly means ‘annually’ (e.g. Θuc. iv 53, Diod. iii 2, Es. Luc. ii 41), or else ‘this year’ (SIG 234–24, OGI 458.64, CIG 3641 b 5, 38). If we adopt the sense ‘every year’, the idea might be that the crops (καρπος) never failed.
departed god and of the vegetation he represents that the Kouretes try to assist by their own leaping. The word has other associations with fertility: Aeschylus uses it like θόρυμα in the sense ‘impregnate’, and θορος, θορη mean ‘semen’. Sexual intercourse was believed to have an encouraging effect upon the growth of crops. This is what lies behind the myth of Iasion’s sexual union with Demeter in a thrice-ploughed fallow field—in Crete; and while that myth is the aition for a custom of ploughing-time, it is conceivable that a sexual act also played a part in the springtime ceremony with which our hymn is connected.

What the god is being asked to do, however, is to spring up from the lower world into the upper. He springs up not in a single spot, but everywhere; in the crops, in the beasts of the field, in men, and by a further extension of the original idea, in everything that is subject to success or failure, affluence or want: in the ships that bring merchandise, in the citizen body as a whole, and in Themis, the principle of order and regularity that both men and nature do best to obey.

It is evident that ‘spring up’ has become a stereotyped prayer in the cult of the Kouros, and that his influence has outgrown its original bounds. He is on the way to becoming a universal god, and it is in accord with this that he is praised as παγκρατης in the refrain. This is what he had in common with the Hellenic Zeus, that justified the identification of the two. In most respects they were, originally, utterly different. And yet, if the idea of a god who regularly rises from the lower world and returns to it seems entirely alien to the idea of Zeus, we do find Zeus in the kingdom of the dead. From Homer to Nonnus we are confronted by the remarkable fact that the lord of the underworld, the consort of Persephone-Kore in Hades, is Zeus—often distinguished by the epithet (κατα)χθόνios, but nevertheless Zeus. He is king of the dead, A. Suppl. 154 ff.:

\[
\begin{align*}
ei & \text{ de } \mu\eta, \ldots \tau\nu \gamma\alpha\iota\omicron

t\nu \sigma\nu \lambda\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu

Z\eta\nu\nu \tau\nu\nu \kappa\kappa\kappa\kappa\kappa\kappa\kappa\kappa

\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron

\mu\nu & \tau\upsilon\chi\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron

\text{O} \text{l} \text{u} \text{m} \text{u} \text{m} \text{i} \text{t} \text{o} \text{u} \text{s},
\end{align*}
\]

and 230 f.:

κακε ί δικαζει ταμπλακήμαθ', ώς λόγος,
Zeus άλλος εν καμούσιν ύστατας δίκας.

Ag. 1386–87 (cj.); Nonn. D. xxvii 77. For Euripides he is not Zeus άλλος, but Zeus, fr. 912:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{soi} & \text{ τω πάντων μεδέοντι χοήν}

\text{πελανών τε φέρω,} \text{ Zeus εί} \text{ 'Αδής}

\text{δνμαζόμενον στέργεις . . .}

\text{σύ γάρ} \text{ εν τε φεος τοις Ουρανίδαις}

\text{σκάπτρον το} \text{ Διός} \text{ μεταχειρίζεις}

\text{χθονίων} \text{ θ} \text{ 'Αδή} \text{ μετέχεις} \text{ όρχης}.
\end{align*}
\]

It is he who greets Oedipus with an omen of thunder when he is about to become a hero. Like Persephone, he is connected with the growth of cereal crops. Hesiod bids the farmer, at the moment when he starts to plough his first furrow of the year, to pray to Zeus

39. Th. 969 ff., etc. The child of the union was Ploutos, cereal wealth. Iasion was a farmer, according to Canter’s certain correction in Nonn. D. xlviii 677. For the type of ritual cf. Frazer, *Golden Bough* (3rd ed.) ii 97–104 and xiii (‘Aftermath’, 1936) 153–6.

40. Verse 57. This sense of πόλεις is normal in Crete.

Chthonios and Demeter that the crop may be abundant. This aspect of his power is more fully expressed in the eighteenth Orphic Hymn, 3–5:

Zeũ xhônie aekpbtoûxe, tâd' ierâ déko proboûmos,
Ploutôon, òs katêchis gaiês klidáas ápápsis,
ploûtoûtôn geneûn brotetûn karpoûs ènántov. 43

But it is not only the fertility of crops that depends on him: he has at least a negative influence over the fertility of men. When Phoenix seduced his father's mistress, his father called upon his erinyes to make Phoenix sterile;

θeoi ð' ètêlei on èparás,
Zeûs te kataxhônos kai èpaimê Perseфонea. 44

This Zeus who is lord of birth and death in both the animal and vegetable kingdoms, this Zeus who himself dwells both above and below the ground, shows affinities with the Cretan Kouros that cannot be fortuitous. If these were original features of the Hellenic Zeus, they would sufficiently account for his identification with the Cretan god. There is perhaps as much to be said for the hypothesis that the identification came first, and was responsible for the development of Zeus' chthonian aspect. Zeus could not be expected to become a dying god, to desert Olympus for half the year in favour of Hades. But some of the functions of a dying god could be fulfilled by an infernal counterpart of Zeus, a Chthonian Zeus who lived permanently in the underworld. 45

While Zeus accepted from the Kouros the condition of death, the Kouros, under the influence of Zeus, renounced the ignominy of dying, and became like Kore an immortal who 'went to earth' and returned each year. It is only in the light of this mutual influence between the two deities that we can approach a genuine understanding of the Dictaean hymn.

M. L. West.

University College, Oxford.

43 Perhaps it was originally this Zeus who was the consort of Demeter and father of Kore.

45 The Cretan year-god might himself have been lord of the dead among his other functions; the case of Osiris shows that the two things may go together. I am indebted to Professor Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Mr John Boardman for comments and corrections to this article.
Orientals in Alexander’s Army

This note is meant to comment on a point arising out of P. A. Brunt’s and G. T. Griffith’s articles on Alexander’s cavalry (JHS lxxiii (1963) 27 ff. (at 42 ff.) and 68 ff.). In the course of their arguments, they examine two passages in which Arrian lists the grievances which, by 324, the Macedonian soldiers felt against Alexander. Brunt examines vii 6.2 f. and comes to the conclusion that the grievances there listed were mainly recent, and that the reorganisation of the cavalry into four (and soon five) hipparchies, as well as the admission of Orientals to them, took place after the Gedrosian disaster. Griffith examines vii 8.2 and concludes from this passage that some Orientals served inside the hipparchies during the Indian campaign. I here wish to point out that the two passages concerned need closer scrutiny.

It is important to notice that they cannot be taken closely together. In 6.2 f. we have (i) the epigonion; (ii) the King’s ‘Medic’ dress; (iii) the Susa marriages; (iv) Peucetes’ Orientalism; (v) the integration of Orientals in the Companions (at length). In 8.2 we have (i) the King’s ‘Persian’ dress; (ii) the epigonion; (iii) the integration of Orientals in the Companions (briefly). Chapter 6 is a leqémon, its scene Susa; chapter 8 is from the main source (probably Ptolemy), its scene Opis. Chapter 8 leads on to the familiar mutiny; chapter 6—obtrusively—fails to lead on to anything: in its place, it is a pointless interruption of the narrative.

Here we must remember that (as is well known) the Opis mutiny and reconciliation are, for us, recorded only by Arrian, apparently from Ptolemy. The other sources mention a mutiny which embodies some elements of Arrian’s Opis mutiny, but which, where they localise it, they appear to place at Susa (Diod. xvii 108.3; 109.2 f.; Just. xii 11 f.; Plut. Al. 71; Curt. x 2 f.—with some of it missing in the gap). It seems to be the easiest supposition that Arrian’s pointless leqémon is in fact taken from one of the sources of the other tradition, where it duly leads up to a mutiny (at Susa?). Finding that Ptolemy, whom he preferred to follow for the factual framework, placed the mutiny a little later, at Opis, and realising that there were not two such mutinies within a short time, Arrian inserted the soldiers’ grievances—in his usual way of adding colour from other sources—in the context in which he found them, omitting to notice that Ptolemy himself gave an abbreviated summary of those same grievances in his description of Opis, before his account of the mutiny. Thus our two passages—the long leqémon leading nowhere, and the short summary from the main source that properly leads up to a mutiny—are doubles, due to Arrian’s unsuccessful use of scissors and paste. No one familiar with Arrian will think him incapable of this. In fact, both his strength and his weakness—his critical, but not sufficiently critical, use of his sources—are here beautifully illustrated.

It follows that the two lists cannot be interpreted precisely as they are by Brunt and Griffith: they must cover the same ground and not refer, in the one case to very recent happenings, in the other to the Indian campaign. What this ground is can be seen with little difficulty. The shorter list mentions three grievances and will show it more clearly: they are the ones that Ptolemy thought most important. They are: the King’s barbarian dress; the epigonion; the integration of Orientals in the cavalry. We must agree with Ptolemy’s selection: these were clearly of more immediate importance to the men than whom some Macedonian nobles had married or how Peucetes behaved in his satrapy. However, these events are not limited to the Indian expedition. The ‘Persian’ dress, as is well known, became a regular habit after Clistus’ death. The epigonion had indeed just appeared at Susa, as all the sources agree. (In fact, Alexander’s public display of, and praise for, their skill cannot but raise the question of whether he was not challenging the men, who had left him in the lurch in India, to a mutiny that he could easily crush.) But the training of these boys had begun some time before the Indian expedition (Curt. viii 5.1; cf. Diod. xvii 108.2; λόγον ἱκανόν by 324; Tarn, Al. i 77). So we can deduce nothing about the integration of Orientals: κατὰ τὴν στρατιάν τῶν πᾶσιν, embracing all these things, refers, not to India (an expedition that had officially been closed with the ‘prize-giving’ and celebrations at Susa), but, as the emphatic πᾶσιν makes clear, to the whole of what we call ‘Alexander’s expedition’. The slight exaggeration need not surprise us in this rather rhetorical context.

Nothing, then, emerges about the integration of Orientals. This is confirmed by close scrutiny of the longer list of grievances. Not only does it contain the same three items (as well as two undoubtedly recent complaints), but this time we have a detailed list of Oriental tribes whose best members were integrated. The list, apart from Drangians, Arians and Parthians, whom Alexander had only recently drafted into service (Brunt, 43—rightly adding that the Evacae probably came even later), includes Bactrians, Sogdians and Arachosians—duly placed at the beginning and confirming that the list is in chronological order. They, however, as we know, served under Alexander before the Indian expedition. So the obvious answer is that integration went on as the army proceeded; that, at least by the time Clistus was dead and freedom had disappeared (Curt. viii 4.30), Bactrians and Sogdians, by then
serving the new King (Arr. iv 17,3), gained entrance to the Companions. Others followed as they came to be drafted into service. Let us remember the Macedonian training of the epigonoi.

Is there anything to disprove this natural interpretation? A few passages in Arrian have been alleged (e.g. Brunt, 44 f.; Griffith, 68 f.). But they are inconclusive. For one thing, accurate reporting of military matters is not one of Arrian’s virtues. The man who—to cite only a few obvious examples—can use the word σουματοφόροικα; in three different senses (iv 3.2 et al.: the foot agema; vi 27.2: a governor’s bodyguard; and the proper technical use for the elite of great nobles, passim); who can contradict himself within a few lines on who led the mounted archers to the junction of Acesines and Hydramotes (vi 5.5; 6.1); and who seriously thought that Alexander meant to defeat Porus’ forces with cavalry and archers (v 14.1 f.—cf. Hamilton, PAGA i (1961) 9)—this man was far from the great military historian of conventional modern encomia. We cannot be sure that Arrian in each case accurately reproduced comprehensive lists of fighting units or of their losses.

Moreover, if Oriental units are mentioned separately from the Companion cavalry, this in no way implies that members of the same tribes could not also serve inside the latter: as Arrian makes clear (cf. the list of the few men who joined the agema and the stress on the strict selection in vii 6.3 f.), there had been no large-scale integration, nor necessarily any major reorganisation, at least until 324. We must imagine the process as no more than the admission of a select few, both for military and for political reasons. We do not hear of any Macedonian cavalry reinforcements between 331 and 324. (Brunt, 37, conjectures some in 328/7—but none are mentioned in the sources, perhaps because Alexander was making satisfactory alternative arrangements.)

It should be emphasised that the result of this scrutiny in no way invalidates the main points of Brunt’s article. In particular, I am convinced that the evidence he advances satisfactorily supports his return to the view that the reorganisation in four (later five) hipparchies followed the Gedrosian disaster, and that it was then that Orientals were first admitted to the agema (and perhaps, I should add, to the fifth hipparchy). Nor is Griffith’s case basically affected, except that I must reject his use of the list of grievances in support of it. I am not sure whether he is not rating Arrian’s accuracy too highly; but I have nothing better to offer on the problem of Alexander’s use of Western Iranian horse—a problem which I suspect we owe largely to Arrian’s limitations.

Appendix: Note on Arrian vii 6.4

Brunt, 43 f., recognises that this passage (often printed without qualms) is corrupt and unintelligible as it stands. However, only a very small change is needed to improve it. (I cannot find out if it has ever been suggested.) Read:

\( (3) \ldots \text{κάι οἱ Ἀκραῖοι \& \ldots} \text{ἐπει \& καταλογοθέτενες ἐς τὴν ἱππον τὴν ἑταρίκην} \ldots \)

\( (4) \ldots \text{καὶ τίμητε ἐπὶ τούτοισι ἐπαρχία προσγενομένη,} \)

\( \text{μόνον} \) \text{oδ βαρβαρικὴ ἡ πάσα (ἀλλ' ἐπαληθεύσας γὰρ τοῦ πεπολεμηθέντος κατελέγοντας ἐς αὐτὸ τῶν βαρβάτων), τῷ τε ἄγνατοι, κτλ.} \)

The omission of μόνον after προσγενομένη would not be surprising. The parenthesis (translate, perhaps: ‘But in fact barbarians had been selectively added to the whole cavalry when it was increased in numbers’) explains, what Arrian has omitted to tell us at the time, how both the few barbarians in the rest of the force and the many in the fifth hipparchy came to be there at all.1

E. Badian

University of Leeds.

1 I should like to thank Mr Brunt and Mr Griffith for discussing the interpretations here advanced with me. The opinions expressed, as well as the remaining faults, are wholly my own.

A stop in the Strassburg papyrus

In JHS lxxxiii (1963) 108 B. D. Meritt and H. T. Wade-Gery write as follows about P. Strassburg 84 verso line 8: ‘In earlier studies of this papyrus (we include our own studies, in ATL i and ii and elsewhere) it has been assumed that these words start a new clause and are preceded by a heavy stop. On this assumption, no credible restoration has yet been found: the difficulties disappear when μετ’ εκεῖνο is taken to qualify the preceding verb [ἀναφέρετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν μετ’ εκεῖνο. This, we believe, restores μετ’ εκεῖνο to a natural place in its own sentence and gets rid of a long-standing obstacle: and if we are right, this ties line 8 firmly to what precedes.’14

Footnote 47 reads thus: ‘We hoped we had made our position clear on this, in Hesp. xxvi (1957) 187, as well as in the translation which we have repeated above. Yet Sealey in his criticism of that article (Hermes lxxxvi (1958) 442) still assumes that we put a stop before μετ’ εκεῖνο and construct that phrase with what follows: ‘Die Worte μετ’ εκεῖνο γνωμόνων τῶν ἔργων sind sehr unklar.’

I did not assume that Professors Meritt and Wade-Gery put a stop before μετ’ εκεῖνο or construct that phrase with what follows. I invite them to read page 445 of my paper in Hermes, where I wrote: ‘Meritt und Wade-Gery behaupten, dass der Kommentator, indem er eine Stelle erklärt, auf seine Erklärung einer anderen Stelle nicht verweist; daraus schliessen sie, dass die Worte μετ’ εκεῖνο nicht den Anfang zur Erklärung einer neuen Stelle darstellen können.’

VOL. LXXXV
In the reconstruction offered by Meritt and Wade-Gery the words με τη χειρι γνωμένον του ἔργου seem to me to be loose in reference, especially in comparison with the precise dating in lines 3–5; therefore I called those words very unclear.

Raphael Sealey.

State University of New York at Buffalo.

The Greek Kitchen: Addenda

(PLATES XXIX–XXX)

Since the publication of 'The Greek Kitchen' in JHS lxxi (1962) 121–137, fresh material for the Appendix (pp. 132–137) has come to light, mainly in the shape of terracottas which were unknown to me at the time, and I take this opportunity of correcting and adding to the original list. A number of pieces listed below were brought to my notice by Dietrich von Bothmer, of the Metropolitan Museum, New York (nos. 14, 15A, 30A, 39A, 33B), with whom I had two valuable discussions; for knowledge of no. 53B, I am indebted to Madeleine V. Verhoogen, of the Musées d'Art et Histoire, Brussels. Others to whom I am indebted for information and help with photographs, are: Madame Lilly Ginouves, of the Louvre; Miss Elaine Loeffer, of the Art Museum, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence; Signorina Paola Pelagatti, of the National Museum, Syracuse; Jean Balty, of the Brussels Museum; Bernard von Bothmer, of the Brooklyn Museum; P. Devambez, of the Louvre; R. Noll, of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna; A. Oliver, of the Metropolitan Museum, New York; N. Raumschüssel, of the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden. Miss Alison Frantz took the photographs of nos. 45 and 74, here Plate XXIX.2, for which many thanks are given. Mrs A. D. Ure was assiduous in lending rare books, and Miss Lucy Talcott made valuable suggestions on the subject of the Vienna lekythos.

Corrections

No. 14 is now New York, Metr. Mus. 51.11.12, Rogers Fund. The Statathou figureine, no. 23, is republished in Amandry and others, Collection Hélène Statathos, ii pl. 17.69, but the other, no. 34, is not catalogued, though it appears in a collective picture of a museum case on p. 11, fig. 4, bottom. No. 48 is published in Die Kasseler Antiken (1948) pl. 13, fig. 12A, no. 143. The item in Dresden, noted in 'Kitchen' p. 137, is listed below as no. 53A and shown on Plate XXX.1. The Rayet figureine, mentioned separately by Chase and Winter (see 'Kitchen', p. 137, appeared in two sale catalogues of the Rayet collection, once in 1879 and again in 1886. The present whereabouts of the figurine are unknown to me, and it does not seem possible, from the two descriptions in the catalogues, that it is to be identified with one of the figurines already listed.

Republication

Some items included in the original list but badly or not previously published are shown here in new photographs. The numbers in the original list are 13A, 45, 74, here Plate XXIX.1, 2.

Additions

Ovens (6–20).

15A. Brooklyn Museum 34.697, bought of Seltman.

I am not sure whether this is genuine. It resembles no. 15 closely but unconvincingly. In the Staatliche Museum, Berlin, there are two photographs (nos. 4035–6) of a woman at an oven, once in the possession of Frau Lucie Mankiewitz, of Berlin. The present whereabouts of the terracotta are unknown.

Grinders (24–30)


The word 'Erythrai' is written in ink under the plinth. The squared basin has a raised platform down the centre. This figurine forms a pair with 33A.

Mortars and Pestsles (31–4)

33A. New York, Metr. Mus. 56.63, gift of Joseph V. Noble: Salt, Galerie Fischer 19 Nov. 1955, no. 44, pl. 2; Plate XXIX.4.

33B. Sofia, National Museum inv. 7268: Fouilles et Recherches ii, Apollonie Pontique (Sofia, 1948), 55, fig. 66, no. 6.

No. 33A forms a pair with no. 30A.

Kneading Tables (35–53)

53A. Dresden, Albertinum inv. ZV 1831: Plate XXX.1.


53C. Providence, Museum of Art, Rhode Island School of Design 58.097, Anonymous gift: Bulletin of the Rhode Island School of Design, Museum Notes, May, 1964, p. 1 Fig.


There is still some difficulty in distinguishing between the actions of grinding and kneading.
of the handle, a youth steps to right, one spit held behind him and one in front (much of this is missing). Just before the fragment breaks off, there can be seen a deep platform which masks the youth's left foot and ankle. All three youths wear loin-cloths. The platform perhaps received the strips of meat which the youth with the spits will spear, as on the Boeotian black-figured lekanis lid in Adolfseeck; alternatively it could be an altar for the roasting of the meat, the youths will then be splanchnoptes. On the inside a bearded man with a loin-cloth round his waist bends to a large deep bowl. The bowl, set on legs, has a horizontal handle which is attached to the bowl by a palmette at either end and has five vertical strokes along its length, hard to explain. There is also a vertical handle at 90 degrees to the horizontal handle, and both are most likely complemented by another lying directly opposite. The bowl and the legs, from their shape and details, are of metal. The man has his right hand at the edge of the bowl, his left holds a pile of what are most likely lengths of dough for bread rolls. They do not resemble the usual rendering of slices of meat (see, e.g., note 4 above). The contrast between representations of bread and of meat is to be seen on cup fragments in the Cabinet des Médailles, Paris, by the Brygos painter, which Beazley has suggested show long strips of meat and small pieces of bread—'rolls or cornets', and our food is nearer to the shapes of the bread. If this identification is correct, we have then a man holding a pile of dough in his left hand, whilst with his right he is taking out or putting in (?) more dough. The action suggests scraping the side of the bowl, and the likeliest explanation is that he has kneaded the dough together in the bowl and is now taking the dough out in the shape of rolls to bake, and indeed the rolls in his left hand have a limp, unbaked look about them. As was noted in the previous article ('Kitchen', 123), meat was not a commonly eaten food, it was the food for an occasion, usually religious. Here doubtless the occasion is religious too, the outside of the cup showing the roasters of the meat, the inside giving pride of place to the baker who provides the necessary edible utensils to accompany the meat when cooked.

The University of Southampton.

B. A. Sparkes.

4 Adolfseeck, Schloss Fasanerie 120: Neugebauer, Antiken in deutschem Privatbesitz (1938) pl. 68, no. 161; Brommer, Antike Kleinkunst in Schloss Fasanerie, Adolphseeck (1953), 6, fig. 10; CVA II (xvi) pl. 63 (752) and pl. 64 (753) 1-2; Zschietzschmann, Hellas and Rome (1959), p. 192, above. Early fifth century.

5 For splanchnoptes, see 'Kitchen', 122, note 7. Especially the Ricci hydria mentioned there.

6 Cab. Méd. L 243, L 46, L 78, 600 and another fr.: ARV² 370, 8; see Studies Robinson ii 77-82 (Beazley).

3 Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. 1921: Mentioned by Beazley in CVA Oxford ii (ix) text to pl. 13 (414) 9.
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Discussion Review


This book has been eagerly awaited, but in no way does it fail to answer expectations; it deserves the careful attention of everyone seriously interested in Greek literature. The ninety pages of the introduction are equally divided between the treatment of the legend, including a careful discussion of the lost plays on the subject, whose fragments and testimonies are given, and the history of the text together with an assessment of the manuscripts. Then comes the text, together with a full apparatus criticus; apart from the four ancient manuscripts (among which the Paris papyrus is dealt with in an addendum on p. 438), the editor uses ten of the sixteen medieval ones that contain this play, all of which he has himself collated either from the originals or from photographs. The commentary, together with two sets of addenda, occupies some 280 pages; there are two brief appendices and three indexes of extreme accuracy and great usefulness. The book is excellently printed and produced; I have detected only three misprints, all insignificant.

It has long been disputed how far we can go in using Seneca’s Phaedra as a guide to the contents of the lost ‘Επιστόλων καλυπτόμενος. In our own time an optimistic view has been taken by W.-H. Friedrich and has been defended in detail in the assiduous dissertation of C. Zintzen (Analytisches Hypomnema zu Senecas Phaedra: Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie, ed. R. Merkelbach, Heft I, Meisenheim/Glan, 1966). Barrett after a scrupulous weighing of the evidence concludes that it is highly dangerous to use Seneca to reconstruct the lost play; his warning on pp. 16–17 must be closely heeded, supported as it is by reasoned argument. Bruno Snell in his Sather Lectures (Scenes from Greek Drama, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964, p. 23 f.) has not convinced me that Barrett is mistaken. It is generally agreed that the scene in which Phaedra expresses the wish to hunt (358–403 of Seneca’s play) is based on the sickbed scene of the extant Hippolytus (170 f.). ‘If a scene taken from a context known to us,’ Snell writes (l.c., p. 23), ‘fits so badly into Seneca’s play, we may assume that the main structure of those parts that are coherent has been taken over from one single Attic tragedy.’ The logic of this argument does not bear close inspection. ‘As we know from other dramas of Seneca,’ Snell continues, ‘he does not aim at a consequence of logical action or at a coherent psychology in his characters.’ That reflection might well warn against readily assuming that a Senecan play must closely follow a particular model, except in cases where this can be fully demonstrated; but Snell goes on to argue that ‘if we can trace back vital scenes to the first Hippolytus, it seems probable that other scenes that fit the same texture go back to the same tragedy’.

Apart from arguments that have been used before and have been dealt with by Barrett, he relies chiefly on fr. 430 Nauck = fr. C. Barrett, which he considers ‘the most important evidence for the Euripidean origin of the plan of Seneca’s Phaedra (p. 26).

ἐξω δὲ τάλμης καὶ θράσους διδασκαλῶν ἐν τοῖς ἀμήχανοις εὑρόπατοι.
"Erato, πάντων δυσμαχωτῶν θεόν."

Snell insists that the words ἐν τοῖς ἀμήχανοις must denote a very special kind of moral helplessness. He finds the expression τὰ ἀμήχανα ‘typical of the early lyric poets’ (p. 33; it occurs at Archilochus fr. 67 A Diehl and Sappho fr. 130 L-P’); ‘helplessness (ἀμήχανος) begins when in the vicissitudes of the emotions one loses contact with other men and stands alone’ (p. 34). The portrayal of that condition ‘links Euripides with the archaic poets’ (p. 39); ‘in this condition’, Snell continues, ‘we find Phaedra at the beginning of Seneca’s play; this condition is new and typical in Euripides’ early tragedies’. I see not the slightest reason for attributing so specialised a sense to ἐν τοῖς ἀμήχανοις in this fragment. Any person who finds it impossible to get what he desires can be said to be ἐν τοῖς ἀμήχανοις, and Phaedra in any version of this story must have been in that position. In this place the line forms part of a characterisation of Eros of a not unfamiliar kind; compare Aeschylus, P.V. 59 (of Prometheus) δενὸς γὰρ εἰρέτων καὶ ἀμήχανος τόνων. Its value as evidence for Phaedra’s moral condition in the first Hippolytus amounts to zero.

It is indeed likely enough that Seneca made considerable use of the lost Hippolytus of Euripides; Barrett’s careful summary of what we know of the plot of that play agrees well enough with Seneca. But there is not enough evidence to prove that this play served Seneca as the basis of his work, and Barrett’s warning that for all we know the Phaedra of Sophocles may have been to some extent made use of must not be disregarded.

Barrett’s sketch of the history of the text in antiquity provides several valuable modifications of the classic treatment of the subject by Wilamowitz in his Einleitung in die Griechische Tragödie of 1889 (never subsequently revised). Barrett warns against over-estimating the importance of the edition of Aristophanes of Byzantium as a landmark in the history of the text; he points out that we cannot safely think of it as ‘published’ in any modern sense, nor can we suppose that no one copied a tragedy from any other text after its appearance. Pre-Alexandrian texts, if they are ‘wild’, are wild not simply because they are pre-Alexandrian (see p. 56 f., and cf. pp. 438–9).
Barrett shows that Wilamowitz was too specific when he traced the choice of the ten non-alphabetical plays to a definite selection made by a particular man during the second century A.D.; he thinks that during the third century the plays that were generally read largely coincided with the ten that ultimately survived. Barrett in this section acknowledges a general debt to Petrali, and with good reason; he shows that there is no reason to suppose that all common errors in the ancient manuscripts of Euripides go back to the same source, and warns that throughout the ancient, as well as the medieval, tradition we must reckon with the fact of extensive contamination. It is doubtless symptomatic of the general state of affairs that the sixth-century Berlin papyrus, which preserves some 150 lines, agrees in error now with one and now with another of the manuscripts of Euripides, but offers no new readings unknown to the medieval tradition.

The presence in the medieval tradition of pairs of variants known to have existed in antiquity makes it certain, in Barrett's view (p. 58), that we must reckon with transcription from more than one uncial manuscript. He considers the possibility that the two medieval classes of the selected plays derive from the independent transcription of different uncial manuscripts; but he prefers to suppose that only one uncial manuscript was transcribed, but that corrections were later imported from another. His stemma of the manuscripts that contain the Hippolytus is printed on p. 62. The class Ω consists of MBOA, the class Λ of HCD; within Λ there is a subordinate division between HCD (Δ) and L. V is a hybrid, like its younger relative, the Haeniensis.

Barrett's careful analysis of the divergences between manuscripts points unmistakably to the presence of considerable contamination, a factor for which Turyn in his book on the manuscript tradition fails to make allowance. Barrett's concise verdict on that work will be found at p. 61, n. 1, his brief demonstration of P's derivation from L on p. 429; both seem to me correct. C and E, not previously collated, are of real value; the antiquity of the tradition represented by the fourteenth-century manuscript CDE is confirmed by the admission of the tenth- or eleventh-century Jerusalem palimpsest.

The apparatus criticus is by far the fullest, and clearly the most accurate, yet offered; and any competent judge will agree that Barrett's text is greatly preferable to any of its predecessors. As any reader of his article on Bacchylides fr. 4 in Hermes lxxxii (1954) 421 f. or of his suggestions on Menander's Dyscolos must know, Barrett is a textual critic of the highest order, possessing learning, ingenuity and judgment, each in high degree. He stands as far from the conservatism of those who cling desperately to the most absurd readings of the manuscripts as from the radicalism of the wild emenders. He is not an emender of the palaeographic school who acts as though all corruption were an affair of juggling with letters. He has no difficulty in making up his mind; indeed, he seems to me sometimes over-confident in advancing a solution to a vexed problem. This is true especially in the matter of diagnosing interpolation, where as the notes below will indicate I believe he often goes too far. No sensible person would deny that the text of Euripides had suffered interpolation. But in the nature of the case it is hard to detect interpolations with certainty; and ancient taste in the matter of moralising reflections was clearly so different from our own that it is desperately difficult to draw the line.

We come now to the commentary. Barrett is intimately acquainted with the surviving texts of Greek poetry; his command of the secondary literature of his subject appears complete; and he has applied to the task of elucidation the entire technical apparatus of modern scholarship. His learning is all the more imposing because he uses it not to swamp the reader with bibliography but to save him from it. Erudite commentaries that abound with references to secondary authorities are of great value to professional scholars, who would be churlish to be ungrateful for help that greatly eases their own labours; but the reduction of such matter makes for greater readability. Barrett seems to me to strike a happy mean in this respect; he cites secondary literature where necessary, but not otherwise. Many commentaries on Greek plays make dull reading; the same old parallels, many already present in the oldest editions, are troted out by editors who lack the discrimination to see what is relevant and what is not. Barrett cites enough evidence to support his argument, and no more; he has the finest and most delicate appreciation of that evidence's value. The minutest points are treated, and yet the reader is never bored, so lively and so lucid is the editor's presentation and so compelling the continuous activity of the keenest and sharpest critical intelligence. Sometimes ruthless logic is pushed too far. Euripides was a poet and not a scholar, and cannot have taken half the trouble to write the play that Barrett has taken to explain it; in some places he is credited with a degree of rationality hardly to be demanded of the most rational of logicians. But the occasional annoyance caused by what some readers may think pedantry or fussiness is a small price to pay for the privilege of contact with a mind of such remarkable acuteness.

One main feature of the commentary is its intelligence; another is its author's extraordinary familiarity with the Greek language. He knows classical Greek poetry by heart; and this knowledge is made more effective by his firm grasp of Greek grammar, both morphology and syntax. As a disciple of Eduard Fraenkel, whose important influence is acknowledged in the preface, Barrett is familiar with the work of Scholze and Wackernagel, the two great scholars who used their mastery of linguistic science to throw light on literary texts. The remarkable use to which Barrett puts this branch of knowledge clearly shows how grievously we are suffering from the lack of adequate liaison between linguists and literary scholars in most universities today. In
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English-speaking countries the grammars used in schools are for the most part the work of writers with an inadequate notion of linguistic science. Of course beginners in Greek should not be plunged into comparative linguistics; but there are many points at which the most elementary grammar is affected by it, and even a beginner will take no harm from being given a general idea of its methods and results.

Barrett often uses the results of comparative linguistics to explain the text; but his commentary is rich in observations on style and usage that spring simply from his own acute perception and painstaking gathering of facts. Often he corrects widely prevalent misconceptions; often he supercedes all previous treatments of a familiar topic; many of his remarks on style and language are wholly new and original. Scholars will find much to write into the margins of their Kühners, their Schwyzers and above all their Liddell and Scotts; and school-teachers, however busy, have a duty to make a special study of a book which can teach us so much Greek.

Interest in language and style, though dominant, is not out of proportion. The treatment of metre is throughout masterly; the handling of the lyrics compares well with that of Wilmowitz, undemonstrable theorising is absent, and the book is rich in the detailed metrical observation that aids textual criticism. Questions of religion and mythology are well handled; so is the topography of Trozen, about which Barrett shows Euripides to have been well informed. Barrett never forgets that the work he is explaining is a play, and dramatic questions are admirably handled; the structure and mechanics of the action could scarcely be more clearly or more cogently explained. But no mortal can have everything; and this commentary will not inspire the reader with delight in the Hippolytus as work of art.

The tendency to split hairs, combined with a habit of referring to dramatic, as well as linguistic matters, in technical or semi-colloquial language (as on p. 399 Artemis is said to have ‘no axe to grind’ for Phaedra) can convey disagreeable reminders of the schoolroom. It is mistaken to complain that in the paradoxes there is no ‘high poetry’, or that the Chorus learned about Phaedra’s state while washing clothes at the spring is ‘trivial’; the paradox is well suited to its function in the play. (Contrast with this the sympathetic treatment of the second stasimon; in the fine passage on pp. 297-8 only the word ‘fairyland’—again on p. 306—jars). More serious is a tendency to water down the tragic dilemma by lecturing Hippolytus for ‘puritanism’, ‘priggishness’, etc., at times almost giving the impression that the whole trouble must have been avoided if Hippolytus had shown more common sense. Barrett truly says (p. 391 f.) that the downfall of Hippolytus springs from a defect that is the reverse side of his very virtue; his cult of purity, for all its beauty and nobility, is bound up with an intolerant rejection of an essential part of human life'. Hippolytus’ utterance at 1364-7 causes the editor to rebuke him for ‘blindness to the defects of his narrow puritanism’; and the farewell of Artemis at 1437-9 prompts him to complain that ‘for all its beauty the love of Hippolytus for Artemis lacks something essential’. That is the attitude of a monotheist.

The ancient Greeks were not Christians, and did not insist on having everything; and they knew there are some good things that one cannot have without sacrificing others. Hippolytus’ view of life is not a comprehensive one; but the poet recognises its splendour and does not reproach him for its limitations. In point of power to communicate a full enjoyment of the beauty of the poetry and the impact of the tragedy, this commentary, like all others known to me, falls short of Dodds’ Bacchae.

Now to points of detail. P. 12, n. 1: Would a marriage between Phaedra and Hippolytus, Theseus being dead, have been thought of as incestuous? Hyllus in the Teuchinae is shocked by his father’s command that he should marry Iole, who is undoubtedly in a sense his father’s widow (1225-6); but he is shocked not because of this but because she has caused the death of both his parents, and in the end he agrees to marry her. P. 34 (cf. p. 315): it is in no way surprising that Theseus should rule in Trozen during the lifetime of the aged Pittheus. In the Acestis the ruler is Admetus, not Pheres; in the Bacchae Pentheus, not Cadmus; in the Andromache Neoptolemus, not Peleus. P. 46: in view of the division of opinion on these matters, it should not be stated dogmatically that the ends of the Seven Against Thebes and the Phoenissae are interrelated and that of the Heraclidae mutilated.

On 1.3: Aeschylus, Sept. 941 seems to me an undoubted instance of ποίησις meaning ‘from the Black Sea’, and Sophocles’ Tr. 100 is another instance of the type of expression dealt with here; see C.Q. n.s. iv (1954) 91 f. 10-11: ‘Euripides obviously cannot make Aphrodite speak of Hippolytus as ἀγάλης when his ἀγάλης consists precisely in the rejection of herself; he contrives nevertheless to imply the ἀγάλης by the otherwise pointless insistence on the ἀγάλης of his foster-father’. This is over-subtle, and the insistence that the standard epithet must have ‘point’ is misplaced. 17: a tasteless comment of Wilamowitz is very properly corrected. 32-3: Barrett demonstrates that Jortin’s correction of ὀργίωνας to ὀργίωνων must be accepted; ‘many of the more deep-seated corruptions in our texts’, he rightly reminds us, ‘are due not to the eye or to the ear, but to the mind’ (p. 161). The doubts cast by Barrett on the alleged use of the imperfect in verbs of name-giving (cf. Fraenkel on Agam. 681) may be thought to be diminished by a forthcoming note of mine on the Tebtunis fragment of Sophocles’ Inachus. 41: a good note on ἣρίη and del. 58-60: B. shows that ἄδορτες should be preferred. 79-81: a notoriously difficult passage is convincingly explained. 91: ‘The old man is like the person we all know who says “Do you know what I did this morning?” and actually waits for us to say “No, what?” before he proceeds.’ This illustration not only lowers the tone; it may prevent the reader from
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seeing that the utterance is one of a conventional type dictated by the nature of one-one stichomythia. 93 f.: the explanation of the way the word σεμώνς is used in this dialogue is masterly, and the defence of the tradition in 99 unanswerable. 115: despite B.'s suggestion (p. 181) that the old man's opening words at 87 furnish an explanation, I find ως πρῶτες δοῦλος ἐλήμαν odd in its application to the prayer he says he will offer to the goddess. The old man is a slave, and must address even a human master in the words proper to a slave; how can he demonstrate his humanity in face of the goddess, or imply that Hippolytus should copy it, by insisting that he will address her in such language? τοὺς νέους γὰρ οὗ μιμητέον can very well stand by itself, and I am attracted by the suggestion of H. Richards, Aristophanes and Others, p. 293, that φρονοοῦσα may be corrupt for φρονοῦσα: cf. Sophocles, Tr. 51-2; and see Barrett on 421-5 and 876. 121-2: to the list of places supposed to be fertilised by rivers flowing underground or under sea and then surfacing elsewhere I would add Paphos, fertilised by the Nile; cf. Bacch. 406, which Jackson, Marginalia Scenaica, p. 117, explained by citing Manilius iv, 635. 148-50: 'the dry land of the open sea' is shown to refer to the sandbar that separates the lagoon north of Trozen from the open sea. 191-7: B. doubts the genuineness of these lines, and they certainly surprise in this context; yet for the Nurse to dilate upon this theme would make abrupt her expression of the wish for death at 250-1. 219: a good note on πρὸς θείον. 221: it may be correct to write ἔγον- at the end of one line and —α- at the beginning of the next, but the effect is ugly and the exactitude attained not worth the effort. 246: Wilamowitz quoted Homer, Il. 13, 279. 261-3: after B.'s excellent remarks, let us hope no one will ever again echo Wilamowitz' disastrous assumption that the Nurse knows all through this scene that Phaedra is in love. More than any of his other writings, Wilamowitz' commentary on this play is bedevilled by his insistence, so strong in the first half of his career, on seeing Euripides in the light of Ibsen; many of Gilbert Murray's anachronistic misconceptions derive from Wilamowitz.

271: B. puts a crux against the words οἷς οἶδ' ἐλήμαν· "The answer to 'we should like you to tell us ἶτες ἐστίν ἢ νῦσσος," he writes, 'is not 'I don't know how to find out,' but simply 'I don't know'." In strict logic this is true; but in almost any conversation no one would complain if this answer were given to this question, especially if the giver happened to be the person most likely to be in the know. Nor is the ellipse in 272 which we must assume if we accept the tradition as awkward as B. contends. 277: B. accepts Wilamowitz' suggestion that θανεῖν has displaced οἶδ'· Now since Phaedra is obviously not out of her mind, as ἐν' ἅρμας would imply, the Nurse might conceivably assume that she meant to fast to death; and the fact that it makes the two parts of l.277 tautological does not strengthen the case against the traditional reading, tautology being not uncommon in this author. Still, the emendation certainly gives a more satisfying sense. 287: in the note on p. 213 δεσπότας is a misprint for διεσπότας. 290: the excellent note on the 'coincident' use of the aorist participle corrects a widespread misconception. 298-9: cf. Horace, ep. 1, 6, 66-7 and Isocrates, ad Nicolaem 39: was it a locus communis as early as Euripides? 307: the Nurse's hideously vulgar parody of an oath by a divinity is both linguistically abnormal and highly typical of her ethos. 328: οἷς ἦν τρίγυρον is convincingly explained by means of the parallel at Aeschylus, Suppl. 161. 352: cf. Christ's reply to Pilate (Matt. 27, 11; Mark 15, 2; Luke 23, 3; cf. John 18, 37). Was this a common formula for evading responsibility for a statement by another without denying its truth? 362-72: the one real parallel for the separation of this strophe from its antistrophe (669-79) is Sophocles, Phil. 391 f.~507 f., which is not cited.

381-5: B. rejects the view of Wilamowitz, Dodds and Snell that Phaedra is here made the mouthpiece of a polemic against the Socratic paradox that ὑθεῖς ἕκυτον ἀδικεῖ. 'It is not Euripides who is polemising', he writes (p. 226), 'but Phaedra, and she is polemising not against the Socratic explaining away of moral weakness in terms of ignorance but against the much simpler view that all wrongdoing is ordinarily due to natural vice.' Snell in the Sather Lectures already quoted (p. 30 f.) justly retorts that what B. calls 'the much simpler view' is not Greek at all, but Christian. Snell insists that Phaedra means that men do wrong not out of ignorance or stupidity, but out of a failure to control their passions; γνώμης φύσιν at 377 and ἐν φρονείν at 378 should probably, as he argues on p. 58, be given a more intellectual sense than B. (p. 228) will allow. Yet B. is surely right in denying that we can be sure that in this place Euripides had Socrates in mind. In the passage of Plato's Protagoras (352) which Snell thinks contains Plato's reply to Euripides, the view expressed by Phaedra is cited as the ordinary man's opinion; and as B. says there is no reason why Plato should be taken to have one particular holder of it in mind. Snell tries to diminish the force of this objection by pointing out (p. 61) that according to Plato the holders of this opinion justify it by speaking of inner conflicts (men act ἔδοξαν ἤττωμένον, etc.), and so does Phaedra. But this coincidence proves nothing; how else would Snell expect anyone who held this view to justify it?

386-7: an excellent note on καιμός. 407-9: the statement that this is 'the first surviving instance of a τότος which continues through Greek into Roman literature' is not true; see Sophocles, Ajax 1192 f. 428-30: a mirror, says B., can be either self-revealing or other-revealing; Time's mirror is of course other-revealing, yet here Euripides elaborates the metaphor as though the mirror were self-revealing; and he finds the result 'an odd confusion'. But Time's mirror is very often self-revealing, and Euripides clearly meant it to be so in this place.

P. 238: in the last line on this page, the apostrophe
of τοῦτο has been omitted. P. 239: four lines from the end of the note on 437–8, ἀπέλευσεν is a mistake for Ἀπέλευσεν. 451–2: is it really so strange that the Nurse should speak of legends of the gods as having been written in books? There is no point in saying that no old paintings could have been found in houses of Euripides' day (p. 242); even if this were certain (as it is not), Euripides might well have imagined them in ancient palaces. 459–61: 'τι δεσπότας ἄλλος θείον is rendered by 'to have other gods as masters, to be subject to other gods'. That would translate ἐπὶ τῶν ἐξίσους ἄλλος θείον ὡς δεσπότας: what is in the text should mean 'beneath the sway of other gods' (see LSJ s.v. ἐπί B.I. 1 g, p. 622). 468–9: the famous crux is brilliantly and, to my mind, convincingly solved. 478–81: cf. Med. 407–9. 484–5: for the corruption of φύγης to λόγος, cf. Aeschylus, Suppl. 170, and for the reverse corruption cf. id., Eum. 985; though B. rightly rejects the idea that it has happened here. 496: Scaliger's προφητός is rightly put in the text. 503–4: B. is surely right to read αἱ μὴ σε. 507–8: B.'s interpretation, made clear by his punctuation, is convincing.

530–1: B. renders, 'For the shafts neither of fire nor of the stars surpass that of Aphrodite launched from the hands of Eros, the son of Zeus'. ὅσον he thinks 'is treated as though preceded not by ἐπέρησεν but by τοιοῦτον, a not unnatural irregularity'. To me the irregularity seems highly unnatural, and I know no parallel; nor do I easily understand why the shafts of love should be compared simply with shafts of light, which are like them in travelling fast and far, but not in their destructive power, which one would expect to find stressed here. Suppose that by a common type of corruption ἐπέρησεν has ousted ἐπέρησες. In that case the shafts of love will have been compared to, first, 'the shaft of fire on high', i.e. the sun, which is not only bright and swift, but scorching, and, secondly, 'the shaft on high of the stars', i.e. the lightning. ἄστραπτη (ἀστράπτη) derives from ἄστρωτον (see Frisk, Euphemologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache, p. 170); and ἄστρωτον βέλος at Aeschylus, Agam. 365 could well mean 'lightning', as Gilbert Murray suggested in his edition of 1936. Other explanations of the passage require us to suppose that Zeus in Olympus, aiming at Paris in Troy, were to overshoot the mark his bolt would travel 'beyond the stars', which seems an unlikely direction for it to take; if ἄστρωτον βέλος means 'lightning' we can write ἄστραπτη paroxytone and supply an object from καυμάω.

542–4: B. argues that in all other cases of διὰ with a genitive used with ἔναυ and an indirect object in the dative, the genitive denotes an activity of the subject and the dative the person to whom that activity is directed; he, therefore follows Nauck in adopting Dobree's conjecture θανατος... ἔναυ. This may well be right, but the conclusion is put a little too forcibly; the existence of the phrase δι᾽ ἄγγελον εἴρηται τινι, together with the not uncommon tragic use of ἔναυ to mean 'to come on' someone, often to his hurt (see Jebb on Sophocles, Antigone 234), should deter us, as T. C. W. Stinton warns me, from putting Dobree's reading in the text. 552: B.'s conjecture φανιωμεν γεφυριος heals sense and metre, postulates a very likely corruption, and may well be right. 577: B.'s explanation of τοι μελεταν φιλης δομοτος is to be preferred.

584–8: B. accepts Murray's γεγονεῖ δ' and renders, 'I hear a voice, but I have nothing sure; but it carries clear where the cry has come to you through the doors'. The sense would be more satisfactorily if one read γεγονεὶ δ' and translated, 'but tell us how the cry came to you', i.e. 'tell us what was its content'. 585: B. adopts Weil's ιωρ, now confirmed by P. Oxy. 2224. At Sophocles, O.T. 1219, modifying the conjecture of Burgess cited in Pearson's apparatus, I propose ὅσι θεόμαι | περιαλλ' ιωρ γεων... 594: B. makes a good case for Barthold's ηκτέρησεν.

621: B. A read ἓ καλκὸν ἢ αἰθήρον ἢ χρυσὸν βάρος, ΩΥ have ἓ χρυσὸν at the beginning of the line and καλκὸς at the end. B. insists that the former must be right, because gold is much heavier than bronze; but are the weights of the metals relevant at all? This manner of expression is simply a device to secure three cola of which the last is longer than the first two (cf. Homer, II. 6, 48, cited by B. ad loc.); to refer to the metal X by the expression 'the weight of X' need not imply that X is specially heavy. 622–3: B. inquires whether τῆς αἰθήρας depends on τοῦ τιμίματος or the other way round; if the former, the sense will be 'the sum at which its value is assessed', if the latter, it will be 'the amount appropriate to his estate'. Both are somewhat complicated, and the second alternative, which B. prefers, involves supposing a surprisingly prosaic sense of τίμημα. I am attracted by Stinton's suggestion that we read τοι indefinite and render 'buy children for a given price, each for what it is worth'. 625–6 are expelled by B. with some confidence; attempts at emendation', he says, 'have in any case failed'. But with Pierson's ἐκτίμωμεν the lines give a wholly intelligible reference to the custom of the wedding feast; the intolerable ἐκτίμωμεν and the incompatibility with 628–9 vanish; and κατὰ in 627 takes up κακῶν in 625. The placing of 625–6 between the protest against women's existence in 616–24 and the proof of their badness of 627 f. does not seriously 'disrupt' the argument; and the μὲν πρῶτον of 625 would not be alone in having no answering ἔπεσα δὲ or the like (see Denniston, The Greek Particles, p. 389 (iv)). Here as in other cases B. may well be right, and the doubt about the lines is certainly worth mentioning; but is it safe to pronounce that they must be corrupt? 634–7 are deleted with more reason. The speech is certainly more effective if Hippolytus says nothing about one's wife's relations and does not concede the possibility of χρηστά λέκτρα, though even here I do not feel entirely sure that late actors, and not the poet, were responsible. 649: Wecklein's tentative conjecture ἐνυπαθῶν is worth a mention; cf. Plato, Laws 798 B. 659: D's reading ἐκδημητήριον, which Hermann had conjectured, is rightly put in the text. 663 is objectionable; it gives an anticlimax and
the sense is poor. Herwerden was the first to cut it out; B.'s suggestion that it was a substitute for 661 is most attractive. 670-1: B.'s solution of the problem is highly probable, and he is right in saying that the repetition (λόγος...λόγον) 'is not only blameless, but deliberate and effective'. 686: B.'s interpretation of κακόνομα as meaning 'I feel disgraced or degraded' is surely right, whatever may be said by people who will never believe anything without a parallel.

691 is cut out: 'as if,' writes B., 'at a moment like this she will turn her mind to her husband's maternal grandfather in his dotage'. B.'s contempt for Pittheus is unjustified. It is clear from more than one passage that he was important to the poet and his audience, as he might well be considering his connexions; he had brought up his grandson Hippolytus (11) and in view of his known άνευι might have been expected to be specially shocked. In such a context συμφοράς is a natural way for Pheadra to refer to a situation which from her point of view may well be so described. The case against this line is feeble. 715-6: B.'s conjecture is seductive; only in the phrase εύθυμη...τύχα συμφοράς, 'something for this trouble of mine', as he renders it, the genitive is appreciably harder than in expressions like τόρος κακών or προδρόμα τῶν, which B. suggests are parallel, and the possibility of a solution along the lines indicated by Wilamowitz (ad loc.) cannot be ruled out.

734: B.'s reading, with Maas's transposition in the antistrope, seems the most acceptable solution. 739-49: Barthold's deletion of παρτήρ in the strophe and ημιθρόμ in the antistrope is a bold measure; but as B. observes it heals sense and metre in both places, and it is an odd coincidence if it is wrong. 742-51: the myth is admirably handled. 765: the masterly note on what is misleadingly called the 'accusative in apposition to the sentence' must be carefully studied. 758-63: B. attacks the crux along the lines laid down by Weil, supposing that ἀπ' ἀμφοτερῶν, looks forward to a double apposition, and that the sense is 'Pheadra's journey was illomened both when she left Crete and when she landed at Munich'. In 757 he thinks ἐτρημίας has replaced something like Μύκοιδος τ', and in 760 he follows Weil in changing δ' to τ'. Κρητισας, as B. admits, is not normal glossographer's Greek; but as he says (p. 434) it may have come in from 752. Once it is acknowledged that τόσον must be predicative and strongly emphatic, and that its force must extend over the whole sentence down to ἄρον, it becomes hard to doubt B.'s localisation of the corruption, and his conjecture may well be correct. 760: the list of tragic lengthenings before mute and liquid is most valuable. Aeschylus, P.V. 582 πορ ελέγχος is usually emended, but Stinton compares the epic name Πορφυρέγεθον and quotes Bacch. 1019, where as Dodds observes the tradition is metrically defensible; what of Aeschylus, Sept. 898?

808-10: a good note on the use of the word κλίθαμα. 811: the sensible remarks on the ἐκκλήσια deserve everyone's attention. 816: I would take ἀμαρτοι κοίον to mean 'consigns your life to darkness': see the note on a problem in Sophocles' Inachus mentioned under 32. 826-7: B. well shows how the text as it stands must be interpreted, but voices a suspicion that it may be corrupt. Prima facie, as he says, one would expect the two nouns each of which is accompanied by τίνα to be parallel, and Theseus can hardly enquire what τίνη of his wife is in question; both difficulties would be removed if instead of the second τίνα we read τίκεifie. 840-1: B. marks τίνος κλίθω with a crux, while making the necessary change of κοίον to κόπαοι. 850: B. rightly adopts Kirchhoff's φηρός τ'άλλ'οιο. 863: B. says that σαίνευ 'is used of a person or a thing which attempts to rouse, or which in fact rouses, a person's favourable emotion'. At Aeschylus, P.V. 835 and Euripides, Rhes. 55, for instance, favourite emotion is not in question; the verb means rather 'to claim someone's recognition', 'to impinge on the consciousness so that one recognises it' (thus Stinton), as Jebb on Sophocles, Ant. 1234 clearly saw. 867: B. prints ἐπισκεφταί from an unpublished note of J. U. Powell, which neatly explains the variants; accepting Maas's suggestion that μέν...βίον came in from 821, he puts a crux against ἐμοί...τεροί. If Maas is right, as he very probably is, there is little hope of restoring the right text. 871-3 B., after Nauck, deletes: certainly one is glad to have ancient authority for their removal. 875 was cut out by Wilamowitz on the ground that after Theseus has described the κακών as ὧν ἄθλησαν ὄλλην λέκτην, the Coryphaeus cannot at once ask him to describe it with the word λέγων. To modern taste, this is certainly anomalous; but to ancient? Expressions like ἄροτος, ἄροτος, ὧν λέξαε, are not descriptive but emotive; and it is not safe to assume that after someone has called something 'unmentionable' or 'indescribable', it is not possible for another person to say, 'Tell me what it is'. At 602 the fact that the Nurse's speech has been ἄροτος has not prevented Hippolytus from hearing it; cf. Ion 782 ἄροτον ἄροτον ἀνάφαδον λόγον ἐμοὶ προφείταν. 903: B.'s conjecture στήνασας εξέσει may well be right. 908: Leh's χρόνος παλαιός is rightly adopted. 912-3 are deleted; this time B. has had no predecessor in diagnosing interpolation. He complains (i) that Hippolytus cannot, at a time like this, advance his own ubiquitous curiosity as a reason for admission into his father's confidence, (ii) that λέγων and ἀλοκέτατο show that this curiosity is described in terms of disapproval, (iii) that the lines destroy the pattern of short appeals and pauses, (iv) that they are inconsistent with 611, and so cannot be joined to it by γάρ. But (i) the curiosity that makes one want to know all, in times of dire affliction, that affects one's family is a natural curiosity, (ii) 'is convicted of greed' is a pejorative expression, but it may be used here metaphorically to express the strength of the desire and not its reprehensibility, (iii) the 'pattern' might or might not be punctuated by a gnomic parenthesis of this sort; if it were, this would not be the only such
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Case in Euripides, (iv) the run of the sense is, ‘One (i.e., the afflicted) should not be silent in time of trouble; for the human heart (i.e., that of their friends) stands convicted of avidity even in such times.’ 911, B. says, appeals for speech for the speaker’s sake, 912–3 for the hearer’s; but neither line specifies for whose sake speech is desired, and the speaker might reasonably be taken to mean that it is desirable for the sake of both. 924: the manuscripts vary between present and aorist and between subjunctive and optative in all other combinations, but B. rightly restores ἐπερβάλλει, which happens not to be in any of them; cf. Alc. 1077. 945: B. rightly follows Wilamowitz in adopting Musgrave’s ἐλπίδα. 952–5 are well explained, and the nonsense about Hippolytus being an Orphic is well exploded. The nature of fifth-century Orphism is not necessarily relevant to this passage; the play is located in the heroic age, and the poet may have had in mind no more than may have been attributed to Orpheus, say, by Aeschylus. 983: B. adopts Herwerden’s ζύντας for ζύντασις. At Thucydides 7, 71, often adduced in defence of the manuscript reading, B. rightly takes ζύντας γνῶμης not of an inner conflict in the minds of the combatants, but of their mental participation in the fighting. But if that is right, the word here might mean that the φρένος of Theseus συνίσταται τῶν ἐποίησε (see LSJ s.v. συνίστημι, B 11 2). This reflection would restrain me from putting ζύντας in the text: but it certainly gives an easier sense, and by a slight change. 986–7: does the poet mean Hippolytus to seem ‘priggish’ here? That is certainly the impression his words make on modern taste; but when one remembers the similar language of the virtuous Creon at Sophocles, O.T. 583 f., one wonders whether the effect can be intentional.

1007: Murray’s ἐτοι is adopted; certainly Aeschylus, Cho. 565 f. does not protect the tradition, as Wilamowitz supposed. 1014–15: B. puts a crux against τοῦ μύη. If the lines are genuine, he would incline to read ἔκτις, ἐκινησαί (rejecting Wieseler’s ἐκινηδού), which is nearer to the ductus litterarum; but he thinks there is ‘a strong but not absolutely conclusive case’ for cutting out the whole of 1012–15. If that were done we should be rid not only of what B. calls ‘the nonsense of 1014–15’, but of certain difficulties in 1012–13. Hippolytus, B. says (p. 352), ‘treats the folly as self-evident, yet it is oddly uncertain where it is meant to lie’. Yet since in the first place Phaedra’s husband is alive and well, and in the second the kingdom is not hers to give, the uncertainty is not really very perplexing. The first person singular ἠρώτα is indeed rare in Euripides, but as B. on 700 shows, it cannot safely be altogether eliminated, and the shift in meaning between τὸ σώμα in 1007 and τοῖς σώματοι in 1013 hardly amounts to a strong reason for excision. There is a case for cutting out the passage, but I should hesitate to call it ‘strong’. 1029 is also deleted by B.; Valckenaer was the first to cut it out. B. argues that there is no point in adding an imprecation of exile to one that already implies utter destruction, and in strict logic this is true. Still, it would be possible to say, ‘May I perish without name or reputation, wandering in exile over the earth;’ ἀλλάζω δὲν does not always connote actual death, and to call the line ‘a manifest interpolation’ is to go too far. 1032: Nauck’s τῷ for τῶ is rightly adopted. 1042: B.’s tentative suggestion that μὴν has ousted μοι seems very plausible. 1044: B. rightly prefers ἔκτις: it looks as if ἔκτις in the next line ironically picks up this word. 1045–9 are left untouched, but following Nauck B. cuts out 1050. It is good that there is external evidence against it, and B. rightly calls it ‘too similar to 1047 for comfort’; but was Euripides incapable of writing it?

1070: B. must be right in deleting τὴς. The ellipse of the verb in the first part of this line is most unusual; was αἰεῖ really extra metrum, and has, say, τοιοῦτος been omitted after it? 1082–3: B. thinks this speech is intended ‘to throw subtle light on Hippolytus’s psychology for its own sake, to suggest that this feeling of inferiority, of otherness, is what lies behind his urge to establish himself as a paragon of virtues that the common man cannot share’. No Greek hero needed a feeling of inferiority in order to practise virtues that lay beyond the reach of the common man, and Hippolytus was the son of Theseus and an Amazon. Hippolytus’ point here is a rhetorical one; he finds his father’s treatment of him so unaccountable that he affects to take refuge in the supposition, obviously not to be seriously entertained, that it is due to prejudice on account of his birth. Neither this line nor 1455 gives the slightest support to a modernising psychological interpretation which we must utterly reject.

1102–50: even B. is perplexed by the baffling problem of the two, perhaps three, masculine and two feminine participles used to refer to themselves by the singers of this ode. If male singers sing all or part of it, who might they be? B. rules out the idea that they might be the companions of Hippolytus addressed at 1097 f. on the ground that these leave at 1098; but it would not be impossible for them to wait and sing the ode before they go. True, it is not announced that they will do so; but neither is it announced that the handmaids will sing their part in the exodos of Aeschylus’ Supplices, a fact indicated by the deliberate mention of them at 975 f., some sixty lines before. (B. surprisingly asserts that the presence of a chorus of Egyptians is ‘announced’ at Suppl. 825 f. There is nothing in the text about these people; see L’Antiquité Classique xxxiii [1964] 366 ff.). B. tentatively suggests that at 1105–6 the poet may have written ζένων δὲ τις ἐπιλέικυν ἔκτις κτέλται κτέλται κτέλται. This is a most ingenious conjecture, and together with Musgrave’s emendation of 1020, put in the text by B., it would enable us to assign the ode to the regular chorus. But in view of the possibility that the companions of Hippolytus might be the singers, it is worth observing that one could emend away the two feminines. Alternation, as B. argues, is most unlikely; and on the balance I incline to agree.
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with him that it is desirable to have the ode sung by the women.

1122: 'Ελλάνας ... 'Αθάνας is puzzling. Aristotle, de mirabr. auscult. 840a mentions an 'Αθ. 'Ελλανα near Metapontum; and in the Spartan rhetra at Plutarch, vii. Lycurg. 6, 2 Bryan's suggestion that the mysterious Ζωή Σωλίδινος and 'Αθάνα Σωλίδινα are really 'Ελλάνας and 'Ελλανα might easily be right. I therefore suspect that 'Ελλανα is a cult-title of Athena at Trozen, otherwise unrecorded; but I cannot prove the truth of my surmise. 1146: it ought to be remarked that for a tragic chorus to say 'I am angry with the gods' is without parallel.

1183: only two horses can be harnessed to the yoke of a chariot, so that in a team of four, two must be trace-horses. Hippolytus was driving a team of four (1212, 1229); but I do not find that the horses being called ἄριστοι ἀγῶνες in this place involves an imprecision that is specially 'odd', but rather one of a kind with which poetry abounds. 1189 is rightly taken to mean 'fitting his feet right into the footstalls'. 1204: B. justly remarks that πονοκτοίς in the sense of 'lively' or 'violent' seems oddly undignified here; and rather than suppose with Björck that it is meant to characterise 'honest homeliness', I had rather suppose that the words meant 'we were alarmed, as was natural in young men'. Young men are not, of course, cowardly, only they are excitable, and might easily be startled by the uncanny sound. 1234: a good note on the use of ἔναμης as nomen actionis, 'oddly ignored by LSJ'.

129 2: B. puts a crux at the end of this line; but may not be an instance of the plain accusative of respect? 1316: I take παρελέξεις, like παρέλευρος, at Aeschylus, P.V. 1065, to be a metaphor from taking an arrow from its quiver; cf. the shooting metaphor in ἄρχης, which B. rightly prefers at 1324. 1338–41: cf. Sophocles, Ajax 131–3. 1364–7: an excellent note on the avoidance of ὄν ὄν ὄν in anapaests. 1375: B. rightly considers the metrical difficulty as warranting a crux. 1379: B. rightly adopts Weil's τι. 1385–6: B. follows Weil in changing ἀνάληγτον to ἀναλήγητον on the ground that 'the notion that the suffering itself feels no pain at the suffering is absurd'. But in Greek words like νόσος, κακόν, πάθος were easily personified, and a word that had come to mean 'ruthless, unpitying' might in poetry easily come to be applied to one of them. 1416–22, a difficult passage, is convincingly explained. 1436: B.'s interpretation is surely right: cf. Homer, Il. 20, 127 f.; 24, 209 f., etc. 1431: B. thinks 'son of ancient Aegeus' is unexpected when Aegeus is long dead, and thinks the expression is used because Aegeus was already old when it became known that he was Theseus' father. This seems to me misplaced subtlety. 1462–6: B. is reluctant to believe that Euripides himself can have placed at the end of his plays the morbidising tail-pieces which in the manuscripts conclude so many of them. He argues that 'in four plays at least the lines were added later to cater for a public addicted to sententious commonplace'. Can he so confidently acquit the fifth-century public of such a taste? The tail-pieces may be later additions, but the fact would not be easy to demonstrate. B. exaggerates the obscurity of the tail-piece of the Hippolytus itself. μάλλον if taken as B. shows it must be with ἀδυσερεθεῖς is easily intelligible; nor do I see any reason to doubt that Euripides could have used τῶν μεγάλων with reference to Hippolytus. Hippolytus was a son of Theseus and a hero (cf. Hippolytus 1 fr. 446 Nauck² = fr. U. Barrett), and that is enough to warrant such an appellation.

The above remarks fall very far short of an adequate description of the richness of this profoundly learned and supremely intelligent book. If some of them indicate disagreement, that should not obscure the reviewer's admiration of what seems to him a truly great achievement.

Christ Church, Oxford.

HUGH LLOYD-JONES.


Ulysses Found is a lively popular account of Ulysses and his wanderings. The author has drawn on his considerable experience of sailing in the Mediterranean to add local colour to the epic narrative, and another page to the long saga of Homeric geography. Mr Bradford's general thesis is that the course of Ulysses' voyage can be plausibly plotted on map and chart if one follows, and suitably interprets, such information as Homer gives about sailing times, wind and weather conditions, points of the compass, and descriptions of landfalls. He hopes by this method 'to discover the traditional sources of Ulysses' voyage, and the underlying truth beneath so much of the later myth-enshrouded story' (p. 44). At times he comes near to foudering in the Charybdis of Gravesian mythology, but his normal course is never far from the Scylla of Periplovs and Pilot.

He finds the basic datum for his course-ploting in the 'five days' that Ulysses gives for his alleged voyage from Crete to Egypt (Od. 14, 257). From the known distance of about 900 miles an average speed of roughly three knots may be calculated. So, when Ulysses' squadron was blown westward by the gale from Cape Malea for 'nine days', he reckons that they travelled at the same average speed, and covered 648 miles to Lotus-land. Now 'the island of Jerba lies approximately 650 miles from ... Cape Malea' (p. 39), so Jerba = Lotus-land, Q.E.D. He is not troubled by the possibility, indeed probability, that εὐνήματος is a vague and conventional period of time. When Ulysses drifts on his raft for 'seventeen days' from Oggyia to Scheria, he is, according to Mr Bradford, covering the 330 miles from Malta to Corfu at an average speed of three-quarters of a knot. It would be nice to believe that it all really happened, but Mr Bradford will hardly convince where Hennig and Bérard have won little support, and his arguments will make little impression on those who are averse to locating fairyland on the map.
Mr Bradford’s use of circumstantial evidence seems as open to criticism as his literalism. Ulysses lands on ‘goat island’ off the land of the Cyclopes in thick fog (Od. 9, 144). Bradford identifies this island with Favignana (in classical times Aegusa) five miles off the coast from Trapani in W. Sicily, and claims that sea-fogs, which are quite rare in the central Mediterranean, are not uncommon in this area. But sometimes significant details are either omitted (e.g. that the land of the Cicimrians is one day’s sail from Acaea, which is itself far to the east: Od. 11, 11 and 12, 3–4) or minimised (e.g. the short nights in the land of the Laestrygonians; Od. 10, 86). He points out that the last war showed that shipwrecked sailors could endure extreme exposure for periods as long as Ulysses is said to have done, but does not venture any corroboration of his hero’s feat in hanging by his hands from the fig-tree over Charybdis from sunrise to late afternoon.

The book’s claim to the attention of classical scholars must rest on other grounds. The author has spent nearly ten years sailing the Mediterranean in all weather and in a variety of small boats. His sea-level view of the Odyssey at least confirms that Homer was well acquainted with the ways of these waters. He has seen fishing and trading boats with masts and rigging very similar to those used in Homeric ships, and has found them quite efficient with the wind coming from anywhere abaft the beam. ‘I have travelled’, he writes, ‘in the Aegean... in caiques no more than 40 feet long, carrying mules, goats, sheep... ‘ So much for Dörpfeld’s argument that horses could not have been brought from Thraki to the mainland (pp. 106–7). There is a ‘marked tidal action’ in the Messina strait, and the Admiralty Pilot gives information about whirlpools (p. 144 and pp. 149–50). So much for Rose’s statement (O.C.D. s.v. Charybdis) that there is nothing of the kind there. British sailors describe rugged coasts as ‘iron-bound’. Did the τέλος χάλκων ἄρρητων of Aeolus’ island (Od. 10, 3–4) arise from some such expression (p. 69)?

These, and many similar details, can help the Homerist to ‘know the brine salt on his lips, and the large air again’. But all too often the work wavers disconcertingly between scepticism and credulity. ‘To confuse fact with fiction in the Odyssey is to make a grave mistake (p. 174)’. But soon (p. 176) he is recounting ‘exactly what happened’ at the shipwreck off Thrakinia, and he has no compunction about mating Ulysses on Malta as ‘Sacred King’ with the ‘Priest-Goddess Calypso’, and explaining his subsequent home-sickness as due to her having ‘lost her attraction after child-bearing’ (p. 192 and p. 190).

What has Mr Bradford found? He has found that in some respects life along the Mediterranean seaboard has altered very little in 3,000 years. He has also found that to dwell lovingly on the past in imagination helps a man to see the present with heightened sensitivity. One may doubt whether he has found Homer’s Ulysses or his ports of call, but it is not unrewarding to follow the author on his engagingly personal Odyssey.

J. V. Luce.

Trinity College, Dublin.


The question of most significance to our understanding of the Homeric poems, after the great light shed on them by the work of Milman Parry and Lord, is that of their position in the long tradition of Greek heroic poetry. We have little evidence outside the poems themselves; but we know that for scholars of the ancient world there still existed external evidence which could be used for comparative purposes, namely the so-called Epic Cycle. All poems of the Cycle are lost, and the fragments are exiguous; but a summary of the contents of the Cypris, the most important of the Trojan War cyclic epics, is found (together with a life of Homer) at the front of a number of Homer manuscripts; and at the front of Venetus A alone are found similar summaries of the other Trojan War epics: the Aethiopis, the Little Iliad, the Ilisperis, the Nostis, and the Telegony. These summaries are quoted as coming from the Chrestomathy of Proclus.

Proclus is thought, both by others and by Severys, to have been a grammarian of the second century A.D., not the neoplatonist philosopher of the fifth; his Chrestomathy was an abridged manual of literature, containing in four books a great deal of potted information about the poetry of Classical Greece. Although it is lost, we possess a very abbreviated record of the contents of the first two books in the Bibliotheca of Photius, the Byzantine scholar; and we have the Life of Homer and summaries of the Trojan War epics mentioned above.

Professor Severys began forty years ago to work on the Chrestomathy of Proclus with a view to producing an accurate edition of these two sources—the contents of the first two books in chapter 239 of the Bibliotheca of Photius, and the Life and summaries found in the Homer manuscripts. In 1938 he published two large volumes, containing a critical study of the manuscript tradition of Photius, and a survey of modern editions of chapter 239, followed by the text itself and full commentary. For twenty-nine pages of text (including apparatus criticus and translation) there are over 400 pages of prolegomena and 200 pages of commentary. The work had been done with tremendous care; Severys had gone into the minutest detail in his discussion of the readings of the manuscripts, was himself accurate and severe, while embodying his findings in an easy and even humorous style which was a pleasure to read. Scholars had good reason to look forward to the completion of the work by two
similar volumes on the Life and the summaries of the Cycle.

The work is not yet complete, although three more volumes have appeared. The war, of course, interfered. Then in 1953 came Tome III, the critical study of the manuscripts containing the Life and the summaries. Severyns had hoped to produce the text and commentary at the same time, but found (as Livy had before him) that the further he got in the deeper it became. To help the reader, however, he enclosed in a pocket at the back of that book an advance copy of the text as it would eventually appear. At that time he still expected to finish his work in one further volume. In working on the last part, however, he found that the detailed survey of previous printed editions provided enough material for a book of its own; this was published in 1962, under the title, Texte et apparat. Here again he included a booklet giving his own text.

Now Tome IV of the major work has appeared, containing a briefer survey of the printed editions, followed by the text with full apparatus of the Life and summaries of the Cycle, and a translation, but still no commentary. It is beautifully produced, like its predecessors; but the list of printed editions does little more than summarise the information in Texte et apparat; and the actual text has already been published twice, attached to the previous volumes. Admittedly, here we have testimonia, tituli, marginalia, corrections in the manuscripts, as well as the apparatus criticus; but even for the text we are not completely informed. Severyns records no modern emendations except those which he has adopted; nor in the places where he has printed an emendation in his text does he argue the case for it anywhere in this volume. Nothing therefore can usefully be said now about the few occasions where he has introduced new emendations of his own. We must wait for the commentary; all will be discussed there.

The present volume, then, is the conclusion of the textual-critical and palaeographical researches of Severyns on the Chrestomathy of Proclus. It is of course the greatest value to have a text of the fragments established with such care and accuracy. We should not complain of the tremendously high standards which Severyns has set himself, the detail he has felt to be his concern; to complain of that would be to deny scholarship. Nor, again, should we question the value of the meticulous survey of previous printed editions; we can learn lessons from this example which will be applicable in the study of other authors; and, as Ritschl said when he did much the same for Plautus, it is a good thing that somebody should do it, 'Müste doch eben jene Untersuchung irgend einmal von irgendwen gemacht werden' (Opusc. ii.1-34). But Severyns' own qualities make us impatient for more. The volume which is yet to come, which will be the sixth as a result of these researches, will be far the most important. One of the finest living Homeric scholars will be commenting on the most complete evidence we have for the Epic Cycle, with (no doubt) in his mind the question mentioned above, of the light that may be cast on the Iliad and Odyssey themselves. He will have to deal with the question of the reliability of the evidence in these summaries, as it is well known that in certain details they contradict powerful testimony that we have from elsewhere. Severyns has discussed this from the textual point of view in Tome III, 281 f., but his conclusions there will affect the coming commentary. Homeric scholars will await, with the greatest expectations, the final volume; and that will complete, as Professor Severyns says (Avant-propos, p. 10), 'une œuvre à laquelle j'aurai, sans amertume ni regret, sacrifié le meilleur de mon temps et de mes forces'.

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

M. M. WILLCOCK.


This is new, folks. Mr Davenport's translation of Archilochos chimes with the hour—translation, I say, not adaptation, for although, when I read it through, I made the common mistake (p. xvii) of assuming that it was 'very free', Mr Davenport informs us that this is not so. According to Mr Hugh Kenner's introduction, 'a massive regrouping of our aesthetic decisions has enabled us, for perhaps the first time in the history of the West, to read bits without romanticising our loss'. This is the age of Miss Marianne Moore, one of whose poems 'commences in the idiom of a Bell Telephone Co. leaflet'. Mr Davenport delights in translating torn shreds of papyrus and solitary glosses, and favours us with poems like no. 26: 'Nasty Which thinks Woman Hatefulst And father Dear Not O Upon', and 201: 'Grape'. The appearance of γνωριμία in the papyrus and the attribution of ρητος by Herodian must not lead us to suppose that Mr Davenport requires at least one Greek word to be preserved and its meaning agreed before his Muse can take flight; on the contrary, no. 99 consists of two sets of brackets followed by 'ulcer?'. The supply of poetry is inexhaustible; fr. 206 (Lasserre) appears in its traditional form as 123, and emended by Edmonds as 20, and 127 is a second foot at 31. Mr Davenport conjures beauty out of what, in a lesser man, might be thought mistranslation; there seems to be an artistic association in his mind between ἄνδρος and ἄνδρος (55), γνωριμία and γνωριμία (83), θηρία and θηρία (103), πυρὸς 'fire' and πυρὸς 'wheat' (151), ἄνθισ and ἄνθισ (235), and between 'rameurs' in Bonnard's French and 'rameaux' (122). The haunting loveliness of 207: 'One half, One third' derives not from the Bell Telephone Co., but from ἡμευ τρίτων, which I thought meant 'One and a half'. It seems only fair
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that Mr Davenport should be the first to produce evidence for Archilochos' travels in Italy (92) and to obtain access to the correspondence of Aristophanes (p. xvi).

However, the book is not quite beyond reproach. It might be thought that Archilochos is clear and usually terse where Mr Davenport is obscure and usually verbose, and that the early Greek prefers vigorous allegory to sophisticated metaphor. Interpolated conceits like 'orchard' and 'ramrods' (121) do not entirely compensate for missing the whole point of the fox and eagle story (65). Only where Archilochos uses a striking epithet like ἐκφλοκαίῳ of the sea (279) does Mr Davenport come into his own. Still, with more and more shredded papyri coming onto the market, it looks as if people minded like him have worlds to conquer—perhaps I may add, since he is not averse to a little Mod. Lang. in his pages, 'ohne mich'.

A. D. FITTON BROWN.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.


The first part of this, Snell's third, edition of Pindar was devoted to the Epinician Odes and appeared in 1959, with a preface in which the editor explained that the decision to divide the book into two parts was due to information which he had received from Mr Lobel, that a considerable addition to the fragments was likely to be made by a forthcoming volume in the Oxyrhynchus series. This volume duly appeared, as The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part xxvi, towards the end of 1961; it produced one contribution (2439.i.ii.10) to our knowledge of the Epinicians, enabling us to read ἰδέαντες for θαύματος at Isb. 8.173; its significance for the fragments is shown by the fact that whereas Snell's 1953 edition required 114 pages for the fragments, the present edition has 160, almost all the increase being due to the new texts from Oxyrhynchus. The increase is even greater than these figures show, since the publishers have changed the format of the series since 1959, giving a wider page with more words to the line, but with the rather unfortunate result that the two volumes of this edition are no longer uniform. Snell has not reproduced the Oxyrhynchus texts in toto; he points out in his preface (p. v) that this is really an editio minor, and he has therefore omitted 'sescentas lacinias exiguas', which those who hope that they can improve on Snell's work as a connector of fragments may look for in the proper place—the editio princeps. It is a measure of Snell's skill in these matters that he has found something usable in every one of the Oxyrhynchus papyri from 2436 to 2451.

The preface contains a heartfelt tribute to Lobel's skill, patience and helpfulness to others, which we may all wish that we had written; it is followed (vi-vii) by a list of the papyri referred to in this volume, giving Pack's numbers (where they exist), Snell's sigla, references to the editiones princeps and to the present edition, and a note of where the papyrus is kept; a list of abbreviations (viii) completes the introductory matter. The fragments are numbered from 1 to 359 (fourteen more than in 1953); Schroeder's numbers are kept as far as possible, but on the one hand there are now many fragments which were unknown to Schroeder but have to be placed within his numera-tion (for example, all the identifiable Paeans from 1 to 22 have to be grouped under fr. 52 a–w, Schroeder's fr. 52 having become Pas. 6.118), and on the other hand many Schroeder numbers no longer have a fragment to denote: many have been swallowed up in papyrus texts, some have been transferred to other authors, and some simply rejected—but the latest habitat of each of these fragments is duly recorded under its old number. The printing and proof-reading are excellent; and it need hardly be said that Snell's editorship is at its highest standard: all but the most advanced specialists will find here all that they can need of Pindar's actual words—though they will, as before, have to look for the context of quotation fragments in the texts of the authors who quote them. Unfortunately this austerity extends also to the new testimonia; it seems to me especially regrettable that Snell has excluded the full text of the new Life of Pindar (Poxy 2438). No doubt that, and the fragment of a commentary on the Hymns (if that is what Poxy 2260 is); cf. JHS lxxxiv [1958], 207, should in all strictness go in a new edition of the Scholia, but when will there ever be one?

After the text, as in previous editions, comes the 'Metrorum Conспектus' (161–73); then the index of proper names (174–90) and the index of words not included in Rumpel's Lexicon (191–215). This index, prepared by H. Maehler from the material available in the files of the Hamburg Theaurus, includes words from papyrus fragments not quoted by Snell in the text, and will be invaluable to students; I offer one small gleaning, ἐκτος from Pas. 1.3. The modestly named 'Specimen indicis auctorum' of 1953 has been replaced by a fully fledged 'Index fontium' (216–33). The last page contains a list of three passages which contain quotations from other authors but falsely ascribed by their quoters to Pindar, a few addenda, and a well-deserved word of thanks to three people who helped with proof-reading. Nor must we fail to add our thanks to Snell for this edition, and for all that he has done for Classical studies in general and above all for our understanding of the lyric poets; his successive editions of Bacchylides and Pindar have conferred endless benefits upon us, and we are truly grateful.

University of Leeds.

J. A. DAVISON.

Professor Schlesinger sets out to consider the general theory of tragedy by means of a careful consideration of all the extant Greek plays. In his preface and in Ch. I ‘Definition and Diversity’, he determines to make the term ‘tragedy’ as inclusive as possible; he will not make it meaningless by including every play for which successive archons granted a tragic chorus at the Dionysia, but neither will he agree to exclude those plays which do not conform to the canons of individual scholars and critics. Tragedy for him is anything which was written with a deeply serious intention and has been accepted as tragedy by significant numbers of people. Naturally he excludes satyr-play and the tragicomedies, * Alexis, Helen and Ios;* and he also distinguishes a class of ‘exotragedies’, which fail in various ways to measure up to the seriousness of tragedy. To this he assigns *Iphigenia in Taurica* ‘an adventure play’; *Rhesus; Phoebissae* in which ‘the leaps from catastrophe to catastrophe allow none to be deeply felt’; *Iphigenia in Aulis and Orestes* ‘melodramas’; and also *Andromache*, where the political partisanship is too pervasive for tragedy. All these plays may serve as boundary markers for the others, the ‘high tragedies’, which S. proposes to examine.

In Chh. II, III and IV, S. proceeds under the Aristotelian heads of *μηθος, ιθος* and *διάτομα.* ‘Tragedy and Logic’ argues that high tragedy demands ‘historicity’ of situation, convincing characters and an impression of strict logic in development; ‘when visible arbitrary choice by the dramatist enters into the course of the drama, the loftiness of tragedy is compromised’ (p. 25). ‘The minor logic of motivation’ is sometimes waived (though seldom by Sophocles with his technical mastery), but a powerful ‘logic of the idea’ invests the denuement with a sense of rightness and inevitability. But this is not fate tragedy of the kind described by Bothius; human action is important, even when, as in *Heracles,* it is crippled by an unmerited stroke from Heaven. ‘Character and Characters’ lays down that the chief agent of a play is usually admirable, though neither faultless nor invariably sympathetic. ‘Antagonists’ may be more one-sided. S. comments that Shakespeare shows that tragedies can in fact be designed with remarkably villainous chief agents, and on the other hand, it is possible, in spite of Aristotle, for a saint to be a tragic hero, though then the tragedy tends to pertain rather to the society in which he lives. ‘Tragedy as a Process of ‘Thinking’ considers how far the spectator can hope to be wiser for seeing a Greek tragedy; it ‘may either define more accurately the limits within which men must operate, or indicate preferred actions by human beings’ (p. 54). Chh. V and VI speculate on ‘Purposes of Tragedy’ and sum up the ‘Criteria for Definitions’ of the art-form. The appendices contain notes on the other three Aristotelian elements of drama, and 48 pages of ill-written and useless summaries of the extant plays.

As an intelligent, fair-minded but rather pedestrian book, this reminds me of Kirkwood’s *Study of Sophoclean Drama,* which S. especially recommends; but it is inferior in cogency, clarity and precision, and the inferiority is only partly due to the fact that he is dealing with more general issues. There is a virtual contradiction between pp. 7 ff., where he carefully admonishes us that tragedy intended by the author but bungled is tragedy still, and p. 67, where he says that such a play would be correctly excluded. I had to read pp. 27 ff. through several times before I was sure that what S. was arguing was that a tragic hero should command moral approval rather than dramatic sympathy—the quotation from Seneca is nicely calculated to obscure the point. It may well be my own obtuseness which prevents me from knowing if *Oedipus the King* as an example of ‘emotional development of a nearly static situation’ (p. 81) is a mistake for *Oedipus at Colonus.* The naïve discussion of lapse of time in Greek tragedy (pp. 13 and 138) is superfluous in the light of Fraenkel’s treatment of the subject (*Agamemnon,* p. 254). S. carries his presumption that any Greek play is a great play a bit too far; and I find the tone of his remark that ‘one can only be “original” by attacking this reputation’ (p. 140) rather disquieting. On the other hand I admire his catholicity of outlook; dramatic critics are sometimes over-inclined to lay down one particular philosophy of life as the only suitable basis for tragedy. I think I can say, after picking my way through S.’s obscurities, that it was worth the effort.

A. D. FITTON BROWN.  
Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

---


In fashioning a plot out of legend, the Greek tragedian was bound to accept certain *données,* but asserted a good deal of freedom over details. Professor Lattimore argues that, even in selecting and rejecting details, he still had to respect ‘the rights of the story’ by observing some formal limitations. Bassanio must choose last and choose right; Eteocles last and wrong. Lost children must be found; the unrecognised must be revealed; the traduced must be vindicated. The plot of Greek Tragedy has a logic shared with humbler forms of literature; its greatness resides in expression, tone and morality; though we are warned to look for moral dimension rather than any one moral proposition. L. proceeds to consider a nexus of story patterns. First he dismisses the notion of *hamartia* ‘the tragic flaw’, not so much because he accepts Else’s view that this is not what
Aristotle meant by *hamartia*, but because he cannot find a single Greek tragedy of which it can fairly be said that a flaw in an otherwise noble nature entirely accounts for the hero’s downfall. Then he examines the view that punishment of *hybris* is a dominant theme of tragedy. He observes in passing that *hybris* is not what we think of as pride that goes before a fall; Epiphanius may have earned the gratitude of Miss Austen’s admirers by coupling ἔθιμος and προκρίσης, but no classical Greek would have accused Mr Darcy of ἔθιμος. Still, the punishment of pride does play a part in Greek Tragedy; but plots of this kind tend to be excessively simple and to generate an unfortunate sympathy for Heaven’s victims, unless these have exercised a degree of choice. Choice plays an important part—Rivier regards it as the archetype of tragic situations—and L. now reviews it in its different manifestations; sometimes it is made *ab initio* and declared, sometimes it is covered by deception, sometimes the dramatic moment is a decision to persevere in a choice previously made. Usually (though not always) the choice is irrevocable, as with Agamemnon at Aulis, where L. rightly understands the ‘yoke of necessity’ as the inevitable consequence of a decision freely taken. Plays of supplication and sacrifice also exploit the moment of choice, but the important themes of revenge and discovery have little scope for it. L. ends with some remarks about character, imagery, rhetoric and ceremony (i.e. producers’ effects); he inclines to side with those who think of the characters of Greek tragedy as conceived mainly in accord with the requirements of the action.

This is a most attractive and useful little book, and very easy reading. As L. himself realises, it is a bit discursive; but, particularly in the case of the discussion of *hybris*, we are the richer for that. Occasionally I think L.’s judgement is at fault. I have no patience with Else’s view that Aristotelian *hamartia* is a mistake about the identity of a person. I may be old-fashioned; but when Aristotle says that neither the fall of an outstandingly good man nor of a villain is suited to tragedy, and arrives by elimination at the fairly good man who falls by some *hamartia*, he cannot be thinking of an intellectual error—to which an outstandingly good man would be equally prone—but of a moral lapse. L. argues at length that when Antigone is led out to die, she believes that Haemon has deserted her. He grants that, for a character to continue deceived like this would be exceptional (he might have mentioned the Charioteer in *Rhesus*); and I feel sure that, if Antigone had believed this, she would have said so outright. The truth is rather that Haemon is in the play not so much to love and be loved by Antigone as to punish Creon. I react with benevolent incredulity to L.’s suggestion that Heracles at the end of *Philoctetes*, is ‘the last stratagem of Odysseus’—surely a rather cheap ending, even if the poet could have hoped to get it across to his audience. Every now and then, L.’s lively mind leads him to incautious assertion, often with regard to the possible context of fragments; but if as many people as I hope read this book it is certainly not the mistakes which will live longest in their memory.

A. D. Fiton Brown.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.


‘Die Absicht dieses Handbuchs ist es, in verschiedenere Arten von Material einzuführen, das wir benötigen, wenn wir versuchen wollen, die Geschichte der griechischen Bühnenauflührung zu rekonstruieren.’ That is how the author sets out his aim in the introduction. In fact the great wealth of information amassed in this short work, admirably classified and interpreted, amounts to a concise history of Greek theatre production from the time of Thespis down to late imperial times. This new book written in German corrects and brings up to date but does not replace the much more detailed *Greek Theatre Production* (1956). It also summarizes the results of the author’s numerous other studies on the history of Greek drama scattered in various periodicals, and primarily his *Monuments Illustrating Old and Middle Comedy, New Comedy, and Tragedy and Satyr Play*, which came out in 1960–62 as Supplements 9, 11, and 14 of the BICS.

In the first chapter the sources for the history of ancient theatre are described. Authors, theatres, and inscriptions are dealt with very briefly. As the title implies, the emphasis is laid on dramatic monuments (bronzes, terracottas, reliefs, mosaics, paintings, jewels, etc.) representing, or decorated with, dramatic masks, characters, or scenes. The second chapter is a geographical survey of the evidence for dramatic performances beginning with Athens and ending with Malta and Gaul. The treatment here varies according to the material available in each case. The author naturally dwells at length upon Athens where the abundant material gives a good picture of the evolution of stage building, costumes and masks. Professor Webster believes that the earliest performances took place in front of the old temple of Dionysos Eleutherus (as in the Kabeiran theatre at Thebes) until c. 470 when the *ikria* on the southern side of the orchestra collapsed; the whole auditorium was then transferred to the slope of Acropolis, and the orientation of the theatre changed. The *skene* had only one door down to the second quarter of the fourth century. The *ekkyklēmena* goes back to the period 470–30, painted scenery to the Periclean theatre (c. 430); the high stage was introduced around 300 B.C. in Athens. The discussion of masks within the general frame of theatre production in different periods of Attic drama is very interesting and useful. Webster distinguishes fourteen comic mask types already extant in the late fifth/early fourth century. In the next period (370–25), the heyday of Attic terracottas with comic subjects,
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thirteen more masks are added. The mask list of Pollux (IV 133–54), which is ‘im grossen und ganzen aus der frühhellenistischen Zeit und grösstenteils auch in attischen Denkmälern bezeugt’ (p.32), is discussed in connexion with the Hellenistic objects from Athens (325–150). Some Pollux masks are Middle Comedy types which were abandoned by New Comedy poets (IV 143–5, nos. 1, 2, 5, 9: first and second pappos, first and second Heronian, cannot be illustrated by Hellenistic monuments, or survived for a while in the early third century (IV 145, no. 6: sphenopagon, probably Knemon in the Dyskolos). Some established already in the early fourth century (no. 4: wavy-haired old man, IV 148, 150, no. 25: maison), and many others known from the second quarter of the fourth century, enjoyed success in the world of New Comedy. By far the most interesting case is that of the leading slave (no. 22, cf. no. 27). The type is traced back to the fifth century (Attic vase in Leningrad, Trendall, Phýax Vases, BICS Suppl. 8, no. 6, Bieber, Hist. of Gr. and Rom. Theat., 3, fig. 184), and down to the second half of the third century a.d. (Agora VI, nos. 560, 563–4, 567). The long series of monuments (Attic and non-Attic) illustrating the evolution of the type, and accordingly the changes in the conception of the slave role, shows that the glorification of the slave, which is supposed to be one of the originalities of Plautus, is to be found already in the third quarter of the third century in the slave masks with semicircular trumpet (mouth and beard) that look much more talkative and ebullient than their counterparts of the late fourth/early third century. The third chapter is a chronological summary in which the same evidence discussed in the previous chapter is arranged in chronological order, and contemporary pieces of information from various places are joined together. There follows a long list of monuments referred to in the book, select bibliography, and index.

Webster has gone far beyond Robert, Bieber, or Simon, in the study of dramatic monuments, and has produced a system of classification and interpretation which is unquestionably solid and sound. It is, therefore, only with some minor points that the following few remarks are concerned. P. 16: If the moulds from Ostia, etc., are really for cakes, then it is very probable that the cakes were offered to the audience (crustulum, Thes. L. L. s.v., see specially CIL XI 9613), as has been suggested (Pasqui, NSA 1906, 372). P. 20: SIG² 457 was dated c. 220–208 by M. Fyel, Contrib. à l’épig. rét. (1943), 88–132. P. 33 f.: Q. Marcus Straton, the distinguished comic actor who knew his Menander so well, is dated to the first century a.d. in IG II¹ 12664 (cf. Peck 681), and may well be the same as the komodos Straton (Plut. Mor. 673 C), who must have been quite famous—otherwise Plutarch would not have mentioned him, or expected Sosius Senecio (cf. Mor. 672 D, Groag, RE⁸ III 1190, where Straton is wrongly referred to as comic poet) to remember him. P. 43 f.: The little building with statues of Tragedy and Comedy in Thasos may not be a choragic monument but a

Dionysiac Stibadion (Picard, CRAI 1944, 127 ff., Manuel d’arch. gr., IV 2, 1153 ff.). P. 46: Nikophon of Mileos performed at Minoa of Amorgos (IG XII 7 226).

This work is not, of course, supposed to be a corpus of information about Greek drama; however, I think that some other places known to have had theatres and dramatic performances deserve a brief mention also: e.g. Sparta (Woodward, BSA 26, 1923–5, 119 ff., 28, 1926–7, 2 ff., 30, 1928–9, 151 ff.), Phigalia (Diod. XIV 10–11, Athen. IV 149 b, IG V.2 422); Aigai (Diod. XVI 92–3); Amorgos (IG XII 7 420 B, 229, 237 12 386 8 387 11 388 8 389). Ios (IG XII 5 1010), Keos (IG XII 5 531 5 597 9 604 3 1061 4 1063 4 1064 6 1070 a), Paros (IG XII 5 1298 3 139 140 ['Ivō tragedy? cf. index VI.1 s.v. ]); Tenos (IG XII 5 798 8 800, 804 8); Babylon (Rostovtzeff, SEH II 1049, III 18 36, n. 17), etc. The book is set in a clear and very readable type and has very few misprints (p. 26 29 and 48 15 read Aixon for Axione, p. 451 Romanos for Romaios).

In conclusion I should like to stress that this is an extremely valuable book for quick reference, indispensable to all scholars working on, or interested in, the history and archaeology of classical drama.

G. M. SIFAKIS.

The Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington, D.C.


This book consists of nine lucid chapters (pp. 1–194) followed by a detailed collation (against the current Oxford Text) of sixteen MSS of the Prometheus, Septem and Persae, viz. A, B, H, K, M, P, Q, V (all collated, but sometimes carelessly, by Wilamowitz), C, J, I (a Mount Athos codex not investigated by Turyn), N, Nd, O, Y, Ya. In the last three chapters Dr Dawe discusses curiosities in the MSS, offers some emendations, and establishes the independent value of the Salamanca MS (E) of the Eumenides. The first six contain the substance of his argument, which I summarise as follows.

Turyn’s distinction between ‘old’ and ‘Thoman’ MSS is unreal; the ‘Thoman recension’ may indeed be a figment. Almost all of the sixteen MSS ‘constant show the influence of groups to which they do not themselves belong’. Horizontal transmission is shown to exist on a wide scale by the enormous number of variants and corrections in the MSS: it is liable to occur especially at cruces, where the scribe is driven to consult new evidence. As more information about MS readings is gathered, Sondeapekkae diminish, and so the difficulty of demonstrating MS affiliations increases; yet a general agreement in other readings will support the evidence of the significant errors. But even the relatively fluid groupings indicated by the new material may be shown by
exhaustive collation to be illusory; it is conceivable that the tradition will turn out to be so open that there will no longer be any point in the inclusion of MS symbols in the apparatus. Examination of the collation demonstrates that all MSS contain scribal emendations, some of which seem to be relatively old; on the other hand, any MS or MS group may preserve an ancient reading in isolation. The natural deduction from this, that the assumed common ancestor of the MSS must be of great antiquity, is supported by external evidence, but the confusion of the MSS makes it impossible to recover 'archetypal' readings. Hence the postulation of an archetype is of small practical value.

The evidence and argument presented by Dr Dawe thus deals a fatal blow to the assumption that the interrelationship of Aeschylean MSS can be determined without the labour of exhaustive collation and attests the urgent need to extend and revise the fundamental work of Wilamowitz and Turyn. Only when all MSS have been thoroughly collated and a pattern of groupings established through careful analysis of their variants will there be a firm basis for reconstructing the text of Aeschylus. This book is of great value both as a contribution to the achievement of this end and as a stimulus to, and model for, the work of others. Incidentally it demonstrates how gravely restricted the usefulness of Maasian stenmatology can be by its failure to take account of so-called 'contamination'.

Dr Dawe's analysis of the readings of his MSS is in general convincing. Occasionally he seems inconsistent, e.g. in his treatment of the readings τιμῶν (Th. 236: τινες των), στρατός (Pers. 279: λείψις Q^2 γρ. supra lineam) and γένος (Pers. 704: δόμαρ 1), which all look like intrusive glosses: he attributes the poetic variants τινες and λείψις to internal collation but regards δόμαρ as an ancient reading. Here and elsewhere he cites little evidence for glossographers' language. Some variants which he conjectures may have originated as glosses seem unlikely to have done so, e.g. δόλωσα or δελωσα (Pers. 691), βολευμάτων (Th. 438), τάλαμα (Pers. 290), πόλιμα (Pers. 444), βρατοίς (Pers. 708). For his emendations he makes only modest claims, but three at least deserve serious consideration: Ag. 626 ἐφανερωσεν εὶ τῆλιν, Ch. 246 σημειώσεν, Supp. 924 η (for ει, giving attractive connexion with what precedes).

I append some notes on details. P. 52n. Cf. Wilamowitz on Th. 364. P. 57. Th. 236: cf. ΣΣ on Th. 775 and Ch. 399, Suda s.v. τίνες and τίνω (and see Adler's ref.). P. 67n. δοδώρην may have been corrupted to δοδώρην because περικλῆς τεσσαρότος was taken to mean 'wise prophets' and ἀλλακτεν to be absolute (cf. πέποϑα). P. 74. Pers. 703: cf. Pers. 705, Th. 294, Eu. 530. P. 75. Pers. 913: μελέων is surely an intrusive gloss, cf. ΣΣ on Fr. O.8.68, P.3-5.2.4-80, Suda s.v. γένος, etc. P. 92. Th. 1074: the gen. μακάρων is due to assimilation of Λος (perhaps aided by collation with 226 θεοὶ κτλ.). Had it been construed with μετα, ἰδρυς would also have had to be changed. P. 95: Pers. 444: here and in 446 τόπων looks like the ancient reading, cf. Σ on Pi. N.6.6, Suda s.v. τόπων, etc. P. 97. Th. 1024: ἄγος is a precise gloss on ἄνγερος, cf. Σ on Th. 716, Suda s.v. (n.b. s.vv. ἄγος, ἀγνοτάτος). P. 99. Pers. 92: κακῶς was perhaps imported by internal collation, cf. Th. 751, 759, 1041. P. 103, ll. 24-7. Note ΣΣ on Th. 34, 160, 594-5, 865, Th. 238, 834, Pers. 435. P. 117. Th. 335: cf. Hes. Th. 749, A. Ch. 571, Theoc. 2104. P. 119. Th. 878: corruption of μέλερα could have been helped by μέλικες διή in 879. P. 120. Pers. 704: cf. ΣΣ on Th. 834; S. Tr. 1224, E. Alc. 930, Ph. 1070, Andr. 626, etc., Suda s.v. δάμαρτος, etc. P. 124. Th. 450: ἄλλων theōn is perhaps an emendation, cf. Th. 1074 (discussed above). P. 146. Th. 223: if τιματις is right, it means not 'punishment' (a sense unattested in Aeschylus) but 'honours' (cf. 229); cf. similar oxymora in Ag. 1983, 1483. The phonetically similar ποιας could have replaced it through internal collation, cf. 112, 176, 268, 565, 620. P. 147. Th. 688 (not 689): ἁνωσα occurs at Th. 437. P. 156. Th. 226: θειος, facilius lectio (cf. Dawe on Th. 551, p. 166), probably i. erroneous: note the surrounding plurals, 217, 219, 223, 231, 233. P. 173. Pers. 207: φάθον looks like a careless repetition from 206, for τρόμος, τρομοί, etc., are not generally glossed in tragedy (though Σ on Th. 540 ff. has τρομόβιον); they have survived into Modern Greek. P. 178. Th. 959: at 774 Prometheus' release is only thirteen human generations distant. P. 182. Th. 1017: cf. Eu. 168. I have noted some 50 errors, of which few are likely to give trouble. P. 57. Th. 330: read 376. P. 77-78: read Pr. P.83. P. 38: read 92. P. 126, l. 14 ἐπικριμένων: read ἐπικριμένων (Dr. Dawe brought this to my attention). P. 192. E. 364: read 374.

E. W. WHITTLE.

University of Birmingham.

See supplement on p. 260.


Professor Stanford's edition of the Ajax is a welcome addition to the list of texts he has already given us. It offers us a lengthy introduction on background matter and on the characters and structure of the play, a revised text, a conscientious and thoughtful commentary, and a series of appendices on text, metre, style and a number of points of debate.

The general impression given by the edition is that it is an exploration of the possibilities within existing criticism rather than an attempt to open up new ground. The text has no apparatus but readings are discussed at some length in the notes. S. gently establishes his preference for one reading over another, but on the whole he is more eager to defend a MS reading against subsequent emendation than to put forward emendations of his own. In the commentary the contributions of other scholars are stated and assessed with great fairness; in fact, S. is so accommodating that he can rarely bring himself to say that
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any suggestion lacks some point of possible relevance. There is not a dogmatic word in the book. The suggestion throughout is that in the complex dialogue between Sophocles and his audience, we have no right to say that this effect or that hint could not have made itself felt. If, sometimes, he seems to throw his net too widely (e.g. notes to 780-2, 795-802), the material is gathered for us and the tone of its presentation invites us to make our own judgment. S. advances his own ideas and preferences with caution and supports them invariably with scholarship and good sense. This edition will be an admirable teaching-instrument.

In reviewing so generous and tolerant an editor, it may seem ungenerous to suggest that the attempt to be all-inclusive has its dangers. For instance, S.'s account of the Homeric Ajax is a valuable compendium of the facts; but Ajax is made to carry the full weight of his Homeric beginnings throughout the play, and it is doubtful if this could have been contemplated by a playwright or appreciated by an audience. In the same way hints from outside the text as well as within it are used to invest Ajax and the lesser characters with a complexity of personality that puts one in mind of a case-history. S. talks freely of modern psychological method (e.g. pp. liv, livi, 103, 237, 290) following his principle of not neglecting anything that may help, but some of the results he achieves with it must be viewed with suspicion. He says of the chorus that 'like the fifth-century Athenian sailors they are emotionally unstable and temperamentally volatile' (p. lli); 'Tecmessa's abundant use of γε' indicates 'a feminine tendency to emphasis' (p. 128); 1064 is used as evidence of 'Menelaus's heartlessness': 'the colour of the sand means more to him than the abandoned corpse' (p. 194). Suggestions like these are always advanced tentatively ('may', 'possibly', 'perhaps'), and if we accept this as criticism of search rather than of statement, we should perhaps be grateful for a method that shakes up our thinking as often as it awakens our doubts. But when we come to S.'s assessment of the total play, we find that the method does not yield much of value. The motive for the Tragede is declared to be Ajax's compassion for Tecmessa and his son. ('He now for the first time recognizes with pity how harsh their fate will be if he dies in avowed enmity with the Atreidæ.' p. 142). The 'one dominant aim' of the play's structure is 'to exhibit many different aspects of Ajax's heroic spirit' (p. lxi). Ajax has the 'fatal flaw' of 'boastful arrogance' (p. xxv), but he experiences a 'partial 'sophronisation' ' (p. xxxvi), is 'justified' (p. 1) in the last scenes and enters a 'Communion of Heroes' (p. xlii, cf. note to 865). All of this has an old ring; and much post-war criticism has got further by attempting to penetrate the mind of Sophocles rather than that of Ajax.

As we would expect, S. is hospitable to the idea of ambiguity and the 'shared construction', and says many good things about them (e.g. note to 331-2 and p. 268). His respect for his poet makes him refuse to admit the possibility of unconscious repetition with vocabulary (p. 279, note 28) and sometimes he finds significance in word-echoes where others would plead accident, but the appendix on style is excellent. It is probably respect for Sophocles again that leads him to minimise the influence of the demands of staging: the appendix on the Tragede barely notices the possibility that Sophocles was eager to clear his stage for the lonely death. On the other hand there are many occasions (e.g. note to 1171-2) where S. is visualising the play in performance and suggests a good reconstruction of the events on stage.

The edition displays very great care and there are few errors: on p. 186 Jebb is read wrongly on περισσερήν and Dain on the attribution of a speech, and there is a very occasional misprint, but otherwise the book is a model of accuracy. The organisation of the notes with their square and curved brackets picking up every possible reservation sometimes produces a stammer in the otherwise beautifully lucid exposition, and such index-entries as 'great bodies theme', 'island symbolism', 'pathos', and 'vagueness' unfortunately suggest a kind of filling-system control over the devices of poetry. But S. has been able to reduce to order a mass of diverse material and on the whole we should be grateful for the schematisation that has helped him to do it.

It will be apparent that these are criticisms of faults that emerge directly from the great virtues of this edition. No editor of Sophocles has been so self-effacing, or has made available to his readers in such compact form so many and varied starting-points for new thinking about the play.

G. H. GELLIE.

University of Melbourne.


Professor Vourveris proposes a 'humanistic' interpretation of Philoctetes to emphasise its universal and eternal human themes. His method is to separate the 'historical' (Part 1) from the 'universal' (Part 2), and to study the play in detail in Part 2 for its continuing significance and moral lessons.

There will be sympathy with Vourveris' ideals and aims as set out in his introduction. The pitfalls of such an interpretation, however, are clear, and it cannot be said that Vourveris, despite his method of studying the play as it develops, scene by scene, has guarded sufficiently against them. The division between historical and universal within a play is not only difficult and somewhat artificial, but of doubtful value. It is not, in fact, satisfactorily maintained here, and the discussions of Part 2 often refer to the historical setting. More serious are the tendencies
both to generalise freely, so that the analysis of the play itself is dissipated in rather superficial philosophical paraphrases or discursive platitudes, and to impose certain views upon the play rather than to attempt to elicit its meaning, in fact, to manipulate the play rather than to follow it. These weaknesses in the analysis are underlined by an inevitable comparison with Professor Linforth’s similar running analysis of the same play published in 1956. Indeed it is not clear that Vourveris, who is most familiar with the work of German scholars, has always profited as he might from other modern work on Sophocles, and many critics, including Kitto, have escaped his bibliography altogether.

For Vourveris, _Philoctetes_ is a study in man’s opposition to the divine will through ignorance, and in his need for learning and self-knowledge. All three chief characters in the play err and learn. Thus Sophocles’ message for men is _eidos_ through _nudula_. These ideas are unexceptionable in themselves, and the synthesis, which is Vourveris’ particular contribution, is neat and comprehensive. But even a general statement of Vourveris’ position in terms of the play suggests that the synthesis fits _Philoctetes_ only loosely and, even so, with some serious distortions, and that the ideas are remote from the ‘imaginative centre’ of the play, as an audience or reader experiences it. Odysses opposes the gods by substituting his own methods. Philoctetes opposes them by refusing to go to Troy, but learns from Heracles. Neoptolemus opposes the gods by following Odysses’ plan, but is a ‘pupil’ who moves away from the influence of his evil ‘sophistic’ teacher Odysses into the world of his good ‘socratic’ teacher Philoctetes. Vourveris, at the beginning of Part 2, scrupulously indicated the error of attempts to reduce the play to a philosophical scheme. It is hard not to feel that he himself has provided a demonstration.

How Odysses learned is obscure. That he erred in practising guile seems to stem more clearly from Bowra, whose view Vourveris uncritically revives, than from Sophocles. Indeed, according to Vourveris, we actually see in the prologue Odysses already perverting the terms of the prophecy (though Sophocles was unfortunately prevented by considerations of dramatic economy from stating them here), and defying the will of the gods. Vourveris here perverts his own analytic method. It is perhaps a mark of the pressure to which his outlook subjects his method that there is not even a clear statement of where and how the gods’ stipulation of persuasion in the fetching of Philoctetes is first revealed in the play. There is no attempt to answer the many criticisms of Bowra’s view. Why is nothing made of Odysses’ supposed sin? Why indeed does Sophocles let Philoctetes, in speaking of the _δήλος_ say (1.1269) _οὐκ εἰσιν πειθεῖς λόγοις_?

If the book as a whole is, in my view, disappointing, I should not fail to say that Professor Vourveris’ enthusiasm and love for the play are infectious, and that he makes some sound observations (e.g. on Odysses’ final attempt to bluff Philoctetes) and has a useful discussion of the ‘merchant’ scene.

_A. E. HINDS._


This is a book before which the most exacting critics, if they know their job, will surrender at discretion. With a judicial objectivity and never a trace of impatience with the perverseness and misplaced fastidiousness that earlier scholars have applied to this play, Ritchie shows conclusively that it contains no demonstrably un-Euripidean features at all, but has a great deal in common with the earliest dated plays (Alestis, Meles; to a rather lesser extent, _Hippolytus_). Indeed, by the end of the book I came to wonder whether the tiresome question of authenticity would ever have reared its head, had it not been for that vague remark in the First Argument that some unnamed persons in antiquity had suspected that the play was spurious. Ritchie’s discretion precludes his claiming explicitly at any stage in his argument that the play is definitely by Euripides; he has succeeded in making the task of impugning its genuineness impossibly hard, and dispelled a great deal of mist in the process. What is perhaps of no less value is something never to be suspected from title or dust-jacket and indeed a by-product entirely subordinate to the author’s main purpose: in the course of his examination of the alleged anomalies in the play he states clearly and with sufficient documentation just what, in the light of up-to-date knowledge, Euripides’ normal practice was, with side-glances, when called for, to Aeschylus and Sophocles. He has thus _en passant_ gone a long way towards providing what is for practical purposes that much-desiderated ‘grammar of dramatic technique’ (see _JHS_ 78 [1958] p. 134). Undergraduates who know their way about this book and also have Barrett’s _Hippolytus_ at hand are in a far better position than their forerunners ever were to write informed and interesting essays about Euripides—so, for matter of that are their tutors, when it comes to criticising the results—while others of more specialist interests will benefit from the model _ἐνδοθέσεως_ of stylistic method as applied to vocabulary (ch. iv) and metre (ch. vi).

In his opening chapter Ritchie treadssure-footedly over the treacherous ground of the external evidence, evaluating it carefully and giving a workmanlike account of the treatment the play received from scholars in antiquity. By precise regard to the wording of the documents and by exhausting all logical alternatives eight facts can be elicited, and these are clearly set out on pp. 56–9. The relation of the play to the _Dolomia_ and the fusion of the various Iliaic elements (e.g. what Aeneas says to Hector in
Rh. 85 f. derives not from K but from Polydamas’ advice to Hector in M 60 f. and N 726 f.) are examined in ch. II, together with other traditional data. The dramatist’s own inventions and his methods of manipulating his material (which prove to be quite skillful) make an interesting study; in particular Ritchie’s suggested solution to the problem of παῖς πάτης in 685 (p. 74) is ingenious and dramatically convincing. I like too his observations on the wolf-skin disguise and the dream (p. 76). Neither will the sensible remarks on plot-construction and characterisation attract dissent.

Perhaps in ch. III Ritchie comes as close as he ever does to special pleading, but in fact his logic never deserts him. The absence of an expository prologue from the play as we have it is certainly an anomaly, though if its absence should ever be guaranteed by fresh evidence it would not, in my view, undermine Ritchie’s main contentions. He does however build up a strong case for believing that one once existed, and if so some of the less satisfactory features of the play (e.g. the epiphany of Athena, 595 f.) would probably be mitigated. Space precludes detailed discussion here of ch. IV (Vocabulary and Syntax), V (Style), VI (Metric) and VII (Structure of the lyric parts). The upshot is convincing; although the conclusions would almost certainly be unaffected, I confess that I should have found the tables on pp. 150 ff. rather more illuminating if instances of ἤπαι λέγουσα, ἤπως τραγῳδοῦσα and the like which occur in the iambic sections had been distinguished, if only by an asterisk or other convenient symbol, from those found in the choral parts. Regard is however rightly paid to the ‘quality’ of occurrences as well as to mere numerical incidence and the data is laudably up-to-date; even δίδυμος (in the Euripides fragment in P. Oxy. 2461, i.15 does not escape the net). Previous compilations such as those of Rolfe and Eysert have been laid under contribution, but are presented in a verified and refined form. Inevitably this part of the book is hardly scintillating reading, but such research, if it is to be useful, must be exhaustive, and Ritchie is not one to shirk spade-work.

The metrical doctrine in ch. VII is eminently sound, stemming mostly from Ceadel and Miss Dale. The less reliable Descroix is treated with appropriate caution at pp. 280 ff., but the inferences to be drawn from properly analysed percentage-figures are plain enough, while the shape and scale of the lyrics tell the same story. In short, nothing forbids us to assume an early date in Euripides’ dramatic output, and I for one should be very surprised if reliable fresh evidence should turn up to contradict what has been established in this book.

I conclude with a few details:

P. 7, n. 1. A good deal more has been written on the alphabetic arrangement of the Alexandrian edition since Wilamowitz’ Analekta Euripidea in 1875; see e.g. Barrett’s Hippolytus, p. 45.

P. 89. For Euripides’ habit of dropping all interest in minor characters who have served their dramatic purpose, Teucer in Hel. 68 f. is a good example.

P. 107. To the examples of anapaests alternating with lyric strophes in the parodos, add S. Ant. 100 f.

P. 109 lines 13–16: is what is said here quite consistent with p. 106 lines 7–11?

P. 262. ‘... Andromache, only three years later than Hippolytus’? Surely ‘a few’ (or the like) was intended: since when did Andromache join the list of dated plays?

P. 267. Had Ritchie had prior access to Barrett’s note on Hipp. 1029, this instance would surely have been cancelled and the exception-count adjusted; there is no doubt that this verse is an interpolation.

P. 294–5. The agitato passage in trochaic tetrameters reminds me very forcibly of the use of the same metre in Plautus Rud. 706 f. in a similar situation, in so far as a parallel from Néa has more than curiosity interest in this connexion.

P. 297 f. The adoption of a simple metrical symbolism (such as Snell’s) or a marginal numbering of the lines in the scansion schemes would have made for easier reading.

P. 300. The two dactylo-epitrite choruses in P.V. have been called in question (see Kranz, Statimon, pp. 266 f.); whether there is any substance in this or not, these systems are unique in the surviving works of Aeschylus.

Sed quossum habe? These details have been appended not as captious criticism or for any intrinsic value they may have, but as some evidence that I have scrutinised this excellent work with the critical attention it deserves.

John G. Griffith.

Jesus College, Oxford.


Platnauer’s Peace has long been eagerly awaited by Aristophanists, and it turns out to have been well worth waiting for. It contains an up-to-date text and apparatus criticus, together with the first commentary on this play since those of Sharpley (1905) and van Leeuwen (1965). It goes without saying that Platnauer’s scholarship is unimpeachable, and the editors of subsequent volumes in this new Oxford Aristophanes series will not find it easy to keep up the standard which he has set.

His book is for scholars, not for tivos. It is not suitable for sixth-formers, and hardly even for first-year undergraduates. Readers are expected to have previous acquaintance with Aristophanes, and to have no need of grammatical exegesis except on points of serious difficulty. We are expected to know without being told that τὸ κάκωτ’ ἀπολογεῖται (2), εἷς κορακας (19), και κλεόνα κακρά (255) are imprecations, that γέφυρα Ἡρακλίου (107) does not mean ‘I shall write to the Medes’, and that κλεόνα (776)
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does not mean ‘closing’; we are required to decide for ourselves whether ἄν marks a frequentative statement (67), a strong affirmative (378), or a polite request (958); we are assumed to be familiar with all iambic, trochaic, anaepastic, and dactylic metres. But these are fair assumptions. The Peace is practically never read in schools or by less advanced students. There is no point in writing for a non-existent class of readers, and by excluding them from consideration Platnauer is able to make his commentary more concise. Editors of more popular plays appearing subsequently in the series will need to be more condescending.

On serious problems of language or interpretation Platnauer’s comments are generally admirable. I seldom disagree with him, but sometimes I wish he would express himself more clearly. Occasionally he seems to have changed his mind without fully revising his note: on 336 it is misleading to say that a scholiast ‘helpfully’ says there is a metaphor from snakes when, as it later appears, Platnauer does not believe that there is any such metaphor. And the obscener the text, the obscurer the comment. He has a quaint old-fashioned idea that what is rude in English is polite in French (witness his coy comment on 49: ‘The Budé edition’s footnote may perhaps be quoted: “c’est-à-dire pour uriner”’), while some lines are not adequately interpreted even in French (879, for example). But a prudish attitude to the Peace is really absurd; a student who is too squeamish to read frank explanations will be too squeamish to read this play at all.

The fullest notes are on problems of textual criticism. A good summary of the manuscript evidence is included in the introduction. This edition is the first to make use of L (the Triclinium manuscript described by N. G. Wilson in CQ xii [1962] 32–47). The Triclinium tradition represented by L, B, and the Aldine edition is conveniently denoted by the symbol t, while a signifies the more important manuscripts RVTP. C is dismissed as a copy of P, while H is not mentioned even to be dismissed. A selection of testimonia is printed above the apparatus criticus. There are few novel emendations, but the discussions of old ones display an abundance of good judgement. The obelus is perhaps too lavishly used; 18, 169, 1225, and 1266 are lines from which it might reasonably be removed. The discussion of 741–5 is muddled, but it is exceptional.

With historical problems Platnauer is much less at home, and some of his political and prosopographical notes are inadequate. About Kleonymos (446), as he says, ‘we really know very little’, but we do know more than he tells us. Peisandros (395), Pheidias (605), and Theagenes/Theogens (928) raise questions which he does not even ask, much less answer. Does 502 refer to the affair of Simaitha (cf. Akharnians 524–9) or to the Megarian decree? What have Sophokles and Euripides to do with peace (531–2)? Why are the council concerned with holidays (714)? The list of ignored historical problems is a long one.

Literary criticism is almost entirely absent, being confined to a single paragraph of the introduction (p. viii). The character of Trygaios is summed up in a couple of lines; no other character is described or assessed at all. Platnauer says the play contains ‘some really charming lyrics’, but he does not say which lyrics are charming or why, and he makes no other attempt to estimate the quality of the verse or the effectiveness of the various metres.

An equally serious defect is his failure to visualise the setting and performance in detail. In his introduction (p. xii) he at first envisages three doors, but then tells us that the beetle’s stable has a door of its own; this makes four doors, a highly improbable number. He thinks Peace is hauled up through a trap-door, and fails to see that a chorus of twenty-four can hardly haul a rope upwards without some elaborate pulley arrangement. He thinks Peace is a figure, not an actor, and yet requires a ladder to reach the trap-door (p. xiii). He has not worked out the exits and re-entrances of the First Slave in 1–19. He does not say how many boys appear at 1265, or how many speaking actors need to be on stage simultaneously at this point. And many smaller details of stage business are left unmentioned.

The book is attractively printed and bound in the usual Oxford style; I like the large lettering on the spine and the spacing of the Greek dialogue. There are some misprints, but most are unimportant. It is a pity that no use is made of indentation to distinguish various metres; even in the elegiac couplet in 1239–40 the pentameter is not indented. ‘All dates in this book are b.c.’ (p. vii) sorts ill with the assertion that the Aldine edition was printed in 1498 (p. xxiv). References are sometimes given in an unhelpful form. On p. 152 we are referred to ‘Arnott, op. cit.’ No work by any scholar named Arnott is mentioned elsewhere on the page, and after turning back page by page laboriously the reader has to decide for himself whether the reference is to the work of ‘G. W. Arnott’ (a mistake for W. G. Arnott) mentioned on p. 75 or to that of P. D. Arnott mentioned on p. 129. These signs of carelessness are trivial; far more serious is the absence of an index. That a distinguished scholar and a famous university press should in 1964 publish an important scholarly book without an index is inexplicable and inexcusable.

D. M. MacDowell.

University of Manchester.


The title of this excellent book, which is based on the author’s Kieler dissertation of 1962, clearly indicates its scope. After sketching the development of the profession of mageiros in classical Greece, with
emphasize on the essential fact that the mageiros is not primarily a cook but a man hired to perform the sacrificial slaughter of an animal and to prepare the sacrificial meal afterwards, Dohm reviews the awkward questions germane to any discussion about the origin of the cook on the comic stage: where do Maison and Tettix spring from, and did Epicharmus and old Attic comedy already have the role of mageiros, at least in embryo form? The evidence is too sparse for simple black and white answers to such questions, but Dohm’s discussion clarifies the issues well; here as elsewhere throughout the book the author shows his ability judiciously to assess the value of confused literary evidence and to present complex arguments in a limpid (if not always succinct) style.

The main part of the work deals inevitably with the cook’s role in middle and new comedy and in Plautus. Dohm is almost certainly right to date the origin of the role proper to the twenty years before 330 B.C. (cf. Webster, Studies in Later Greek Comedy, 66, 194); then, for a period of a century or more, the mageiros flits on and off the Greek comic stage in play after play with such regularity that the non-specialist might well be pardoned for protesting ‘Too many cooks!’ We have a large number of fragments up to 50 and 60 verses in length from cook roles in this period, and these passages, together with the cook scenes in Menander and Plautus, Dohm submits to a rigorous typological analysis. In the author’s view, all the longer fragments (together with the cook scene in the Pseudolus) are instances of the ‘episodic’ use of the mageiros role, where that character’s appearance is intended merely to amuse the audience with a series of typical motifs, and the role is not (or only lightly) integrated into the plot. This is argued as convincingly as the evidence allows, though Dohm is naturally aware of the dangers that attend such predication about fragmentary material. The author also believes that he can detect a gradual development in this ‘episodic’ use of the role, from simple monologues in which the mageiros merely recites lists of ingredients or recipes to highly sophisticated dialogues with other cooks (apprentices and the like) or with the cook’s hirer (or the hirer’s slave) in which sometimes a high degree of imagination and wit is revealed by the author: e.g. Damoxenus, fr. 2, with its barbed ridicule of scientific alazonia. Typologically Dohm’s analysis is always competently, sometimes brilliantly, done, and the detailed interpretation of those fragments that Dohm selects as being representative of particular types of mageiros scene is perhaps the most impressive part of this book.

1. The fragments are Antiphanes, fr. 222; Sotades, 1; Euphorion, 1; Anaxippus, 1; and Damoxenus, 2. In discussing the last of these (161 ff.), Dohm produces an unmetrical conjecture (v. 31, p. 174 and n. 1), and fails to note Alciphron, 3.19.8 (from comedy? cf. Meineke, FCG 4.334; Kock, Rh. Mus. 43 [1888] 40 ff.) as a parallel for comic ridicule of the Epicurean term katastikos (p. 165).
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mentioned here: that of Fraenkel cited above and A. Giannini, ‘La figura del cuoco nella commedia greca’, Acme, 13 (1960) 135 ff. Such shortcomings, however, are comparatively few in this useful book, which is likely to be a standard work for many years to come.

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT.
University of Newcastle upon Tyne.


This very exhaustive survey of the manuscript tradition of περὶ ἰρής νοῦς and of the treatment of the text in the earliest editions of the Hippocratic Corpus is presented very much as an enquiry conducted for its own sake. But the natural sequel, an edition by the author, would be a service to scholarship, since in spite of the studies made by Dietz for an edition which he did not live to make, and of later work by Wilamowitz, Regenbogen and Pohlenz, there is still no separate edition of περὶ ἰρής νοῦς.

Rivier’s particular contribution arises from his investigation of the late MS Codex Corinianus 14,10, of s. XV (C), which contains, among much miscellaneous matter, texts of περὶ φιλίας ἀθρόου and of π.ι.ν. from a point in c. 8 (VI. 374-23, Litterre) to the end. C was not used by previous editors and there has never been an adequate discussion of it.

C has many readings in common with θ (Vindobonensis med. gr. 4 of s. X.) our oldest MS of π.ι.ν., which is independent of M (Marcianus gr. 269 of s. XI). M became authoritative for forms and phrases, and so had an influence on late MSS and on editions. But C shares other readings with M against θ, without being of the family of M. Rivier argues for a lost common ancestor of C and M which he calls β, or rather, in respect of its text of π.ι.ν. only, β'. (Superior numerals he uses to denote 'hyparchëtyes', MSS of which only one part is relevant to the text discussed and which may in their full extent be by different hands.) β' would have been a cursive MS.

Further back, now among uncial MSS (to judge by errors of copying which would arise only in this script) β' and θ would have a common ancestor in a MS called α or rather α' for π.ι.ν. only. α is descended from 'Ur-Vaticanus' and this in turn draws ultimately on two sources, the edition of Artemidorus Capito, so much criticised by Galen, and in many places on the lemmata of Galen's Commentaries, though he did not comment on π.ι.ν.

The importance of this is to show that in the transmission of this, as of other medical texts, there is much unacknowledged contact between theoretically separate branches of the tradition. This is to be assumed as much for early MSS as for those later ones which show the influence of the first modern editions, notably of Cornarius' edition of 1538. The text of C has led Rivier into this laborious attempt to trace (if I may borrow a word from anatomy) the anastomosis of this MS tradition. It becomes more than ever necessary not to rely on one or two favourite MSS.

Whether C will bear all this weight of reconstruction is not certain, but the considerable service of the present book remains; to have drawn the full attention of scholars to C, in spite of its late date. A valuable feature is the three elaborate stemmata: on p. 90 the ancestry of C and M and θ, on p. 147 the MS tradition of π.ι.ν., and on p. 168 the pedigree of recentiores and editions. We have now to see what effect these studies will have on any edition which Rivier may later publish of π.ι.ν.

E. D. PHILLIPS.


This is a disappointing and tantalising book, good within its limits. It is an expanded thesis, and reads like it; it consists of refreshingly sensible answers to a series of questions that scarcely deserve the effort and ability spent on them.

The preface encouragingly rejects Quellenforschung as speculative guesswork: 'It is difficult to see what, if anything, is proved by the retailing of the same fact by two ancient historians' (p. 34). Dio's work is his own, not an epitome of his sources; and it is a pity that a 'large proportion' of modern writing about Dio flutters around the candle of source-criticism. But it is easier to protest against a tradition than to escape from it; a long chapter on Dio's method of composition is built upon three examples, Cicero, Brutus and Cassius, Hadrian. It proves the obvious, that Dio was anecdotal, not analytical. But it is surely deference to the Quellenforscher that prompts the conclusion (p. 55) 'Dio's handling of Cicero is a failure', attributable firstly to 'Dio's extensive knowledge of anti-Ciceronian literature' and secondly to the nature of his narrative. Dio can hardly have escaped reading a good deal of Cicero; and it needs no tradition to formulate in the mind of an ancient or modern historian Dio's picture of an inept scholar politician, vain, irresolute, unable to understand the political realities of his day, incapable of acting according to his understanding. Cicero provides evidence enough for his critics as well as his admirers, and judgement is a matter of taste.

So throughout. It is good to read (p. 85) that 'the search for a proto-Dio is futile'; a pity that convention requires several pages of futile search to follow. Again, the discussion of the Maecenas speech is vitiated by a discussion (p. 105) of the 'source or sources' which 'prompted' it. Though M is quite clear that Dio 'alone of imperial writers' put forward 'a coherent plan' to consolidate the 'relations between the Emperor and the ruling class', which failed
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because it was ‘hopelessly reactionary’ (p. 118), it is not at all so clear that the plan consists of a restatement of the administrative practice of the Antonines, modified by a few slight adjustments that seemed sensible to Dio; and that the formal plan was prefixed by a political justification. The partnership of the Emperor and the ‘best men’ is to impose concordia on the ruling class, in order to eliminate the political interference of the mob; ‘the so-called freedom of the masses means the bitterest slavery for the better sort’ (52, 14, 5). This is the stuff of the speech, the bedrock of Dio’s political assumption, recurring again and again in his treatment of Egnatius Rufus, Helvidius Priscus and others, relevant to third-century Rome that was soon to erupt into savage street-fighting. It is no concern of the source-critic; it should have concerned M.

The last long section, the history of Dio’s own time, has a similarly dutiful look. It is a neo-Xiphiline epitome, neither prolongemena to the yet unwritten history of the Severi, nor a study of Dio’s bewilderment in a lifetime of startling change, when ‘the age of gold turned to rusty iron’ (71, 36, 4).

But beneath the façade of trite questions, M. reveals himself as a historian of stature, widely read, and, more important, with a deep insight into the rationale of Roman imperial politics, of the forces that pressed upon emperors, senators and generals. Though the terms of a thesis imprison his ability, M. encourages the hope that his next work will be heavierweight, if he can write about what seems to him to matter, dealing with questions of his own choice. It has been observed before that the hardest part of the historian’s task is putting the questions; finding the answers is by contrast easier. M. look like an historian who is capable of getting his questions right.

JOHN MORRIS.

University College London.


It is interesting to see Diogenes Laertius included in the Oxford Classical Texts, since the series rarely goes outside the range of authors commonly read in schools and universities, and Diogenes is not one of them. His artless lives of the ancient philosophers, which vary in length from a few paragraphs to sixty pages, consist largely of anecdotes and bibliographies: sometimes the composition is so careless that the same anecdote occurs twice in one biography. This results from his habit of copying out two or more sources at length and then failing to revise the material afterwards. But this very habit of copying makes him valuable to the expert in ancient philosophy, since the sources from which he worked were sometimes excellent: they contained among other things an account of Stoic logic and the text of three works of Epicurus, which do not survive elsewhere.

A new edition is welcome; hitherto scholars have had to rely for most parts of the text directly or indirectly on Cobet, who did his work hastily and without enthusiasm, often emending the text too drastically. Owing to the lack of a good apparatus criticus it was not easy to discover what readings are in the manuscripts and what is due to conjecture.

Mr Long has collated afresh all the important manuscripts and examined the others sufficiently to establish that their importance consists merely in the few corrections of the text that they offer: so he may fairly be said to have put the text on a firm basis for the first time. Another merit of his edition is that it has a separate apparatus for testimonia and quotations from fragmentary authors, which is a great convenience to the reader. In the index nominum heavy type indicates passages where Diogenes refers to his sources.

In all this Mr Long has done good work. But there are shortcomings to his book. The chief of these is that he does not always display good judgment in deciding whether to print emendations in the apparatus criticus. Though the apparatus mentions many emendations that must have cost a great deal of effort to assemble, it omits others which have a strong claim to inclusion and must have been known to the editor. For example at 6.99 ἀντιπόρτεμος δ’ αἰτῶν, where Wilamowitz (Hellenistische Dichtung 1.60 n.2) proposed δὲ ζῶν and expressed surprise at the use of ἀντιπόρτος in this context, Long does not mention this emendation; yet his apparatus reports a variant ἀντιπόρτος from FP, which appears to make the conjecture certain. At 4.48 there is no mention of H. Richards’ proposal ἀπετόων for ἐκτόων of the MSS (C. R. xvi [1902] 395); elsewhere Richards gets less than his due, e.g. 2.27 his transposition Λυκέδαμονι ον καὶ Ἀβρόωνον (Xenophon and others, pp. 55-6), and though some of his suggestions in C.R. xviii (1904) 340-6 are recorded or adopted, I feel that Long would have done well to give more of them.

Some other criticisms:

(a) It is a mistake to use the siglum co for one of the MSS frequently cited in conjunction with the sigla c and o for other MSS rarely cited: the reader is not told how he is to interpret co when it appears in the apparatus.

(b) In the preface, after pointing out that all MSS share the lacuna at the end of book 7, Long continues (p. vii): ‘codex B litteras uncielas, spiritus angulares, scripturam continuam passim praebet, ex quo concluad potest archetypum ante saeculum nonum vix scriptum esse’. I cannot follow the connexion of thought here. Just after this, in the list of readings quoted to show that the tradition is already contaminated by the date of the three earliest MSS, I noticed some trivialities that would have been better omitted; but there is no doubt that a long list of readings can be assembled from the apparatus to prove the point.

(c) Though the paper and the arrangement of the text on the page are first-class, the proof-reading has
been careless. There are over fifty misprints; most of these can be corrected by the reader without difficulty, but there is one that is more serious: at 2.108, after the quotation from comedy, the text omits without trace the sentence: ἔριξε γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ Ἡμοσθῆνας ἄκηκοινα, καὶ Ρομπίκινους ἔνα παιδεύχαι. This sentence appears to be a genuine part of the text, and without being able to check the primary MSS I have verified that it occurs at any rate in the fourteenth century MS Arundel 531 in the British Museum (incidentally this casts doubt on Meineke’s conjecture, adopted by Long, in the last line of the comic fragment).

To sum up: this is a useful book, but it is very much to be hoped that there will soon be a revised and corrected edition.

Nigel G. Wilson.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

Rochefort excels in the handling of the philosophic and religious material, but statements upon the historical background tend towards rashness. The alleged ‘burning of Antioch by Theodosius in 387’ (p. vii) seems to be a muddled echo of Thessalonika, and it throws some suspicion upon his argument for the dating of the archetype of Julian. Identification of the prefect Anatolius with Julian’s magister officiorum (p. 69) is an inherited error (cf. Loeb, Ammianus, Vol. i, p. 549) and ignores the prefect’s death (xxvi. 6, 5). He is, however, correct in stressing the unity of these four essays and their importance in the sequence of events anterior to the openly anti-Christian legislation of June A.D. 362. While overtly expressions of Julian’s conception of politics, philosophy and religion, they also reveal something of the hardening attitudes and pressures leading to the abandonment of toleration. Rochefort’s presentation does much to set this portion of Julian’s career in perspective. In the ‘Letter to Theonistius’ Julian parts company with his mentor. The monarch appears as οὐκ ἔφεσα δυνατόν but as ‘the servant and guardian of the laws’ (261 a), a man of action as well as theory. Reason and order are the themes of the diatribes against the Cynics and, associated with them, the Christians, marking an orderly closing of the ranks of Hellenism against such anti-social and irreligious beliefs. The oration on the Mother of the Gods, with its syncretism and mysticism, illumines the faith whereby he directs his path through life. Julian behaves as no mere visionary ascetic, but as the energetic promoter of a considered programme of social rehabilitation, and this point is well brought out by Rochefort.

One criticism remains. Despite the editor’s labours to produce a definitive text, on the evidence of this volume urgent consideration must be given to the question of proof reading. In the text there are a score of misprints, and of a quality that dams them. Four (217 d 5, 230 d 1, 175 b 1, 175 b 6) are confusions of ζ and η, five (234 c 3, 230 b 5, 239 a 7, 116 a 5, 176 a 3) interchange ζ and δ, three (205 c 6, 228 c 1, 163 a 6) mishandle the letter λ, and two (228 b 4, 224 b 8) omicron. Three misprints occur in six lines on p. 76 and such repeated carelessness contrasts oddly with the care Rochefort has taken to establish his text. In proof and print he has been deplorably ill-used.

A. F. Norman.

University of Hull.

Pp. 105. öS. 96.

It is sad but true that a large number of entries in the etymological dictionaries of Greek are marked ‘unexplained’, ‘obscure’, ‘of unknown origin’, etc.
Most of these are rare words in Greek, often recorded only in glossaries and therefore suspect as mutilated either orally or textually; but there are some common words too without satisfactory etymology (e.g. θάλασσα, παων, ἔνοος, βασιλεύς). It is possible that a few have unrecognized cognates in I.-E.; but the majority must be loan-words from other languages.

How far is it possible to reconstruct a language from loan-words? Not at all, unless it belongs to a well-known family, and then only partially on a phonological basis, for nothing of the morphology can show through. Moreover, the phonological system of the language may have been transformed by the process of borrowing, so that the reflexes postulated belong not to the reconstructed language itself, but to a mixture of two separate processes. It would be interesting to see the result of reconstructing English phonology from the loan-words in Japanese.

If the language is not only unknown, but does not belong to a familiar group, the task is manifestly impossible. Hence all attempts to explain the loan-words in Greek must start from the assumption that the language in question belongs to a known family. Moreover, the I.-E. family contains such a wide range of monosyllabic roots and optional affixes, that granted complete freedom to devise a transformational pattern almost any language can be made to yield some plausible results.

We establish the I.-E. origin of a language partly by explaining a high proportion of its vocabulary by means of a single set of reflexes, but also by observing the presence of at least traces of the I.-E. system of morphology. If we can pick and choose among the elements to be explained, and may also neglect the morphology, it may be doubted whether the results have any real validity, spurious though they appear.

Dr Merlingen has already presented us with a new I.-E. language to explain some of the unetymologised vocabulary of Greek (see 'Das 'Vorgriechische', und die sprachwissenschaftlich-vorhistorischen Grundlagen', Vienna, 1955, and 'Zum 'Vorgriechischen', in Linguistique Balkanique 4 (1962), 25-55, and 5 (1962) 5-44; this 'Akhaisch', as he calls it, has some affinity with the Pelasgian of van Windekens and the Vorgriechisch of Georgiev, but it is a satem language. Since this hypothesis will not satisfy more than a fraction of the obscure words, Dr Merlingen now devises a second I.-E. language, of the centum type, to account for some of the remainder. This he names provisionally 'Psigreisch', since the sound shift *p>ps is regarded as a leading characteristic.

The whole of this publication is devoted to establishing the phonology of this imaginary language. The immense learning and ingenuity which have gone into it leave one astonished; several hundred Greek words are, with more or less plausibility, traced to I.-E. roots by means of the complicated system of phonetic rules established. It is impossible to do more than select one or two for comment.

Ξανθύς is recorded by Firk as 'unerklärt'; Lat. cànum is tempting from the point of view of sense, but offers insuperable phonetic difficulties. Merlingen now proposes the shifts *k>z, *d>b, thus making it possible to connect ξανθύς with Lat. cand-tus, cand-idus. The semantic connexion is possible, and the sound shifts are supported by other examples (ξενος > *kom, ὕπνος > *ep, ἀγων > *andr-; cf. ἀνόητης > *andr-eik-, cf. Lat. lūtica, etc.).

Διόνυσος is traced to *dion-on-oi, a participial formation from a verb with the base *dei-i- 'sehen, schauen' > 'leuchten'. This enables him to associate it with Δίος and Lat. Dīsna, cf. also Θείον. The one clear fact about this word, that it is a compound of Δίος (Zeus), which is confirmed by Myc. di-ou-nu-jo, is thrown aside with the remark that w in Myc. is, 'wie ibilich', to block the hiatus. I know of no instance of Myc. w. used to block a hiatus; it occurs as a glide after u (e.g. ku-wa-no = kínavo; if this is not merely preserved in borrowing, cf. Hitt. kawanna(n); e-nu-ou-ri-jo = 'Ernaunos'); but after other vowels seems to be always original. Since Merlingen postulates loss of I.-E. *h between vowels, this is a severe obstacle, for he elsewhere uses the absence of w from Myc. words to prove their derivation from Psigreek: θεός (Myc. te-o) > *deinos and λαίας (cf. Myc. adj. ra-e-o) > *lēv-

ἐβερε is traced to 'ph-, dies mit den ersten zwei Lauten zu W[ald]- [P]okorny II 68 περ-, πην- 'Sтаub, Sand' and is connected with ψίμπω; 'aus pmn- (pum-). Here we are dealing with a hypothetical suffix attached to a root too short for satisfactory definition.

Those with a taste for the miraculous will follow Merlingen through 100 pages of similar etymologies, which will convey at least an impression of his immense ingenuity. But most of us will stick at the assertion on p. 7 that 'so könnte man etwa Teile des Anglonormannischen (Lateinischen usw.) aus dem Englischen rekonstruieren, des Lateinischen aus allen abendländischen Sprachen, des Kirchslavischen aus dem Rumänischen usw.' Perhaps an even better analogy would be the reconstruction of Hindi from the Anglo-Indian loan-words in English like tiffin, chukker, cummerbund, etc., without of course making use of Sanskrit. It might prove an instructive exercise.

Institute for Research in the Humanities, University of Wisconsin.


The Greek relatives have not been so fully treated before now. There has been a fair amount of activity in the field, but either dealing with the problem of the relative as an IE onyma, or else in Greek directed particularly to the Homeric stage. We can therefore extend a welcome to this wider survey. It is based on a thorough and judicious survey of a great quantity of material. We might,
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however, at the risk of seeming ungrateful, desire more extensive use of prose authors; for, while verse is well represented (down to the three tragedians and Aristophanes), only Herodotus and Lysias are examined intensively in prose.

In the introduction some general questions are broached. Here the most important point to emerge is the wide variety, evident in the other IE languages as well as in Greek, which affected both the forms used and their functions. The stem *yo- of the principal Greek relative δς appears elsewhere as a relative also; but we cannot conclude that it had this function in IE. The development belongs rather to the individual languages.

The main body of Monteill's work falls into three sections. The first explores the ways in which the uses of the relative were constituted, by examining the relevant uses of δ, η, τό and δς, η, δ first in Homer and then in Herodotus. The two stems were at markedly different stages of development in Epic: δς, which had behind it some Mycenaean use (ο- and io-, also o-te), was already well established, but δ (stem *Io-, *Io-) had not advanced much from the status of an anaphoric pronoun. In Herodotus the stem *Io- had largely taken over from *yo-, but with the interesting exception (in addition to the nominatives δς, η, οί, αί) that δς was used after dissyllabic, elidable prepositions, and Monteill gives a good account of this (p. 93). The contrast of the Epic and Herodotean stages is the chief concern of the first section, and provides a good idea of the working of two functional systems. However, it is a consequence of this treatment that we do not get such a balanced and continuous view of the history of δς as we are later given for δος and other relative forms.

The complex forms δς τό, δοτς and δστερ are dealt with in the second section, as well as derived forms such as δοτρος, οτος, δος. With the first three there is the problem of finding the special nature of the relative which will give the clue to its further history and its relations with possible rival forms. δς τό requires discussion of the meaning of τό (pp. 107–12): Monteill finds its basic sense that of integration, from which he derives for δς τό the timeless or permanent aspect. δος is the most important, and that not only because of its considerable extension. Its use as a definite relative seems already close in Homer, and thereafter is of course well established. Monteill thinks that δος had a defining value from the start: one may doubt this, but the point requires fuller treatment than can be given here. He relies on this defining sense to explain the semantic development of δος, which in turn is taken to account for the increased use of δος at the expense of δς. But other reasons may be thought of, to which at least equal weight could be given: both the greater ‘body’ of dissyllabic δος, and the general instability of boundaries between the uses of all the relative pronouns (with which we can include both δ and τις).

On the formal side there is a useful account of the way in which Greek set up the system that is observably in the series οις, ποιος, ὁποιος, τοιος, among others.

Finally Monteill turns to the elaborate system of conjunctions built on the relative stems, which make up the greater part of the remarkable total of seventy-four forms used either as relative pronouns or as conjunctions taken from their stems (p. 393). The chief are δε, δος, δευς, and the temporal forms. In each case there is a discussion of the form, then analysis of the use treated historically, in the course of which there emerges much of interest. The general conclusion is reached (pp. 398 ff.) that in Greek of the fifth century the system of conjunctions had become more closely structured: the excessive number of forms and of varieties of use, which were characteristic of the earliest stage, had now given way to a somewhat more coherent and limited system. But it was still one of great complexity, with differences between dialects and between authors. The next task that faces us will be to trace the simplification which occurred in the period after that covered by Monteill, and for this he provides the necessary background.

University College, Swansea.

A. C. Moorhouse.


This is the second in the series of metrical studies published under the direction of Bruno Gentili. It takes up the κυκλικά which as a technical term (whether noun or adjective) and a metrical category in modern metric arises from a misunderstood passage in Dion. Hal. Comp. Verb. 17, who is talking in terms not of metric but of stylistic criticism, κυκλικά should be related to words like στρόφυλος, ἐπιτρόφυλος elsewhere in Dion., referring to the rhetorical ‘tempo’ in which such fluid and unimpeded rhythms could be delivered; this is essentially the position of Goodell, Chapters on Greek Metric, 1901. The history of various forms of misunderstanding is recounted: the ‘cyclic dactyl’ and the ‘logaoedic’ categories of the Westphal-school (now almost extinct), Hermann’s use of the passage to explain why the long of a dactyl cannot be resolved, with Maas’s addition of a way to distinguish between an apparent adonean as dactyl (with slightly shortened long) and as anaepst (with full long), Fraenkel’s ‘rising dactyls’ in Stesichorus, and Wiifströnd’s adjustment of full long in some anaepsts by the coincidence of metron-end and word-end, with its slight consequent pause. All these authors have erred in trying to extract a technical sense from Dion.’s stylistic remarks.

Much of this thesis is an expansion of the arguments of Koster, Traité IV 21, p. 82–5. In answer to both authors it may be said that the wholly illegitimate use of the Dion. passage by the ‘logaoedic’ school (well demonstrated by Rossi) is quite different from
the way it is taken up by Hermann—Maas—Fraenkel—Witfstrand, who, while realising that Dion. exhibits all the woolliness of thought inevitable in an attempt to combine prose and verse-rhythms in the same discussion, recognise a significant metrical core in the doctrine of the 'rhythmicians' whom he quotes. We have not exhausted all that metric knows or needs to know when we assign a long or a short syllable to a metrical pattern on paper; much of the enormous complexity of Greek metrical usage can only be understood in terms of performance, of what was audible to a sensitive Greek ear, or visible to an audience, and this we have to endeavour to reconstruct—a laborious process of inference for which authors like Dion. give us an occasional clue. It is not very helpful to distinguish in such passages between metrical on the one band and critica stilistica on the other. Dion. himself did not make any clear distinction between the two; it is simply that, as with all his contemporaries, his concepts of metrical analysis were inadequate: thus in Comp. Verb. 20 he rambles on and on about the rhythm of the stone of Sisyphus (l 598) and yet misses the crucial metrical point of the reiterated caesura between the two shorts of the meter which causes the stylistic 'bounciness' of the line. What the modern metricians in question are seeking to do is not to anchor their theories to a theory of Dion. or his sources but to utilise the facts of Greek apprehension which seem to underlie his pronouncements and show how these may account for objective metrical phenomena which they themselves have observed.

A. M. DALE.

London.


An index of the Linear B tablets is an indispensable tool for all engaged in the study of Mycenaean Greek. The only such index was E. L. Bennett's A Minoan Linear B Index published in 1953, which has not only become out of date with the large increase in material since then, but was entirely in Linear B script. A new index in transcription was long overdue, and this has now been admirably executed by Mrs A. Morpurgo Davies, and printed with appropriate accuracy in the series of Incunabula Graeca produced by the University of Rome's Centro di studi micenei under the direction of Professor C. Gallavotti.

Each word is printed in roman transcription in accordance with international convention, the state of the text is carefully represented by the use of dotted letters and square brackets, and the references are listed. But this would be only an index; what justifies the title Lexicon is the addition, in Latin, of a description of the context, such definition of the words as is possible on this evidence, and a note of generally accepted interpretations, with references to the literature. It is not of course a complete index of interpretations proposed. Mrs Davies is extremely cautious, and we read all too often 'vis verbis obscura'.

For instance, s.v. ta-to-mo, she uses this formula and continues: 'in PY Cn-vulgo gr. στάθμος confertur, sed adject. vel substant. ad oves spectans videtur'. Now στάθμος is a noun relating to sheep, for in Homer it often means a building used for sheep, a sheep-station or the like (e.g. Π 18 598). Secondly, ta-to-mo occurs in PY Vn 46, which, though Mrs Davies does not recognise the fact, is a list of building materials; what Greek word means a place where sheep are kept and a constructional member? The coincidence that στάθμος also has this second meaning 'standing-post, pillar' (e.g. Od. 1 333) is so striking that this identification can be regarded as among the most certain in Mycenaean.

But it would be wrong to give the impression that excessive caution is here a bad thing; this Lexicon would have been much less use and far more tiresome if more interpretations had been included. Two minor problems that confront the compiler of such an index are alphabetisation and the treatment of incomplete words. Mrs Davies has treated each sign as a separate entity, and consequently words beginning with $a_{1} or a_{2} (= a_{i})$ are found at the end of the section devoted to $a$; in this she differs from the order used in the Vocabulary of Documents or the Glossary of L. R. Palmer's Interpretation. It is not of much importance, but an international agreement on this point might save time. Incomplete words which cannot safely be restored are little problem; they must be inserted in their alphabetical place with brackets to show they are incomplete; the use of hyphens between syllables is helpful here. But where they can be certainly or probably restored, should they be indexed as restored or incomplete? The only satisfactory answer is to repeat them in either place, and this Mrs Davies has generally done; but where there is no doubt whatever of the restoration, she has omitted to index the incomplete form (e.g. [ti-ni-ja-ue-jo] PY Ep 617 14 is indexed only under po-li-ni-ja-ue-jo); for some purposes it would be desirable to have all such cases noted. Similar principles have governed the indexing of decensional forms under a single lemma; but here cross-references seem always to have been inserted.

It is unfortunate that any work on Mycenaean Greek is likely to be out of date by the time it is printed; new tablets are still being found, and although the texts of the Pylos and Mycenaean tablets are well established, work on the Knossos tablets continues, and additions and alterations are constantly being made. So far as possible new material and the results of joins were communicated to Mrs Davies so that she was able to incorporate these in advance of publication. Only the tablets published in BSA 58 (1963) pp. 68 88 have been omitted, and these are fully indexed in the article mentioned. Altogether this is an indispensable tool for all interested in Mycenaean
Greek, and we must be grateful to the compiler and publishers for the care and good judgment which have gone into its making.

JOHN CHADWICK.

Institute for Research in the Humanities,
University of Wisconsin.

LEJEUNE (M.) Index inverse du Grec mycéenien.

Professor Lejeune’s new book is a reverse index (on the model for instance of the German Rückläufige Wörterbücher) covering all the words or fragments of words written in the Linear B documents of Knossos, Pylos and Mycenae, or inscribed on the sherds of Thebes, Eleusis and Tiryns. The index itself lists the words without indicating their origin or their contexts, and without any attempt at interpretation; for all this the reader is referred to the Mycenaen Graecitatis Lexicon [MGL] published by this reviewer in 1963. The usefulness of the book is obvious; Professor Lejeune himself (p. 11) points out its utility for any research in grammatical flexion, derivation, composition, etc., but, apart from these purely linguistic purposes, Mycenologists will find its assistance invaluable in the primary task of editing documents, of restoring sentences or words, of joining fragments, etc.

All the words and variæ lectioës reported in MGL are listed in the index, with the sole exception of the fragmentary words consisting of a single syllable, which form a separate section in MGL (pp. 378-86) and which are not repeated here. Moreover, the book contains a few corrections to MGL (first set out in the introduction and then entered in the index), including some words (mostly fragmentary) belonging to texts published after the date of MGL. Such additions are also listed in direct alphabetical order in a separate section (‘Appendix I: Suppléments à MGL’; pp. 95–6): any reader of MGL should now be induced to insert them at the appropriate points in his copy of the book. The volume is completed by a second appendix, which, by means of two word-lists, provides the reader with the full evidence for the signs still undeciphered and for those (like a₂, pte etc.) which do not fit in the normal syllabic system of Linear B. In this connexion it is interesting to notice that Professor Lejeune’s complete acceptance of the syllabic values adopted in MGL involves some slight deviation from the standard transliteration recommended by the III International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies (1961): in particular the sign *a₃ is transliterated a₂ (and not ai), the sign *66 (lb₂) is not transliterated, and a new sign *91 (with the value tae) is added to the syllabary, in accordance with a conclusion reached independently by Professor Lejeune himself and by Professor Palmer (see MGL, p. xii).

The success of a work like the one under review rests as much on the fullness of the information provided as on the clarity of its arrangement. Whoever uses the volume even for a short while will have no reason to call the former in question. The latter depends, obviously enough, on the solution of a number of small problems which, however trivial, have their importance in the final result. Any lexicographer should be grateful to the author of this book for having had the courage to set out these problems in the introduction and to outline the reasons which have induced him to adopt one solution rather than another. For my part I find no ground for disagreement with any of these decisions; more critical readers will at least know what they have to quarrel with.

The book has been written and published with remarkable speed: less than a year separates its date of publication from that of MGL. Even so the reader should be warned that the progress of Mycenaean studies will oblige him to do some additional work before using either the Index or MGL: a few weeks after the Index, the Knossos tablets were published in a third revised edition including a large number of new readings (Chadwick and Killen, The Knossos Tablets, 2 BICS Suppl. No. 15, London 1964; see now the preliminary list of Addenda to MGL prepared by J. Chadwick and announced in Nestor, 1964, p. 361), while the last months of 1964 have seen the publication of a new fragment from Knossos (Chadwick, Nestor, 1964, p. 353) and of a recently excavated tablet from Thebes (Kadmou, iii [1964], pp. 27–8, abb. 9, but see also Nestor, 1964, p. 361).

ANNA MORPURGO DAVIES.

OXFORD.


This volume, ‘conceived’ in 1956 but completed in 1962 only, aims at presenting the new evidence of the Linear B tablets and showing what conclusions can be drawn from it. The resulting picture is of the greatest importance to all interested in Early Greece. The author does not set out to present an ‘agreed’ view; on the contrary. He has written an intensely personal book, in which the reader is introduced to the most controversial issues in very great detail. In challenging the views of others, and establishing his own, the author insists time and again on the importance of method—methodology is his favourite word—which, I should think, often has the effect that the reader becomes suspicious. Nevertheless, let me state at the outset that it is good to have between two covers the views of one of the protagonists of Mycenaean studies, especially as the author has been able to take account of evidence that has come to light since the publication of Documents. I also believe that, if only the author could refrain from repeating untiringly that his ‘method’ is scientific, in fact the only scientific
approach, and would be content with presenting a more or less cogent, or persuasive, picture, fellow-workers would be much less put out by what seems to them an exaggerated claim often based on rather dubious argument, and much readier to listen to him. But no matter how one 'feels' about the author, this is an important book and will have to be consulted by those working in this field on any question that interests them.

The main section of the book (pp. 113–379) presents the texts, with a more or less detailed commentary, often, but not always, with a translation. Not all the texts contained in Documents are given, on the other hand texts discovered since are amply used. The results obtained in this section are summarised in the 'Introduction' (1–110). The rest of the book is taken up with a Bibliography (381–402), Glossary (403–66, it 'comments on every extant Linear B word'), an Index to the tablets utilised (474–9), and Addenda (483–8). If the book went to press in October 1962 (p. V), it is difficult to understand the absence from the bibliography of such works as Nadja van Brock, Notes mycénienes, RPh 34, 1960, 216–31; Recherches sur le vocabulaire médical du grec ancien, 1961; P. Ilievski, The abl., instr. and loc. in the oldest Greek texts, 1961; the second part of Milewski's study (on Mycenaean names) in Lingua Posnaniensis 8, 1960, 146–82; Morpurgo, Il genitivo mycenico, Rendiconti Lincei 8/15, 1960, 33–61; L'esito delle nasali sonanti in mycenico, ibid. 321–56; Szemerényi, The origin of the name Lakedaimon, Glotta 38, 1959, 14–17.

The Introduction gives of course more than a summary of the results of the main section. The first, 'epigraphical', chapter rather briefly (1–4) discusses the finds and the shapes of the tablets, and then proceeds to discuss the system of classification adopted for the tablets, together with the system of ideograms, and only after a preliminary elucidation of the system of measures does it arrive at the syllabic signs, where again the bulk of the inventory is simply presented as generally accepted while the remaining, often disputed, cases are discussed at some length. I am not so sure as to what kind of reader is aimed at. As a beginner, but perhaps even as a moderately advanced student, I should find the ideograms most baffling: no attempt is made to explain why an ideogram should be given one significance rather than another. (And it is as well to remember that even the decipherers slipped up on some at the beginning.) The ideal is to my mind achieved in L. Derry's admirable Initiation à l'épigraphie mycénienne (Rome, 1962) where the information is given in the proper sequence and depth so that the beginner can really assimilate matters as he goes along.

A brief exposition of the Spelling Rules is followed by a consideration of the Principles of Interpretation, where the author, quite rightly, stresses the need for the combinatoric method, and by a brief survey of the Mycenaean Language. With the keys in our hands, we are now ready to open up the secrets of the land (The Geographical Setting), of its inhabitants (Personal Names), the way their society was organised into a feudal hierarchy, and what they lived by (Economy, Religion). The section is appropriately concluded with a discussion of the Final Catastrophe that turned all this glory into a rubble heap—to be discovered more than 3,000 years later.

Most of Professor Palmer's views on these varied topics have been known from a large number of articles but especially from that admirably lucid work of vulgarisation, Mycenaens and Minoans (London, 1961), apparently not reviewed in this journal. But it is only in the present work that one gets a comprehensive view of the author's doctrine. One pervasive feature is the growing number of gods and of people said to be connected with some religious service. The brief summing up of Mycenaean religion (p. 103, half a page!) gives, in addition to gods of Classical Greece, not only the 'Two Queens' and the 'Lord' at Pylos, the 'Lady of Labyrinths' and the 'Lady of Athana' in Crete, but also the more shadowy, and very uncertain 'Dove', 'Stallion' and 'Serpent'. To find the latter in o-pi is, in view of the etymology of 'ogwHis to my mind impossible; the form (dative?) would also need some justification. Themis, who for some reason has been omitted at p.103, appears elsewhere in the book, but so does a new goddess, Opa, interpreted as 'Omph, p. 278, incredible, in spite of, or especially because of, Empedocles' 'Ompolh. And no more credible are the Dipsoi, whether as 'The Thirsty Ones' or as 'The Dead', whose emergence cannot be said to be due to strict methodology. The only fact—if one accepts Palmer's interpretation about recipients—is that Dipsoi are entities worshipped at Pylos. But the rest is pure speculation triggered off by an etymological interpretation; Dipsoi must be == 0p0 which the author so rightly dislikes in others.

Religious and economic phenomena are treated with constant reference to the Ancient Near East. This approach is wholly admirable. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the Asiatic parallels themselves are not always all that clear. Thus the new matere teija is said (p. 257) to be self-evidently 'to the divine mother', who corresponds with Hittite sittaniannis 'mother of god'; since this is the title of a priestess (!), possibly connected with the queen, it is deduced that the title refers to the queen of Pylos. But we should note that this is a purely Hittite, not Mesopotamian, title, possibly translated from 'Cappadocian' (Kronasser, Lingua Posn. 9, 1962, 35; Etymologie der hethitischen Sprache 2, 1963, 125 f.). The situation is complicated, not clarified, by the Lycian eni manahah quoted (p. 484); this is obviously from Luvian annis massanatis 'mother of god', but she is a goddess, not a priestess.

In the secular sphere, too, the author rightly points to the obvious, and important, parallels offered by the contemporary Near East. They are certainly much more important than the long alleged Germanic parallels, which are now rather more cautiously adduced, although the 'linguistic gate of Gothic'
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(p. 189) has still not disappeared. But the ‘parallels’ are sometimes unchecked. Hittite taksannas (189) is not the word for ‘commercial land’. The proper form of the word is the nom. taksatar (taksannas is the gen.), and its meaning was even for Friedrich's Wörterbuch (1954) ‘Vereinigung’ (?), Gemeinschaft’ (?). Thanks to Laroche (BSL 58, 1963, 68) we now know that it is simply ‘plaine’, and the verb taks- is not ‘zuteilen’, as Palmer thinks, but expresses the notion of ‘arrangement, accord, combinaison, adaptation, conformité’ (i.e., 65 f.).

As a philologist, this reader naturally read with particular interest the sections or comments on the language of the tablets. The fragmentary character of our evidence may excuse the method of presenting isolated statements about pronouns, verbs, etc., but, surely, with the noun at least, a more systematic treatment, even full paradigms, such as are given by Deroy, would have been desirable. It is surprising that the morphology of the noun is discussed without any clear statement about the case-system of Mycenaean. The instrumental, one of the outstanding archaisms of the Mycenaean noun, is only mentioned in connexion with the plural (48 f.), and we are not told whether the author thinks that there was one in the singular as well, although ekamate, when contrasting with ekamapi, surely represents -e, and not a datival -ei, let alone a locative -i; in the Syntax (58) all these are treated as varieties of the dative.

The author is sometimes carried away and beyond the facts by some pet notion. His desire to avoid the interpretation of perce as φεῖσε, and his wish to see in it a passive aorist makes him assert (p. 266) that ‘an aorist passive -φησί is attested for post-Myct. Greek in compounds such as ἐκαρπάζω, ἐκαρφέσας, cf. imperative ἐκαρπές’. In fact, nothing of the kind is attested. If the passages, or LΣJ, had been consulted, it would have been easy to see that all these forms are active, and in all probability (see Schneider, Griech. Gram. I 68g) have nothing to do with φεῖσο. Likewise, his wish to interpret ἔκανε to ἔκομεν as verbal forms leads the author to rather surprising analyses (52, 63, 205 f.): τοῦ is a jussive aorist ἔκομεν, ἔκομες, etc. In such an analysis, the inf. ἔκκομεν, which is in use in Mycenaean times. And why is the prescriptive in the present, when the jussive is of the aorist? None of these points is raised, let alone answered.

Another point of word-formation concerns the interpretation (251) of reketeroteriœ: the first part, rekêr-, cannot be a dual (lekêer-), see Lejeune, La parola del passato 87, 1962, 418 f. The interpretation of owex as ôf(f)/ôfëxs (344) is rather puzzling. If h from IE *s survived in Mycenaean in intervocalic position (as is held at p. 44) we should find o-w-e- to indicate ouho(h). Moreover, the suffix -wënt would be added to the stem, so that we would have o-w-e-wënt, i.e. ôhêhêfë, from *osês-wënt. It is still best to look for ‘ear, handle’ in the end-part -owe (≈ -ôfës), whatever the explanation of the initial part.

This brings us to the field of phonology. The interpretation of wêpða as wêk-pêza (51) is surely precluded by the spelling rules (cf. ponkîpi for -kîp). But even if a wêk-pêza could be admitted, it would be from *weeks-pêza like the ἐκσαρεῖς quoted (cf. also deketo from *dek-Ô-tô), and wekâdîa cannot be equated with ἐξσαρεῖα (see Szemerényi, Synopse in Greek and Indo-European, Naples 1964, 119 and 406). As to the sonant nasal, the statement (41) that we find ‘in medial and final syllables . . . an o-vowel in all (!) the sonants attested’ is both exaggerated and misleading. As was shown by Dr Morpurgo (Oc.), even in Mycenaean the normal development of ëm is a; 0 is found in a small number of words only: amû, anaosato, areçoto (?), ençepêza, arepazo (but also areçpazo, arepate), and pemo (but also pema), as against the 3rd decl. acc. -ai(s): arepás, ekamate, arepâsia, karaapi, and the deviation is clearly due to the preceding labial or labialised sound. The view (p. 175) that mazan must be mylæan cannot be seriously entertained until it is shown how z can be connected with the later sound; and how can one rule out a formation in -id- (cf. Paktjan-?)?

But Palmer’s major original contribution to Mycenaean phonology is his palatalisation theory (36 f.). Alternative spellings like râg/ti-ja, ta/ti-ja prompted the suggestion that Mycenaean possessed palatalised sounds (r, t, d . . .). On the strength of alternations between ze and ke, etc., it was suggested that the z-signs were in fact palatalised k, g, not the later dz/žd, and this seemed to be confirmed by such spellings as su-za = suolai (i.e. suk’ai), ai-za = aiopia, ka-zo-ε = kaikoeç, ka-za = kaikia; and so for zaçete a kauçete ‘this year’ (Doric σάεσε, Ion. σηεσε, Att. τηεσε) was assumed. These facts were interpreted as indicating a palatalised set of consonants (p’, b’, t’, d’ . . .) while the signs dava dava tava tava, etc., were used to establish a contrasting set of labialised consonants.

The existence of plain: palatalised: labialised sets to the neglect of the Greek contrasts voiced: voiceless: aspirate then led to the conclusion that the syllabary was created for a non-IE language.

This hypothesis, seemingly so simple, is fraught with great difficulties. It is assumed, for instance, that the spelling topëza (Att. τόπεςα) has final -gya, not -dza. Since the physiologically normal development is from gy to ðy and, similarly, y can be reinforced to ðy but not to gy, one would naturally like to be given instances of the reverse process so readily assumed. In the absence of such evidence the identity of the original consonants ðy gy surely means that gy must have reached a stage where it was (or could be regarded as) identical with the development of ðy. Since the development from ty is indicated by Myc. s, while ðy is represented by z signs, the solution must be sought along the lines indicated by Lejeune, Minos, 6, 1960, 87–137. But one important consequence of this solution is that forms like suza kazoe can no longer be interpreted as containing ky, the
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allegro-form of kiy. They must be taken as having
reached the affricate-stage tf/j/N. If in later times
kakion appears and not *kakion, the explanation is
that the latter was replaced by the clearer type just as
thetaion was replaced by teyion, etc.; but at an earlier
date the 'regular' forms existed.

But the whole background to this hypothesis
appears less and less sound. If Lejeune's view (BSL
59/2, 1964, 76), that pu₂ is only used for later qo,
should prove true, then the syllabary had a special
sign for one aspirate at least, and we know already
that there was a special sign for one voiced sound, too.
It can no longer be maintained that the Aegean ear
was deaf to the essential Greek differences, at least
not on the strength of the syllabary. Perhaps even
more important is to realise that the alleged labialisation
is not a fact but was simply invented as a corollary
to the palatalisation which is a fact, though in a
rather different sense from that meant by Palmer.
Early Greek had a par excellence palatalised system
of consonants as has been emphasised recently by
several scholars independently (Stang, Symbolae
Olsenens 93, 1957, 27-36; Diver, Word 14, 1958, 1-24;
Allen, Lingua 7, 1958, 113-33). But this was no
more due to the influence of a substratum than the
corresponding development of Latin during the Late
Empire. If the syllabary reveals a palatalised system,
than was due to the Greek system being heavily
palatalised. And if it is rightly assumed that Linear
B was invented on the mainland (not in Crete any-
way), then the corollary must be that it was invented
by scribes attuned to the Greek phonological system.

OSWALD SZEMERÉNYI.

University College London.

PALMER (L. R.) and BOARDMAN (J.) On the
Knossos tablets. (The find-places of the
Knossos tablets. By L. R. P. The date of
the Knossos tablets. By J. B.) 2 vols. in 1.
xxviii + 255, xi + 101. 4 plans. 31, 17 plates.
7, 17 text figures. Index. £4 10s.

It is good at last to have a full publication of the
differing views of Professor Palmer and Mr Boardman
on the date of the Knossos tablets. The rather
sensational way in which the controversy started and
continued has made it difficult to assess the real
merits of the conflicting views: whether Evans was
correct in dating the Linear B tablets at Knossos to
about 1400 (Boardman) or whether they belong to
the Late Minoan IIIA period some 200 years later
(Palmer). Even now, however, one great difficulty
remains in the path of the student, if not the specialist,
of Aegean pre-history. The arguments have become
so detailed that few except those closely familiar with
the layout of the Palace and with the reports of its
evacuation can be expected to master a great deal of
this book. And yet, it would be regrettable if this
were to result in a belief that the problem was too
complex to grasp in its essentials or that the basic facts
were too much in doubt to warrant a verdict. For
this reason the present review will concentrate on the
main issues at stake and on the methods employed to
deal with them.

A first requirement is to disentangle from the mass
of detailed argumentation, much of which is not very
relevant, the essentials of the problem, which like the
Palace building itself must be looked at as a whole.
It has long been evident that the spread of tablets
throughout large areas of the Palace implies that the
catastrophe, to which they owe their preservation,
was a general one and was not limited to a few iso-
lated parts of the building. This is in accord with
Palmer's opinion that all the tablets are contemporary
(p. 171). From the fact that these tablets were left
laying around, it follows that any subsequent reoccupa-
tion of the building must have been superficial and
limited. So it can be assumed that the archives
belong to a time when the building as a whole was in
use and that they were preserved by a conflagration
which ended occupation of the building as a palatial
residence. Furthermore, the Palace, in its final
form, with its pottery, frescoes, stone vases, seals,
sealings and other furnishings must as a whole belong
basically to one period, be it around 1400 or around
1200 B.C.

It seems that these fundamentals were not imme-
 diately apparent to Palmer, for they are not specifi-
cally faced until an appendix on page 241, and then in
parenthesis: 'I avoid the word "reoccupation" as
question-begging, holding as I do that the palace
remained in full use by the Mycenaean Greeks until
much the same time as the destruction of the Mycenaean
palaces of the Mainland'. The consequences
of this view are far reaching. In the first place, if
Palmer is right, not only is the term 'reoccupation' to
be avoided but Evans' reoccupation phase in general
must be abandoned, since none of the vases from the
Palace are later than LM IIIB and these have been
used by Palmer to date the destruction. Secondly, it
would follow that the vases found above the paved
floors are to be connected with his LM IIIB destruc-
tion and that Evans was mistaken in classifying them
as LM II, likewise Furumark in calling some of them
LM IIIA 1. These consequences we will consider
later.

The main problem can now be stated simply.
Was Evans correct, as Boardman maintains, in
believing that the building he excavated was basically
a Palace destroyed in LM II/IIIA with certain
limited areas reoccupied by squatters in LM IIIB, or
is Palmer right and the Palace was in fact destroyed
in LM IIIIB and then abandoned?

So stated, the matter resolves itself into a question
of dating. What is the evidence for dating this great
destruction? Absolute dates for both Cretan and
Mycenaean objects depend almost entirely on corre-
lations direct and indirect with Egypt and its fairly well
fixed chronology. But no certain Egyptian imports
were found in the Palace destruction debris, so we are
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compelled to look principally to the pottery and in the second place to the sealings, seals, stone vessels, frescoes and architecture for which chronologies have been established. It would, however, be a mistake to regard these as entirely independent fields of study. In practice they are so interconnected by finds throughout the Minoan and Mycenaean worlds, relating two or more of these categories, that it is almost impossible radically to alter the chronology of one without consequentially having to alter that of the rest as well. However, the pottery remains the best yardstick.

Evans, and Mackenzie his pottery expert, reported that pottery which they termed 'Palace Style' was typical of the destruction level in the Palace. This seems to be accepted, partially at least, by Palmer though it must be admitted that on this point, as so often, his argumentation is evasive. In any event, it is clear that vases of this style must have been in use at the time of the destruction for them to have been found above the paved floors of the Palace at all. It remains to state the evidence for dating this distinctive style of pottery.

This can be done independently of the stratigraphy of the Palace, both by the Egyptian objects found with pottery of this type elsewhere in Crete and also by its correlations with Mycenaean pottery, the chronology of which has cross ties with Egypt. The evidence from Crete is unanimous. The latest imports found in association with Palace style pottery belong to the 18th Dynasty, roughly 1575 to 1300 B.C. For example, the Royal Tomb at Isopata contained beside its Palace style vases ten Egyptian alabaster vessels and at least three other Egyptian imports which have been assigned to the mid 18th Dynasty. But Mycenaean correlations permit greater precision. The vases on the Mainland which correspond stylistically with those of Palace style appear in Late Helladic II to early IIIA contexts, after which they disappear.

Their correspondence is sufficiently close for Wace to have suggested that the Knossian vases of this style were a sign of Mycenaean influence at Knossos. Whether this interpretation, made before the decipherment of the tablets, is accepted or not, the close interrelation and approximate contemporaneity of the two styles, Mycenaean II-early IIIA and the Palace style, is indisputable. A terminus post quem for the related Mainland pottery is assured by the finding in Egypt of Mycenaean vases of considerably more advanced style at Tell-el-Amarna, a town with a short life of some 15 years, dated approximately 1365-50.

The conclusion seems inevitable that since Palace style vases were found associated with the Palace destruction and since this style can be independently dated around 1400 B.C., the dating for that catastrophe which Evans proposed and Boardman supports is to be preferred. It could perhaps have been argued that the vases, which are in general large luxury articles, were heirlooms of some 200 years standing, preserved in the Palace until the destruction date proposed by Palmer: but this is precluded by the same date, about 1400, clearly indicated by the associated palace material, particularly the sealings.

These basic factors in Late Minoan chronology are for the most part accepted and not restated by Boardman, but in an appendix on the pottery (by the reviewer) the evidence for associating Palace style pottery with the destruction is set out. Another appendix on the sealings by Kenna outlines their stylistic relationship with deposits elsewhere conformable with the earlier dating around 1400. The onus of proof, however, that the previously accepted dating is erroneous lay with Palmer. What proofs does he offer?

Nothing precise on chronology. Instead the reader is offered as guidance 'that the ceramic timescale itself needs reassessment' (p. xiii) and that 'the stylistic dating of the clay sealings is to be rejected' (p. xiii). The former dictum implies that the Palace style is to be translated to the LM IIIIB period. But if so, it is difficult to see the relevance of one conclusion that 'the general picture ... is that "Palace Style" pottery appears to have been found in a generally unstratified late Minoan layer' (p. 194), not that this has been convincingly argued. Nor is another conclusion on page 196 any more constructive: it quotes the words of a few scholars who have doubted the validity of stylistic classifications of pottery and then throws out the possibility that 'Palace style' pottery might have been 'in use at the same time as the masses of LM III vessels discovered in situ at Knossos'. Rejection of accepted pottery classifications is in any case a double-edged weapon, since these provide the only evidence for dating the re-occupation deposits (or destruction deposits, if Palmer is right) to LM IIIIB, or for dating the destruction at Pylos by 'the massive documentation in the shape of LH IIIB pottery' on which Palmer relies (p. 202).

His treatment of the sealings is equally unhelpful. It ends by pleading that 'pending certification of the exact provenience and find circumstances, it will be wise to suspend judgement on the claims to date tablets by stylistic analysis of associated sealings' (p. 202). But why wait? Enough sealings have been published with their find places to enable an assessment to be made of the style in use at the time of the destruction and Palmer agrees that they are of the same date as the tablets themselves (p. 197). Like the pottery they can be and have been dated independently of the stratigraphy of the Palace and this evidence is not taken into account by Palmer.

Although Palmer casts doubts on the validity of widely accepted pottery classifications, he does not hesitate, in his consideration of the sealings, to ascribe firmly to LM IIIIB a stirrup jar, described as having decoration of bands only, which has never been drawn or photographed and cannot now be traced (p. 197). And this classification is bolstered by a warning to anyone wishing to ascribe it to LM II that the 'repercussions of so drastic an updating of a stirrup-jar of this description would be felt throughout Aegean
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archaeology' (p. 222), which is simply untrue. To this questionable anchor he proceeds to attach chronologically a pithos found in the same room (which Evans with detailed reasons considered to be of MM IIIB date) and to use Evans' stylistic comparison of the latter vessel with another pithos in Magazine X in order to suggest that the sealing from that Magazine is of LM IIIB date! As supporting 'evidence' is cited a similar sealing found in the Little Palace where, it is asserted, Evans assigned the sealings to LM III in his 1905 report and where 'the stratigraphic conditions admit of no doubt' (p. 197). But Evans did not ascribe the sealings generally, or this sealing in particular, to LM III in his report, as Palmer himself complains on p. 163. Evans said that it was found, and the italics are mine, 'Among the fragmentary sealings belonging to the earlier part of the building...'. and continued of a second sealing, 'Another seal impression found here, also of good period (apparently LM II)...' Nor is there any justification for the statement that the stratigraphical conditions in the Little Palace admit of no doubt. They are never recorded in any detail and one glance into the boxes of the Stratigraphical Museum from this building or into Pendlebury's Guide, 'which is in the main reliable' (p. xiii), will show a mixture of pottery from LM I to LM III not to mention later Hellenistic and Roman material. And this is in agreement with Mackenzie's observations that 'Throughout the area covered by the West House' (i.e. the Little Palace) '... the greatest confusion prevailed everywhere in the deposit' (p. 167). It is difficult to harmonise arguments of this order with Palmer's claim made in the same section: 'for my part simply check the facts' (p. 200). By contrast Boardman scrupulously keeps separate his statement of the evidence and his comments on it, and yet his comments on the Little Palace are more factual than the account of Palmer (pp. 61-7).

So much for the primary evidence for dating the destruction and the tablets. It cannot be said that Palmer has shown adequate reason for revising the conventional chronology at Knossos and with it that of the Late Mycenaean and Minoan world in general.

Nor has he accepted the logical consequences of his own case for such a revision. For if the end of the Palace and its archives are carried down to LM IIIB, then in the first place Evans' 'reoccupation' phase is removed and all that he termed 'squatter' occupation becomes part of the 'palatial' occupation; at the same time the LM II/IIIA destruction vanishes and all that Evans ascribed to a catastrophe at this date becomes part of the LM IIIB debris. From this it would inevitably follow that Evans' concept of an LM II style or phase of development was completely mistaken and that Mackenzie and Pendlebury, both of whom were in substantial agreement with Evans on this point, were no less in error. When they describe one sherd or floor as being LM II and others as being 'reoccupation' in character, they were making unreal distinctions, since all would belong basically to a single period about 1200 B.C.

And yet Palmer time and again bases his arguments for an LM IIIB palace precisely on these distinctions made by Evans, Mackenzie and Pendlebury. For instance, a crucial point in his argument for making the tablets in the Domestic Quarter LM IIIB is a statement by Pendlebury (incorrect in the reviewer's opinion) that the whole area was cleared of its (LM II) debris and reoccupied. And anyone who would question this view is warned that such difference of opinion 'would imply that the archaeologist, who was Evans' field director from 1925 and devoted so many years of study to the archaeology of Crete, was capable of massive and consistent errors in the diagnosis of pottery'. But such errors, inconceivable to Palmer in this context, are precisely those of which Pendlebury with his master and colleagues stands accused if Palmer obliterates the LM II/IIIA destruction. And without that destruction what meaning has Pendlebury's statement?

One more example of the logical consequences of Palmer's views and his failure to take them into account. We are assured (p. 214) in the case of the Room of the Saffron Gatherer, that the 'terminus post quem for the laying of floor IV is given by the LM IIb pithos (pithos sherd is meant) found 0.32 metres below it, while its 'Mainland-Reoccupation' character is guaranteed by Mackenzie's analysis of the plaster. It follows that the upper floor and the objects found on it or above it will likewise be of LM III date'. Here the views of Mackenzie on the date of two matters, a sherd and the character (not analysis) of a floor are vital to the argument. Now Mackenzie's opinion regarding the style of the pithos sherd could only have been gained from a study of the later features of the many pithoi in the West Magazines of the Palace. These and the tablets found with them should be LM IIIB in Palmer's view. But if so, and if we substitute LM IIIB for Mackenzie's LM IIIB, we are in immediate danger of having a post-destruction or reoccupation floor with tablets after LM IIIB. As for the floor, Mackenzie's opinion as to its re-occupation date was derived, as he explains, both from its similarity with floors in other areas where there were 'late constructions' and because it was quite different from the terraza' floors which Mackenzie called 'Palatial in character' (p. 126). Again this observation is meaningless if 'palatial' and 'reoccupation' are synonymous, and the chronological conclusion drawn from the distinction between them is valueless. These examples are typical. They arise from a failure on Palmer's part to recognise the consequences of his own theory of an LM IIIB palace with LM IIIB archives.

If Palmer's theory is right, then Evans, Mackenzie and Pendlebury are wrong in recognising a difference in date as well as in character between LM II and LM IIIB. Materials which they called LM II and LM IIIB would be contemporary and practically the
whole of the accepted classification of Late Minoan and Mycenaean objects would be full of ‘massive and consistent errors’. In assuming that they were wrong, it is ineffective for Palmer to use in evidence their own classifications and the opinions expressed in their excavation reports, vitiated as these would be by their ‘errors’. His proofs would have come better from the related material outside Knossos, and this Palmer has failed to take adequately into account. Until he can show that outside Knossos LM II/IIIA pottery, sealstones, frescoes, stone vases and the related Mycenaean II and early IIIA material appear consistently in advanced IIIB contexts, his case for the date around 1200 for the destruction at Knossos remains unproved and improbable.

It has, however, been a valuable exercise. Many of the questions Palmer has posed about the Palace were worth asking. It has made archaeologists look again at the evidence and reassess its value. As a result several of Evans’ real mistakes are being corrected including errors over the provenance of tablets carefully dealt with by Palmer in pp. 9–62. Again, the material is now being studied in greater detail than Evans had the time to attempt. Perhaps it will also lead to a clearer distinction being made in excavation reports between fact and comment, and for this Boardman’s section of this book will provide an admirable model.

This section, which supports the orthodox chronology, has been referred to little in this review since it raises few contentious points but, when the thunder of this controversy has faded, its value will remain as a lucid account of the excavation and as a valuable supplement to the excavator’s Annual Reports and the volumes of the Palace of Minos.

M. R. Popham.

*British School of Archaeology, Athens.*
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To get a whole volume in this series devoted to the work of Hesiod or in the style associated with the Boeotian poet is a rare treat and one which has been eagerly awaited for some considerable time. Yet it would be idle to pretend that the new texts do much for Hesiod’s reputation as a poet. They are composed in what has been aptly termed the abbreviated-reference style, and one will look in vain for a passage of direct speech. But there are other things these texts can do. Lord has told us that ‘all singers use traditional material in a traditional way, but no two singers use exactly the same material in exactly the same way’. It is possible to distinguish individual styles. The papyrus fragments now assignable to Hesiod are nearly doubled, and at long last we have enough material to make conclusions about unity of authorship and the poet’s identity a distinct possibility for the future. Certainly Lobel has done the groundwork admirably. Following the clues offered by the occurrence of proper names and making full use of other mythological texts, this scholar is seldom at a loss to suggest the context of a passage. His notes are a model of economy, making their points effectively and with the minimum of fuss. The plates are excellent and the index comprehensive.

Some of the fragments published here supplement texts already known. Thus 2491 fr. 1 adds Thoas the Aetolian to the list of Helen’s suitors (cf. *Iliad* 2, 568). 2495 fr. 21 expands the story of Mestra by another nine lines, and shows that P.I.F.A.O. 322 fr. F precedes fr. A. 2481 fr. 5(b) col. ii coincides with F 4, 8–9 and thus provides a most useful corrective. 2481 fr. 5(b) col. iii reveals that Merkelbach was wrong to connect P. Berl. 9777 verso and P. Vogliano. The thirty-seven lines of this fragment have nothing to do with Eunomus, but tell the story of one of Porthaon’s daughters, Stratonice, who was carried off by Apollo and presented to his son Melanesus, and her descendants. P. Vogliano is in fact now supplemented by 2496–7. Although this adds the scraps of another seven verses to the text, even this does not allow us to determine the details of its subject-matter. 2481 fr. 5(b) col. iii only starts on the three daughters of Porthaon in its fifth verse. Before that we get the end of an account of the descendants of the daughters of Thestius. The transition is made by a simple *olai* formula. 2494 A fills out P so as to give us the greater part of the seven verses which preceded *Aspis*, 1–56 in the *Catalogue*. 2481 fr. 5(a) col. i combines with other fragments, previously known or new, enabling us to reconstruct twenty-nine lines on the daughters of Tyndareus and Leda, the first daughter of Thestius, and their offspring. Of special interest is a reference to the slaughter of Iphigeneia, here called Iphimeade, who is made immortal by Artemis and worshipped by men in the guise of *Ἄρτεμις εὐφωβίς.*

Texts completely new are equally exciting. Some reproduce the order of events to be found in Apollodorus i, 9, 7–9. One, a combination of 2481 fr. 1 and two other pieces, tells the story of Salomeus and how he was punished for daring to imitate Zeus, and that of his daughter Tyro, including her liaison with the god Poseidon. This family saga is continued after a gap which C may well fill by 2481 fr. 2, 2485 fr. 2 and 2486, a passage of thirty-six lines which enumerates the twelve sons of Neleus, concentrating on the ability of one of them, Periclymenus, to change shape and his encounters with Heracles. 2481 fr. 3, which we know belongs in the first book of the *Catalogue* as verses 6–8 equal Rzach fr. 15, carries the genealogy one stage further by listing the children of Nestor.

2489 seems to include a transition from one part of the poem to the next, but the beginning of these verses is not preserved. We are luckier with 2495 fr. 16 where the story of the twin brothers Krisos and Panopeus is apparently introduced in line seven by
the phrase ή οἶνος. Other fragments give just bare genealogies, 2487 parts of twenty-five lines on the descendants of Danaus and 2501 those of Melampus. Yet others incorporate traditions for which we have no other evidence. Thus 2503 appears to connect Dardanus, Broteas and Pandion, while 2498 yields two new names for the sons of Boutes. The latter, if Pausanias is to be trusted, comes from the Μεγάλαι 'Hoiou. At least one other piece, 2495 fr. 37 from the Κύννης γάμος, does not belong in the Catalogue. That Ceyx appeared in the poem, however, is established by 2483 fr. 1 col. ii.

Formulaic peculiarities are not infrequent in these texts. An analysis of such forms and a comparison with Hesiod's use of formulas should enable us to take the next step forward and settle basic problems of authorship and date. One looks to the future with growing hope.

P. WALCOT.

University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire.


This is in three respects an unusual addition to the Oxyrhynchus series: it has less than half the pages (and costs less than half the price) of a normal volume, it is the first to be edited by Professor D. L. Page, and it is devoted to a single (hitherto unknown and so far unidentified) work. Thus the reviewer has a double task, not only to give an account of the volume as published, but also to deal with the Greek text as itself a new book—and the second part of this task calls for intuitions not unlike those employed by the Bellman in his navigation in search of the Snark: the Greek text is not 'a perfect and absolute blank', but there are wide spaces of emptiness in which any quantity of hypotheses may 'softly and silently vanish away'.

The volume begins with a preface in which the joint editors of the Graeco-Roman Memoirs, Professor Turner and Mr Skeat, explain why it is devoted exclusively to No. 2506, described as 'an ancient commentary on Greek Lyric Poets', and pay a tribute to the work of Mr Lobel, who has been studying this papyrus 'for a long period of years' without (and no one who contemplates the fragments as published will regard this as a reproach) being able to solve all the problems involved in its reconstruction. Page's own tribute to Lobel, his disclaimer for the book of 'an authority to which it is not entitled', and his modest admission of inability to contribute much 'in arrangement, reading, and supplement' are followed by his acknowledgement of the work of Dr (now Professor) J. W. B. Barns in studying 'the evidence of papyrus-fibres of front and back'. The joint editors then thank Barns 'for help in mounting the original for the photographer', acknowledge a grant from UNESCO and pay a tribute to 'the care and courtesy of Messrs R. & R. Clark', the printers.

Page then gives a succinct account of the fragments (p. 1), regretting his inability 'to form a clearer conception of the general nature' of the work from which they come, or to make 'helpful suggestions' about its authorship. This is followed by a transcription of the text (pp. 2–29), accompanied on the few occasions when this is reasonably possible by what may be called a reading text (words divided and accented); the text is divided into 176 fragments, ranging from the relatively bulky and intelligible (under which may be included Nos. 1, 4, 5, 17, 26, 48, 47, 98 and 102) to those which do not contain a single certain letter [such as 118θ, 175 μ], or my particular favourite 176 [...]. Most of the major fragments listed above have been built up, often with the help of fibre-correspondences, from a number of smaller pieces; and it will be evident to students that there is little more to be done in this way: there is little corn to be gleaned in a field already harvested by such a 'combine' as Lobel, Page and Barns. Since every fragment is illustrated, the reader has a good opportunity to marvel at the patience, skill and ingenuity of the transcribers, though it must be regretted that the double plate VI, almost all devoted to Barns' reconstruction of fr. 48, has been so bound in that it cannot be seen as a whole. The notes, mainly textual but with concise commentary where this is called for, follow the transcription (pp. 29–48), and there are two indexes of Greek words, for the identified quotations and for the accompanying text. Admirably edited and printed, the reader can only regret that the text itself is in such a battered state as hardly to seem worthy of such skill and care.

The more intelligible fragments listed above seem to deal mainly with biographical evidence to be extracted from the works of four poets: Alcman (1, 4, 5, 17), Stesichorus (26), Sappho (48), and Alcaeus (77, 98, 102); those relating to Alcman and Stesichorus have already appeared in Page's Poetae Melici Graeci (as Nos. 10, 13, 193, 217), and the reference to Stesichorus' two palinodes has produced some discussion (cf. C. M. Bowra, CR n.s. xiii [1963], 245–52). Of Sappho we do not learn anything new, but there are stimulating hints about Alcaeus: somebody was killed by a people called Alieni, and Amardis suspected Alcaeus of complicity (77); there was a παιδάτιας 'at the bridge' with which Antimenes and Alcaeus were somehow connected, and which may have formed part of a war between Astyages and Alyattes (98); lastly 102 mentions Lydians, Alcaeus, Antimenes and Croesus, all in a few lines.

Page has rightly not accepted the joint editors' description of this text as a commentary; he contrasts it directly with 2460, as well as with 2506–7 and 2389–90, and he remarks that 'it is easier to say what the book is not than what it is'. In spite of these omens, I am going to risk the suggestion that we have here to deal with a series of biographies of lyric poets, of a type at least similar to Satyrus' Life of Euripides,
already known from Oxyrhynchus (1176, published in 1912); putting my head into the Boojum's mouth, as it were, I add that it seems at least possible that the fragments come from Satyrus's Ætiol, which evidently dealt with a great variety of subjects (FHI III.159 ff.). In any case, the puzzles about the two palinodes and the παράρεις at the bridge need more discussion than Page has found room for; we could have gladly exchanged the ill-informed discussion of the threadbare topic of Alcman's nationality in fn. 1 (on which Page's commentary too is uncharacteristically woolly) for an equivalent amount of new material about any of the four authors here certainly represented.

The main reflexion which I am sure this volume must suggest to papyrologists and metapapyrologists alike is that the time has come when all hitherto published papyri must be looked at again for possible fibre-correspondences, and that future editors of new papyri will be expected to record fibre-correspondences not only on the written scraps but also on the blank pieces found with them.

J. A. Davison.

University of Leeds.


This doctoral dissertation is a useful contribution to studies in early Greek language and thought. Gruber proceeds from the assumption that the range of meaning denoted by certain Homeric nouns is highly complex and impossible to convey by a single noun in modern German: for example φόβος in Homer may mean 'a fear', 'fright' and 'fear of death'. Gruber sets out to illustrate certain 'komplexe Begriffe' in Homer and to show how their range narrows in later Greek.

Analysis is restricted to five words, φόβος, ἔφιξ, ἑτή, κόὸς and νέμεσις. Some limitation is sensible since it allows Gruber scope for detailed discussion of individual passages and does not duplicate general studies such as W. Porzig, Die Namen für Satzinhalt im Griechischen und im Indogermanischen and the more specialised work of Snell, for instance in Die Ausdrücke für den Begriff des Wissens. It is less clear why Gruber has chosen this particular group of words. Are αἰβός, μετά or νύμα simpler concepts? It transpires later that φόβος, ἔφιξ, ἑτή and νέμεσις may each denote a 'démonisches Wesen'. κόὸς is the odd man out, no less complex apparently, and included presumably for contrast and comparison.

Gruber is well aware that the distinction abstract/concrete is inadequate and even irrelevant for interpreting early Greek language. Sometimes he makes use of distinctions which could seem to be abstract/concrete dressed up in new terminology (active/passive, cause/effect, internal feeling/external result, daemonic/abstract) but the strength of the book is its insistence that either/or questions are often illegitimate and that meanings merge into one another in a 'linear progression'.

φόβος is treated in greatest detail. The active component of the word is seen in A 440 where Phobos is a god among gods. Gods and heroes can cause φόβος, and Gruber draws a somewhat obscure distinction between the φόβος inspired by a hero on his own and that when he is accompanied by a god. This active φόβος is seen in the name Deiphobus. The effect of φόβος is flight: βή δὲ φοβηθείς X 137 is Hector's physical reaction to seeing Achilles. Cause and effect are indistinguishable: 'an impulse (fright) proceeds from a daimon Phobos, or a god or a warrior. The enemy reacts in external, visible flight, which is motivated by the psychic condition, fright', p. 25. This tripartite aspect of φόβος is brought out well. But Gruber's reluctance to attribute a 'Grundbedeutung' to words sometimes leads to a curious myopia: when Athene tells Diomedes (E 311) that δός or κάμαρως must have restrained him Gruber explains δός as 'a state of inactivity' because the external behaviour of someone affected by δός or κάμαρως is identical, p. 26. But Athene knows that Diomedes is inactive; she wants to know what has caused this inactivity. A noun is not a sort of tabula rasa which derives meaning solely from the verbs precipitated of it.

δέης, φρίξια and φρίη are also examined. In later Greek φρίη takes over the sense of 'flight' from φόβος, which comes to be restricted to 'fright'. Gruber should also include φίλες: φίλειν λοχενίων (K 311), where φίλεσ is a verbal noun doing the job of φίλεσ (cf. ib. 327), does not fit any of the previous categories. There is brief discussion of a cult of Phobos in later periods. Nothing new is said here but the evidence is interesting and can bear repetition. Gruber's treatment of personified Phobos is incomplete without reference to art, e.g. the representation of Phobos as a charioteer (ABV 143-4, 1), and as a winged figure (ARV², 126, 3 (a)).

In a short review much must be omitted. Gruber establishes an interesting distinction between ἔφιξ and νέμεσις by comparing the verbs used with each word. νέμεσις cannot denote a 'mental disposition'. This is ἔφιξ which can be the cause of νέμεσις, 'the objective manifestation of strife'. Three aspects of ἑτή are seen in T 270 ff., (cf. λ. 61 ff., and δ. 592 ff.): (a) mental confusion leading to (b) error in action and consequently (c) shame: ἑτή denotes all three concepts. Less convincing is the rigid progression proposed for Soph. O.C. 1233, 'die Wörter wachsen an in der konkreten Bedeutung'. Is ἔφιξ more concrete than ἑτή; is it? The treatment of νέμεσις and κόὸς is least satisfactory. Some comparison with other words for anger and honour is wanted, and the omission of any reference to Dodds and Adkins is surprising.

The sections which discuss the later development of each word are very brief and too little attention is paid to context. Gruber does not suggest, as he might, that meaning is likely to become restricted as
the vocabulary widens. Herodotus is the only prose writer to be cited more than three times and the lyric poets deserve greater attention. But Gruber has set himself a limited objective and on the whole he pursues it with clarity and sensitivity. Those concerned with the language of Homer in particular will consult this work with some profit.

A. A. Long.

University of Nottingham.


Professor Guthrie hopes to write the history of Greek philosophy as far as the Neopythagoreans on the scale of the present volume. We must all hope that he will be able to complete the task and also that he will not be cramped for space when he reaches the 'post-Aristotelians'. It is ominous that after abjuring the μεθοδός to whom Kirk and Raven allot so much space, he has not yet brought us to Parmenides. This has a double disadvantage. The temptation will now be to treat the next volume as having but one basic theme: ex nihilo nihil fit. This is orthodox but not sound. Furthermore, the present volume simply demands Parmenides for significant contrast: this is particularly clear in the course of the summing-up on the Milesians (pp. 144–5) and in the treatment of identity of opposites in Heraclitus (pp. 444–6). The reader who comes to the book without historical perspective must also be warned that in the course of the long chapter on the Pythagoreans he is confronted with some doctrines and some persons (the fluxion theory and Epanthias are instances) belonging in time and sophistication more to Guthrie volume III than to Guthrie volume I. Guthrie tries to minimise the difficulty (pp. 146–7 and 216–17) but not convincingly. Using the merely convenient terms 'fifth' and 'fourth-century', he could with advantage have dealt with the Pythagoreans in successive volumes. He is here as elsewhere a little too ready to say that the best course is that 'which Aristotle himself felt forced to adopt before the end of the fourth century b.c. '. One wonders whether even Aristotle did not mean to make some distinction between the generations and between the several ramifications of the Pythagorean school in his phrase 'the philosophers of Italy who are called Pythagoreans'.

The chapter on the Pythagoreans occupies two-fifths of the volume, and the author is to be congratulated on being so sure a guide through the labyrinth. This is probably the best available general account of the Pythagoreans, at any rate in English. Guthrie makes great efforts to be judicial and balanced on all controversial issues and his work often reads like a summing-up in court. But inevitably the personal equation is there and it is a reviewer's duty to uncover it. The interests served by Orpheus and Greek Religion and The Greeks and their Gods have a dominance appropriate to a discussion of the early days but not to a treatment of the school as a whole. We hear too much about the taboo on beans. The emphasis is on primitive parallels and pre-philosophical interpretations. It is more important for the history of philosophy to note clearly the two kinds of rationalisation—the political and the purely medical. The former of these contains a puzzle: Guthrie notes the passage (p. 185) but does nothing to solve or even to recognise the puzzle. If, as Diogenes Laerlius reports, beans must be avoided as ἐλεγχομένων τι, ought we not to be surprised? The obvious Pythagorean line would be that beans are dangerous because they are organs of the democratic process—even Socrates is said to have complained of them as a means of electing experts! This beans taboo ought to be shown as a typical case of Pythagorean development from religious dogma and taboo to rationalised doctrines, and of the persistence of a taboo with new intellectual buttressing in the successive generations.

Guthrie does, of course, mention Pythagorean political history in his account of the life of Pythagoras and of his school. He states the numismatic evidence clearly and refers duly to Delatte, Minar and von Fritz. But he fails to treat this political aspect of the κόσμος as a leit-motif of the school's teaching. It is important not so much for the external history of the Pythagorean societies as for the general principle that cosmic order belongs to society as it does to the universe and is based on the same mathematical rules which are self-evidencing and entitled to prevail. This is the social counterpart of personal ἰδιόλογες θεός, Plato's Republic, Politics and Laws are not really to be understood until this tenet of Pythagoreanism is grasped. Indeed, we are told as early as the Gorgias that ἴσης γνωμητρική has great power with gods and men.

Another trait here and throughout the volume is the desire to use Aristotle as an authority as much as possible. An eloquent defence of this is made at pages 41–3 where Guthrie summarises his article in JHS lxxvii (1957) 35–41. He says specifically (p. 42) that Aristotle's 'lost book on the Pythagoreans is one which we might give a good deal to possess'. Of course we might; yet if we could recover what Heraclides Ponticus wrote about them it might be even more informative. Aristotle is undoubtedly valuable where he sets out to ascertain simple fact, as on constitutions or didascalias or in the Historia Animalium, works begun at least under his aegis and continued very profitably. If we had his book, some of the legendary amalgam could be separated off from the Pythagorean tradition. When, however, it comes to his evaluation of the material, Guthrie himself tells us why care is needed. Aristotle and we are on one side of a 'divide': the earlier people are on the other. Thus a margin of error due to the Aristotelian standpoint as well as to the didactic aim of a particular treatise must be allowed for. To admit this is no disrespect to Aristotle: on the contrary, it is a tribute
to his almost miraculous personal achievement. What Cherniss has done for us—perhaps with too much pertinacity in places—is to look critically in detail at each piece of Aristotelian evidence for the Presocratics and to ask ‘How and why could Aristotle because of his own principles have misunderstood or misinterpreted these data?’ Such criticism in detail has a permanent value, though it is of course open to counter-criticism by those who set out to vindicate in the same detail what Aristotle says. There need be no malice involved in this process on the part of either side.

Guthrie’s estimate of Plato as a witness for the Pythagoreans is much more cautious and perceptive—apart, that is, from his too limited appreciation of the political side. Plato is indeed more of a distorting medium than Aristotle, but he was closer in spirit and fuller in understanding. He knows quite clearly how far he goes with the Pythagoreans and where he goes beyond them. (Rep. viii530e). Yet he plays allusively with Pythagorean ideas just as he does with those of Protagoras and the Heraclitans. In a sense, as compared with Aristotle, he is ὁ ἐκὼν ἀμαρτάων. But he is only ὄμολον if we in turn can detect the ἀμαρτία. The place where this needs to be done most carefully is in the Timaeus. Guthrie shows signs of awareness of this at several points; but perhaps it needs to be said definitely that those of us who rejected Taylor and backed Cornford’s teaching that the Timaeus contains Plato’s cosmology were too ready to forget that the dramatic setting and the giving of the discourse to Timaeus of Locri are indeed indications by Plato of his indebtedness to both fifth- and fourth-century Pythagorean thinking. Therefore if judicially used the Timaeus is first-class evidence for such thinking.

The other chapters only brief notice can be given. The Milesians are treated as a whole, as a ‘school’ in a sense. Probably this is right historically: Thales can hardly be separated from the other two; but the ‘originality’ of Anaximander must not be occluded by his coming second in time. The Egyptian and Babylonian influences on Thales are stated fully: perhaps primeval chaos doctrine is not so relevant to his main tenet, and the Egyptian story of Nun comes closest to the earth riding on the water. On the other hand Babylonian (and other eastern) ideas together with Hesiodic and Orphic (the egg, πας Kirk!) teaching seem to lie behind Anaximander and nothing obviously Egyptian. Guthrie holds—I think rightly—that ἐξ ὄρη in the first fragment of Anaximander must refer to the separated opposites which pay retribution and not to the Boundless. Might one add to the Lexicography of ἄνευρον he gives the ‘boundlessness’ of inexhaustibility: the font et origo available that becoming may not fail? Later people called this ἀφηγή; it does not matter very much whether Anaximander did if we are satisfied that he so thought of the ἄνευρον. One wonders whether the problem of the ‘innumerable worlds’ can be settled by one or another interpretation of the first fragment.

Guthrie states all sides of the argument and settles for Cornford’s successive single worlds in endless time. This is perhaps less unlikely than any other solution, but difficulty of the sources and the obvious confusion with Atomist ideas almost force us to ἐπιστή on the matter.

The chapter on Alcmaeon is very welcome, particularly to the reviewer: for it provides independent argument for a case he stated. But its main achievement is to give a clear picture of Alcmaeon as a serious pre-Socratic thinker. He was not concerned with the Eleatic denial of becoming, and this fact deprives him of first-class importance if that question is to be taken as the dominant philosophical issue after Parmenides. But if the combination of genuine empirical evidence with a world-view is important, Alcmaeon is outstanding. Guthrie suggests that Empedocles is a comparable figure. Let us compare them. Alcmaeon is (a) less tied to religious dogma; (b) less interested in cosmogony and cosmology (if he had a view on the planetary motion it was probably borrowed); (c) much more concerned with real physiology: and (d) able to assert with some empirical basis for the assertion the distinctiveness of man, the brain as organ of control and the distinction of thought and sensation. Clearly Alcmaeon deserves far more attention than he has yet received, and we can thank Guthrie for helping to make this clear.

Xenophanes also receives the careful treatment he merits. His ἔνιερν is perhaps seen too much through Aristotle’s eyes. While Pantheism and transcendence are logically incompatible for a modern theologian or philosopher, they need not have been so for him. To say that the one god is not like in body to mortals is rather to deny the Olympian divinities than to assert categorically that God is spherical. Yet the case for reading back a spherical notion of the Universe into Xenophanes from Parmenides is strong. To do this, indeed, makes Xenophanes the first ‘Eleatic’. For God’s remaining in the same place utterly undisturbed reveals a distinctive world-picture: not Anaximander’s γράφων τάξις, not Heraclitus’ equal counter-thrust, but an internally and externally unchanged unity.

The chapter on Heraclitus might be better reviewed by someone more in disagreement with it. I would only warn of the danger of thinking of cyclic change and Anaximander’s mutually unjust opposites alongside Heraclitus’ succession of phases each living the other’s death and his dictum that war is father of all and strife laudable. He only means that order demands the balanced process which is stress and not that stress is ‘wrong’. I agree with Guthrie on the ‘flux’ fragments, but would point out that ἔτερα γᾶρ ἐπιρρέω ἑδονα in Plutarch Qu. Nat. 912(a) [Guthrie p. 489, passage (d)] is fairly clear indication that Heraclitus himself used the figure to prove unity of structure in continuity of process—the ποταμός is ὁ αὐτός though you cannot step into it twice as identically the same. This only puts a little more paradoxically a saying Kirk accepts as genuine (Cosmic Fragments,
NOTICES OF BOOKS

pp. 367 sqq.). But is not the more paradoxical way of saying it likely to be the original one?

Long as this review has become it omits to notice much in Guthrie's volume. He himself speaks of doing again the work of Gomperz for our times; but in quality and importance this work looks more like a new Zeller if it continues as it has begun. It is more pre-digested than Zeller. It has valuable parallels from modern scientific thinking when this helps to illustrate, but it does not go out of bounds in this matter. It is a true history, written in the Cambridge tradition of the study of ancient philosophy—a tradition initiated by Jackson and followed actively by Cornford. The Press has done its work well and the price is not outrageous by present-day standards.

J. B. SKEMP.

University of Durham.


Readers of Professor Havelock's books have learnt to expect from him lively presentation of an original and challenging point of view, and this volume will not disappoint them. Its modest title covers a new approach to the whole history of Greek literature and thought. The importance of the oral character of early Greek poetry has long been recognised. Adopting a chronological framework which gives oral performance and transmission the longest possible run—early disappearance of Linear B, introduction of the alphabet near 700 b.c., little use of the written word till the late fifth century—Havelock sees 'the oral state of mind' as the dominating factor in all Greek culture until Plato's rejection of it.

His starting-point is the attack on poetry in the Republic, which must reflect 'an over-all cultural condition which no longer exists': for Plato poetry is 'a source of information and a system of indoctrination'. That his view of it must have been very different from ours will be agreed; but this is only a beginning from which Havelock pursues his new version of the 'From Mythos to Logos' theme in two directions—into the early history of Greek literature, and especially of epic; and into a reassessment of Platonism itself.

What is the primary function of poetry, of rhythmic and formulaic speech, in a society without writing? In Havelock's view it is didactic—to impart moral guidance or even technical information in a memorable form. Hence the elevated and dispassionate quality of the Homeric 'tribal encyclopaedia', which fulfilled the Pan-Hellenic purpose of preserving traditions from Mycenaean times into later Ionia, continually remodelled to suit contemporary ways. The Catalogue of Ships in Iliad II is a 'Mycenaean sailing list', originally composed and memorised in verse, which partly turned into 'a sailors' guide to the Aegean' about 700 b.c. Even the stories of the gods (surprisingly in some cases?) were 'paradigms of the operation of the public and private law'. Verse was indeed not only the epic minstrel's medium, but the normal form for any important utterance, used by prince or judge or general and setting the thought-forms for the entire culture as they have been set in later times by mediaeval scholasticism or modern scientific thought. If the objection is raised that the Iliad and Odyssey do not (thank goodness!) read like a 'tribal encyclopaedia', Havelock's reply is that oral transmission could only work if the pupil—whether boy at school or adult audience—'was trained to a habit of psychological identification (nemesis) with the poetry he heard'; and 'memory could identify effectively only with acts and events'.

The antithesis of this 'image-thinking' was conceptual thought, made fully possible only by the use of writing. The 'intellectualism' (philosophia) which awakened Greece from the spell of oral tradition found its first mature champion in Plato; and the change from 'oral culture' to abstract ideas is the essence of his philosophy. His doctrine of the psyche puts separation of the knower from the known in place of 'the immemorial habit of self-identification with the oral tradition'. The realm of 'opinion' which he rejects is the many visible acts and events which are the content of 'orally preserved communication'. And through dialectic he invented 'an abstract language of descriptive science to replace a concrete language of oral memory'. It is unfortunate that by regarding abstract concepts as 'Forms' and talking of 'imitating' them he 'allows himself to fall back into the idiom of precisely that psychic condition which he is setting out to destroy'. But perhaps this was an historical necessity: 'the new mental era required its own banner to march under and found it in the Platonic Forms'.

This is a remarkable thesis, which more orthodox classical scholars may well greet with incredulity. To one reader, at any rate, such incredulity seems justified: too many pieces of the puzzle do not fit, and Havelock's efforts to force them into place are unconvincing. Even if we accept Homer's 'didactic' function, it is difficult to place all other poets down to Euripides in the same category, conforming 'to the idiom and the genius of preserved oral communication'. The rise of prose and the early development of abstract thought, which to suit Havelock's thesis should have coincided, present a special problem: the chief early prose writers were narrators of acts and events, while the first considerable attempt at abstract reasoning occurs in the hexameters of Parmenides. Havelock, who denies the existence of Milesian prose or any genuine fragments of the Milesians, explains that the double task of discarding 'both the rhythm on the one hand and the syntax of the image-series on the other ... seems to have been too much for the energy even of the Greek mind'. Other questions are answered equally weakly or not at all. Socrates, surely a protagonist of conceptual thinking yet never writing a word as far as we know, is 'a figure of paradox'.


Plato's own rejection of the written word in the *Phaedrus* and elsewhere goes unexplained; and although Aristotle is mentioned as a 'disciple, who could correct and systematise the logic of his master's discoveries', no reference is made to the *Poetics*, which seems to turn Havelock's account of the subjectmatter of poetry upside-down.

This volume is intended as the first of a series which will include, it appears, one on 'the pre-Socratics and their archetype Hesiod'. Further elaboration of Havelock's theme will be of great interest. May the present reviewer make one plea: that points of importance be included in the text rather than so often relegated to notes in small type.

H. C. Baldry.

University of Southampton.


Professor Gould's book is a vigorous and interesting specimen of the type of study which compares different ideas, different cultural concepts and different times for a maieutic educational purpose. It examines Plato's theory of love and compares it with Christian, Romantic, and Freudian views of love. It brings out coincidences and conflicts, chasms and continuities between the ancient and the modern, and between the modern and the modern. Comparison is an increasingly important element in higher education, and this book, which is substantially a series of lectures delivered by its author when he was visiting St Andrews, is a highly suggestive example of the teaching technique indicated by the comparative approach.

The book begins with a discussion of the principal elements for comparison; there follows a study of the *Symposium* in two chapters containing lively and amusing representations of this dialogue's speeches; then the other dialogues which bear upon the book's argument are considered serially, in a chronological order which is widely accepted. A link is quite reasonably made with Aristotle in a chapter which treats his criticisms of the Forms, rather than any concept of love. After this, a reconsideration of the argument and a justification of Platonic love against the others bring the book to an end, except for copious and erudite notes and an index.

The scheme of the book is well suited to a course of lectures. If, however, we take the dialogues (apart from the *Symposium*) more or less as they come, we find that there is enough about love in the earlier and more 'personal' Socratic works to justify this course; there is certainly something in the *Republic*; and the *Phaedrus* is a linchpin of the argument; but after this a gulf separates us from what small amount there is in the *Timaeus* and the *Laws*. It emerges that many of the important works after the *Phaedrus* have nothing particular to tell us about love. This is fair enough in that the gap tells the truth to the reader and the *Timaeus* has enough in it about love to suggest that the *Symposium* and *Phaedrus* were not completely forgotten by Plato, but I am inclined to think that a thematic rather than a consecutive treatment of the dialogues might have produced more meaty chapters and indicated more sharply the variety and difficulty of the subject.

For this problem of Platonic love is not solved. Professor Gould does not claim to have solved it, but one might easily suppose that he has assumed the solution in presenting Platonic love as something 'far above the personal' (p. 17). Platonic love in this book is the love of knowledge and the Good. It is the love that is expounded in the Socratic part of the *Symposium*. The sexual element is underplayed throughout. It is not given its share even in the philosophical love of the Good, etc. I am not sure, for instance, that ἰδίος ἐν καλῷ is as sexless as Professor Gould's interpretation suggests (p. 49). The operation of love's power at a personal level is of very considerable importance in the *Republic*, but Professor Gould does not discuss the problem in sociology which Plato set for himself and for us all in this dialogue's attempt to canalise a force that is as uncompromising as geometry; he treats the *Republic* from the point of view of the desire and love directed towards knowledge and the Good as it appears in the 'Sun-Line-Cave' section. The *Phaedrus*, of course, can be brought to bear upon the more personal aspects of the *Republic*'s theory of love (p. 91)—cf. the following chapter: 'The *Phaedrus*: Rational v. Irrational Love'—but this does not fully compensate us for the author's neglecting to consider the personal element in the ideal society's theory of Eros, especially in view of what he has to say about the Romantics and the Freudians.

At the outset, Professor Gould seems to intend to give comparable weighting to the four species of love, but the course of the argument brings it about that two poles of comparison emerge: on the one hand Plato, and, on the other, Freud, who is 'the greatest of our nightmares' (p. 3); who was begotten by the Romantics (pp. 16-17); and who has helped to encourage a popular erotic irrationalism which in many ways is Romantic in character. Plato's reasoned and natural view of love is contrasted with the excessively personal theories of love put forward by Socrates and Jesus (pp. 164, 166); and Christian love pays too little attention to the beautiful (p. 166). While it is admitted by the author that both Platonists and Freudians in their study of love are really trying to analyse the unanalysable (p. 19), Plato's approach to this unanalysable is regarded as being healthy and rational, Freud's perverse and pathological. We are told that the Freudians are obsolete; that we are all 'post-Freudian' (p. 13); that Freud's views have recently been rejected (p. 170); but if this is so, a remarkable amount of energy is wasted in drubbing a dinosaur: so much, indeed, that it is difficult not to suspect that the monster is still at large. The Freudian is a 'wearsisome phenomenon' whose explana-
tions are 'defiling' (p. 13) of much of the beauty and excellence in human achievement. The author does not investigate the meaning of defilement, but merely accepts the popular view of what is clean and what is dirty, allowing it thereby a scientific value which it does not possess in its unexamined state. I think that Socrates, or a modern logical analyst, would look into the matter more closely. Surely the notion that 'high' achievements are necessarily damaged by having 'low' unconscious sponsors is open to question? Germane to this is the familiar reductionist criticism of Freud which appears at several points in the book (pp. 16-17, 22-3, etc.), and seems to be quite deliberately stressed. Briefly, the intent of this criticism is that Freud and his followers identify 'success with bodily pleasure' (p. 102), and put forward an infantile ideal for grown men (p. 48). For them, civilisation is not particularly important, being a mere artificial pearl surrounding the true Irritant of sex. The reductionist criticism implies that since for Freudians civilisation is only a by-product, they are not especially concerned with maintaining or defending it (pp. 173-4). Further implication: Freudianism is primitivist (cf. its Romantic ancestry): its pleasure principle is simpler than that of Plato (p. 16) and, in Freud's view, 'the lower the drive, the more it is to be honoured' (ibid.). This is less than fair. Freud and Freudians are as much concerned as Plato and Platonists with the task of promoting rationality and civilised conduct. The psycho-analytic process attempts to restore an equilibrium between (1) the demands of reason together with the pressing realities of the external world, and (2) the satisfaction of unconscious wishes and urges; it intends to prevent neurosis from establishing its own special and unstable equilibrium. It is clearly reductionism that Freud is opposing in the preface to his Three Essays in their fourth edition. This work was first published in 1905. The preface to the fourth edition was written in 1920 and it suggests, under the influence of M. Nachmansohn's 'applied' essay: Internationale Zeitschrift für Arztliche Psychoanalyse, iii (1915), pp. 65-83: 'Freud's Libido-theorie verglichen mit der Eroslehre Platos', that Freud saw the need to stress how wide and inclusive his theory of love in fact was in order to counter reductionist criticism. In doing this he recalls the line taken by Nachmansohn (especially op. cit. 82-3); see Strachey's Standard Edition, VII, London, 1953(6), p. 134. Professor Gould is acquainted both with the Three Essays and with Nachmansohn's work (p. 15); he quotes in German the preface in question, but will have none of its implications. But Freud was serious in his wish to broaden the scope of concept of love in the context of his theory, as will be seen in his Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, 1921, St.Ed., XVIII, 1957, p. 91; and in Resistances to Psychoanalysis, 1925, St.Ed. XIX, 1961, p. 218. Like Plato, Freud continually developed and modified his views during the greater part of his career.

The Romantic theory of love is criticised not so much in the shape of the great Romantic philosophers and writers, as in the debased and minuscule romanticism of modern popular culture. This enables the cultural effects of Romantic philosophy and their Freudian accelerator to be dealt with together. Professor Gould subjects the popular theory of love to humorous censure for its irrationality; and appears to agree with Plato and the Christians about the undesirability of mere personal choice as a basis for marriage (pp. 12, 170). Though he is aware that this kind of romantic sexual selection goes back at least as far as Ovid and Virgil (p. 8) in fact it goes back indefinitely, he implies that it is a latterday phenomenon, as indeed it is in its socially accepted form. I suppose it is no harm to tell undergraduates: 'to confuse love with mere sexual need is almost the worst mistake a person can make' (p. 19), and it is humorous to apply it to the Freudians, who are usually respectable bourgeois, but it is simplistic and 'Romantic' without its corollary that the separation of love from sexual need can sometimes be mistaken.

On the whole, Plato is presented as the upholder of reason against the irrational, of nature against the perverse. For him, love was a desire for knowledge and knowledge had its proper objects. Freud, romantic against classical, scientist against philosopher, was more interested in process than in object. Plato is a classical philosopher in this book, almost as classical, I think, as he is in the works of John Wild. Not enough is conceded to the 'surd' element in Plato's thought (see E. R. Dodds: JHS 4 lxxv [1945] 16-25; The Greeks and the Irrational, 1951). But the antithesis between rational Plato and the irrationalist others makes a stimulating set of lectures. One would not be inclined nowadays to overstate the view that a book is written to be read and that lectures are composed to be heard, and consequently have to be rewritten to make an acceptable book. However, when the lecturing style is especially sprightly and when the lecturer has a sense of humour, difficulties can be created for the reader. If I had heard Professor Gould, I might have been able to discern by vocal nuances and facial expressions how seriously he wished to be taken when for example he mentioned 'wretched clinical histories' (p. 15), criticised motor cars, modern architecture, erotic songs and advertising, bemoaned the decline of patriotism and religion (ibid.) and generally hinted that new was bad and old (not merely Greek) was good. I am not sure, as it is, whether these remarks (together with remarkably frequent evaluative expressions) are jocular, or a submerged sermon. I am sure, however, that the greater part of them should have been edited out. The style of the book is itself lively enough to convey the immediacy of the spoken word.

These criticisms spring from the book's virtues, not its vices. It is a work of considerable interest. It is full of life; it opens out many paths for speculation and discussion. At its heart there seems to be the salutary assumption that classical studies are alive and
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relevant. I hope that it will be widely and appreciatively read.

H. D. RANKIN.

University of Sheffield.

GULLEY (N.) Plato's theory of knowledge.
£1 12.

Mr Gulley's book is a valuable contribution to the debate on Plato's epistemology in which Mr Runciman and the late Dr Bluck have also engaged in recent years. Although Mr Gulley's style requires the reader to make an effort, the effort is soon rewarded and his real lucidity of thought makes the long sentences easier to follow. He is more definite in his thinking and more forthright in stating his position than either Bluck or Runciman. This is particularly valuable in his treatment of Plato on mathematical knowledge—a field where he has already an expert's standing. Even if he can be proved wrong, he is so clear as to be helpfully wrong. The notes at the end of the book, where they are of any length, are valuable. The long note 19 on Chapter III (pp. 194–5) ought perhaps to have been worked into the text: it gives Gulley's view of Sophistes 238a–249d and is eminently sane about the meaning of the passage. He ought, however, to have seen that what is said here about the failure of Friends of the Forms to recognise that 'being' can be predicated in a sense of 'becoming' links with the function of the 'Circle of the Other' in the world-soul and in human souls in the Timaeus—the production of δόξα και πίστεις βέβαιως και ἀληθείς. His pages on the Timaeus are in fact one of the less satisfactory parts of his book. The philosopher can in fact be a physicist with one circle of his Soul: this is Plato's attempt to meet the dilemma on which Gulley tries to impale him (pp. 145–7).

Though the book borrows Cornford's title, it could with more accuracy be called Plato's Criticism of Perception with an addendum on mathematical knowledge. For it deals chiefly with the problem posed by the anamnèsis doctrine: if we know by being 'reminded' of the Forms by particulars, why are particulars of a lower order of being altogether, and (in the Phaedo) capable of snaring the soul and imprisoning her? Why does Plato insist on a priori knowledge and yet use the empirical to prime the a priori pump? Mr Gulley first introduces the doctrine of recollection as Plato's attempt to find a more satisfactory epistemological procedure than Socrates' search for definitions ending in professions of ignorance. But did not Socrates also begin with 'empirical' instances of a kind—not deserting the ranks, for instance? Is not the Meno rather saying 'If virtue is knowledge, do we really know what knowledge is; and can we, if we study the nature of knowledge, arrive by a kind of reverse process at a closer identification of "virtue"? We can only do it if virtue is knowledge: it will not help us if virtue can equally well be ὀφθη δόξα. If knowledge, to be knowledge, must be recollection, we are some way on to our first principles of epistemology.

Mr Gulley makes two novel points in treating the Meno. He thinks that the mathematical nature of the example implies that mathematical examples are those best able to evoke 'recollection' of the mathematical propositions they illustrate. He is even ready to see the αἴτης λογικῆς as simply supplementing the ὀφθη δόξα once the mathematical proposition is established—though he does admit that real tying down of opinion may require establishment of truth 'behind' all mathematical theorems as such. The reviewer would hold that Plato had the Forms doctrine already 'up his sleeve' here though not prepared for the explicit statements of the Phaedo because of the scope of the Meno as a preamble to epistemology. Mr Gulley also holds that the recollection theory itself is tentative in the Meno, as tentative as the religious doctrines which introduce it. I doubt this. It is 'tentative' as a first essay; but it is a method, not a myth and is employed confidently in so far as it is employed. The tentativeness is rather in the main theme of the dialogue.

The section on the Phaedo is an excellent exposition of what the dialogue says and a shrewd analysis of it. It contains Gulley's reply to Hackforth's criticism of his Classical Quarterly article (n.s. IV (1954)) and pp. 34–6 of this book deal very concisely with the main issues. He shows clearly how emphasis on the simplicity of forms precludes διάφορα and κοινώνια εἴδων at this stage; or, as he puts it, any attempt to distinguish a priori from non-a priori truths within the field of conceptual thought. Mr Gulley also shows very acutely that both the method of hypothesis and the explanation of sensible processes by Forms as 'causes' are intended to be contrasted with the current practices of ἴδιος περὶ φύσεως.

It is not possible to treat the whole book in the same detail as I have treated the opening chapter, but its scope and importance seem to me best indicated by attempting to show how the author formulates his problem. He examines Symposium, Republic, Cratylus for evidence on the intelligible/sensible relation and on the nature of mathematical knowledge. I am not sure that much original comment arises here, though of course the survey had to be made. He again says that mathematics is striving away from sensibles, or ought to be; and Rep. VII, of course, supports him. He deplores δόξα as used of inconstant sensibles in the latter part of Rep. V, for he thinks Plato depressed its value by so using it. But its ambivalence—appearance and opinion, sensible particular and popular proposition—enable Plato to build up his whole allegory of the cave and relate metaphysics and 'periagogic' education. As for the Cratylus and the Theaetetus, Gulley makes Plato reduce the flux doctrine to absurdity to establish the conclusion of the Cratylus from the Theaetetus also—that there are non-sensibles
which are not in flux and that therefore, and only therefore, there can be knowledge.

When he reaches the later dialogues, Mr Gulley seeks to trace the continued existence of a recollection theory. Clearly it is there in the Phaedrus myth, and he looks at the Philebus passage about fourfold classification to see if he can find it there. He admits that he cannot and that the implication there is that such a doctrine is no longer needed. The Politicus passage on ‘visible likenesses’ (285d–286b) is more hopeful at first sight, but it lands Mr Gulley in the same difficulties as it once landed the reviewer! He thinks the reviewer shot his way out, and perhaps he did; but my translation and explanation are intended to take into account the immediate context without forcing it to say the same as the Phaedrus passage. The immediate Forms in question I take to be statesmanship and weaving. The latter is better illustrated visibly than the former, which deals more in ‘imponderables’. I think the Forms of both statesmanship and weaving are ἀδύνατα, but the special sense of ἀδύνατον applied to the former seems here to be ‘an ἄδυνατον which does not readily allow itself to be intuited from ἀδύνατα’. Of course all Forms, however clear their likenesses, are ἀδύνατα in their own right. If this remedy is desperate, what other is proposed? I am not quite sure, either, about Mr Gulley’s propositional δόξα which is ‘though the result of an analysis between concepts is the result of an analysis other than that which affords insight into Forms and ‘ordinary’ δόξα fixed on sensibles. I suspect that Plato never was really happy with propositional truth, but did not invent Mr Gulley’s superior δόξα. If he did, he called it ὑποθετική δόξα and came to see gradually that such ὑποθετική must be propositionally stated.

I conclude with unrestrained thanks for the admirable closing chapter on Mathematical knowledge, where much is said in a brief compass. Space forbids detailed comment, but I welcome particularly the suggestion that ‘intermediate’ mathematical objects may have a real place in Plato’s later thought though they must be banished from the Republic. Mr Gulley has not conquered the Sophistes for us, but we need to be very grateful to him for his varied achievements in this book.

University of Durham.

J. B. Skemp.


In 1959 Professor Hall published an article in Phronesis on the subject of ‘Justice and the Individual in the Republic’. In the present volume he carries the same approach further, maintaining that ‘throughout his dialogues Plato has a constant and fervent concern for the individual’, in which the concepts of freedom and equality play an essential part. He is at pains to distinguish Platonic individualism from the modern democratic variety: Plato does not allow the individual to make his own mistakes; Platonic freedom lies in the mastery of self; Platonic equality of opportunity consists in ‘the placement of individuals into those orders of society for whose tasks they are naturally suited’. There is no claim here that the Republic or the Laws anticipates the constitution of the United States. Nevertheless, this book is an attempt to present Plato in a radically new light which critics of Plato’s ‘closed society’ will reject out of hand, and which most Platonic scholars will find it difficult to accept.

Plato’s individualism, according to Hall, is ‘a metaphysical individualism of self-realisation’, ‘the attainment of justice within the soul because of its inherent value’. The early chapters of his book review previous conceptions of arete (surprisingly, without mention of Adkins’ Merit and Responsibility): up to and including Socrates a utilitarian ethic prevailed, based on ‘techne-phronesis’, which sought arete for its consequences rather than for itself; and the incohesiveness of the earlier dialogues (including Republic I) is a deliberate attempt to discredit such utilitarianism by an author who apparently knew better from the first. In the Meno and more explicitly in the Phaedo Plato ‘begins to reveal his own ethical position’. But the Phaedo’s account of the soul and its emphasis on excellence for the philosopher alone—‘excellence not of man’s humanity, but in spite of it’—is a passing phase of Plato’s thought. In an interesting but not completely convincing chapter Hall seeks to show that in the Republic, Phaedrus, Timaus and Laws the rational and immortal part of the soul is a ‘differentiated unity’ which must have personal survival after death: the immortal individual is at the centre of Plato’s thought.

The individual’s place in this life is the subject of chapters on the Republic and the Laws. Slaves or non-Greeks, we have been told earlier, must be left out of the picture: Plato was neither pro- nor anti-slavery, but he accepted the contemporary assumption that the slave was ‘less than an individual’. Any other man, however, if he lives within the ideal state, can acquire the full measure of justice through control of the whole soul by reason. The artisan’s justice, based on ‘educated right opinion’, differs from the justice of the philosopher only in being less stable. Through knowledge of the Forms the philosopher also has a special virtue, wisdom; but this gives him only a superior social function, and disappears from Plato’s thought after the Republic. Hall makes no reference to the story of the metals. As for Republic IX with its assertion that domination of the soul by its rational part leads to the happiness of the philosophic life, the philosopher is used here only as a model. ‘The actual reference to the philosophic life is not merely the life of philosophers, but all those whose rational part rules the soul: the just citizens of all orders or classes of the ideal polis, or of its approximation, the practical polis of the Laws.’

The Laws ‘climaxes the development which began
in the Republic of the predication of a justice or morality applicable to all men as the defining characteristic of man. Intellectual superiority now no longer implies superior morality. Temperance, the arête of the individual citizen, includes wisdom of the highest sort as well as the dominance of the rational element within the soul. Obedience to the laws is to be gained primarily by rational persuasion, and this is the object of the preambles. The Nocturnal Council, on whose special training and qualifications Plato puts exaggerated emphasis, has no superior virtue to the other citizens: they only understand virtue better through their knowledge of the one and the many.

Much of what Hall writes is true of Aristotle, and he might well have pointed to the Nicomachean Ethics as a sequel to his account of Plato’s development. But to the present reviewer his account of Plato’s thought does not make sense, unless we are prepared to play Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark and ignore the theory of Forms as a temporary aberration of Plato’s middle years. The standard for man is set by the Form of Man, and the nearest approximation to the Form is the philosopher: his arête, drawn from knowledge of the Forms, must surely be higher than that of the demimourgos. The relationship between justice in the Republic or temperance in the Laws and philosophical wisdom may be far from clear, but it is easier to believe that Plato’s conception of the position of the ordinary man remained obscure than to make him the central figure of Platonic thought.

H. C. Baldry.

University of Southampton.


The book, a slightly revised version of a Cambridge Ph.D. dissertation, is divided into two parts. The first (chapters I–IV), which attempts to lay down the principles of an adequate theory of semantics, is proper to Linguistics and would not appropriately be discussed here. The second part examines the validity of these principles by applying them to an investigation of a particular lexical field within Plato’s vocabulary, that connected with the concept of knowledge.

In chapter V the author defines the extent of the material investigated, which is the whole Platonic corpus of the O.C.T. apart from spurious and doubly genuine works; the fact that some which are authentic (e.g. Hippias Major, Menexenus, Epistle VII, Epinomis) are included among the latter unnecessarily limits the material, but does not impair the validity of the investigation.

Chapter VI is devoted to a more detailed discussion with specific application to Greek of some features of linguistic analysis already outlined in Part I, in particular transformational syntax, context, and the tense-aspect system.

The results of the analysis are given in chapter VII. First the meaning of δημομορφος and τέχνη is shown to be definable only in terms of their hyponyms (ἐπιστήμη, γνωμητρία; ἐπισκόπη, γνωμητρία, etc.). Then the hyponyms themselves, together with their corresponding verbs (ἐπιστημένοι, γνωμητριές, etc.) are examined in their predicative function and turn out to be reducible by syntactical transforms to a small number of kernel sentences: from this the deduction is made that the essential structural principle of the lexical field of τέχνη is transformational derivation from kernel sentences containing ἐπιστήμη.

The meaning of ἐπιστήμη itself and several other verbs is established by a combination of these factors:

(a) Occurrence or non-occurrence in a set of nine environments set up mainly on syntactic grounds.

(b) Relationships within these classes between individual verbs such as that of consequence (e.g. γνωσθαι—ἐνεια, λαμβάνει—ἐγείνοι).

(c) Frequency in each environment. It is to be noted that the frequency is not the total number of occurrences of a verb: this, it is argued, would reflect chance rather than choice, since in the development of an argument the same word tends to be repeated, and the length of the argument would be the controlling factor. The frequency, therefore, is the number of separate passages in which the particular verb is found. This distinction is clearly necessary, but open to criticism on the grounds that the passage divisions are subjective: the difficulty could have been overcome by presenting the individual as well as the passage frequencies along with their references.

The environments (denoted by various objects of the verb) and the frequencies are as follows:

1. + infinitive (p. 183 ff.): ἐπιστήμη 55, μαθάνειν 11, εἰδέναι 1, ἐπανέν, γνωρίζειν 0, συνέναι 0, ἀγνοεῖν 0.

εἰδέναι seems to be used synonymously with ἐπιστήμη, but the relationship of γνωσθαι cannot be determined (p. 185). ἐπιστήμη is the consequent to μαθάνειν; the same applies to classes 2 and 3.

2. + τέχνη or its hyponyms (p. 188): μαθάνειν 10, ἐπανέν 7, ἐπιστήμη 5, all others 0.

In this and most of the other environments the usage of ἐπανέν is to some extent distinguished by being predominantly negative and/or partitive (e.g. ἀδότι ἐπανέν τῆς τέχνης).

3a. + neuter plural of adj. ending -ικός (p. 188 ff.): ἐπιστήμη 3, μαθάνειν 9, γνωσθαι 1, others 0.

ἐπιστήμη and γνωσθαι are not synonyms in this environment (p. 190 ff.).

3b. + neuter sing. of adj. ending -ικός (p. 196 ff.): εἰδέναι 2, γνωσθαι 2, ἀγνοεῖν 2, others 0.

4. + noun denoting a person (pp. 199 ff.): γνωσθαι 7, εἰδέναι 1, μαθάνειν 1, συνέναι and ἐπανέν 0.

Some instances of εἰδέναι are synonymous with γνωσθαι, others are not (p. 203). γνωρίζειν is the antecedent to γνωσθαι in the relation of consequence.
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(From p. 202). Of the instance of μαθάνειν (incorrectly given on p. 166 as Philebus 44b instead of 44b) the author remarks that it is ‘doubtfully classified as such’ (p. 204). No further explanation follows, but presumably it is class 7 which is thought of as more appropriate.

5. + two substantives which are opposites, alternatives, etc., e.g. ἵππον καὶ τὸν πεπαθιημένον τοι καὶ ἀπαθείμενον (p. 204): γνώσεις 7, ἀγώνες 3, εἰδέναι 2, συνέναι 2, ἐπιστῶμαι 2, μαθάνειν 1, ἐπιστάσθαι and γνωρίζειν ο.

6. + τί λέγειν/βούλεθαί/βούλεθαί λέγειν depend- ent on either a personal or personified noun, e.g. λόγος, δόμα (p. 208): μαθάνειν 39, εἰδέναι 27, συνέναι 10, γνώσεις 3, ἀγώνες 3, ἐπιστᾶσθαι 1, γνωρίζειν and συνέναι 0. μαθάνειν, εἰδέναι, συνέναι, γνώσεις are synonymous. There is no relation of consequence between μαθάνειν and ἐπιστάσθαι.

7. + oratio obliqua clause, apart from those in class 6 (pp. 205 ff.): εἰδέναι 277, γνώσεις 66, ἀγώνες 26, μαθάνειν 11, ἐπιστᾶσθαι 7, συνέναι 2, γνωρίζειν and συνέναι 1. The relation of consequence between μαθάνειν and ἐπιστάσθαι does not hold for all instances in this class. No distinction of meaning can be drawn between γνώσεις and ἐπιστάσθαι (p. 207).

8. used absolutely (pp. 209 ff.): μαθάνειν 66, εἰδέναι 21, γνώσεις 8, συνέναι 3, rest 0. μαθάνειν has no consequence relationship with ἐπιστάσθαι; it is synonymous with συνέναι, but not with εἰδέναι or γνώσεις.

9. + impersonal noun (pp. 212 ff.): εἰδέναι 67, γνώσεις 55, ἐπιστάσθαι 28, μαθάνεις 22, ἀγώνες 15, συνέναι 7, γνωρίζεις 5, ἐπιστῶμαι 4.

The book’s unity of purpose is somewhat spoiled by the amount of space devoted to discussion and illustration of transformational syntax, a theory which has come to enjoy considerable vogue during the past decade, especially in the United States. The author appears greatly attracted by it, but as there are doubts about its feasibility as an economic system, and as the semantic analysis could have been carried out without it, it would perhaps best have been left out.

There are also one or two erroneous views of Greek grammar, e.g. ‘for the other moods (i.e. other than the indicative) the dimension of time reference is not relevant’ (p. 112); likewise the account of tenses and aspects (pp. 111 ff.), though correct in theory and true for the material investigated, does not hold for all verbs; as a result the relation of tense and aspect to meaning is stated too categorically (p. 116).

However, in its primary object, to exemplify an objective method of determining meaning, the book is on the whole successful: the results of the analysis, with some reservations about those verbs, the occurrence of which in various environments is too infrequent to allow safe conclusions to be drawn, can be accepted. Regarding the question of whether the results yield new information, the author disarms criticism by claiming merely to ‘make explicit pre-

vously intuitive knowledge,’ but in this he does himself rather less than justice.

L. BRANDWOOD.

PLATO. Laches et Lysis. Ed. P. Vicaire. (Collection ‘Érasme’, textes grecs, vii.)

Plato’s Laches and Lysis both have elaborate and lively dramatic settings; the one shows us Socrates with elderly and distinguished public men, the other Socrates amidst Athenian adolescents and boys still at school. No Platonic dialogue lacks a philosophical core, but neither of these is off-putting to non-philosophers. M. Vicaire does a service in editing them for ‘l’enseignement supérieur’. He does not provide grammatical exposition for outright beginners, nor detailed philosophical discussion for specialist Platonists, but a terse and selective introduction and commentary perhaps best adapted for undergraduates for whom these are ‘general books’. Undergraduates will need, of course, to learn more about Platonic style and philosophy from other sources; and for detailed interpretation of the text Stallbaum still remains unreplaced for these dialogues, as for altogether practically 200 pages of Plato; but Vicaire offers useful and up-to-date signposts to the well-girt general reader, and often provides illumination with a minimum of scholarly impedimenta. Occasional rather trivial grammatical notes are spaced with correct explanations of some more subtle particles and ellipses (howlers occur perhaps only at 182 c, 216 c); attention is drawn to Plato’s methodological metaphors; personalities and social background are as a rule adequately sketched in. (But 178 b, what exactly was ὑλομοιοῦσα? 187 b, how did the Carian get into the proverb? 204 e, we know more of Lysis’ family from I.G. II—III 7045; 206 d, we know a little more about palaestras and the Hermæa.) The course of the argument is sign-posted but not explained or discussed. Consultation of the references to Empedocles provided at 214 b would reveal greater complications than Vicaire mentions.

On the ‘signification des œuvres’ Vicaire’s terseness is inadequate. No reader of the Laches, however hurried, should be allowed not to wonder about the relations between ἀθρόεια, καρπέια, ἑρωτικής; and ὁμόθετον; any reader of the Lysis must wonder what ἡλία such as ὑλεία have to do with friendship.

Vicaire should perhaps have wondered himself at greater length before his apparent decision that the Laches is truly aporetic, whilst the Lysis implies its own solution.

Vicaire dates Laches before Protagoras, relying on Festugière’s article in BCH 70 (1946); but Festugière was himself very guarded, and in fact devoted more care to Protagoras than to Laches. If καρπεία at Laches 192 equals δάρμος at Protagoras 349, then why is

In the first half (chapters I–III) of this stimulating and important book Görgermanns tries to fashion a key for the interpretation of the Laws; in the second half (chapter IV) he attempts to use the key to unlock the complex secrets of the dialogue. G. Müller, in Studien zu den Platonschen Nomoi (Zetemata, 9, München 1951), produced a formidable catalogue of difficulties, contradictions and obscurities in the Laws; he claimed that the muddle and confusion of the work exceeded anything that could be explained by posthumous editing or a lack of revision, and in view of what he felt was a basic similarity of style between the Laws and Epinomis as opposed to the other dialogues, all but concluded that the Laws could not be a work of Plato. However, he shrank from actually asserting this, in view of the clear testimony of Aristotle (Politics 1266b5 and 1271b1). In this unsatisfactory state matters rested for nearly a decade.

With a flick of the wrist, Görgermanns tries to resolve the difficulties. His argument is, in essence, very simple. We have always attempted to interpret the Laws in the wrong frame of mind. The Laws is not a genuinely philosophical work; it stands apart from all earlier dialogues as being explicitly ‘literary’, popular and didactic, being written for the instruction of the solid and respectable peasants of Plato’s ‘second-best’ state (Plato actually wants Selections from the Laws of Plato read in schools: 811c–e). If the doctrine of the Laws appears to differ from that of earlier dialogues, it is because, being simplified, it has lost its philosophical rigour, and because it has been written in a protreptic style for popular presentation.

This thesis is exhaustively—even wearisomely—argued in the first half of the book, and carries considerable conviction. It is of course obvious that in any case Plato’s doctrine varies from time to time, merely to suit context and subject-matter. For instance, his reversion to a bipartite analysis of the soul in the Republic (589c+), after the elucidation of the tripartite, will hardly be thought an inconsistency, and Görgermanns hardly needs to invoke the ‘popular’ character of the Laws to account for the dominance of the bipartite analysis there (p. 137 n. 3): is the three-fold soul really so recondivise a doctrine? But Görgermanns’ comprehensive analysis of the relationship of the Laws to rhetoric, poetry and education, based on explicit statements in the Laws itself, makes it quite clear that Plato’s latest work is in a category on its own. Even so, the distinction can be, and sometimes is, overdrawn: a didactic and persuasive purpose is surely not absent from earlier works, and there are some desperately difficult passages in the Laws that would need a very clever peasant indeed to interpret them.

The second part of the book amply justifies the lengthy analysis of the first, and Görgermanns’ elucidation of the philosophy of the Laws in the light of his basic approach is excellent. He is especially good (pp. 113+) on the four virtues, which he finds to be treated no longer systematically and philosophically but very much more in the ‘ordinary’ way. ‘Natural’ ἀφάτος and σωφροσύνη are stressed, and φρόνησις usually means ‘practical’ wisdom and approaches the Aristotelian use of the word. The virtues are not now ‘one’ by being fundamentally knowledge, but form a much looser unity by opposing the emotions and obeying Nomos, the concrete expression of reason; the contrast between reason and emotion is stressed throughout. There is nothing here to contradict the Republic, but the emphasis is vastly different. Görgermanns deals also with the free-will problem, pleasure and happiness, cosmology, theology and dialectic; his discussion is always well-documented, acute and revealing.

Görgermanns is obviously pickled in the Laws, but perhaps he is even more pickled in his own interpretation. Even if his basic approach is sound, it is obviously a fallacy to suppose that if one can find an easily-understood, practical and down-to-earth mean-
ing for a given passage, that must necessarily be the right one. So convinced is Görgemanns that his view of the Laws is universally applicable that he sometimes rides roughshod over the text. Take for instance the notoriously difficult and ambiguous passage 863a3—864b7. Görgemanns’ discussion is full of categorical statements (e.g. p. 138 n. 1) about the meaning and implication of the Greek that suit his book and may indeed be right, which need much closer argument. It is not enough for instance, to slip into small print for a dozen lines (p. 140), knock together the heads of those who interpret differently, and make such magisterial remarks as: ‘Das ist unnötig, es entsteht dabei die neue Schwierigkeit, dass das Nichtwissen auf das Beste selbst zu beziehen wäre, nicht nur auf die Art seiner Verwirklichung’ (referring to attempts to emend 864b6—7). But this is a difficulty only if one assumes that because the Laws is a practical work, the passage 864a1+ must refer to practical ‘know-how’ rather than to theoretical wisdom about moral ends. If Görgemanns had taken the trouble to examine the actual Greek more closely, setting aside his own preconceptions, he would not have dismissed the opposite view so summarily. (Τηρ του ἀριστον δόξαν (864a1) can hardly be a practical view about means, because Plato requires that it should rule and guide every man (ας); the language and context is more appropriate to ἀριστή δόξα about ends; this is the least of the many Schwierigkeiten in Görgemanns’ own interpretation which he simply does not recognise.)

Even so, this book is of fundamental importance for the interpretation of the Laws; Görgemanns has fashioned a golden key, even if he wants it to open more doors than it will.

TREVOR J. SAUNDERS.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne.


This book is a bold attempt to explain the way in which Aristotle’s mind worked. It provides a study of his conception of the method and structure of science (science in the sense of ἐνώριαν, not Natural Science), written to illustrate the thesis that Aristotle was at heart a biologist and that biological modes of thought underlie his whole philosophy. As the publishers’ blurb remarks, a study of this kind has long been overdue; since the idea was first suggested by D’Arcy Thompson it has been taken up by a number of scholars, but no one has yet developed it in a comprehensive way. Mrs Grene’s discussion is selective and can hardly claim to provide this comprehensive treatment, but her book is a stimulating and illuminating essay, and deserves to be read by Aristotelian scholars and by philosophers of science alike.

The book opens with two general chapters. In the first of these Mrs Grene discusses the peculiar difficulties of the subject that arise from the nature of the Aristotelian corpus and from the problem of Aristotle’s development. She draws attention to the weakness of the ‘genetic’ method of interpreting Aristotle (i.e. the study of his development) and urges instead a ‘more philosophically oriented’ approach (i.e. one that tries to make philosophical sense of all the different things that he says on different occasions). Mrs Grene points out that by concentrating on development the student is all too likely to ‘dissolve the thinker he is studying into many opposing thinkers and finally to legislate him out of existence altogether’, and that it is more important to understand the general principles underlying his thought. Similarly in the second chapter, where she deals with the contrast between Aristotle and Plato, Mrs Grene lays her emphasis not on the fact that Aristotle somehow developed out of Plato, but rather on the fact that their attitudes to philosophy are fundamentally different. Her thesis here is that ‘Plato’s problems are not problems for Aristotle at all’, and that it is wrong either to see Plato as foreshadowing Aristotle in a halting way or to see Aristotle as crudely missing the point of Plato’s subtleties.

In these two chapters Mrs Grene hits an important nail on the head, and her plea comes as a salutary reminder in the present state of Aristotelian studies. Her exposition of the Metaphysics illustrates the truth of this very well: it is much more rewarding to read some coherence into this baffling work than to concentrate on sub-dividing it into strata (though we may still believe that stratification is possible). In this approach to Aristotle Mrs Grene makes considerable use of J. Owens’ Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics; indeed her view of Aristotle as a whole might be called an extension of Owens’ view of the Metaphysics. At the same time it is difficult to get away from the genetic method altogether. Mrs Grene is implicitly using it herself as her starting-point when she bases her biological interpretation on D’Arcy Thompson’s theory of development. While she is right in insisting that the genetic method is not of paramount importance, it has to be employed as an ancillary tool if we are to make an intelligent attempt at understanding Aristotle.

Mrs Grene next discusses in turn the Organon, the physical treatises (with an excursus on De Memoria) and the Metaphysics. It is in her handling of the physical treatises that her biological thesis is most convincing. She exposes very clearly the biologist’s ideas inherent in Aristotle’s treatment of the physical world: she finds these not only in his use of final causes but also in the types of natural object and the kinds of change that he discusses, in his treatment of the elements, and in his concept of rest and motion (not motion alone). Incidentally she makes Aristotle’s teleology appear a much more satisfactory concept than most commentators have done. But her discussions of the Organon and of the Metaphysics, though instructive, are less successful. The ‘bio-
logical' elements that she unearths here are less worthy of the name and her thesis wears rather thin; for example, she is reduced to citing 'the careful technique of separating subject-matters' and 'a consuming interest in the kinds of thing that there are and the processes that make them these kinds' as indicative of Aristotle's biological attitude.

This illustrates the chief weakness of Mrs Grene's central thesis. Many of the ideas that she cites as 'biological' are in fact not specifically biological at all, but rather ideas based on common sense. The belief in universal univocal predication (pp. 70–72), the confidence that specimens are specimens (i.e. that the individual is a true instance of the species) (p. 108), the belief that things have their natures written on their faces (p. 161)—these are cited as beliefs of the practising biologist or naturalist. But in fact they are the beliefs of the man in the street, based not on any philosophy of science but on common sense. No doubt they are also the beliefs of the biologist, but he holds them not qua biologist but qua ordinary man. Again, it is perfectly true, as Mrs Grene points out, that the concept of the τι ὦ εἶναι is fundamental to Aristotle's view of living creatures; but this does not mean that it is essentially a biologist's concept, for it is equally fundamental to Aristotle's way of looking at any object. It is worth noting that while Mrs Grene always uses biological examples to illustrate such concepts as form and matter, ὀψία and ἐντελέχεια, one of Aristotle's own common examples in this context is the building of a house.

The book ends with an interesting chapter on Aristotle's relevance to modern thought, in particular to post-Darwinian biology. There is also a useful bibliography, and an excellent 'bibliographical note' to introduce the non-specialist to recent literature on Aristotle.

H. J. Easterling.

Trinity College, Cambridge.


This book is mainly concerned with the interpretation of Aeschylus and Sophocles. The title is justified not only by the fifty pages of Section One on the Poetics of Aristotle, but also because throughout the book Jones shows his conviction that the Poetics, rightly understood, is a better guide to the essence of Greek tragedy than is generally recognised. He takes Aristotle's essential point to be the primacy of the tragic action, which has been somewhat obscured by the importation into the Poetics of the Tragic Hero. Other scholars have of course deprecated the tendency to think of Greek tragedy in terms of character studies, but Jones goes further than any writer known to me. It is not merely that plot is more important than character: the figures on the stage only exist as a vehicle for action and to give the action an 'ethical colouring'. There is no 'stable unitary centre of consciousness' at all, there is practically nothing behind the mask. This almost reverential attitude to the bare praxis Jones takes to have been shared by the audience, and speaks for instance of the Athenian spectators' 'sense of fulfilment and joy as they allowed the acts of the figures on the stage to trickle through the fingers of imagination'. Greek tragedy as expounded here proves to be something rather remote, and indeed Jones does not shirk a sombre conclusion: 'probably not much of the ancient tragic experience is recoverable by us'.

From this point of view, Aeschylus, practically ignored by Aristotle in the Poetics, turns out to be in essentials the most Aristotelian of them all. Jones confines himself mainly to the Oresteia, and here stress on the primacy of the action is combined with another conception, that of the oikos as a community including the dead and the living, together with their material possessions, a community by which the life of the individual is fostered and transmitted, and which is itself almost a sentient being. So far as the trilogy has a 'hero' it is the House of Atreus. As Jones puts it 'the voices of individuals are the fragmented voice of the oikos'; elsewhere he speaks of Aeschylus as 'weaving round the body of the oikos a seamless garment of sin-begotten and sin-begetting action in which individual threads lose themselves in the whole'. Much of what is said in this section could probably be applied to the Septem trilogy, and the whole treatment of Aeschylus seems to me valuable and suggestive, whether the theory behind it is wholly acceptable or not.

In the next section on Sophocles, comparison of Electra and Choephori brings out the decline in the importance of the oikos and the focusing of attention upon the individual. Jones, however, maintains that for Sophocles the essence of the play still resides in action, though the action is 'more characterful' than in Aeschylus. For instance, in the Antigone he warns us not to think of a clash between two personalities each aware of a will and an intelligence opposed to his own; he sees the play as primarily concerned with an action, the burial of Polynices, so that Creon 'finds his adversary, experiences her within the forbidden and performed act of burial'. In all this Jones takes a more extreme position than I should care to adopt, but it is worth considering whether when certain plays seem to us to fall into two parts, this is because we tend to think in terms of characters, whereas to Sophocles and his audience, seeing them in terms of an action, they may have given a stronger impression of unity. On the whole, however, I find Jones' approach less satisfactory here than in his treatment of the Oresteia. There are times when perhaps his theory leads him to get the facts a little out of focus. Thus in the O.T. he thinks that because it so happens that the action is carried mainly by one man, we concentrate too much on the king and do not pay sufficient attention to the deliverance of Thebes; but it is surely Sophocles himself who sees to
it in the second half of the play that we think of Oedipus rather than of Thebes, whose deliverance from the plague is a matter of inference and not presented dramatically at all. Nevertheless, in this section as in all, the author is fertile in new and stimulating suggestions for which we must be grateful. The book ends with a brief chapter on Euripides, in which Jones finds the consciousness of self that is missing in the other dramatists. This aspect of Euripides has of course been noticed by others, but it is here illuminated by many penetrating observations on points of detail. As Jones admits, the difference he finds in Euripides’ approach to personality should strictly involve some modification of the generalisations of his opening chapter.

The book as a whole is original and provocative; it is indeed a challenge to reconsider some aspects of our approach to Attic tragedy. I should hesitate to recommend it to beginners, to whom it might prove discouraging, not so much because it represents Greek drama as more remote from us than I believe it to be, but because it is sometimes a difficult book to read. Jones at times writes with force and simplicity, but there are a good many sentences such as ‘Antigone’s quasi-legal arguments . . . mirror faithfully the near indeterminacy of hypothetical selfhood’, which might make the study of drama seem more abstruse and difficult than it really needs to be. But for the scholar the book well repays the effort needed and should certainly not be missed.

P. T. STEVENS.

Bedford College, London.


Professor Oates has written an interesting book on an important but rather neglected topic. His subject is Aristotle’s value theory, i.e. the theory or theories on which Aristotle bases his value judgements, and in order to examine this theory Oates compares it with Plato’s. Plato’s value theory is based on the Theory of Forms, in which Value is linked with Being in a coherent system, both being derived ultimately from the Form of the Good; thus the aim of the book is to examine the consequences of Aristotle’s rejection of the Theory of Forms and to see what he puts in its place as a foundation for his own value theory.

In order to bring out clearly the contrast between Aristotle and Plato, Oates begins by devoting a chapter to the Theory of Forms and the view of the world that it entails. The theory that he depicts is the classical theory of the Republic, epitomised by the Divided Line, and for the purpose of pointing the contrast between Plato and Aristotle it is no doubt fair to accept this as typically Platonic. But in the forty pages that he allows for this chapter Oates would have done better to concentrate on giving a straightforward account of this classical theory; as it is he complicates the picture and begs a number of important questions by trying to cover too much ground. He insists, for example, that Plato never abandoned the essence of the Theory as seen in (his interpretation of) the Divided Line; the only way of supporting this assertion would be to examine the later dialogues and to see whether they bear it out, but Oates does nothing more in this respect than to take for granted the view that the Timaeus is a late dialogue and that Plato has a simple (and valid) answer up his sleeve to the third man argument in the Parmenides. There is not a hint that these two views are controversial, or that they might need substantiating. Again, Oates gives curiously garbled accounts of the Parmenides (pp. 38–40) and the Theaetetus (pp. 46–7), which are all the more annoying in that they contribute little to the general picture that he is painting.

After this chapter on Plato, Oates treats Aristotle in a similar but vastly superior way, and in two chapters outlines the metaphysics that Aristotle uses to replace the Theory of Forms. In these sixty pages he gives an admirable account of the ‘metaphysics of the individual particular’, the theory of the τὸ ὅστις which forms the basis of Aristotle’s system. He explains lucidly Aristotle’s fundamental concepts such as form and matter, and brings out very clearly the difficulties inherent in Aristotle’s theories of individuation and knowledge of the individual. These two chapters are excellently done.

Oates now turns to his main subject, the examination of Aristotle’s value theory. As he points out in his introductory chapter, this enterprise is at once historical and philosophical: it has two objects, to describe Aristotle’s theory and also to ask whether it is as good as Plato’s. Oates’ thesis is that, unlike Plato, whose value theory is rooted in his ontology, Aristotle is interested in ontology alone; for him the supremely interesting question is τί τὸ ἔρρησε ὅστις; This leads him into two errors: (i) he considers this question in isolation and fails to associate ideas of value with his ontology, so that his value theory has no metaphysical foundation, and (ii), worse than this, he has not one value theory but a number of different theories which he uses on different occasions, so that his system is not only unsoundly based but also inconsistent. Oates illustrates the latter point convincingly from a survey of the treatises: Aristotle uses happiness, φιλόσοφος, κόρος, the final cause, and ‘conventional ideas’ among other things as criteria of evaluation, without any attempt to mould them into a coherent theory. But there is one criterion which might appear to offer a satisfactory basis for a universal value theory; that is the Unmoved Mover, which is represented in Met. A as a perfect being from whom the goodness of the universe is derived. This might seem to be just the unifying ontological criterion that Oates is looking for; but Oates will have none of it. He criticises the arguments of Met. A 6–10, and while some of his strictures
NOTICES OF BOOKS

are justified, others seem to be the result of prejudice.
For example, his interpretation of the image of the
general in A 10 amounts to a perverse refusal to see any
sense in Aristotle’s words; he complains that it ‘does
not serve to strengthen Aristotle’s case because it can
in no way be designated an argument’ (p. 257) and
that Aristotle fails to answer questions about the
connexion of god and goodness ‘with fully compelling
argument’ (p. 256), a complaint that may be justified
but one that comes surprisingly from a critic who was
satisfied by the images of the Sun and the Divided
Line. This lack of sympathy with Aristotle’s point
of view is typical of the book.

Much of the discussion is concerned with the
detailed interpretation of texts, and here it is disturbing
to find that many of Oates’ interpretations are ques-
tionable while some are plainly wrong. It is plainly
wrong, for example, to interpret avdyvwv at Met. 1072
b10 as necessity sine qua non (pp. 185 and 232–3); the
preceding six lines make it clear that Aristotle means
necessity in the sense of the non-contingent. There
is nothing to support Oates’ interpretation (on which
he bases a charge of circular argument) except a
footnote in the first edition of Ross’ Oxford
Translation, which was corrected in the second edition (a
fact that bothers Oates unduly, p. 233 n. 148). It is even
more disturbing to see that Oates is sometimes misled
by the English translation that he is using into a
misinterpretation of the Greek (e.g. pp. 266–11,
where he insists on attributing to Aristotle the state-
ment that ‘the mathematical sciences say and prove
a very great deal about the good and the beautiful’,
when in fact the words ‘about the good and the
beautiful’ (with which he is finding fault) are supplied
by the translator).

Oates is clearly justified in his criticism of Aristotle’s
value theory as inconsistent; but he goes further than
this, and implies that even if Aristotle had thought
more deeply about value and had evolved a coherent
system, it would still be unsatisfactory because it
would not be related to Being, as Plato’s is. The
thesis on which this criticism is based, that Being and
Value must be seen together, is not argued at length
in the book; it is briefly discussed in the introductory
chapter, where Oates appeals to the authority of
Saint Augustine and A. E. Taylor and writes (p. 12)
that ‘there emerges the strong suggestion that the
investigator should see Being and Value together,
because that is the way they seem to be related in
actual human experience, which is after all by way of
being the final court of appeal’. (It is worth noticing
that when Aristotle relies on this court of appeal he is
rebuked by Oates for relying on the ‘conventional
reactions of men’, e.g. p. 216.) It is a pity that this
thesis is not argued more fully, for it might have made the book a more interesting contribution
to the debate on the relation between ‘is’ and ‘ought’.

H. J. EASTERLING.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

(Collectio philosophica Lateranensis, 5.) Rome
not stated.

There has been a considerable increase in the
attention paid to the Parva Naturalia in the past
fifteen years. Tricot’s translation appeared in 1951,
Mugnier’s Budé edition in 1953, and Sir David Ross’
edition in 1955. S. has now published an edition
which represents the fruit of studies which he began
as early as 1933. The result, however, is a disappoint-
ing one: although this book has certain positive
qualities, its value is greatly diminished by the serious
shortcomings and blemishes by which it is marred.

The introduction contains, among other things, a
useful resumé of the author’s view of the filiation of
the manuscripts (to which he has already devoted a
separate study, Les manuscrits grecs des Parva Naturalia
d’Aristote Rome, Desclee, 1961), and here he has
clearly performed a valuable service in carrying out
an even more exhaustive examination of the manu-
scripts than that undertaken by Mugnier. S. also
deals briefly with the question of the development
of Aristotle’s psychology, and here his discussion, as it
stands, is rather unsatisfactory (though in a note he
expresses his intention of taking up the problem again
elsewhere). Like Drossaert Lulofs and Ross he takes
Nuyens’ interpretation as his starting-point. He
observes that he finds no contradiction between the
two theories which Nuyens and others have taken to
mark the ‘second’ and the ‘third’ stages in Aristotle’s
development, namely the view that the central organ,
the heart, is the seat of perception, etc., and the view
that the soul is the énntexësos of the natural organised
body. And yet it is strange that S. does not either
follow up this observation himself, or refer to the
important article in which Irving Bloch has developed
a similar point and challenged Nuyens’ view of the
relative chronology of the de Anima and the various
treatises of the Parva Naturalia (‘The order of Aris-
totle’s psychological writings’, AJPh 74 [1964] 50–77;
and since Siwek’s work was published, a further
important article has appeared on this topic, that of
W. F. R. Hardie entitled ‘Aristotle’s treatment of the
relation between the soul and the body’ in the
the view that many of Nuyens’ arguments are doubt-
ful, and contests his interpretation of certain passages
in the de Anima, but concludes rather weakly that
Nuyens’ chronology may nevertheless be accepted as
probable, if not certain, so far as it goes.

As for the Greek text which S. presents, this may be
described as conservative. Where it differs from
that of Ross (for instance), it is usually to reinstate
the MSS reading (in spite of its improbability or the
difficulties it contains) as against the conjectural
emendations of scholars ancient or modern. (Ex-
amples are his retention of προπνός at Rep. 477a 18, and of
προπνήσεις at 480a 24.) Unfortunately his text is spoilt
first of all by the inordinate number of misprints that
occur (as indeed is the book as a whole: the word Introductio which appears now as Introductio, p. xxv, now as Introductio, p. xxvii, gives us an inkling of what to expect). In the de Senso alone we find μέγεθος for μέγεθος (437a 9), μεμιθύμη for μεμιθύμη (440b 11), ατύχλα for ατύχλα (443a 25), αὐξ for αὐξ (b 19), ἐνοπτίμην παρα-αντίστοις (448a 2) ισολόγεται for ισολόγεται (a 30), and the Greek word ἄναγκαιον appears now as ἄναγκαιον (445b 14) and later, at Resp. 480a 29, as ἄναγκαιον. These errors will probably confuse only those whose knowledge of Greek is fairly rudimentary: but there are others where it is more difficult to establish what S. actually means us to read. At Sens. 437b 32 we find το ιτο in the text, though he translates τοιτ' ('olim'), and at Mem. 450b 20 we find συμβαίνειν though S. appears to translate συμβαίνει (and he notes συμβαίνει as a variant of Ροστ' in the apparatus). But the question of misprints apart, S. has a disconcerting tendency to print one reading, but to prefer another in his notes, as happens for example at Mem. 450a 13 where having printed τοι γνωσμένον in his text, he remarks in his notes (p. 154 n. 26) that he will follow the reading τοι γνωμέν (favoured by Ross). Again when referring to Sens. 446b 27–8 at p. 80 n. 81 he seems to adopt the reading ἐνείαιν in preference to ἐναιν and ye prints ἐναιν in (actual fact ἐναι) in his own text at that point.

His Latin translation is, for the most part, clear and accurate, if rather more clumsy than the original Greek (ἀπορρήθαι δ' ἐν τις sometimes becomes 'move-bit forte quis dubium sequens' for example). As for his notes, S. devotes much of his attention to discussing the meanings of the terms which appear in the text, so that many of his notes read like abstracts from dictionary articles. With such terms as μιξις or δύναμις it is very valuable to undertake a survey of the Aristotelian usage, but S. carries this type of comment to rather extreme lengths, for it hardly serves any useful purpose to be told the various physical senses of κενόν in a note to a passage in which Aristotle merely criticizes the theory of vision in the Timaeus as κενόν ... παντελός (Sens. 437b 15). His notes on the biological doctrines which figure in the Parva Naturalia seem particularly weak. Often he goes no further than to cite corresponding passages in the biological works (though there are certain interesting discrepancies in Aristotle's various descriptions of the anatomy of the heart, for example, which S. might have followed up) and he commits at least one gross blunder when he asserts that lizards (lacerti; in the Greek text σαλβατομα) 'pertinent ad ovipara quadrupeda aequo ac avibus' (n. 35 on p. 274; my italics). Furthermore, outside the sphere of purely Aristotelian studies S. expresses some strangely superficial judgements. Commenting on Resp. 473a 4 (n. 91 on p. 343) he says that Aristotle is probably alluding 'ad Scholam Hippocraticam, pro qua aër erat "materia, e qua ignis fit" ... De Flatibus 5', as if the author of the de Flatibus was a representative member of a School which possessed an identifiable body of generally accepted doctrines. And in discussing the theories of Empedocles which are referred to in the Parva Naturalia S. often seems to underestimate the difficulties of interpretation which these present and to ignore the more recent literature on the subject. Thus the most recent authority apart from Ross which he cites in his note on the clepsydra fragment (Resp. 473b 9 ff.) is Freeman's Companion to Diels' Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, although Furley (JHS bxxvii (1957) 31–4), Timpanaro Cardini (La Parola del Passato xii (1957) 250–70) and Booth (JHS bxx (1960) 10–5) have all made important contributions to the study of this fragment. Finally, I should point out that many of Siwek's references are inaccurate. In note 48 to the de Senso alone there are errors or misprints in the title, date and page-reference of Joachim's Journal of Philology article, in the title and page-reference of M. Stéphanides Revue scientifique article and A. Reymond appears here (as also on p. 87, though not on p. 249) as A. Raymond, and if this note is a particularly bad example, similar mistakes are unfortunately all too common elsewhere.

G. E. R. Lloyd.

King's College, Cambridge.


'Aucun mot français n'arrive a rendre toutes les nuances des termes grecs συγγένεια et συγγενής'; but des P. in tracing the history of συγγένεια from Homer to St Cyril of Alexandria, is mainly concerned with the notion of kinship between man and the divine. His method is to collect and list examples of the word and its cognates, thesis fashion, and to examine their significance wherever they occur. This can and does lead to tedium, particularly in the middle sections, where the argument sometimes tends to become fanciful, if not actually obscured by the introduction of philosophic concepts. It is, however, resumed again with force and clarity when the author turns to the Neoplatonics and the fathers of the church.

Homer emphasised the gulf which divided mortals from immortals, and the phrase 'father of gods and men' signified dependence on rather than kinship with Zeus. Hesiod's statement in the Works & Days that gods and men possessed a common origin was regarded as spurious by Lehrs, and although it finds an echo in the sixth Nemean Pindar's conception of συγγένεια was based on physical liaisons. 'Entrer dans la race des dieux'; des P. comments sadly, 'même comme la victime de l'adultère de Zeus, semble avoir pari à Pindar éminemment enviable'.

The Supplices is of special interest as illustrating an infraction of the fundamental law of exogamy 'et finalement comme un inceste'. The Orestiea again is 'la triologie du sang et de la race'. Even the Erinyes are described as συγγενοί, while there are references in the Agamemnon both to the δαίμων γένους; and the
Marcus too commanded men to love the human race and to follow god. Συγγένες again plays an important part in Neoplatonism, though Iamblichus is the first to refer to τῶν κοινῶν σύνδεσμον θεών τε καὶ γυνών. Clement, Origen and Athanasius, on the other hand, were at one in opposing the notion that man and God were consubstantial, while for St Cyril 'la vraie parenté suppose la foi'.

This book, despite its somewhat forbidding format and startling omissions (e.g. the Pre-Platonics find no place) is distinguished by great learning and the kind of scholarship that might be expected from the author of a work on Pindar's pronouns. It is furnished with an introduction, bibliography and indices of Greek words and ancient authorities, as well as a detailed 'table des matières'. It will be found useful not only by philosophers and theologians, but by students of classical Greek literature and indeed by all who, like the author, are concerned in some measure with the problem of man's destiny on earth.

John Pollard.

University College of N. Wales, Bangor.


This book, the author tells us, is designed as a companion volume to his Aristocratic Society in Ancient Crete. Such local studies can be very valuable, but they are not easy to write; for they can easily degenerate into a mere collection of bits and pieces. Crete, by reason of its peculiar history and character, is especially suitable for treatment, and Mr Willetts seeks to hold his account together within a sociological framework. 'It has been my purpose to attempt to discover, wherever possible, the social needs which the cults and festivals were designed to satisfy or to represent.' This is an excellent idea. There are two difficulties if one goes beyond a mere orderly setting down of recorded beliefs and practices. One is to avoid preconceptions, as we have had to learn to do in dealing with modern primitive races. 'Nothing', the author comments, 'is more prone to become a speculative abstraction than a cult divorced from its social context.' Equally, it might be added, the social context may become a speculative abstraction too. We know so little of what people think when they go through some ceremonial, and it is notoriously difficult to enter into the mind of long dead men. Analogies are risky. Crete presents a great many dangers. Willetts tracks back survivals to primitive origins, explains the new and accounts for the ossified. He seeks to take account of what he calls 'the changing social matrix'. There is another ever-present difficulty, namely, discovering what exactly material objects and representations meant to their creators. In the case of Crete 'Past Legacies' (the title of his first part) involves a study which goes back to the Neolithic culture, and takes in the whole terrifying problem of
interpreting a vast and disputed corpus of material evidence. It is inevitable here that we should think about the tablets. Linear A gets one reference and Linear B two, and the author in his preface advances as the reason for the omission, first, the misgivings of certain scholars on linguistic grounds, and then ‘the poverty of the present material and the difficulty of its interpretation (which) would remain as obstacles preventing its use for immediate historical purposes’. But are the uncertainties much greater than in some or most of the material evidence? He may well follow the judgements of Professor W. K. C. Guthrie on the tablets and religion strictly so-called, but what about the ‘social matrix’ or the economic background? It is quite clear that a great deal can be made out of the Linear B tablets, and it is to be wondered whether there is much point in carrying the scope of the book so far back without some consideration of them. These doubts and problems also afflict his second section ‘Transition and Continuity’. How far can one bit from one literary or archaeological context be combined with another in a chain which also includes modern authorities? And incidentally, despite the imposing Bibliography, works of modern scholarship which one would certainly expect to find are not always cited in the abundant footnotes. The wood is sometimes lost in the trees, and these latter are sometimes of very dubious substance. This is not to deny that we should be grateful to the author for a collection of material of absorbing interest, to dip into (after the manner of A. B. Cook’s Zeus) and to quarry for recondite information. This applies particularly to the chapters on ‘The Cretan Goddesses’; on the youthful gods, the Cretan Zeus, Dionysos and Hya- kinthos; on Asklepios and the Cretan Olympus (Zeus, Hera, Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Aphrodite, Ares, Hermes, Poseidon), with an extremely useful account of their cult-titles. Diverse odds and ends round off the book, including a discussion of the Song of Hybris. There is, in fact, a vast deal of valuable stuff in this book, in the religion and myth of the classical period and later. It is not easy to give it any strongly defined unity. It is also true that Mr Willetts is most readable when he forgets his high sociological purposes.

R. J. Hopper.

University of Sheffield.


Neither the gods nor their worshippers were the same in all ages. Nevertheless this obvious fact has often been ignored by historians of religion and mythology, who have tended to refer to Apollo or Dionysus as if they embodied conceptions which never changed. A study of Greek art should prove a salutary corrective in such instances, and although Hans Walter is concerned with one era only, viz. the notable interim which separated the Parthenon sculptures from Praxiteles, his methods are applicable to other periods.

The post-Parthenon era was characterised by a profound change of outlook towards the gods. Dionysiac scenes, and the statuesque qualities of divinities and heroes gave way to realism. Muses, Maenads and Aphrodite herself all became indistinguishable from mortal women. Backgrounds too altered with the accent on personal relationships, so that divinity in vase paintings is sometimes hard to detect. Zeuxis made even the Centaurs human, and the boundaries separating mythological from genre scenes began to disappear. Helen was no longer the perfidious adulteress of the sixth century B.C., nor the tragic heroine of the fifth, but the personification of the power of female beauty. The emphasis now is no longer on the gods as something remote from men, but on the human qualities that embody ‘dämonische Mächte’. Men were no longer controlled by fate, as Sophocles had believed, but by the forces of human passion as Euripides showed. The existence of these forces was recognised by Praxiteles who ‘hat in der Göttin die Frau gesehen’, and emphasised youth and realism through the medium of common life.

W’s views, though persuasively argued, are sometimes vitiated by specious generalisations. Certainly the statement that ‘die griechische Kunst ist die Geschichte der Menschen’ might astonish the Chinese. Again the phrase ‘dämonische Mächte’ is curiously reminiscent of Kunze’s description of the Sirens (AM 1932). The book is beautifully printed and the photographs are superb. They not only serve to illustrate the text, but help the reader to see into the minds of the artists of the fourth century B.C.

JOHN POLLARD.

University College of North Wales.


Hugo Rainer’s Griechische Mythen in christlicher Deutung seems to have attracted little attention in Britain when it first appeared in 1957, and it is good to be reminded of its existence in this fluent and idiomatic version by Brian Battershaw. The book falls into three parts, loosely held together by an overbranching theme. The first part, ‘Mysterion’, is a series of lectures given at Eranos congresses at Ascona. The second section, ‘The Healing of the Soul’ comprises two brilliant papers, on Moly and Mandragora, written in honour of Jung, and also reprinted from Eranos Jahrbuch. The final section, ‘Holy Homer’, brings together papers from other sources, and tells of the place of the willow in Greek and Christian symbolism, and of the Christian transformation of the myth of Odysséus and the Sirens.

Those who elect to work in a field which combines
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classical and Christian studies have a difficult path to tread. They will face some critics to whom the two fields are utterly discrete: on the classical side those who resent any intrusion of theology as tendentious, on the theological side those who would derive Christianity narrowly from Judaism and seek to expunge any Graeco-Roman influence as alien. Others, in that spirit of benevolent syncretism which Chesterton once grotesquely but exactly described as 'religion gone to pot', are delighted to identify Christianity with the other mystery-religions which floated round the Hellenistic air. Put in an extreme form, it is patently prejudiced either to see no connexion or to see no difference between the classical and Christian worlds; yet it is surprising how many worthy scholars tend to one position or the other, from numerous misinterpreters of Paul to examiners who will not allow John 1: 1 into a paper on Greek philosophy under the Roman Empire. Rahner's book is κακών δοξών ἀδελφός. It is sane and scholarly. It asserts neither disparity nor identity but continuity, which is the only valid principle. Its sound historical sense is clear and persuasive.

A few points of detail. P. 33 cf. Index, for 'Rhode' read 'Rhode'. P. 38 The Greek should read φθέγγομαι οις θέμας πει, θέρας δ’ἐπιθέω, βέβηλοι. P. 58 1.14 for 'Athanasius' read 'Athanasious'. P. 61 n. 3 The Greek is weird and wild. P. 62 The image of the Cross stretching out its arms to welcome Jews on the one hand and Gentiles on the other is found in Athanasius De Incarnations Verbi. Incidentally, Chesterton in The Everlasting Man has an ingenious contrast between the Circle of Buddhism, which embraces everything and adds up to nothing, and the Cross which stretches out its arms endlessly. Pp. 89 ff. There is a strange occurrence of Helios driving four happy horses through the sky in the crudely vigorous mosaic from the ancient synagogue at Beit Alpha in Israel. P. 107 Constantine was probably more of a syncretist than this implies. His family had associations with sun-worship. The chi rho vision had been granted him out of his ancient god the sun. In his new city (though the interpretation has been challenged by Karyannopoulos) his statue was to bear the radiant crown of the sun fashioned from the nails of the true cross. His god was a god of power not of love. P. 167 n. 1 cf. Index, for 'Swarzenski' read 'Swarzenski'. Pp. 184 ff. The conclusion, which rejects any precise botanical attribution for Moly may be right, but it would have been useful to mention the views of Béard and others that it is to be identified with atriplex halimus of the family chenopodiaceae. For the general rather than particular interpretation, together with some telling passages from the magical papyri cf. R. M. Henry On Plants of the Odyssey CR xx (1910) 434 f. P. 252 There is a pretty little problem here. Rahner quotes Hrabanus's simple and delightful remarks about the mandrake. In the Montecassino MS 137 of Hrabanus De Universo, p. 471, there is an excellent illustration of the dog pulling up the mandrake and the man stopping his ears (a legend which Rahner explains with great skill and scholarship). Yet this story does not appear in the text of Hrabanus, nor, for matter of that, in Isidore. How then did the illustration get there? (There is another splendid illustration of the dog and mandrake in an English eleventh-century herbal B.M. MS Cotton Vit. C. III fol. 57r). Pp. 286 ff. The association of the willow with chastity is of considerable interest. Among the Ainos of Japan it is a power of fertility, and the same thought surely underlies the practice, in some parts of central Europe, of beating with a willow wand for good luck. In Ezekiel xxvii: 5 the willow seems to be the type of fertility. In Bulgaria the willow seems to have healing powers. In classical times, of course, Orpheus uses a willow wand as a passport to Hades, and was so represented in Polygnotus's celebrated painting at Delphi. P. 321 L.27 for 'chining' read 'shining'. P. 343 L.5 It is bad to omit even δε from a quotation.

Rahner's strength is on the literary and ideological side, rather than the aesthetic and archaeological. But, with that reservation, this is an admirable book, ranging wide and deep, sometimes exciting, always sensible.

University of Ibadan.

John Ferguson.


This unusual book, which appears with the blessing of Sir Maurice Bowra and Professor Sterling Dow, discusses the Aegean Bronze Age from a novel point of view: the author is a well-known American political columnist, inspired to write after years of reading (Just about everything in English and French) and a trip to Pylos with Professor Blegen, by the conviction 'that key parts of the archaeological record were demonstrably open to political interpretations that have not hitherto been suggested'. The result, intended for both layman and specialist, is a very readable, often interesting, contribution, and one must admire the author's courage and modesty.

After describing the visit to Pylos, A. proceeds to a discussion of Mycenaean society and economics, which includes the suggestions that (pace Blegen) the Pylos goblets were awaiting export to Epirus, that the period covered by the Pylos archives is only a few weeks, that the Dorians' military advantage lay in their being able to arm cheaply with iron whole hordes of common soldiers against only a small elite of bronze-armed Myc. warriors, and an intriguing ref. (p. 85—Scient. Amer., July 1963. I thank Mr. Alsor for this) to a theory that the salt-pan method of obtaining salt from sea water was an Aegean invention and may have played a significant part in trade.

For his professional readers the most interesting section of the book is the last, in which A. considers
the central riddles of the period: the transformation of MH culture into Mycenaean, relations between Crete and the Mainland and what happened at Knossos? Although his underlying assumption that 'basic political processes in the Bronze Age are really highly unlikely to have differed greatly from basic political processes in other eras' is questionable, his close-knit reasoning, illustrated by a wealth of examples (mostly from China), leads him to an intriguing and novel hypothesis. Briefly, he suggests that the Mainland conquest of Crete took place some time in the seventeenth century. The innovations that appear in LM art and architecture are then explained as the result of a 'Greco-Minoan' synthesis. The new 'Greco-Minoan' state (Second Palace Period), centred at Knossos, had only a small Greek warrior class at the top and continued to use Linear A. A second influx of Greeks, perhaps c. 1520 after Marinatos' Thera catastrophe, perhaps later, accounts for the switch to Linear B. On the Mainland the drastic change to tightly controlled palace-centred economies took place by a process of 'feed-back' from Greco-Minoan Knossos. This scheme is of course proposed, in the absence of archaeological evidence, as merely a possibility worth bearing in mind. And such I think it is.

A pity, therefore, that the only purely archaeological part of it is marred by a serious misunderstanding. A asserts that LM art is radically different in spirit from Early and Middle Minoan—'more life-celebrating, more joyous, more natural, more centred on human beings'—and that this new spirit is Greek. In the first place, he greatly exaggerates its novelty: what about the steatite dog lids from Mochlos and Zakro, certain EM and MM sealstones, etc.? More important, while the mistake of regarding the Greek national character as fixed and static is not itself an archaeological one (though archaeologists all too often fall into it), is A. unaware that what has with good reason been thought the specifically Greek quality in Mycenaean and EM II Knossian art is precisely the opposite—the sober formalism already seen (notably by his hero Professor Blegen in MH pottery? Granted, A. does not claim to be writing archaeology. But this is nonetheless a very archaeological subject, and his treatment is not archaeological enough. Terms like 'LH IIIb' may be confusing to the layman, but eschewing them altogether in favour of absolute dates has obvious pitfalls, of which A. warns the reader only once, in a brief note at the beginning. In some places the avoidance of archaeological terminology positively adds to confusion. E.g., in his description of MH life (pp. 91-3) the term 'Middle Helladic' never appears, and it is made sufficiently clear that this is a period distinct from the Mycenaean. Again, (p. 100) 'the late Bronze Age was the pre-eminent era of palace-building', when what he means, and the difference is crucial in the context, is 'the late Late Bronze Age'. However well meant, this is hardly necessary. The general reader is not, after all, incapable of understanding archaeological reasoning and indeed might well enjoy being given more of it.

Other points. P. 95: does 'the majority' now believe Tawagalawas = Eteocles? P. 159: the Mallia bee pendant is not 'pre-palace'. P. 173: on tin from Kirra, see now S. Benton's note, Antiquity xxxviii (1964) 138. 1100 is a high date for refugee settlements in Asia Minor.

The book is beautifully illustrated with a generous and intelligent selection of photographs, mostly Miss Alison Frantz's.

Somerville College, Oxford.

H. M. C. Hughes.


This is an admirable introduction to the study of Greek history, 'neither a narrative nor a reference book' but a 'personal analysis', necessarily subjective but written by a scholar who in my view gets almost all his priorities right. My chief complaint is about its length. It is much too short; so much would be even clearer, more convincing, colourful and stimulating if Dr Finley had been allowed, or had allowed himself, to develop his views in more detail.

He takes a broad view of what history is. About half the book is concerned with literature, 'science, philosophy and popular morals' and the visual arts. This is what history should be, above all a history of the Greeks, for it is not primarily in the details of their wars and revolutions that we should be interested for their own sake, but in the political, social, economic and religious conditions out of which developed their astonishing intellectual and artistic achievements and which may also help to explain, as F. tries to show in ch. VI, why their progress was halted in the end. Unfortunately, our textbooks and school and university courses go badly wrong on this. They concentrate on the less important, and also on the less certain; the evolution of Greek thought is better known than the evolution of Athenian democracy, and we have more direct access to the mind of Herodotus than to what happened at Marathon.

F.'s aim is to 'discuss and, where it seemed possible, to explain how Greek civilisation developed in its various aspects'. To explain how, not why. In the end we are confronted with a mystery, which he does not try to unfold. F. describes the Homeric idea of the divinity, which some may think 'terribly naive'—but 'what a bold step it was, after all, to raise man so high that he could become the image of the gods'; he discovers here a 'human self-consciousness and self-confidence without precedent, and pregnant with limitless possibilities' (p. 15). Later, 'the emptiness of religion' and lack of an organised church are adduced as conditions favourable to philosophic inquiry (p. 127). This is well said, though not novel. The defects (to the religious mind) of Greek
religion were the pre-conditions of much of the Greek achievement, in history, for instance, where Herodotus at most superimposed theological on purely human explanations, and Thucydides swept divine interposition altogether away—what a contrast, unnoticed by F., with Jewish historiography—or in sculpture, where (as he shows) the representation of the god becomes the pretext for idealising the human figure. But how can we explain the Homeric concept itself or determine why other anthropomorphic or unspiritual religions did not have like effects? It was colonisation and travel that made Greeks conscious of the relativity of customs and look for rational criteria by which to judge them (a point not clearly brought out); but the Phoenicians too were great travellers, and there were no like effects.

F. is weakest, I think, on literature (how can he find Theocritus cold and lifeless?) and strongest, after all, on political and social matters. I shall not list rather minor criticisms. One would have liked more on the Hellenistic age which he depreciates too much. The life in Hellenistic cities differed, he thinks, in quality from that in classical. I do not disagree, but would like to add that they tried their best to live up to the old standards, even to hostility with their neighbours; see, for instance, Tac. Ann. VI 42. They had not the power. Lack of power indeed had doomed the polis, as F. shows (p. 88), justly remarking that all solutions of its problems, ancient and modern, propose to rescue the polis by... replacing it, in its root-sense of a community which is at the same time a self-governing state, by something else'. This is one of many passages which deserve to be pondered, like, for instance, that on Solon ('He was chosen by the Athenians themselves. He was not "called" and he had no vocation'), or on the causes of wars (p. 54), or on the role of the demagogues (p. 70, cf. his own important essay in Past and Present 1962, 3 ff., which corrects almost universal misconceptions). But space forbids me to mention more felicities in this description of the 'compulsory originality' (p. 31) of the Greeks, and of the limitations upon it.

Oriel College, Oxford.

P. A. BRUNT.


The aim of this book is to give an account of finds of Greek objects (mainly pottery) in colonial and foreign territories until the end of the Archaic period and to draw from them general conclusions about early Greek colonisation and trade. The first two chapters give a sensible statement of the principles that should be used in interpreting archaeological and literary evidence, and a cautious summary of present knowledge of Greek settlement (or re-settlement) of the Eastern Mediterranean in the Early Iron Age. After these preliminaries we are taken in turn round Nearer Asia, Egypt, the West and the North.

The ‘eastern adventure’ is examined at most length. Boardman observes that in the Early Iron Age a few Oriental objects reached Greece, particularly Crete, and (as is worth stressing) had some limited local effects: the main source was Cyprus, but if Phoenician traders visited Greece, it must have been then. Next, around 800 B.C., Greek traders settled in North Syria, notably at Al Mina, attracted by the market in iron and bronze. During the eighth century these Greeks were principally Euboeans, or so Boardman claims from his perhaps too sanguine identification of four common classes of pottery; but in the seventh century East Greeks took their place, perhaps together with Aeginetans, if it was they who imported the now frequent Corinthian pottery. Next Boardman turns to the artistic effects of this commerce, visible already in the Geometric style, and summarises the main types of importations and their sources and consequences. This is a subject not yet studied satisfactorily and Boardman wisely comments that ‘many resemblances are superficial or may be imaginary’. So it is perhaps premature to detect particular works of immigrant Eastern craftsmen in Greek lands. There follows a quick account of Greek expansion in the East Aegean and a sketch of Phrygian art, which was influencing East Greek in the later eighth and early seventh centuries—here I feel less sure than Boardman that the Phrygian alphabet is derived from a Greek prototype, or anyhow from one current in Greek lands. In any case in the seventh century Greek artistic influence became dominant in Phrygia and Lydia, and later when the Persians came they too made use of Greek art and artisans. This is the most valuable section of the book, and the clearest statement I know of the facts and their probable interpretations.

Egypt is taken separately. Boardman lists a few Egyptian objects from Greece which are earlier than the mid-seventh century, when regular contacts began. There follow a good account of Naucratis, notes on Greek finds from Tell Defenne and other sites, a mention of the numerous but trivial Egyptian objects brought back to Greek lands, and an assessment of Egyptian influence on Greek art. To this influence is attributed the introduction of monumental architecture and sculpture in stone as well as various minor features. Perhaps Boardman is too generous in giving Egypt its due and in recognising emigrant Greek vase painters in Naucratis and elsewhere. A short survey of Cyrenaica is appended: here Boardman’s statement that East Greek finds are slight has since been disproved by his own excavation at Tocra—a neat warning that judgements about many Greek settlements are still very provisional.

The Western Greeks have already had much attention. Boardman brings the record up to date. On Southern France (pp. 223-4) he has missed—very pardonably—a paper in Provence historique 1956, 3-37, where F. Benoist shows that the alleged finding-places of Greek pots earlier than the late seventh century are at best very dubious.

The last chapter takes in the Adriatic, the North
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Aegean, the Propontis, and the Black Sea. Board-

man gives short notes on the sites, the relation between
Greek colonists and Scythians, and Athenian activities
in the Hellespont. For the Pontic region few western
archaeologists have much first-hand knowledge of the
material, and occasionally Boardman is inaccurate.
I offer some minor comments, those on South Russian
sites through the kindness of Mr J. G. F. Hind.
P. 249: The earliest pottery from Byzantium (Ano-

tolia 1956,20, pl. 10) looks to me earlier than the end of
the seventh century. P. 251: If Boardman is thinking of
good quality pottery, Attic is more frequent than East
Greek in the second half of the sixth century.
Pp. 260–1: Much of the material from Berezan was from
the settlement; the other inhabited sites of the Bug-
Dniiper estuary hardly rank as towns; the topography
of Olbia is dubious and the South area has not been
the richest in Archaic remains. P. 275: The state-
mint of some of the skulls at Gute Maritzya were
‘certainly Greek’ should be that some were identified
as of what anthropologists call Mediterranean type.
P. 277: A couple of pieces of Boardman’s Elaeus ware
are reported from Olbia.

There are short critical bibliographies at the end of
each chapter, useful as far as they go. The illustra-
tions have been chosen carefully and include some
important but little-known objects. There is a useful
index. Though the style of writing has signs of haste,
the proof reading has been good (on p. 243, ll. 9–10
are transposed).

Boardman’s productivity puts most of his colleagues
to shame, and his standard remains high. Here his
survey of the finds is remarkably well informed. The
one obvious criticism is that to appreciate this book
fully the reader must have a sound knowledge of the
geographically more central parts of Greek culture and
history and, if he has that knowledge, he is likely to
want detailed references for the finds mentioned. If
these references could be published in a supplementary
pamphlet, it would be a most useful service. In
interpreting his material Boardman is generally sound
and always interesting, though he seems to me a little
too ready to trust statements in later literature and to
accept painted pottery as evidence of the place of
origin of emigrants. But all considered this is a
judicious and reliable work of synthesis, of a sort that
is much too rare. It deserves to be studied and
imitated, and in ten or fifteen years revised or super-
seded. Meanwhile I can think of no scholarly book
that is better value for the money.

R. M. Cook.

Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge.

Cook (J. M.) The Greeks in Ionia and the East.
(Ancient peoples and places, 31.) London:
Thames and Hudson. 1962. 76 plates. 53
text figures. £1 10s.

The excellently illustrated series ‘Ancient Peoples
and Places’ has shown itself very successful in provid-
ing descriptions of peoples known mainly through
archaeology. In the case of the Greeks, however,
where the literature is of overwhelming importance,
general accounts which concentrate on the material
remains run the risk of being like navigators who only
take account of the visible part of an iceberg. Inevit-
ably one asks whether the subject of this book suits the
limitations imposed by the series.

C. tells us (p. 15) that his subject is ‘a double one’.
Down to the fourth century he can treat the Eastern
Greeks as a separate, though never isolated, part of
the Greek people, but in the fourth century the ‘centre
of gravity of the Greek world began to shift Eastward’
and thereafter ‘we...find ourselves in midstream
witnessing the culmination of Greek achievement’.
By accepting this double subject C. has given himself
a period of nearly three millennia. In subject-matter
he certainly does not limit himself to the material
world which he can illustrate: apart from art,
arquitecture, topography, we also meet literature,
thought, history and much besides.

To treat in some 200 pages this vast and diverse
material is a bold undertaking, and it imposes on C.
continuous problem of selection and struggle to
achieve brevity. ‘Brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio’.
Not that we meet obscurity of expression; the writing
is excellent throughout and will cause the layman no
problems of comprehension. Where these do occur
the fault lies in compression in a wider sense. Here
we have, to my mind, the main general fault of the
book. It inevitably leads to passages which must be
cryptic for some of the readers envisaged (e.g. the
Hittites and the destruction of Troy, p. 19); to
chapters which are simply too full (e.g. IX, ‘The Era
of Dominant Personalities’, and X, ‘Between Athens
and Persia’); and to lack of proportion (the destruc-
tion of Samos is told at greater length than the whole
Ionian Revolt). The initiate will not be led astray
by compression or omission. But he will regret that
the rules of the series exclude documentation, so that
the author’s reasons and the evidence for many
interesting statements are not given. For instance,
why does C. interpret mainly underground buildings
as granaries (p. 32)? Other peoples have preferred
them raised. Or why does he conclude (p. 122 f.)
that the landowners still paid ‘rent’ to the ‘Persian
overlord’, when their cities were members of the
Athenian Empire?

There is much in the book that is excellent. On
art, architecture and town planning C. writes with
complete mastery. His aesthetic analysis of, for
example, the ‘Hera’ of Chermays (p. 104 f.) is a joy
to read, and his accounts of buildings and cities,
whether of Old Smyrna, Priene, Pergamon or Ba’al-
beik, are always illuminating. Not surprisingly the
excavator of Old Smyrna is entirely at home in the
early chapters, where the results of this key excavation
are fully exploited. These early chapters are in any
case the most satisfactory, for justice can be done to
the limited material. Perhaps that is the reason why
chapter III, ‘Society in Early Ionia’, in which Homer
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is used and interpreted with most sensitive understanding, seems so superior to VI, 'Cities and Individuals in the Ionic Renaissance', and IX, 'The Era of Dominant Personalities'. In both these the individual poets and philosophers were surely worthy of fuller treatment, or, best of all, direct quotation. Some great poets are not even named, but the philosophers fare little better in what seem to me the weakest sections of the book. It is simply not possible to deal adequately with them within the limits of space imposed—for any level of audience. The brevity with which Zeno is presented (p. 113) must surely confuse any un instructed reader. It is significant that more space was needed to expound his fourth paradox to readers of this journal (119 ff.) than C. uses in his fig. 35. Why anyway choose this paradox for emphasis, when there is the added complication that C. is unwilling to accept Aristotle's account, but prefers the modern reconstruction?

C. writes well and easily on history in the narrower sense, so that criticisms are rarely more than differences of opinion, as, for example, on the establishment of the Panionic League, where C. adopts a reconstruction which Roebeck has shown to be very improbable (CPI 1955, 26-40). His generally very reliable historical judgment occasionally gives place to a dangerous tendency to argue from lack of evidence, as when he concludes from the absence of material remains that the Ionian cities were at their lowest ebb in the fifth century, without even mentioning the tribute lists.

The numerous illustrations are excellent and almost always very well chosen to illustrate the main text. However, the absence of an illustration makes the discussion of Samian palmette tombstones (p. 106) less valuable for a layman, and, conversely, it is odd that two of the coin portraits in plate 65 (f and h) are of rulers not mentioned in the main text. The index, though confined to names, is reliable, the maps, chronological table and notes on the plates clear and useful. The brief bibliography contains some virtually worthless items and omits a most important one, Magie's Roman Rule in Asia Minor.

One's final impression is that the parts of the book which suited the series are excellent, but the author, given his very broad subject, was bound to go beyond these. When he did so, severe limitations of space made the book unavoidably uneven.

J. GRAHAM.

University of Manchester.


The greater part of this book is devoted to a close examination of the foundation myth of Boeotian Thebes. V. is on guard against romantic euhemerism but insists that '... les historiens des religions ont eu raison de souigner contre les philologues de stricte obéissance qu'il faut compter avec la remarquable persistance des traditions non écrites'; he therefore pays attention to Hellenistic local histories of Boeotia as well as to the earliest written versions of the myths from the time of Stesichorus, who described the sowing of the dragon's teeth by Athena (F 18 Page), and Pherecydes, who told of the battle of the newly created Spartoi with each other (FGrHist. 3F 22a and c). The results of V.'s analysis are not uniformly cogent owing to the intractable character of the evidence, but this is nevertheless a work of careful erudition, of interest even to the strictest philologue.

Cadmus in his role as founder of Thebes and husband of Harmonia is firmly distinguished from the fortifiers of the city, Amphion and Zethos (p. 71); and an answer is suggested to the question 'Who were the descendants of the Spartoi?' K. Latte (RE 10 [1910] 1465) denied that there were any, but V. argues that they were a specialised warrior class, a kind of pre-historic forerunner of the sacred battalion of Thebes (p. 226). He enquires why there are so many expiatory victims in the family of Creon—e.g. Haemon, whom the Sphinx destroyed (Oedipodeia F 2 Allen): his solution is that the family were Spartoi, whose hereditary duty it was to die when the safety of the city demanded (p. 234).

The legends linking Cadmus with Phoenicians are considered by V. to be secondary—fragments created by Boeotians living in Miletus, Rhodes, and Thera in the seventh century B.C. when Phoenician mariners were visiting the Aegean. It is true that the story of Cadmus bears signs of elaboration, but can the core of the legend—that Cadmus was a Levantine, not a Greek—be completely eliminated? Excavation in Boeotian Thebes may eventually test the legend of the eastern origin of the Cadmeians, but it is obvious that Phoenicians of the eighth century B.C. and Bronze Age Levantines have become inextricably confused in the memories of the Greeks. In support of the view that Cadmus was a Greek, V.'s text implies that Herodotus 4.147 is evidence for the institution by the hero of the Greek cults of Poseidon and Athena in Thera: but Herodotus states here only that Cadmus coming in search of Europa left Phoenicians and some of his Memhlian kin in the island. Besides, the presence of the Greek cults in Thera of Poseidon and Athena can tell nothing about the original home of Cadmus. Not even V. has much confidence in his suggested Greek etymology of the name Cadmus: he even toys with an Armenian one (p. 156-7). The old suggestion that the name may be linked with Semitic qdm 'east' he confidently rejects, though it is not less plausible than the others.

V.'s reconstruction of early Theban society owes much to Dumezil's Idéologie tripartite. One does not have to accept that fashionable Gallic doctrine to see merit in V.'s notion that the Spartoi are a functional class. He mentions Jeanmaire's ingenious functional interpretation of the old Ionian tribes (Courtoi et Courtes 119-33), but should have noted on p. 240 that
the tribal divisions were already explained as professional classes in antiquity (e.g. Plutarch, Salo 23).

In the most original part of the book it is argued that the Aegeidae of Sparta, Therai and Cyrene are descendants of the Spartoi; Timagaoras 381 F 3 is feeble support for this theory, but Aristotle (F 532 Rise, see V., p. 218) did call the Aegeidae a Thesan phtary, certain of whose members emigrated to Sparta, and Pindar (F. 91 2 Bowra) wrote of the holy ψευς of the Spartoi as though they were a kinship group. I am not sure that Pindar in saying ἤκατον Θήραδε φόντες Αἰγάκης, ἐμοί παυόμε (Pyth. 5.75-6) claims to be a descendant of the Aegeidae (either of Sparta or of Theset): according to V. '... Pindare prétend descendre de leur sang' (V., p. 217). The poet is certainly claiming kinship with them, but we cannot be certain that Pindar was an Aegeid (see also G. Gilbert, The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens [Eng. tr. London (1895) p. 6 n. 1]). V. suggests that some of the dissidents who went from Sparta to Sicily with Dorius, prompted by Oracles of Laio which were interpreted for them by a Boeotian (Herodotus 5.43 ef. 4.149.2), were Aegeidae: this attractive suggestion, set out in a brief supplementary note, deserves to be examined further. V.'s delightful pages are rich in ideas, and good indexing makes the reviewer's task pleasant. The plates are clear, except for XII in which the dragon's cave at the foot of the Cadmeia appears but dimly.

G. HUXLEY.

The Queen's University, Belfast.


If this book were an eighteenth-century pamphlet its title might have continued like this: 'Five short studies of some Greek Ideas and Attitudes chiefly as recorded in well-known passages from the most familiar Authors, together with a brief account by Professor Peremans of Relations between Greeks and Natives in Ptolemaic Egypt.'

What does one say about a book published on this subject in 1962 which does not include in its index of modern authors cited (115 altogether) the names of Louis Robert, of D. M. Pippidi or anyone else connected with the remarkable post-war Rumanian excavations of the Black Sea poleis, or of anyone who has worked on the equally important archaeology of Greek and barbarian Sicily? That is where we can now see how Greeks and barbarians lived face to face; that is where the new material exists. But there is not a trace of it in these discussions. Thus, the only reference to Sicily is M. Reverdin's remark (p. 73), 'N'oublions pas que la grande confrontation entre Grecs et Barbares que furent les guerres médiques a eu son pendant occidental: la lutte des Grecs de Sicile et d'Italie contre la double menace étrusque et punique.' Not only does this ignore the 'grande confrontation' of Greeks with Sicels, Sicanians and Elymians, it is also oversimplified about Carthaginians to the point of serious inaccuracy, pace the inevitable quotation from Pindar (see Ph. Gauthier in RH cxxiv [1960] 257-74).

Even on its own narrow and largely familiar ground this book seems to me to offer too little that is fresh—two essays to be precise, Professor Baldry's on 'The Idea of the Unity of Mankind' and Professor Dihle's on certain aspects of Hellenistic ethnography, in particular on its theoretical presuppositions and synoptic aims as exemplified by Agatharcides and Poseidonius. Is it really necessary that we be told once again that Herodotus did not hold barbarians in contempt, that the tragedies were much exercised by the question, or that Alexander the Great made a great difference?

The Fondation Hardt has made its mark with great rapidity, and it is not pleasant to have to speak up so harshly. But there is a world of difference between holding a series of private discussions for the edification and entertainment of the participants and publishing a more or less verbatim account of the proceedings at a very stiff price. It must be said that several of the participants do not seem to have been sufficiently well prepared for a public discussion. I am thinking not only of insufficient mastery of the subject-matter beyond the limits of each contributor's specific assignment—no one, for example, made any reference to Rostovtzeff's fundamental study of the sources in Part I of his Skthien und der Besorps—but more generally of a failure to think through the implications and complexities of the subject. When Baldry objected early in the discussion (p. 74), 'I would like to make a further point affecting the question how far the authors quoted by Herr Diller are typical of the general view held in their time, how far the anti-thesis between Greek and barbarian was present in the mind of the ordinary Greek or entered into his life' (my italics), he made the basic criticism. Everyone could quote an odd tag from Thucydides, but who tried to measure the sentiments against the fact that he was Thucydides the son of Olorus?

M. I. FINLEY.


The title suggests a thesis about some aspect of Greek leagues and their function, but these three dis-
connected essays have not even a preface to explain why these leagues have been selected.

'The formation of the Peloponnesian League' does not set out to discuss the workings of the league. Instead, Moretti not only sketches but argues about the history of the Peloponnesian over the archaic period in eighty small pages and 104 notes, incorporating the bulk of his two articles on sixth-century Sparta from Riv. Fil. xxiv (1946) 87–103 and xxvi (1948) 204–12, mostly in their original wording. The discussion is sober enough in general (though, curiously, M. is increasingly ready to disbelieve Herodotus as we get nearer the historian's lifetime), but something was bound to be scammed: M. is content to cite Lenschau for his dating of the second Messenian War to the end of the seventh century, and Jaeger for the introduction of hoplite tactics during that war; and since this chronology has done much to determine his interpretation, we could have done with more argument. The conclusion is that Sparta, anxious to avoid further casualties, formed the league mainly as a protection against Argos. The constitution familiar from classical times was established before 524, since otherwise Corinth could not have forced an unwilling Sparta into the expedition against Polykrates. But Herodotus gives no hint that Sparta was unwilling, and only extra-constitutional pressure could have forced her into war against her will, as clearly emerges from Thucydides' account of the debate in 432.

Historical survey occupies most of 'The Boeotian federation down to 422 B.C.', a reasonable short sketch (though M. regretfully fails to mention Ps.-Xenophon, Ath. Pol. 3.11, and assumes that Athens supported democracy throughout). But he includes here a workmanlike analysis of the constitution described in Hell. Oxy. 11 (16 Bartoletti): it could be wished that on p. 137 he had attempted a solution of the problem of the Platanean sympleiteia, but most other problems are sensibly faced.

On 'The federation of the Lycians', M. has done good service already with his article in Riv. Fil. xxviii (1950) 326–50 on the important inscription from Araxa first published by Bean in this Journal, lviii (1948) 46–56. Here he devotes more than half his forty pages to a fair and comprehensive analysis of the workings of the kokon. Problems remain—M.'s treatment of the archaiakes ekklesia (209–11) is not wholly satisfactory, and on the question of Patara as the caput gentis he has not faced Larsen's question, what happened if a crisis arose when the synedrion was not in session—but the basic points are clearly presented and sensibly discussed.

This last essay is on a different plane from the other two. They may indeed be found useful, and this review may have insisted too much on their failings. But it was reasonable to expect more research from a scholar of M.'s standing, especially into the actual workings of the Peloponnesian League.

A. ANDREWES.

New College, Oxford.
Roman curiae); five is a suitable number for a popular reform in a state where the acrophonic numeral system recognises fives. (Acrophonic numerals are not attested until the mid-fifth century, as they know, and why, incidentally, did a state which had them cheerfully put up with a coinage which worked in sixes and fours?) For the preference for ten over twelve, they brush Ath. Pol. 21.3 aside rather more briskly than our ignorance about the Ionic trittyes would seem to justify, and come down for a wish to avoid the Ionian twelve (not four, as Herodotus), the tyrants' Twelve Gods, and above all the twelve months of the religious calendar. On this last, they never seem to recognise that the religious calendar frequently had thirteen months and that the problem of adapting a fixed number of units to a fluctuating year had its complications. The Pythagorean connexion is then turned upside down, and a reverse influence is seen, with Cleisthenic isonomia influencing Pythagorean politics. I am not competent to criticise this.

Three points may be briefly made about the picture of Cleisthenes which emerges. First, the desire to place emphasis on Cleisthenes' geometric, concentric Attica means, as far as I can see, an excessive underplay of the extent to which the tyrants had already made Athens the centre of Attica. Secondly, stress on Cleisthenes the geometer conceals completely the difficulties of geography on the actual ground, and, if the authors could have read Eliot, they would certainly have realised this. Thirdly, stress on the tidiness of the plan means that the elements of mixing in Cleisthenes' thought, even at the level of combining trittyes of different areas in a tribe, are pushed very much into the background.

There follows a good chapter on the influence of the reforms on other states and the later history of the Alcmeonids and Cleisthenes' reputation. A closing chapter on Space and the City from Hippodamos to Plato traces theoretical developments down to the Critias and the Laws. I do not feel much at home here, and confine myself to expressing doubt about the likelihood of Atlantis being Athens and Athens being something else. The relationship of Atlantis to Cleisthenes' reforms does exist, but it is more subtle than that.

D. M. LEWIS.

Christ Church, Oxford.


'The power and wealth of fifth-century Athens were made possible only by that measure of economic development which she was able to achieve in the preceding century.' This sentence (p. ix) is the theme of the book, and if the subject is not new, its treatment is. The author has learnt a good deal from conditions in Australia about rural economy and its gradual change into commercial economy, but he applies these lessons without false modernising. The book does not make for easy reading, but as far as the amount of detailed facts allows, it is written with perspicacity, and many minor or major questions are discussed in twenty pages of additional notes. There are also short bibliographies to each chapter as well as a brief general bibliography.

The first chapter deals with 'the natural background', discussing the land of Attica, its agricultural and maritime potential and its weather. For the noneconomist there is much to learn, even in these first nine pages. Chapter 2, 'The Breakdown of the Old order', leads up to Solon. The crucial question for the pre-Solonian economic crisis is whether, or to what extent, land was alienable. Dr French is not quite clear on this point, but believes with Aristotle and Plutarch that the majority of Athenians had lost their land. I cannot accept that. Aristotle and Plutarch had little more evidence, if any, than Solon's poetry (though that more fully than we have); there the men without land (or with land in bondage) were those whom Solon tried to help; the rest does not appear. Was there no free peasantry left, apart from a few rich landowners? In discussing Solon's measures F. accepts the doubtful equation meidimos = metretes, if only in weight, and makes Solon responsible for the first official issue of coins, a fact now strongly contested by numismatists. However, these matters will remain controversial, and for F., it is more important to stress the intense social discord that followed Solon's legislation.

It is Peisistratos (ch. 3) and his large mobile wealth that determined further developments and met the challenge of feeding an increased city population, Peisistratos' main support. Athens began to trade overseas, in order to get cheap food, work for her artisans, and export markets for oil and wine. Many farmers went over from mere subsistence economy to commercial economy, that is to say, from making a living by farming to making money out of it. The farmers' taxation (tithe?) was hardly of such importance for state economy as F. assumes. 'The New Order' (ch. 4) is the one created by Cleisthenes, when full citizenship was no longer a question of landed property, and city and country were one body to share the government.

The next chapter (5) deals with the events up to 480, when economic developments are hard to discover. Foreign policy became the main issue, but it led to the building of a navy, the general increase in wealth, and the problems of trade facing a Pax Persica on the seas. During the war Athens lost two harvests and a great deal of property by two Persian invasions. Imports of food were badly needed, and F. shows (ch. 6) how Athens overcame the hardship of the first years of peace. Levies from the islands helped, though they were chiefly used for the maintenance of the fleet. Decisive was the opening of the Black Sea route as well as the general naval supre-
macy of Athens. With the creation of the Delian League the position was firmly established. Athens controlled the contributions of the allies and could maintain a strong navy. Here a well-known question has to be answered. Aristides fixed the tributes 'according to each state's ability to pay', and the total amounted to 460 talents, a sum never reached in the extant tribute lists after 454, although the value of money was falling and the number of allies generally growing. F. refuses to accept the solution of ATL that only about half of the 460 talents was paid in cash; the rest was the value of contributions in ships. But as the number of such contributions decreased, and expenses must have grown, Athens would need more and not less cash. That also excludes Gomme's theory of a lower assessment after Eurymedon. There are a number of detailed problems not yet convincingly answered. F. discusses them with cautious common sense; in particular, he stresses the other sources of income for Athens, such as spoils of war, free facilities for the fleet, the gain of new territories, etc. At any rate, Pericles carried out his magnificent building programme and at the same time collected a large state treasure.

F. realises the close connection between policy and economy, without ever giving the leading part to the latter. In ch. 7 he describes the economic conditions of Athens and her empire, and its main result is that, while political power of necessity strengthened economy, and trade became increasingly important, what can be called 'economic imperialism' remained a by-product of politics, and not the other way round. It is also useful to be reminded that pottery, of which archaeology offers overwhelming evidence, takes its place, though an important one, among other goods. Agriculture, with increased productivity and including market-gardening, remained the basic industry.

Chapter 8 deals with the 'social consequences'. Basing his arguments, as he must, on population figures and therefore on uncertain ground, F. confirms the view that a vast section, perhaps more than half, of the population were aliens. The 'Welfare State' of some modern scholars is reduced to its true and moderate significance, more in harmony with the generally modest living standards. The part played by slaves is rightly stressed, but without undue exaggeration. In the last chapter (9), F. speaks of the economic and social consequences of war, while at the same time stressing the cultural achievements of what he calls—with some degree of exaggeration—a 'cosmopolitan community'. Athens in her great time 'never banished poverty', and the dockyards and buildings were only 'relics of her commercial progress'. An outlook on the fourth century might have somewhat altered this dark picture.

This is a lengthy review of a comparatively short book. But on many points I have not even touched. F. has succeeded in packing into small space a large amount of knowledge and argument. For a long time his book will be an essential guide to its subject, and that subject extends deeply into the spheres of political and cultural history.

*London*  
VICTOR EHRENBERG.


In his preface Lotze explains that both parts of the title matter, and we are not to expect simply a portrait of Lysander. Three chapters, the main body of the work, examine from Lysander's first arrival in Asia till his triumphal return in 404, in painstaking detail. There may be objection to his judgement of individual points, as for instance when he takes the *θάσανος* or *Θάσιος* of Dio.xiii.104.7 to be Iasos but he is surely more often right than not, as for instance in his account of Notion (as against Bartolleti's second thoughts in the Teubner *Hellenica Oxyrhyncha*), and the sources are handled sensibly throughout.

A fourth chapter delivers judgement on Lysander, that he fits more easily into his Spartan background than is often supposed, and that we tend to exaggerate his personal predominance: a conclusion to which Lotze is helped by his acceptance of R. E. Smith's disputable thesis that the decarchies lasted till 397. The honours paid to Lysander in Ephesus and Samos, which Lotze deals with capably, might point to a different conclusion, and so might a similarly close examination of Lysander's post-war career. It is to be hoped that this may follow. Without it, no general pronouncement on Lysander has a wide enough basis.

Two chronological appendixes follow. Having himself had to go through the evidence for the dating of the campaigns between Kyzikos and Arginousai, Lotze thought it worth while to set the arguments out again (the earlier chronology—the Hellespont campaign in 409 not 408, and so forth—has apparently remained more influential in Germany): he opts on balance for the 'later' system, and on the evidence he presents he might have opted with less hesitation. The second appendix concerns the Thirty. Here Lotze, building in part on some suggestions by Munro, places the surrender of Athens early and attaches Plutarch's date, 16 Mouynchion, to a definitive settlement of the peace terms and the installation of the Thirty, whose eight months (Xen. *Hell.* ii.4.20) thus run out towards winter. This involves rejecting the conventional assumption that Plutarch refers to the day described in Xen. *Hell.* ii 2.23, but Lotze's system has some advantages, and is worked out coherently. The confusion of Plut. *Lys.* 15 is such as to justify almost any form of reconstruction: but Lotze is perhaps too tender with Lysias 13—if Lysias is cheating, it is not a matter of 'einen abgefeimen Trick' (p. 92), but that he has set himself the impossible task, characteristic of Athenian law-court oratory, of proving that all Athens' troubles were
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caused by the single action of Agoratos, so that some misrepresentation is inevitable.
This will be a useful work of reference for the four years which Lotze has covered.

A. ANDREWES.

New College, Oxford.


MacDowell has essayed the bold task of describing, in a mere 150 pages (much of which is taken up with Greek texts and translation) the homicide law of the fourth century. The qualification in the title is important: MacDowell thinks that ‘almost nothing can be known about Athenian homicide law before the age of the orators’ (p. 149), and confines himself fairly rigidly to a straightforward reconstruction of actual fourth-century practice. The book is a lucid and succinct guide to this notoriously difficult field. MacDowell displays a sane realism, always sticking to the facts and never allowing himself to be hustled by the obscurities into conjecture; ‘I do not know’ occurs with refreshing frequency.

MacDowell starts with the aim of the homicide law and the role of the family, and then discusses the functions of the various courts and magistrates; ensuing chapters deal with oaths, witnesses, penalties and alternative ways of bringing a charge; the last chapter discusses the motives behind the provisions of the law—vengeance, cleansing and deterrence—and sceptically concludes that we frequently cannot tell which motive prompted a given provision: which of the three, for instance, is the purpose of the death penalty?

MacDowell considers that only Demosthenes Against Aristocrates 72 unambiguously shows a belief in pollution as the inspiration of a legal regulation; other passages, he maintains, may be interpreted in this way, but do not have to be. He is inclined to reduce the influence of a belief in pollution to comparatively insignificant proportions; these last pages are especially stimulating, and one could wish for more extended discussion, particularly of the passages MacDowell considers ambiguous.

It is in fact the limitations of the book that give rise to two general criticisms. First, there is the limitation of size. The argument is frequently dogmatically brief (e.g. on p. 75 MacDowell makes a large and unfounded deduction from the single word ἔστω without much regard to the probabilities of the situation). Secondly, MacDowell’s reluctance to discuss anything but positive and concrete evidence for procedure leads him—if I may ride a hobby-horse for a moment—seriously to undervalue Plato’s Laws as evidence for Attic procedure. This is a delicate matter; one is walking on egg-shells and on the few occasions on which MacDowell mentions a passage in the Laws he displays the proper caution (pp. 88, 108–9, 122, 128). Nevertheless the Laws, in suitable circumstances, may be used as evidence. One example must suffice. On p. 26 MacDowell argues, as against Paoli, that a killer suffered no legal disfranchisement until a proclamation had been made against him. Indirect support is provided by Laws 871a: Plato goes out of his way to explain that a killer in his state should consider himself ‘warned off’ holy places, whether a proclamation has been made or not. Plato is surely correcting and refining Attic procedure here: his citizens are to be imbued with a fear of pollution, and are to have much tenderer consciences in these matters than Athenians. The inference is of course not cast-iron, but I feel that MacDowell has here ignored some modest support for his own position; there are many other places where a citation from the Laws, while not necessarily proving anything, would have enriched the discussion.

Remaining comment can best be confined to brief notes on individual points:

P. 4. M. underestimates the natural tendency of popular thought to associate the curse of the dead man with the μισθομα of pollution: Laws 865d–866b, 872e–873a.

P. 20. Household slaves were not designated οἰκέται exclusively: we have δοῦλος at Antiphon V 48, where οἰκέται, to judge from MacDowell, might be expected.

P. 49. If οἱ λογοί τοι ἐφετα is taken to mean ‘take these cases for hearing in an order they determine by lot’, rather than ‘be appointed to office by lot’ (which makes the τοι ἐφετα rather awkward) the difficulty on p. 50 that the appointment of the ἐφετα was by merit disappears.

P. 59. The reasoning from Demosthenes Against Conon seems shaky: Ariston claims that if he had died the charge against Conon would have been one of intentional homicide. The allegation that Conon actually intended to kill him does not need to be spelt out.

P. 68. The conclusion that the father of the priestess in Demosthenes Against Conon was found guilty by the Areopagus of deliberate wounding perhaps conflicts with the last paragraph on p. 69 that ‘all the more trivial cases went to it [the Palladion]’. Why not then deliberate wounding? Presumably because such cases were in fact (pace M. on p. 61) confined to τραύματα ἐκ προοιμίων with intent to kill (see Lysias III 42).

P. 80. The assignation of lawful (as distinct from just) killings to the Delphinion seems to conflict with Aristotle Politics 1900b27 (περὶ τοῦ δικαίου).

P. 108. δοῦλος: ‘enslaved’ is a narrow translation.

P. 126. Surely M. is unduly cautious on the penalty for killing a metic. Such cases were tried in the Palladion, the court particularly associated with the penalty of exile: see Morrow, CPh 1937, 213.

P. 157. The index of Greek words needs to be fuller.

In spite of these caveats both general and particular,
this incisive account of a difficult topic deserves a warm welcome.

TREVOR J. SAUNDERS,
University of Newcastle upon Tyne.


The Attic Ephèbeia has attracted the attention of famous scholars for nearly 150 years. Boeckh's two short dissertations published in 1819/20, followed by that of Dittenberger in 1863, were largely superseded by Dumont's Essai sur l'Éphèbie attique (2 vols., 1875/6), since when no comprehensive study of the subject has appeared, though short summaries of value can be found in Daremberg-Saglio and Pauly-Wissowa. Dr Pélékidis has thus undertaken a long-awaited task, namely to re-examine all the available evidence in the light of the extensive contributions bearing on his subject, which cover upwards of eighty years since Dumont's Essai appeared; and in particular to assess the information derived from recently-discovered inscriptions, which in turn help towards a fuller understanding of those previously known. The extent of his researches is indicated by the length of his Bibliography (pp. 307-11) and of his epigraphical index (pp. 313-20), and the list of ancient authors cited, including lexicographers and scholars, fills pp. 321-7.

The work is divided into three parts, in the first of which he discusses the origins of the Attic Ephèbeia (pp. 7-79); in the second, its history in the fourth century down to 323 B.C. (pp. 83-152); and in the third that from 323/2 to 31 B.C. P.'s conclusions (summarised on pp. 279-81) are followed by three Appendices: I on the population of Athens at the end of the fourth century; II on the Archons Aristolas, Antheieros and Phaidrias, and the Podemata; III the date of the Great Dionysia.

In considering the origins of the institution P. starts by rejecting the dogmatic pronouncement of Wilamowitz that it was founded in 336/5 B.C., and the theory of Matthieu that it developed out of the military education reserved for 'war-orphans', which he attributes to the influence of Cimon; that in the first quarter of the fourth century it was extended 'facultativement' to other citizens, and that only after Chaeronea it was made obligatory for all young Athenians under the law of Epikratès, for which he accepts Wilamowitz's confident but unproved dating to 336 B.C. P. will have none of this, and develops his own views as follows: first, that Xenophon in the Cyropaedia and Plato in his Laws had the Attic Ephèbeia in mind in their respective descriptions of the Persian Ephèbei and the Agronomoi, and that the former in his approval of the Persian system was tactfully avoiding mention of the Spartan form. This assumption is supported, in P.'s view, by Aeschines' use of σωφήματα (in adv. Timarchum) as well as ἡμεικτικαῖα in describing his relationship to Misgolas, which implies the year 372 as terminus ante quem for their association as Ephèbes. Next, he argues back from the evidence of its existence at this date that it was already established in its developed form at least in the first half of the fifth century, but sees no reason to associate this stage with the reforms of Solon or Cleisthenes or Pericles and Ephialtes, while suggesting that before those of the last-named the institution was under the control of the Areopagus (p. 109). His conclusion is that the Ephèbeia represents the evolution in Attica of an institution common to all early Greek communities in the form of an educational system based on age-classes, which in losing its exclusively military character had gradually been opened to all property-owning classes. His debt to Jaeger's Paideia is duly acknowledged, and reasonably enough he is not deterred by the apparently complete lack of ephebic inscriptions before the mid fourth century.

Part II deals with the evidence of ch. 42 of the Athenaión Politeía, with special attention to the meaning and procedure of ἐκμεταλλεύονται, first before the ἀγκυροῖα and then before the Boule, and concludes that the latter might, as Photiades had suggested, strike off the roll of new members those found unfit for ephebic service. After this we have a full account of the organisation, defining the functions of the various officials and discussing the oath taken by the ephèbes on 'matriculation' (Tod, GHI ii. 204, and the variants found in Pollux and Stobaeus), and their duties during the first and second years of their service.

The most valuable chapter in this section is that devoted to L'Apport des Inscriptions', analysing the ten known stelai with (mostly incomplete) lists of ephèbes and the decrees voted by the Tribes in their honour, which afford P. an opportunity to re-examine the views of Beloch and Gomme on the Attic population in the second half of the fourth century. Special attention is naturally given to the stele from the Amphipreon with the names of twelve lochagoi and sixty-two ephèbes (Michel, Recueil, 1704). The lengthy discussion of the many problems raised by this stele (pp. 127-47), which might well have been relegated to a separate Appendix, concludes that Philokles, honoured as the κοινιτικός, is most probably not the same as the στρατηγὸς attacked by Dinarchus (of whose speech he distrusts the authenticity); that the list records the ephèbes of one year only, without a clear indication which of their two years' service it represents, and that finally it cannot be more closely dated than 'either between 329/8 and 326 or 324/3.'

In Pt. III P. emphasises the lack of epigraphical evidence for the chequered period of Athenian history from 307/6 to 267/6 B.C. Of the three stelai (all incomplete) from early in this period it is noted that the one honouring the ephèbes of 306/5, set up in the following year, shows a conspicuous reduction in their number, for which P. approves Gomme's estimate of c. 400 names in all for the twelve Tribes. He suggests, plausibly enough, that there were fewer
NOTICES OF BOOKS

A. M. WOODWARD.


In form this book is a general account of that part of the political history of Asia Minor and the Aegean during the third and second centuries before Christ which concerns the Attalids, paying particular attention to the relations between the kings and the cities dependent upon them. The author seeks to bring out the increasing power and influence of the Pergamene dynasty and to show the unselfishness of the policy which they pursued as the heads of a coalition of free Greek states.

It is welcome that these events should be studied from some standpoint other than that of Rome or the Achaean League. Among the other benefits resulting from this, McShane is able to make clear what the preoccupation with Roman policy has often obscured, the central role of the Attalids in the Aegean from 210 to 189 B.C.

There are, however, complaints to be made. They concern McShane's conception of the relations between the Attalids and the Greek cities of Asia Minor. McShane argues that the Attalids and their Greek allies were joined in a 'hegemonial symmachy', that is, in an association of independent states bound together under the leadership of one power, the hegemon. (Examples of such associations are Philip's Corinthian League and the Greek League founded in 224 by Antigonus Doson.) This suggestion cannot be accepted since there is no evidence for the connection of all the allied cities not only with the King of Pergamum but also with the others, that is, for the existence of a συνέδριον like that of the Corinthian League. (M.'s attempt to escape this difficulty carries no conviction.)

In considering relations between the Attalids and the Greek cities allied to them after 189, McShane minimises the unpopularity of Eumenes II among the Greeks from 189 to 167 B.C. He follows Bickerman (REG 1 [1937] 234) in dismissing the speech in which Polybius makes Eumenes oppose the Roman grant of freedom to the Greek cities of Asia Minor as a free composition by Polybius and then goes on to assert that Polybius must be wrong as to the occasion of the speech. He is thus able to attribute the unpopularity of Eumenes to his friendship with Rome. But this is too simple. Polybius is our only authority for Eumenes' speech and Bickerman (art. cit.) has pointed out that he used a Pergamene source. It is hard to see why such a source should have exaggerated Eumenes' indifference to the 'liberty of the Greeks'. McShane points to the fact that 'later Rhodian-Pergamene conflict was minor' as corroboration of his theory. Pergamum and Rhodes, it is true, only came to blows in the Rhodian Peraea, but Rhodes did much to obstruct Eumenes II in his war with Pharmaces of Pontus, and Rhodian opinion seems always to have been hostile to him. His gifts to Rhodes and his aid to the island in some difficulties over the Peraea immediately after this event are as likely to be an attempt at reconciliation as a sign of untroubled relations. Neither does McShane examine in any detail the relations between the Attalids and their Greek allies after 189 B.C.; he contents himself with a reference to Eumenes' numerous benefactions and
says nothing of royal interference in the cities' affairs.

McShane does not attempt to determine the extent of Attalid power at each stage of the kingdom's development. Had he done so, he might have been able to estimate the feelings of the Greek cities more exactly than he does, for example, on pp. 131 and 136, and to examine more carefully than on pp. 109–10 and 134 the contribution made by the Greek cities to the power of the Attalids, who do not seem to have included any considerable city, save Pergamum, within their boundaries till after 189. It is highly unlikely that those 'free' cities who were allied to Pergamum provided either money tribute or military contingents; for these the Attalids must have been dependent on the resources of Pergamum and its district and on the remains of Lysimachus' treasure. All these points tell against McShane's conception of the Attalids as leaders of a free Greek coalition and suggest that their policy and conduct were more like those of other kings.

This book falls between two stools. The specialist will wish that McShane had argued this case in greater detail: the general reader will find that McShane has, true to his title, not provided a complete account either of the diplomatic history of the period or of the Pergamene kingdom.

McShane's style is, in the main, clear, save for the composition of footnotes. All too often these consist of a string of references, inadequately related to the main text, and some of them of doubtful relevance [e.g. p. 10, n. 5; p. 22, n. 42; p. 124, n. 85; p. 200, n. 3].

Peter Agrell.

Balliol College, Oxford.


This is a new, irregular periodical, planned for 'reports on important new excavations, monographs and certain groups of monuments with full illustration, in particular the works of the great masters of vase painting, and the publication of new remarkable monuments of ancient art'. The first number includes one good study of new finds, and two well-illustrated lectures, which are welcome for the new material they publish. Ghali-Kahil publishes a rich preliminary selection of the pottery from Brauron, from Protoattic to late red-figure. Quality is high. Notable are two footed craters which are taken to be locally produced cult vessels. A close study of the relevance of shapes and themes to the sanctuary and its goddess is promised, and the popularity of certain shapes (marriage, and feminine domestic vases) and themes (Artemis) suggests that this will be a rewarding pursuit, worth trying on other votive assemblages.

Bakalakis publishes important late archaic archi-
tectural pieces from Salonika including an Ionic capital (1.70 m. across) and other mouldings. He reviews other finds in and near the city and concludes that the site of Therme should after all be sought there, and that occupation did not begin only with the Macedonian foundation of 316. Dakaris reviews the history of excavations at Dodona with a most useful series of plans, and reflects on the prehistoric origin of the cults of Gaia, Zeus and the oak at the sanctuary. He goes on to describe the identification of ancient Ephryra and the excavation of the nearby oracle of the dead, by the Acharon, usefully summarising the preliminary reports of recent years.

It is to be hoped that this new enterprise by the publishers of the successful journal Antike Kunst will attract excavation reports which can in this way be more fully illustrated than in the usual reports and chroniques. From some excavators this could be fullest account we ever get of their finds.

Merton College, Oxford.

JOHN BOARDMAN.


This noble study of the Minoan civilisation by a Master is clearly arranged, authoritative in all fields of the subject, wise as well as speculative, and as nearly as possible up to date. There is sagacious comment in brief footnotes at the end. The only demerit is the price.

Ch. 1 surveys the historical background of the Minoan civilisation, with the 'Culture Drift' of Neolithic peasants from the East. The archaeological evidence supports the idea of a spread of peoples westwards across Greece to Italy and further afield, coinciding with the map of the hypothetical 'Aegean' language (Ch. 21). Less clear is the second 'Drift' considered as having brought a tradition of circular buildings and construction with large stones from North Africa. For the early Cretan circular tombs the most obvious antecedents are not in Africa, but in Cyprus (e.g. Khirikitiya) and further East (e.g. Aypachiya). But names with stems in 'Then' (e.g. Thenai in Crete) it is suggested may be of North African origin, and the confusion of l- and r- in Linear B, derived from the language of Linear A, is ultimately perhaps from Egyptian or an allied tongue (Ch. 21).

Spiral decoration is thought to have come from the Balkans (Bandkeramik area) not only to North Greece (Dhimiini c. 2700 B.C.), but to the Cyclades (c. 2500 B.C.) and later in M.M. I to Crete; ultimately from Crete, or direct from the Cyclades, to Egypt (c. 2100 B.C.). The similarities between the decoration on early painted vases from the Balkans (Gumelniza, Cernavoda, Cucuteni B) and that on M.M. Cretan vases cannot lightly be ignored.
(p. 59, Abb. 18). But if there is a connexion, must the influence have come from the Balkans to Crete rather than vice versa? When Cretan dates are compared with those accepted for the Balkans area the answer seems 'Yes'. But the chronological sequences of Crete and the Balkans area, being differently based, are hardly comparable. Cretan dating is based upon Egyptian, and S. (rightly, in the belief of the reviewer) takes a low date (c. 2850 B.C.) for the beginning of the Egyptian First Dynasty. But in Mainland Greece, Anatolia (e.g. Troy), and the Balkans, dating is based (apart from the still will-o'-the-wisp light of Dorak with its suggestion of a Troy II–Fifth Dynasty synchronism) upon C 14, dead reckoning from the depth of deposits, and loose correlations with Mesopotamia, where the chronology before Hammurabi (S.'s dates, 1792–50 B.C.) remains uncertain.

S. accepts early dates for the Anatolian sequence. Consistently with this he emphasises the leading part played by Anatolia in the development of metalworking, which spread with much else thence to the Aegean area including Crete. Beaked jugs in Anatolia may have an origin in metal forms as S. thinks. But the earliest jugs of this kind in Crete (E.M. I) are more like copies of gourds (rounded shape, yellow surface, and skeuomorphic decoration). S. considers the silver cups found at Tod in Egypt as Anatolian (pp. 80, 82). But there are strong grounds for thinking them to be Cretan (M.M., probably M.M. I).

Ch. 2. The dangers of the Cretan seas for early ships are perhaps overestimated. These needed sandy beaches and little creeks, not large harbours (but there is Suda Bay!). Many of the big Minoan settlements are on or near beaches. Ch. 3. Just is the complaint about the mass of unpublished material from Cretan excavations. This Cloud of Unknowing is the blight of Minoan archaeology. Ch. 4 deals sensibly with chronological problems. S. inclines to the view that E.M. III is contemporary with M.M. I at Knosso. The E.M. III spiral-decorated vases from East Crete, and the E.M. III tea-pot from Knossos (P. of M. I, fig. 78) are then really M.M. I. The concept of overlapping 'Styles' of pottery (e.g. Zafer Papoura Style) is a useful corrective to the confusion which results from using the same set of terms both for Periods of Time which are successive, and for Styles which overlap in time.

Ch. 5. S. daringly (but why not?) suggests that Crete may have been inhabited by Palaeolithic and Mesolithic aborigines who mixed with the Neolithic immigrants, bearers of the 'Aegean' language with its -ss-, -nth- endings, when they arrived from the direction of Anatolia. Middle Neolithic pottery is thought to reflect a second group of immigrants coming this time from North Africa. Bolder still is the suggestion that the similarity in technique between the painted 'Neolithic' (is it really E.M.?) ware from Phaistos and Balkan 'Crusted Ware' (with the paint applied after firing) might reflect an immigration into Crete from the Balkans area in late Neolithic times.

Ch. 6. The description of the period of the First Palaces includes a clear account of the latest excavations at Phaistos with a plan (Abb. 25), of the First Palace there. The successive M.M. destructions at Phaistos are correlated with those of Knossos. Ch. 7 gives a good account of relations between Crete and Egypt. From the earliest times connexions were direct, not (more difficult and dangerous, as well as longer) round the coasts of Syria and Anatolia. Egyptian Kefiu is Crete (Ch. 11). S. believes that the E.H. sealings from Lerna were made by Cretan seals, or by seals which had Cretan ancestors (p. 326 note 1). The Knossos hypogaeum it is suggested might have been house-graves like those at Ras Shamra (p. 81).

Ch. 8. The destruction of the First Palaces at the end of M.M. II (c. 1700 B.C.) may have been due to an attack from abroad consequent upon the Hyksos invasion of Egypt; but if so the attackers did not settle. S. argues against the idea of a Luvian conquest of Crete at this time. Elements which the Minoan language and Luvian may have in common are due to their common heritage in the old 'Aegean' language. There is no certain trace of any Indo-European element in the language of Linear A; nor is it Semitic (Ch. 21).

Ch. 9. The Mainland Greeks plundered Knossos after the earthquake of M.M. III and helped the Egyptians against the Hyksos. Ch. 10 has a just appreciation of L.M. I as the last flourishing period of the Minoan civilisation before the decline. S. has taken note of the results of the latest excavations at Knossos which indicate a major destruction there as on the other main sites in Crete in L.M. I B (Ch. 12). Ch. 11. The alteration in the dress of Cretan envoys in the Tomb of Rekhmare reflects the conquest of Knossos by Mainland Greeks between 1470–60 B.C. Ch. 12. The inspiration for the 'Palace Style' of L.M. II came from the Mainland. The 'Ephyraean' style of kylix decoration is of Mainland, probably Argive, origin; but may be due to a Cretan potter at work on the mainland (Ch. 23).

Ch. 13. The Palaces and their way of life were not introduced by conquest from abroad, but developed out of the nature of things in Crete. There is a thoughtful discussion of Matriarchy (Ch. 14) and the 'Pax Minoica' (Ch. 15). The Matriarchal character of the Minoan civilisation and its insularity helped to promote peace. Love of sport was a substitute for war, as in nineteenth-century England; but unlike the English the Minoans had no appetite for foreign conquest! Ch. 16. S stresses the importance of gesture in Minoan life and conversation. Ch. 17 on Religion is followed by Ch. 18, Trade and Industry. Minoan ships combined the oars of the earlier Cycladic vessels with sails from the East. This enabled them to go long sea voyages.

Ch. 19. Minoan art is a revival of the Mediterranean (Palaeolithic) Art of Movement, as opposed
to the Static and Tectonic art of the Indo-Europeans (e.g. Mycenaean and Geometric art). Classical art is an amalgam of Indo-European and Minoan traditions. Myron and Exekias most reflect the Minoan strain in later Greek art. Snijder's theory of 'Eidetics' is explained. The earliest Minoan wall-pictures date from the beginning of the Second Palaces in M.M. III. Whether the Knossos 'Saffron Gatherer' is a monkey or a boy is left an open question (pp. 190–1, 328 note 10). The Phaistos sealings are rightly assigned to late M.M. II, and their place in the development of Minoan art is assessed. Ch. 20. S. thinks that there was no strict division of labour between the crafts; fresco painters may have decorated vases, potters made stone vessels.

Ch. 21. The Phaistos disc is Minoan, with Sign 24 a palanquin, not a Lycian wooden house. There is a sensible appraisal of Linear A. Brice's description of the latest Linear A of Knossos as 'Proto-B' is endorsed. S. thinks that the development of Linear B from A was gradual, and may have begun before the conquest of Knossos by the Mycenaean Greeks at the end of L.M. I B. Words (mostly regarded as proper names) similar in Linear A and B are noted. Ko-ru, a helmet in Linear B, emerges in Linear A as coriander. S. records a doubt about the inscribed gold axe, allegedly from Arkalohori, in Boston (p. 257).

Ch. 22. The Minoan was a high civilization in its own right, not merely derivative, like the Mycenaean from it, or the Roman from the Greek.

Ch. 23. In L.M. II under Greek rule Knossos was the only palatial centre in the island. The Isopata Royal Tomb was built at this time, not earlier. The Greeks brought the Mainland type of chamber tomb to Crete according to S. But it may be easier to find a pedigree for the standard type of Mycenaean chamber tomb in Crete, with M.M. chamber tombs, than on the Mainland where cit and pithos graves were normal in M.H. times. S. suggests that large octopus-decorated stirrup jars may have been in use during the period before the destruction of the L.M. II palace at Knossos. One has a slight impression that S. is not altogether happy (perhaps with good instinct) about the 'orthodox' view of a vase-empty palace succeeded by a myriad-vased Reoccupation.

The shrine at Gournia is accepted as L.M. III, not L.M. I. But S. notes the firm belief of the excavator, Levi, that the shrine at Mitropolis was contemporary with the rest of the building destroyed in L.M. I B. This may well be so, and the shrines with large clay statues may not all be of advanced L.M. III date. The resulting picture of endless 'Ruin Cults' established by Mycenaean Greeks on deserted sites is dreary. The last Ch. 24 considers the image of the Minoan civilisation in Greek legend.

Much learning and considered thought have gone into this book. It is a very fine work, and well produced.

M. S. F. Hood.

Great Milton, Oxfordshire.
in many of the photographs. Each room is given a numerical level, presumably in metres, though we are not told the datum from which these are measured. The main plan of the hieron gives neither a north point nor the vertical interval of the contours. At times, more detailed argument would be welcome. We are told, for instance, that the porch to andron B must have had a marble floor, though the evidence—absence of substruction (sic: a favourite word of Westholm), no markings along walls and threshold—is entirely negative and, if anything, points to the absence of such a floor.

Westholm's English is occasionally clumsy, and he is prone to invent words. Technical terms could at times have been used with profit, 'arris' for 'ridge of the column'—'rusticated faces with drafted margins' for 'the corners at the edges of the blocks are carefully cut whereas the surface between these straight lines are left more unfinished'.

Labraunda is an extremely important site for the history of Greek architecture. It comprises one of the best preserved and most complete series of fourth-century structures; and even if it is, in comparison with the architecture of more truly Greek regions, the blundering work of a barbarian philhellen, it is not the less interesting because of that. As a forerunner of Hellenistic architecture its importance is paramount, and it is annoying that it should be presented to the world in this unsatisfactory fashion.

R. A. TOMLINSON.

University of Birmingham.


Running parallel with the four great volumes of excavation reports on Troy, the supplementary monographs, of which this is the third, have been 'planned to present special critical and technical studies of material that could not be adequately treated in the general report' (Blegen p. viii). The fact that Mrs Thompson agreed to study the terracottas promised painstaking attention to detail, combined with wide knowledge of the field. That she has made of the book an indispensable guide to the intricacies of the Hellenistic minor arts, not terracottas alone, and has illumined many dark areas in the distribution and chronology of Hellenistic types, whilst firmly refusing to claim more for the figurines than they deserve, is a tribute to her scholarship and to her intellectual honesty.

The book, dealing with terracottas ranging in date from the fourth century B.C. to late Roman times, is divided into two parts, commentary and catalogue. The commentary (pp. 3–66) covers general topics such as contexts, technique, style, chronology, costume and cults. As contexts are few, Mrs Thompson has to depend on comparative material from other places and also more fundamentally on differences of technique, clay colour, uses of moulds, etc. Minute variations of style, e.g., set of facial features, inclination of head, receive due evaluation in an attempt to assess the place of a given figurine in a typological series. Of greatest importance here is Mrs Thompson's superficially paradoxical but basically true statement that terracottas have two dates, 'the date at which a given type was created and the date at which the piece was manufactured' (p. 20). Such a truth, even if tacitly accepted before, has been left to Mrs Thompson to set down in writing. The chapter on costume finds the author in a favourite area, and she elaborates on work she has set forth in previous articles. Her discussion of hair styles and headdress bids fair to set up as systematic an arrangement for dating Hellenistic figures as we have in the Roman imperial fashions of later years. The chapter on the craft of the coroplasts at Ilion (pp. 61–6) takes us into their workshops, and Mrs Thompson shows the changing taste of public and craftsman.

In Part 2 (pp. 69–146), besides the catalogue proper with measurements, descriptions and comparanda, there are two more types of discussion, a shorter for small categories of less important material, and a longer for such types as Kybele, votaries (with a specially detailed interpretation of the seated nude females, nos. 58–71, as hierodouloi), dancers and votive-plaques (the local horseman-hero series). Most of the discussions are to be found in the section on religious subjects; the secular subjects are less susceptible to detailed analysis, and Mrs Thompson is content to treat them summarily, though a slight deformity in the arm of no. 155 calls forth a paragraph very much in Mrs Thompson's manner (p. 125).

The catalogue is followed by a concordance and three indexes: general, museographic and Greek. The illustrations contain plans and a photograph of the relevant parts of Troy, and, besides 53 plates of catalogued figurines (V–LVII), 5 plates (LIX–LXIII) of comparanda, including some from the Calvert collection, dug up in the Troad and at Troy in the 1850s. The inclusion of details of the Mantinea basis, pl. LIX, shows that comparative material other than figurines was allowed, and it would have been of great help if a plate with a selection of Hellenistic coin portraits could have been included, to clarify further the discussion of hair styles. The majority of the figurines are shown life size, and only a few are totally submerged in the blanching effect of the offset.

Now that Mrs Thompson has shown once again, as with her Agora groups in Hesperia, what blood she can infuse into broken members, let us hope that she will next present a general book on Hellenistic terracottas, which only she is capable of writing.

B. A. SPARKES.

University of Southampton.
This is the last volume of the Tarsus publication and it takes the history of the area excavated from the earliest Iron Age (c. 1100) down to the later sixth century, when there is a lacuna until the Hellenistic period (described in vol. i). Hetty Goldman describes the digging and deals with the minor objects, except for the seals which are published by Porada. Hanfmann contributes the bulk of the volume with his detailed study of the pottery. Pictures and drawings are on the whole very good (fig. 52 inverted and some mislabelling). There are occasional discrepancies between, for example, the two places in the text where the stratigraphy is described and the plans. Better so, than that they should have been suppressed by conscientious editing or rationalised; after all, these things happen in excavation records, and it is now possible to assess the evidence with hardly less information than was available to the publishers themselves.

The main area dug revealed housing, and there was also a group of Middle Iron Age pottery ovens. The Early Iron Age is of main interest for students of local Anatolian and Near Eastern wares and the finds of pottery are arranged by Hanfmann with great care. The terminus for the Early Iron Age is put at c. 850. It yielded some Greek pendant-semicolon circle cups, well known in the Greek islands, Euboce and Al Mina, a piece (1371) with concentric circles, a shoulder with zigzags (1372; ? a hydria) and what looks like the lip of an early ‘Ionian cup’ (1373). If the Greek sherds help date the period, as they seem to, a date as low as the first half of the eighth century might be argued. Occupation in the Early Iron Age may not have been continuous in this area.

The next phase, the Middle Iron Age, introduces more Greek pottery, of types met at Al Mina but without the full range of ‘Euboce-Cycladic’ skyphoi and in a far smaller proportion beside the native wares. It seems probable, however, that some Greeks were resident, and this we would expect from Sargon’s and Sennacherib’s encounters with them in Cilicia. The end of the period, put c. 700, is equated with Sennacherib’s destruction of Tarsus in 696. This would prove a point of capital importance for the dating of Greek pottery and I have argued elsewhere in this volume that the excavators’ interpretation of these levels can be readily, and perhaps more satisfactorily, modified to present a story which does not offend accepted Greek vase chronology, the literary record, or observed stratigraphy. It may be noted that the pendant-semester circle cups may certainly still have been in use when Sennacherib arrived, but the absence of any clear destruction floors and the extremely fragmentary material (no whole cup) leaves a lingering doubt (cf. BSA lli 8; AA 1963 204 f.). In the seventh and sixth centuries the Greek material remains scrappy beside the local and Cypriot. A fortification wall is built in the second half of the seventh century.

Hanfmann’s skill and diligence with the pottery is wholly commendable and this will be a valuable guide to future excavators in this region. Inevitably his system—describing wares, historical development and then catalogue—leads to some repetition, but much seems justified. For the seals Porada is doubtful about the existence of any real Cilician workshop, but I wonder whether she need look further than her Lyreplayer Group.

One of the disadvantages of this delegation of publication is that a truly synoptic view of the finds is missed. A concentration of weapons could have prompted thoughts on the Cimmerian invasion of c. 630; and could the need for general re-flooring in c. 550 have something to do with Nergillassar’s campaign of 557/6 (Wiseman, Chronicles, 39 f., 87)? Again, what of the topographical history of the site? Is Gölü Kule, the site excavated, the only early settlement here? The casual reader might suppose that the hill was the centre of the Tarsus of later history, and we miss in an otherwise lavish publication even a sketch plan relating the site to classical and modern Tarsus. But perhaps some more comprehensive summary of the site’s history is being prepared.

Merton College, Oxford.

JOHN BOARDMAN.


In this century Danish scholars have been prominent in the study of Philo’s Arsenal; first Marstrand, recently Jeppesen and now Lorenzen. Like Marstrand L. is not a classical archaeologist or philologist but a practising architect, whose aim in this book is to add the fruits of his technical experience in discussing problems of materials and construction. This sounds promising and such a contribution could be valuable; but L.’s is slight. He has some new interpretations and realises that they will be met with scepticism by classical philologists, but maintains that the voice of technical experience ought to be heard. Certainly, as long as this elucidates the inscription (which is after all our only direct evidence for the Arsenal) and is not contradicted by it.

L.’s first chapter deals with the roof construction. He follows Marstrand (Arsenale i Piraeus, 89 f.) and Jeppesen (Paradigmata, 81–2) in interpreting κομψάω, σφιγγάω, ιμάτις and καλλιματά as ‘raking rafters, long timbers, transverse planks and longitudinal boards’ as opposed to the older interpretation, maintained recently by Hodge (The Woodwork of Greek Roofs, 65 and fig. 15), as ‘ridge-beams, raking rafters, long timbers and transverse planks’. As a philologist
I should certainly prefer to see κορυφαῖον with the natural meaning ‘ridge-beam’. Also with κορυφαῖον as ‘ridge-beam’ it is easier to understand the reference to its height ἀνεῖν τῆς καταφορᾶς (II. 50–1), i.e. the maximum height ignoring the double slope on its upper side. L. has not noticed that Jeppesen has now changed his mind, though he quotes the reference (Acta Archaeologica, xxxii [1961] 218 ff.).

L. assumes that a triangulated tie-beam truss was used instead of a prop-and-lintel construction. This, though not impossible (cf. Hodge, 38–44), is most unlikely in this case, since it is difficult to explain ἔπωθημα as anything other than a ‘prop’, resting on the cross-beam (μεσόγιον) and supporting the κορυφαῖον. L. explains ἔπωθημα as a longitudinal beam resting on the centre of the cross-beam, entirely unconnected with the timber-work above, and serving merely as a beam from which to hang rigging. But this allows no sense to the term ἔπωθημα, which must bear some structural relation to something above it (cf. l. 40 στήριξε τοὺς κίονας ἐπωθήματα στολοβάτηρ;) it would be impossible to use it to hang rigging if, as is usually accepted (though not by L.), the central aisle was an important passage; also if such were the purpose of the beam it is surprising that the inscription does not make this clear. L. then differs from previous scholars in placing the cross-beams (μεσόγια) on the longitudinal beams (ἐπιστείλαι), and not on the columns at the same level as the ἐπιστείλαι. Thus according to L. the raking rafters do not rest on the ἐπιστείλαι as purlins but are attached to the ends of the cross-beams to form a truss frame. But the Greek text (and Jeppesen’s translation, which L. quotes) disproves L.’s interpretation, for it states (l. 48) μεσόγια ἐπωθήματα ἐπί τοὺς κίονας. On the actual roofing materials L. follows Marstrand and Jeppesen.

L. next discusses the position of the doors. He insists that with the doors in the short sides difficulties arise over the placing of the central window; he objects to its being placed directly above the central pillar of the doorway, and notes that Jeppesen is forced to emend the text on the height of the doors, a desperate measure. L. tries to solve the problem by placing the doors in the long walls. His language is obscure at this point (p. 16–17), but he has apparently misunderstood the translations which he uses, finding a discrepancy between them which does not exist; he concludes that, in the phrase διαλείποντων θωραίοις κατὰ τὸ πλάτος τῆς σκευοθήκης (l. 22), τὸ πλάτος is the broad side, ‘that is, the long side’! This is quite impossible since τὸ πλάτος is always the short side of a building as opposed to τὸ μέρος, the long side, in this inscription (cf. l. 6 and especially l. 36) and elsewhere. Furthermore, such a position for the doors would clearly have considerable disadvantages, for there would have been continual congestion at the doors, since all gear and personnel would have had to pass through the small central hall between them; L. indeed makes matters worse by assuming that the main road from Zea dockyard ran through it into the Agora (the Arsenal stretching east/west along the south side of the Agora)! Also two passages in the inscription indicate that the δῆμος was to be allowed, and expected, to walk the whole length of the Arsenal: ll. 12–14, διαλείποντων δὲ ἔπωθα τοῦ δήμου διὰ μέσας τῆς σκευοθήκης (δῶδον must refer to the long central aisle, cf. ll. 48–9 μεσόγια... ἐπί τῆς δωδοῦ); ll. 90–2 ‘there must be openings in the chests ös αὐτὸ ἢ ὁ ὀρῶν ἀποτελεῖται τῷ κυρίῳ δεξιόθαν τῷ ἢ ἢ ἐν τῇ σκευοθήκη’.

The δῆμος could not have done this if confined by grilles to a short cross-passage in the middle (and if the grilles of ll. 63–4 were just these two, one would have expected ἐκεῖστερον instead of ἐκατωτος).

In his discussion of the construction of the doorways L. misunderstands the translation of Item 18 (ll. 23–4), and assumes three μέτωπα in each; this leads him to confuse details of the central pier (μετωπῶν) with details of the side walls of the doorway.

L. discusses at length the height of the wall courses. He contests the general assumption of a height of 1/4 feet, but his argument involves a high-handed alteration of the translation of the crucial passage (ll. 26–28); the Greek text clearly disproves L.’s idea (for it would involve πέχω τραμπλισθοῦν agreeing with τῶν τραμπλίων instead of πλάθαις). His reconstruction of the building and discussion of it is thus vitiated by this basic error.

One must be grateful to those scholars whose native language is not widely known who publish in one which is; however, in this case L.’s worthy aim has been frustrated, for he has been very ill served by those who helped him with his English text (as by those who advised him on Greek philology). The English is rarely easy to read and often obscure; Danish word order has been retained almost throughout. Much may be the fault of the printers (I noted seven misprints on 40–41, which is a simple copy of Jeppesen’s translation), but besides the numerous minor misspellings and the total omission of the apostrophe, there are mistakes (e.g. ‘vertical’ instead of ‘horizontal’, 12) and a number of passages which are difficult to follow (e.g. 31–32; 10 n. 6, where it is not immediately clear, unless one knows Danish, that the ‘beam’ must be the ἐπιστείλαι).

L.’s reference throughout to the text of the inscription by the Item number of the Danish translation, not by the section number of the English translation or the line number of the Greek text, is extremely irritating. The drawings are mostly adequate, but some are smudgy; there is no index. The book is an inconvenient shape, being too long to fit into a normal bookshelf except on end.

D. J. BLACKMAN.

University of Bristol.


The prospective purchaser (and I trust there will be many such) of this most excellent work should be
warned that the title provides an inadequate, and even to some extent erroneous, advertisement of the contents. On the one hand, Catling has much to say of Cypriot bronzework at a time when Cyprus was outside the Mycenaean world. On the other hand, it appears that when Cyprus did come within the Mycenaean orbit, in the twelfth century B.C., the vast majority of the bronzework, if not all, was of Mycenaean manufacture—and as this includes material whose description and discussion occupies some two-thirds of the book, it is tempting to suggest that the whole could with more accuracy have been given the title of Mycenaean Bronzework in the Cypriot World.

I am not of course claiming that this is a serious defect. In fact, it may serve as a means of stressing the great value and comprehensiveness of this book. No short title could give a true idea of the work's scope and diversity—even the notice on the dust jacket is too modest and unrevealing. For example, Catling gives us not only a meticulous description and discussion of all bronze objects found in Cyprus during the Bronze Age, but for good measure adds an extremely valuable—even if not exhaustive—section listing the contemporaneous bronze vessels of Greece and the Aegean, and an equally useful catalogue of objects found in bronze founders' hoards in the same area. Who, furthermore, could surmise that beneath the austere title of the book there lurked not only a fundamental survey of settlement changes in Cyprus during the Bronze Age, but also a most fascinating analysis of the relations between this island and the Mycenaean world? With regard to this last matter, even if one does not agree with all Catling's conclusions, the presentation of the case and the thorough and all-embracing use of the evidence are quite invaluable.

On the purely technical and 'catalogue' side, in other words the central part of Catling's work, I have little to say, except only that he appears to have accomplished his object with exemplary thoroughness and clarity—he has even succeeded in making the tedious details of description tolerably readable. It should also be noted that he discusses the possible relevance of the chemical composition of the objects that he records (though I wish he could tell us where the smiths got their tin from).

There is just the occasional cumbrousness: for example, it seems almost unlikely to the rather inoffensive little objects depicted on fig. 16, nos. i–6 to call them 'sub-elliptical barbless arrow-heads with long narrow straight tangs'. However, such oddities are but a sign of precision, and are probably unavoidable. In any case, the reader of this book will gain both from the text and from the excellent line drawings and photographs a complete account of precisely what bronze objects, from the humblest mushroom-headed toggle pin to the most elaborate tripod stand, were made in Cyprus, when they were made, and who made them.

Who did in fact make these bronzes? Cypriot craftsmen, one would naturally suppose. But according to Catling this is not so for the bulk of his material, that of the twelfth century. Though I do not think he ever says it in so many words, he is evidently of the opinion that this was the work of Mycenaean settlers.

This is a matter which needs careful consideration, and Catling's train of reasoning may be summarised thus. Between 1400 and 1200 B.C. (roughly the period of LCIII) there was no Mycenaean settlement in Cyprus, in spite of the presence there of very many vases of Mycenaean manufacture, for in almost all other matters Cypriot culture differed from that of the Aegean. The Mycenaean bronze-workers, masters of their craft, needed the rich supplies of copper available in Cyprus, and so the Mycenaean pottery reached the island by way of trade. At the beginning of the twelfth century, when Enkomi and other sites were destroyed, many Mycenaeans, including craftsmen, settled in Cyprus and had a great influence on the native culture. It is remarkable that in Cyprus, where previously there had been but slight traces of bronze industry, there now appeared considerable numbers of bronze objects, many of which were typologically closely linked with those of the Aegean. It is therefore justifiable to conclude that these objects, of whatever kind or purpose, were introduced by the Mycenaean settlers, who presumably also made them on the spot.

This is the theme that runs through most of Catling's book. In many ways it is convincing, but there seems to me to be room for argument. In the first place, several types of tool cannot be paralleled in the Aegean—there are indeed instances where a type originates in the Near East. On the other hand, two types of tool familiar to the Aegean have not yet been found in Cyprus. Secondly, Catling points to the comparative primitiveness of bronze objects in LCIII (1400–1200). He explains that the rather simple types of tool current in LCII are 'barely distinguishable from those of MCIII, except that they tend to be scarcer and poorer' (p. 109). He continues: 'This situation apparently remained unchanged throughout LCIII.' But it is also evident that bronze objects are but rarely found at all in LCIII, because of the absence of hoards (there being no threat of disaster) and because it was no longer the custom to deposit bronze objects, especially tools, in tombs (which provide the bulk of our evidence). His argument is thus somewhat weakened. Third, although the only hoards which can be dated belong to the twelfth century, the parallels in the other hoards are so close that Catling is satisfied that all must be dated after 1200 B.C. But this conclusion, taken in conjunction with the situation revealed in LCIII, involves the use of argument by negative evidence. Can we be sure that none of the five undated hoards was earlier than 1200 B.C.? Even if we could, can we be certain that the Cypriots were not using similar tools in the thirteenth century, particularly as some types appear
NOTICES OF BOOKS

O. Catling is, nevertheless, quite likely to be right: he has an unrivalled knowledge of and feel for Cyprus at this period. His reasoning is based on the whole of the evidence, not only that of the bronze objects. He has in fact produced a book of absorbing interest for the whole Late Bronze Age in Cyprus—and in the Aegean as well—and one which within its defined limits should undoubtedly become the standard work.

As a brief footnote, may I say how gratified I was to discover here what must surely be the topographical ultimate—Zyyi?

V. R. d'A. DESBOROUGH.

University of Manchester.


'This publication of excavations at the Delion on Paros has been awaited for two generations. That it can still be undertaken after so long a delay by the excavator himself is rare good fortune, denied to so many other excavations on classical soil.' Thus Kunze in his foreword. Rubensohn's publication is neat, accurate and complete. The site is on a hill just north of Paros town. In the fill of the nearly square peribolos was found the mass of archaic votives which form the bulk of the finds. Within stood what seems to have been an altar, and a crude 'rock-altar' with which Rubensohn is inclined to associate the few Bronze Age Cycladic finds made on the surface of the site. In the sixth century ('not appreciably later than the middle' may be too early) a small Doric temple was built, with a new altar, and a group of rooms, including a dining-room with pebble floor. The peribolos-terrace was extended for the temple and the new bastion provided with a small Palladian stairway; an odd feature in Greece, but matched in archaic Chios (cf. Amf xlix 1959 187, 218). Inscriptions name Delian Artemis and Kynthian Athena, so the site can be recognised as another of the dependent, Delion sanctuaries of the Greek islands.

The finds are varied, though fragmentary. Among the marbles may be picked out a fine early classical sphinx (pl. 9), pieces of fourth-century or later tables, and pyxides of local marble which call for a review of the Parian workshops producing these vessels. The other finds are largely from the archaic deposit beneath the floor level of the sixth-century temple. Of the bronzes—fibulae, pins, and a striking head which looks seventh-century, not perhaps late (pl. 12.19). A necklace of faience scarabs is of the type studied in Perachora ii 469 ff. The scaraboid seal, pl. 1161 VI is of the Near Eastern class studied by Porada in The Aegean and the Near East; VII is related—inverted, the device shows as two goats' heads. Other seals are noted now in the reviewer's Island Gems (s.v. in Index). The vases are of some interest. The Late Geometric offer the variety of multiple brush patterns which is usually associated with Parian, but Rubensohn is convinced that Paros had no fine wares of her own since there are no good clay beds. He also rejects Paros as the home of 'Melian' orientalising, of which there are a few pieces from the Delion. Other Cycladic vases include polychrome plates. Among the imports are East Greek scraps, some Protocorinthian and some imitations of Protocorinthian. A copy of an aryllabos of c. 700 carries a painted inscription and may be Cycladic. References to some works in English might have helped in the attribution of some Cycladic vases (cf. the Siphnos excavations) and of the Swan Group miniatures (p. 127 f.; cf. Beazley, ABV 655 ff.); and in the identification of East Greek, not Boeotian sandal-vases (p. 128; cf. Higgins, BMC Terracottas ii 32; the signed Boston example, Fairbanks 526, is an imitation), and the placing of some of the classical figurines found in surface deposits (Higgins, t.). These figurines, though unexciting, are discussed in some detail. It is only in these matters that the treatment of the finds seems at all dated.

JOHN BOARDMAN.

Merton College, Oxford.


One of the more interesting buildings in the sanctuary of the Kabeiroi at Samothrace is this large and high but roofless enclosure, some 17 metres by 14 in plan, designed for a large altar in the open air. It is an early forerunner, dating from c. 330 B.C., of the Great Altar of Pergamum, and has some architectural pretensions, with a Doric colonnaded screen instead of a mere enclosing wall on its west, or entrance, side. It turns a blank, doorless back on the main Hieron and Hall of Votive Gifts. But even on its west side it came very close to the river; and its façade acquired a satisfactory setting only c. 200 B.C., when an orchestra was built over the river, and a cavea to the west of this, which could serve on occasion as a theatre, with the façade of the altar court as its skene. Finally, overwhelmed and buried in the sixth century A.D., the altar court was lost to sight so completely that Conze's expedition, though uncovering its east wall, never recognized it for what it was, and attributed many of its marble blocks to the
Hieron. Salaè and Chapouthier, who uncovered more of it in the twenties and thirties, made little progress, owing at the outset to inexperience and later to Iron Curtains (Lehmann himself could get no word from Salaè); while the Theatre, which they did uncover, was nearly all destroyed by local vandals. Luckily, Lehmann and Spittle, the architect, were able to piece together all the surviving evidence for Altar Court and Theatre in the ten years before Lehmann’s death, when this volume was substantially complete. Spittle gives full drawings of the site, the chief fragments, and his own restorations. P. M. Fraser had already published the inscriptions, but the other relevant evidence, of pottery, coins, lamps, etc., appears in the present volume. The ceramic evidence, much the bulkiest, is published by Iris C. Love, together with the inscribed ceramics from the Altar Court itself and from the Hall of Votive Gifts. The whole volume is long and exhaustive, in the way that we have come to expect with Samothrace.

Spittle, in the first chapter, completely restores the building. An earth platform filled the enclosure, extending to the top of its fourth course, and supported a long altar (identified from one cover-slab only!), running north and south, about one metre from the east wall. The side and rear walls had foundations some 71 cm thick, the front screen 82 cm. From these measurements we can be sure that the antae displayed their sides, not their fronts, on the west façade—resembling, for instance, those on the Propylon at Gaggera in Sicily. The west façade was about 17 metres wide; which, since the metopes averaged over 70 cm, the triglyphs about 51 cm wide, seems to entail 14 triglyphs and 13 metopes along the front. So, again recalling Gaggera, there were three metopes between the axes of the two centre columns. A full Doric entablature continued round the whole building. The front epistyle blocks can be distinguished from the rest of the architrave by their carefily worked soffits. Not all were inscribed on the front. So we know that the dedicatory inscription on the façade was short—at most six metope-spaces in length, out of the eleven making up the entablature between the faces of the two antae. In its first phase, the building had neither roof nor pediments. It had scroll-akroteria at the corners, meant to be seen from inside the court, too. But it also had antefixes and cover-tiles, which Spittle stops against a continuous cross cover-tile in a way seemingly necessitated by the design, but unsupported by actual evidence, and perhaps unprecedented.

Among notable details are (1) the absence of marble steps below and outside the front stylobate (Spittle restores wooden steps, but I think I should prefer ramps); (2) the mixture of stones, marble being used for the colonnade and continuous entablature, limestone for the bulk of the walls, local porphyry and marble for the floor of the court and presumably marble for the altar, although I cannot find the material of the altar’s cover-slab, fig. 9; (3) the general use of pi-clamps and very oblong lwesises in the construction; (4) the column-capitals, each of which had a straight echinus, the slope of which was continued by four, not three annulets below; (5) the extraordinary epikranitis along the walls just below the architrave, a thoroughly Ionic feature, though treated here to a Doric hawksbeak moulding; (6) the variety in the triglyphs, some of which are square-headed, some segmental, though all had distinctive ‘ears’ on the corners; (7) the blocks of the N.E. corner, which seem to be replacements—especially the cornice-block, which now contains the corner of a pediment and an A with broken hasta, of late appearance.

The second feature has parallels in late fourth-century buildings—for instance, in the Temple of Hemithea at Kastabos, which I hope to publish soon, where the cellar-walls were of limestone, the columns and entablature of marble. The local porphyry at Samothrace was used not only in the floor, but in the theatre’s retaining walls (see Fig. 118). Porphyry was exploited by Hellenistic builders, too, to judge from a Hellenistic Doric column of red porphyry, which I saw at Phereaklos on Rhodes in 1969. Did the masons of Samothrace ever erect porphyry columns? As for the third feature, the pi-clamps, I do not see that all the supposed holes for them were really meant for them. Some could be dowel-holes with adjacent pour-channels (many such holes exist at Kastabos). Unhappily, Spittle’s drawings give no indication of their depth. The sixth feature, the variation in the triglyphs, is explained by Lehmann (p. 82) by the freedom of workmen of different origins to make the glyphs to which they were accustomed. This seems to me unthinkable. The corner-blocks of the frieze, we know, had straight-headed triglyphs (Plates 28 and 29). I should like to think that the segmental triglyphs were confined to one side—perhaps to the entablature above the colonnaded screen. The seventh feature, the later ‘pediment’, is restored in Fig. 57 as a truncated pediment, a trapezium on elevation. The parallaxes for this, Figs. 119 and 120, seem unconvincing, and the block remains a puzzle. Perhaps it formed part of some composition like a Roman scannae frons, embracing several half-pediments and small pediments. Spittle and Lehmann conjecture that internally it served to hold some canopy above the altar. But, despite their claims (p. 57), the cuttings on the architrave block seem too rough, those on the altar step too crooked to have anything to do with a canopy.

In Chapter 2, Lehmann places our building in its architectural context, and in Chapter 3 traces its actual history. There is much that is learned and admirable in these chapters. For instance, while investigating the relative dates of all the principal fourth-century buildings, Lehmann challenges the late date now assumed for Athena Alea at Tegea from the relief of Idries found there. Why could it not be set up on his return home by a Tegeate who had proceeded with Scopas to Caria? Lehmann also argues that the Corinthian capitals at Tegea are more
primitive and surely older than those of the Tholos at Epidaurus. And he connects the rinceau-sima of Tegea with those of the Tholos and the fourth-century Temple of Apollo at Delphi, in all of which the palmette of the antefix grows out of the sima—a group apparently earlier than Epidaurus, our Altar Court, the South Stoa at Corinth (and now I can add Kastabos), where the designs of sima and antefix are disconnected. Lehmann certainly makes good his argument that stylistically his Altar Court is of c. 350–25 b.c.; and some of the proportions he adduces in his very thorough argument are most telling—e.g. the height of the columns, 6½ lower diameters, and the great height of the echinus. He has also, from his researches on the ears of triglyphs, concluded that the earliest seem to be from Andron A at Labraunda, of c. 350 b.c. He concludes that our magnificent Altar Court was built because at an earlier time the porphyry rocks on its site were considered holy, and served, in fact, as an unhewn but very sacred altar.

But while I agree with his general dating, I consider many of his arguments shaky. He seems to have come to architecture late in life, and has reared the enormous weight of his learning on foundations in places rather weak. I cannot agree with him on the following quite important issues.

(1) Despite p. 73, the epikranitis around the exterior below the architrave must be an Ionicism (and why not, when Lehmann is so keen to trace this type of building to the Asiatic coast?). The Amazon Sarcophagus in Vienna, too, is Ionic, if it is anything. The fragment from Pisistratean Eleusis, so far as I can see, need not come from an exterior at all, but from a normal Doric internal cornice.

(2) I cannot believe the two types of triglyph were haphazardly arranged (see above).

(3) I see no resemblance, let alone a close likeness, between the outer cornice of our building and the Cyrenean Treasury at Delphi. The bed at Delphi has two tiers of moulding, not one. So whereas at Samothrace the corona dips below the level of the bed-soffit, at Delphi it does not. Moreover, the simas on the two cornices have quite different profiles. Finally, the taenia of the metopes at Samothrace lacks the moulding so important at the Treasury.

(4) Lehmann assumes that the wider centre intercolumniation with three metopes found at Samothrace was a daring invention of Mnesicles, c. 435 b.c., and is otherwise found on Doric façades only in the mid-fourth century—e.g. the Treasury of Cyrene and our Altar Court. He hopes (p. 68, n. 31) that he can date the Propylon of Gaggera to the same period. But he ignores the Propylon of Sunium. For myself, I still believe that Weller's restoration of the archaic Propylon at Athens, which has this arrangement, is correct, and that its later modifiers have no shred of evidence (see JHS 1960, p. 148). Moreover, all the Delphic Treasuries, Doric and Ionic, have a wider central intercolumniation. The late archaic Athenian Treasury, indeed, appears to have only two, not three metopes between the columns. But in fact it throws the two triglyphs that should come directly over the columns well outside their axes—a rather painful solution, which one cannot think was popular for long.

(5) The foundations have alternate rows of 'headers' and 'stretchers'; and Lehmann (p. 70) dates all parallel instances of such construction to c. 350–25. But the precinct wall of Eleusis, which Noack, Wrede and others all consider Periclean, is built in just this way (Wrede, Pls. 38 and 39).

It is perhaps fortunate that Lehmann can rely upon the firm evidence of the pottery to clinch the correct date for the building, which he has fortunately reached by arguments such as these.

On the analysis of general artistic detail Lehmann seems much happier. But I wonder if the antefixes of the Altar Court are as elegant and well-carved as Lehmann says. The eyes (fig. 80) of the palmettes seem particularly crude. Unlike Lehmann (p. 95), I find Miss Kleemann's conclusions on fifth-century ornament rather shaky; and I doubt whether the Giustinian Stele dates as early as the decade 460–450.

On the restoration of the dedicatory inscription I am not qualified to criticise Lehmann. But I must remark that in the six words of his version—Ἀρρήδηιος καλὸς Μακεδόνων θεός τα κάταρα—he obtains a spelling of Arrhidaios otherwise unknown, two words, καλὸς and κάταρα, hitherto known only from Hesychius, and a neuter plural, κάταρα, for a word which Hesychius surely considered a feminine singular. For his' entry runs: Κάταρα· ἡ καταράα.

HUGH PLOMMER.

*Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge.*

**MYLONAS (G. E.)** *Grave circle B of Mycenae.*

(Studies in Mediterranean archaeology, Vol.VII.)


This can only be described as a disappointing publication. No one could better write on Grave Circle B at Mycenae than Professor Mylonas, who shared in its excavation with the late and much lamented Dr Papadimitriou; and indeed he gives us in four quarto pages a succinct, informative and readable account of the Graves and their contents, followed by a good bibliography. But it is not surprising if in that space he can give us virtually nothing he has not written before, in *Ancient Mycenae* (1957) and elsewhere. The illustrations add nothing fresh; the half-tone work is only mediocre; the plan is uncomfortably small and without a scale. It is puzzling that this short article should appear at this date and as Volume (sic) VII of a series that had as Vol. I Per Alín’s important 160-page monograph on the history of Mycenaean settlements in Greece. It
is also shocking that while Vol. I costs only 36 Swedish crowns these 10 pages cost 15—about a guinea.

F. H. STUBBINGS.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge.


Here is the first part of the eagerly awaited final publication of the Pheidias workshop excavations of 1954–8. Not everyone would have chosen the form of this volume, with its discursive style, light annotation, glossy paper and lack of index or full inventories, as the best medium for communicating such important results. Yet this style of publication (defended by Schiering on p. 165) makes for easier reading, presenting the material as it does in a partly digested form; and the results may therefore reach, as they deserve to, a wider public than usual. The present volume falls into two halves: Mallwitz' account of the architectural findings, and Schiering's of the pottery and other dating material. The moulds, tools and other finds connected with the workshop's activity will be published by Kunze in a forthcoming number of the Forschungen.

Both writers pay close attention to the all-important question of the stratification. It was largely by this means that they were able to settle the old controversies connected with this site, although much of the evidence had disappeared in the earlier excavations; and their achievement is matched by the clarity with which they explain it. Briefly, there was enough datable material to establish beyond doubt that Adler's original identification of Building A, the ancient structure underlying the Byzantine church, as the workshop used by Pheidias for the construction of the colossal Zeus and later pointed out to Pausanias, was indeed correct. The much-discussed Building C, Dörpfeld's choice for the workshop, is after all nothing but a Late Hellenistic barn. The great mass of this dating material came, not from inside Building A, but from two layers of spill which mostly lay to the south and south-east. The earlier stratum, called D, was also thinly present inside the building and proved to be closely connected with the workshop's construction, in that it is later than the foundations, yet earlier than the eventual floor; it therefore gives an excellent guide to the date. It was held in by an important retaining wall to the south, beyond which was layer E, discernibly later and with an extension containing so many piece-moulds and other working materials that it was christened the 'Formenschicht'. This debris seems to be the result of more than one spring-cleaning of the workshop, after the first period of intensive activity connected with the Zeus. It is thus of the greatest importance that the bulk of their contents indicated a date of c. 440–30 for D, 430–10 for E and the Formenschicht. Here then is the settlement of another age-long dispute: the Zeus was the work of Pheidias' latest years, undertaken after the Parthenos (dedicated in 438/7) and after his fall from grace in Athens.

But there is a great deal more to the report than this. As Mallwitz' study shows, Building A in its own right proved to have baffling and contradictory features. One of the bigger secular buildings known from fifth-century Greece, it is massively founded, with supporting piers along the sides, a channel to keep the surface water away from the walls, and the retaining wall a few yards away. Above, the surviving stone socle is over a metre thick and was coated with marble stucco on the outside. Both long sides have a distinct lateral bulge towards the north, perhaps to counter an expected landslide. Such appointments seem out of proportion to the building's purpose, and they are in strong contrast to other features. For instance, the headers of the toichobate, though always visible, were not aligned with each other on the inside and were not even always set at right angles to the wall above. Dowel-holes are almost entirely absent; almost every horizontal measurement of the building shows irregularities; and the many inaccuracies of levelling were also clearly present in the original structure.

Mallwitz' reconstruction of this schizophrenic building necessarily involves many hypotheses; but one of these is fundamental to the whole attempt (p. 90). It is, that the forty-foot-high colossal was actually assembled in the workshop, and then dismantled and carried piecemeal across to its destined place in the temple (M. rejects Adler's idea of a full-scale model in the workshop). For this reason, he must naturally have a building slightly higher than the statue; and from this many further implications follow.

How well-founded is the original hypothesis? Basically it rests on the well-known correspondence in measurements between the workshop and the cela of the Temple of Zeus where the statue was to stand. Yet this correspondence is hardly exact: on internal measurements, the workshop is about a metre longer and a metre narrower than the cela. The space between the two rows of internal columns also differs slightly in workshop and temple: but more important is the fact that the columns of the workshop are of most controversial quality as evidence.

M. honestly admits his doubt (p. 39) as to whether these really belonged to the original building. There is no proof that they did, and their bases (the only part found in situ) have shallow foundations. One might have hoped that these bases could be chronologically related to the filling in, about 400 B.C., of the well dug in the north-west corner of the workshop during its construction; but the relevant cross-section (p. 41) breaks off at a crucial point. It was, however, possible to say that the columns were put in after the completion of the main stone-work of the
building; M. guesses immediately after, and connects the columns with a two-storey stone scaffolding to facilitate work on the colossal. He agrees (p. 85) that supplementary scaffolding in wood would be necessary, to provide more levels and to give access to the back and front of the statue as well as its sides; but it seems to me that this rigid stone structure would impede more than it helped. According to M., the columns are excluded by their shallow foundations from helping to support the roof. He therefore suggests a triangular tie-beam truss for the 12.25 metre unsupported span, thus carrying a stage further the already rather revolutionary findings of A. T. Hodge on the early use of trusses. This seems unlikely; if Phidias knew about trusses in c. 435, why was the idea not known to Iktinos ten years earlier? It would have saved him a lot of trouble in roofing the slightly narrower central span of the Parthenon cela. The Treasury of Gela, the only plausible precedent for a trussed roof in mainland Greece, quite likely had internal columns after all (JHS lxxii, 205). The foundations of the workshop columns are scarcely shallower than those inside the Bouleuterion not far to the east, and these carried large longitudinal beams. If the workshop ones are indeed original, their likeliest function would surely be to support cross-beams for the roof—provided that this last was not excessively high.

This brings us back to the question of the statue. Pausanias says only that Phidias worked on each part of it in the workshop; the natural place for the assembly of the gigantic core would surely be the temple itself, as Stevens assumed in the parallel case of the Parthenos at Athens. But a more decisive indication is given by the question of supports; even if the wooden core was hollow (as M. suggests) the weight of the Zeus together with its pedestal must have been enormous. The Parthenos rested upon poros foundations probably 7 metres deep, while the Zeus in its final position was supported by the specially laid floor, over a metre thick, which was lodged at the sides on the much deeper column-foundation of the cella. Yet according to M., it was completely assembled in the workshop, with nothing but an (inferred) pavement of poros slabs separating it from the soft sand. Surely it would have sunk, or at least tilted out of the vertical against the comparatively flimsy columns? One might add that these columns would be most deceptive as a 'mock-up' of the vastly thicker columns of the temple; while the presence of the well at least excludes any placing of the statue in the same relative position as in the cella (as in Hesperia xx, 316, fig. 1a). To sum up, I do not think that the evidence of the statue is enough to justify either the tall, three-storey building of M.'s reconstruction, or his resultant interpretation of the internal columns.

But there are other important and admirable things in M.'s contribution. He does not neglect the later history of the building; on the contrary, he produces several new grounds for thinking that the Roman reconstruction of Building A, to which much of the extant brickwork belongs, was never completed; while the dating of the final Byzantine church to rather before A.D. 400 (p. 108) makes it an outstandingly early example. One may also mention M.'s intelligent unravelling of the outlying buildings to the south, some of them following soon after the workshop; and his careful analysis of the several sets of roof-terracottas found in or near the excavated area.

I have left little space to consider Schiering's contribution, but this too is a masterly piece of work of its kind. There are a few Archaic sherds found, but the bulk of this part is devoted to the lavish finds of black-glazed ware. In addition to the already familiar Archaic Elean pottery, S. identifies a very large proportion of the black-glaze as of local manufacture (over 80 per cent of the listed pieces definitely Elean; even Phidias' own jug is 'attisch oder elisch'). The quality of clay and paint is usually the basis for identification, but in a few cases (notably plates and stemless cups) S. is able to point to subtle differences in shape from the Attic versions. His analysis of the evolution of the shapes is indeed penetrating, if at times he goes too far in attributing sculptural qualities to lamps and plates. Later, and a little more tentatively, we are introduced to Elean red-figure: the earliest piece is a plate of c. 400 with a medallion of Perseus. Possibly the group of pieces concerned (fragments of eight vases, mostly kraters) is not yet quite big enough to form an 'einheitliche Gruppe', but time should prove S. right. Certainly it is an attractive suggestion (p. 275) to make Phidias and his entourage introduce the art of red-figure painting to Elis. S. also contributes interesting chapters on the uses of the various shapes at Olympia, on the suitably cosmopolitan list of owners' inscriptions, and on a remarkable sketch, probably of apotropaic nature, incised on some black-glazed fragments.

The summary of findings is short, because of the interpretative nature of much that has gone before. Here it seems to me that the excavators have shown perversity in one matter. Because of the comparatively early dating of many finds from layer D, and especially of the Phidias jug itself which is placed at c. 435 (and is in any case earlier than the completion of the workshop), S. concludes that the master paid a protracted visit in the mid-thirties to supervise the erection of the workshop, among other commitments; that he returned to Athens to stand his trial in 433/2; and that he then reappeared at Olympia to make the Zeus. Would it not be far simpler to take the archaeological evidence as confirming Jacoby's arguments, formulated just before the excavation, for placing Phidias' trial and departure from Athens in 438/7 after all? (See F.Gr.H. III b (Suppl.), I 490 f.) Phidias may well have arrived somewhat abruptly in Elis, and had to equip his workshop from scratch.

It remains only to say that the plates, conveniently bound in a separate volume with the excellent folding plans and sections, are of the usual high standard.
The text has a few unimportant misprints, but a more serious objection is that many of the text-figures, particularly those that show such vital details as the surviving column-drums, are on an irritatingly small scale.

A. M. SNODGRASS.

University of Edinburgh.


To capture the mood and character of any country, let alone an island as inscrutable as Sicily, is beyond the power of a single individual. Each man's subjective view sees one feature as more impressive or indicative than another; a clearer picture may perhaps be derived from a composite study to which many viewpoints contribute. This book tries to evolve such a picture, by excerpting travellers' accounts, by quoting local and foreign writers who have dealt with Sicily and Sicilians, and by reproducing a number of sketches and paintings where these mirror the taste and attitude of the beholder no less than the aspect of what was beheld.

Wegner has chosen well. His extracts are grouped into five sections, four geographical and one of poetry and genre-description. All are translated into German where this was not the original language: but while the emphasis tends to be on the German travelers their contributions do not preponderate. The classic will find Stesichorus, Pindar, Plato, Theocritus, Cicero, Diodorus and others in the company; nevertheless it will do him good to see the Sicily he knows through them set beside the Arab writers, the experiences of von Riedesel and Goethe, the early archaeological investigations of von Stackelberg, and the realities of modern Sicilian life as described by Danilo Dolci.

The presence of so substantial a German element of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, however, gives a particular emphasis to the character of the Teutonic visitors and in consequence contains an added interest. One finds here an especially strong dose of the Drang nach Sud, of the 'romantick', of ravishment with sunrises and sunsets and of proper reaction to the 'horrid' and 'awful' in the scenery of Etna—a fair share too, in a later period, of brutal Realismus which carries over to our own times.

The selection is nevertheless diversified and well made. In the circumstances any reviewer would be tempted to add his own preferences. Since the anthology is thin on the twentieth century (only six entries, three of them by Dolci), one might for instance propose something from Tomasi di Lampedusa and include an extract from Gavin Maxwell's The Ten Pains of Death; while from a century ago it is a pity to miss the Notiziele of Giuseppe Cesare Abba, recently and happily translated as The Diary of one of Garibaldi's Thousand, by E. R. Vincent. Abba, a northerner who, after the capture of Palermo, went with the detachment which traversed the centre of Sicily, was full of comment which for evocative pungency deserves a place among essential Sikeliaka.

Indeed, the quantity of possible material, of which even the useful bibliography offers only a selection, is such as to provide for an anthology twice as long. It is a disappointment, therefore, when with the volume no more than two-thirds complete these kaleidoscopic and carefully-arranged vignettes suddenly end. There follows in their stead a sixty-page Nachwort, in which Wegner attempts to discover some common denominator by which 'the Sicilian' in human character or artistic expression can be identified. Some of this discussion draws on the data provided by the anthology; but it is too long, and too much of it consists in historical narrative, overweighted on the side of classical antiquity. For its full impact it also needs more illustration than the book provides. In their various ways Antonello da Messina, Emilio Greco, and the anonymous artist of a seventeenth century coral Christmas crib in Trapani represent the spirit of Sicily; but it is of little use to say so unless the reader has a fair chance of appreciating as much for himself.

Among elements characteristically Sicilian Wegner stresses a tendency to neglect structural form in favour of elaborate detail, and an artistic dolcezza melanolicia. These features he traces by a tour de force of artistic perspective from the temples of Selinus to the stucco-work of Serpotta, and from Empedocles to Verga and Pirandello. But when a country has been so markedly subject to diverse influences any consistency is hard to seek, and the most remarkable of Sicilian characteristics remains an inconsistent variety, a repeated contrast of light and shade in which change represents the only stable feature.

Wegner is justifiably concerned that the industrialisation of Sicily may suppress the individuality of the people—an individuality they have in his view created and preserved from the Greek period through so many centuries of foreign domination. This may be the price the island must pay for the ending of the squalor, poverty and brutality which compose the dark reverse of the Sicilian coin. Certainly in reading of the endurance and ecstasy of their predecessors in their encounters with the various hardships and wonders which the island offered, modern travellers, cushioned as they are by the greater comfort provided by Alitalia or the Nastro d'Oro, may well be persuaded to a deeper and more sensitive evaluation of a land so mysterious and fascinating. The two adjectives may sound as an echo of the overtones of a travel agent's advertisement: they should not be roughly brushed aside on that account. For this is the appeal which Sicily exerted upon our forebears; Wegner's admirable little book helps it to do so still.

A. G. WOODHEAD.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

It is often said that the aberrant versions of Greek myths seen in archaic Etruscan art are the result of the artists’ failure to understand what they were copying, aggravated sometimes by the acceptance into the new repertory of misunderstood motifs and figures which were further distorted by later artists. In many cases this is demonstrably true. Hampe and Simon suggest that there are, however, a number of mythological scenes in Etruscan art whose iconography lies outside that known to us in Greek art, and which are the result of the artists’ knowledge of Greek epic. They are in fact original contributions to the iconography of Greek myth. Some Pontic vases and bronze reliefs are taken as demonstration pieces.

(1) A new Pontic vase in Heidelberg is taken to show the duel of Heracles and Kyknos. Phobos and Eris appear on Heracles’ shield in the _Apsis_. On the vase H.-S. see Eris in the three-winged head which flies before Heracles, while Kyknos is _qojon_ βλέπων, with a mask set before his helmet. This may be too ingenious. The mask, a satyr head, may just be a component of a fancy helmet, and working for Kyknos, like the lion mask on another helmet on a Pontic vase (H.-S., pl. 11). Perhaps the satyr-lion-mask caps or helmets on some Etruscan and other works should be mentioned here (Beazley, _Leaves from House Gems_ 8). ‘Eris’ does look very like a shield device acting independently (Heracles’ shield is blank), recalling the literally whirling device on Polyneikes’ shield in Eur. _Phoen._ 1124–7 (which may explain some of the other fine whirliigig devices on shields; cf. Beazley, _Antike Kunst_ iv (1961) 59 ff.).

(2) A fine though fragmentary bronze relief in Perugia is convincingly explained as showing Heracles fighting Amazons, with Zeus and Hera as supporting opposed deities. Hera opposing Heracles has literary authority and is seen in Etruscan, but not in Greek art.

(3) A new Pontic vase in Basel is thought to show Tydeus fighting Polyneikes at Argos, watched by the princesses, their future brides. This is possible. In Euripides the oracle calls the combatants boar and lion, and Tydeus at Thebes has a moon on his shield. Here he has a star, and ‘Polyneikes’ a lion-mask on his helmet. These details might have been culled from lost epic but blazons could have told the story more clearly. As with (1) we are asked to believe in a most riddling artist. H.-S. think to see the necklace destined for Eriphyle carried by Polyneikes, but the three paddants might just be another piece of bizarre armour, like the bells which hung in _Tydeus’s_ shield at Thebes (Aes. _Sept._ 385 f.).

(4) Apollo the Avenger shoots down Tityos on several Etruscan works, but no details are without reasonable parallel in Greek art. The encounter with Koronis is shown with much circumstantial detail on a Pontic vase.

(5) The Dispute of the Goddesses at the Wedding of Peleus is brilliantly recognised on a New York Pontic vase. They recline at the feast, with a disembodied Eris lurking behind the couch, and are summoned by two heralds (Hermes and another) with Chiron, from the other side of the vase. This is a new illustration, taken from the _Kyklopia_. On the well-known Munich vase the artist shows the sequel with the same two heralds leading the goddesses to Paris.

(6) Paris meets Helen on a Pontic vase, with Aphrodite in attendance and Aeneas bearing gifts. This seems probable, but that the Triton in the animal-frieze below refers to Nereus’ warning to them on their way to Troy (an episode attested by Horace only) is less easily accepted.

(7) At Troy. Pontic vases show Athena helping Achilles slay Hector, closely following the _Iliad_, and a fairly explicit death of Achilles. Here and elsewhere there are some shrewd identifications of metaphoric subsidiary friezes or groups (as of fighting animals) echoing the main action (and cf. _JHS_ bxvii [1957] 281 n. 36).

(8) The Monteleone chariot. A convincing explanation of the puzzling scenes. (a) Achilles receives his new armour from Thetis while two eagles drop a dead fawn to the ground (a familiar type of omen). (b) Achilles fights Memnon with Homeric detail. (c) Heroised Achilles returns to the Isles the Blessed satisfied by the sacrifice of Polychexa who collapses below. The subsidiary frieze shows young Achilles lion-taming under Chiron’s guidance.

Hampe and Simon have made their point well, but what have they proved? That Etruscan artists (and their customers) knew their Greek epic cycle so well that they invented an iconography for scenes that the Greek artist ignored? This is hard to believe. Perhaps all this shows what many have suspected, that the workshop of Pontic vases was started and at first staffed by Greeks, and that Greek artists laid out and perhaps executed many of the fine archaic metal reliefs found in Etruria. Then why these strange scenes unknown to the Athenian vase-painter? The Caeretan hydriae suggest one answer, for they carry equally odd and original scenes, and were certainly made by an East Greek living in Etruria. The mass survival of Attic vases may make us forget other iconographic traditions in Greece which we know less completely from smaller potteries (like ‘Chalcidian’), Peloponnesian bronzes or some classes of gems. On the vases and metalwork made in Etruria we may be given a clue to Ionian iconographic traditions which are hard to seek in the work (banal and repetitive by this time) of their vase-painters at home and which we have yet to recognise or discover in other materials.

Merton College, Oxford.

John Boardman.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


This is a report on the results of one test excavation and three seasons of digging and surveying. The monuments excavated are an early Imperial Roman villa, a public building, originally Roman but reconstructed in the Byzantine period, and a Byzantine city-bath; the survey covered the whole of the city and some of the neighbouring cemeteries. Beside description and discussion of the new finds, we are given an account of those of previous excavators, which have never been fully published, and of features to be seen in surface survey, the first reliable plan of the city as a whole, and a chapter on its political and social history which pulls together most of the existing evidence on it. This is most useful, in itself but also as a stimulus to further work; for it remains true that the greater part of this important site remains to discover, both in plan—the agora, e.g., is still unlocated—and in depth—almost nothing is known either of the harbour which began to operate in the sixth century B.C. or of the Hellenistic city, founded and patronised by the Ptolemies, while even for the Roman and Byzantine periods which are nearer the surface the evidence is inadequate.

Conclusions in such circumstances are of course often highly conjectural and some of these offered here have already been disproved by the work of R. G. Goodchild and the Libyan Department of Antiquities. Thus, an additional city-gate has been found at the west end of the Monumental Street and there may therefore be others hitherto unsuspected. Moreover, it is now clear that at the neighbouring city of Teucheira part of the curtain-wall was used as the back-wall of a court attached to a gymnasium, that the graffiti on this wall are ephebic, not military, and that graffiti indistinguishable in kind were cut on other walls of the gymnasium complex. This affects Kraeling's deductions from similar graffiti at Ptolemais, both on the subject of garrisons (p. 16) and on the history of the city-wall (pp. 24 f., 62)—many blocks carrying similar graffiti were used in late Roman and Byzantine buildings and so long as they were thought to come from the wall appeared to imply that this was being dismantled precisely when the city was most seriously threatened by raiders; in fact they probably came from a gymnasium and the heavily inscribed blocks of a wall, now to be seen in situ a little south of the church, seem to indicate its site.

There also seem to be some dubious or erroneous interpretations of the evidence. Kraeling speaks of 'the prevailing and often strong winds from the north-east' in view of which he looks for a harbour on the west side of the promontory (p. 49); but I understand from Goodchild that the prevailing winds along the whole North African coast are from the north-west, so that almost all its ancient ports were to the east of headlands—and it accords with this that the area near the west shore at Ptolemais was not much exploited in antiquity as far as present evidence goes. The case for a royal domain west of the city (pp. 9 f., 38, 113) rests on a confusion between a Domitianic boundary stone recording the recovery of city-land, which was found outside the West Gate (AE 1954, 188), and a Vespasianic stone which refers to royal land but is of unknown provenance (SEG ix. 360). I cannot, in any case, accept the suggestion that this domain might be relevant to the ownership of the Tower Tomb, traditionally called Ptolemy's Tomb, for whose history the only solid evidence seems to me that it was respected by those who made the quarry in which it stands and that they had ceased to work that quarry by the first century A.D. when chamber tombs were cut in its walls. It seems unlikely that the Paul commemorated on a paving-stone in the Public Building would have been appointed to a Libyan post of lower status than his title (megaloprepestatos) indicates for him (p. 26 and inscription 14); if the date is early fifth century, the post must, surely, have been temporarily upgraded, but more probably it is later and Paul's contribution to the building was smaller than Kraeling supposed (perhaps simply the flagging of the court which contains the inscription). The stele with plastered-over inscription of 'the year 15' (perhaps 17/16 B.C., but it is, I think, far from certain that all such dates in Cyrenaica are years of the Actian era) found in the house next to the Roman Villa (p. 198 and inscription 2) is an insecure basis for dating that house—for it may well be re-used there. The inscriptions are altogether in need of more work; here I would only comment that the aqueduct inscription (p. 73) is more probably Augustan or Julio-Claudian than later, and the text naming an Antoninus (p. 79) of the second than the third century (so that it is some evidence for a building in an otherwise apparently blank period), that inscription no. 3 refers to a proconsul as well as a legate, no. 10 probably to an emperor, no. 11 to a proconsul's official decision taken with his consilium (with consular date above the main text), and that in no. 5, 14, I should reject the fill στρατηγος and so the conclusion on the survival of this office at Ptolemais (p. 7) in favour of a cognomen such as Stratou.

To make so many points of this sort must sound like quibbling. They are meant to put the reader on his guard against uncritical acceptance of detail and not to detract from his appreciation of the serious contribution which Professor Kraeling's excavations and this volume make to our knowledge of Ptolemais.

Joyce Reynolds.

Neunham College, Cambridge.


Mr Caskey, through no fault of his own, is undertaking an impossible task—to make prehistory intelligible to historians without illustrations. Ac-
expecting this limitation, it is of course a scholarly and generally accurate account written with unrivalled practical experience in handling the material. I shall find the bibliography the most helpful part of it. For the general reader he might have included a few elementary warnings of the noisier bees in some archaeological bonnets. A student might find it helpful to be told that Valmin’s term ‘Adriatic Pottery’ is a nonsense: it appears to be rough Prehistoric pottery which Hammond once attributed to the Dorians passing through Epiros. It can only be dated by its shape: so by those excavators who care to mend it.

The author spoke of Dörpfeld’s ‘unshakable conviction’ but he did not make clear what desperate measures Dörpfeld took to defend it. In order to explain the extreme paucity of Mycenaean pottery in Leukas, which he maintained was Homer’s Ithaca, and to connect his rich Early Helladic graves (R Graves) with Odysseus, he telescoped all three Bronze Age periods in Leukas. Finally, our author makes no mention of the great Nordic myth which aims at deriving Mediterranean civilisation from the Baltic. In fact his order may seem to encourage it. He does not make plain the enormous differences between the Macedonian and Helladic Early Bronze Age pottery. It took A. W. Heurtley quite a long time to identify his Molyvopyrgos material as belonging to the same period as Troy I. Heurtley never tried to divide his Macedonian Early Bronze Age into phases. It was too unlike Helladic pottery. The theory that Helladic pottery started as Early Helladic in Troy, became Macedonian in Macedonia, marched through Thessaly to turn back into Helladic again in Eutresis, really is not credible.

Mr Caskey is more at home further South and his synopsis of the Early Bronze Age in Lerna and the Argolid is particularly valuable: his account of the Cyclades and Crete is sound.

One curious omission is a general account of Bronze Age weapons, or of the interaction between metal working and hotter kilns, which made possible the beaks and spouts characteristic of the period. The only weapons found in Macedonia during the Early Bronze Age are stone axes, and that in a copper-bearing country. It does not look as if Macedonia was well equipped to invade Eutresis against fine bronze axes in the Early Bronze Age, if invasion is always to be regarded as the only way of spreading culture. This is a good but not a final pronouncement on the Early Bronze Age in Greek lands.

Sylvia Benton.


Vermeule, who is mainly responsible for the new edition of Greek, Etruscan and Roman Art, has altered the size and format and has grouped the illustrations together at the end of each chapter, tucking away the captions and inventory numbers between text and illustrations, neat and tidy. The historical chapters are preceded by chronological lists, a very clear map, a history of the collections and a useful bibliography for the general reader; there is also a short chapter at the end on Greek and Roman textiles. Inevitably there is much ‘name dropping’, and Myron, Polykleitos and others appear on occasions with what seems scant justification. The temptation to talk down to the reader which this sort of enterprise constantly evokes is mercifully absent, and the book is successful both as guide and history.

In similar format, Greek Gods and Heroes, mainly the revision of Miss Hazel Palmer, presumably aims at a younger audience and has always been something of a hybrid. In containing short biographies of the figures illustrated, it is necessarily terse and partisan, but its numerous editions indicate that it fulfills a need.

The standard of production for both books is high, the proofreading impeccable. As the only drawbacks for an English buyer are the prices, the British Museum might wish to provide us and our children with books on similar lines.

University of Southampton.

B. A. SPARKES.


German scholarship cultivate a form of belles lettres which English speakers find difficult to appreciate, since it depends so much on metaphysical punning. Sichtermann's skill in the genre is evident from the first page, where he asks about Greek vases ‘Hat ihr heutiges Dasein einen Sinn, ist es ein wirkliches Da-Sein?’ He rejects, quite rightly, the claim that the effect of Greek vases comes from an absolute fitness for purpose and material, or from some happy congruity of decoration and shape, or from the significance of the subject: instead, Sichtermann discovers, this effect derives from Art, and Art is the representation of Myth, which permeated all Greek life. All this and more is propounded with wide-ranging erudition and, though the history of the study of Greek vases is not always interpreted correctly, there is for many living writers the gratification of finding themselves quoted. The book is produced nicely and the illustrations are of good quality.

R. M. COOK.

Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge.


The last fascicle of the Copenhagen corpus was published in 1931. The present one includes such
NOTICES OF BOOKS

old material of the categories covered as was not included in previous fascicles, but is mainly the rich additions of the following thirty years, due in great part to generous help from the Ny Carlsberg Foundation. The text by Johansen and the pictures alike make it an exemplary fascicle. It is confined to Attic black-figure, red-figure and white-ground, and ranges from an amphora by the Gorgon Painter (pl. 313, 1) to a fourth-century griffin calyx-krater (pls. 356, 2–357); both good of their kind, but there is much better in between. The most important unpublished vase is an amphora Type B (complete with lid) by the Amasis Painter (pls. 313, 2–314), with obscure subjects: A, bearded man or god meeting two youths with spears, the first naked with a dog, the other wearing a short cloak, followed by Poseidon and a warrior (Ares?); B, between naked youths with spears and fillets in their hands, Athena greeting a bearded man wearing a nembri over a short chiton and a youth in an elaborate long chiton with a spear. There is also a pleasant slight lekythos by the same master (pl. 328, 1). Unpublished black-figure pieces include: a round-bodied hydria near the Painter of London B 76 (pls. 319–21), a volute-krater-fragment (pl. 322, 3) with ships inside the neck like those found in the same position on dinoi; a fourth-century Panathenaic with an unusually lapiidary style of inscription (pl. 318, 1); and a fragment, apparently also from a Panathenaic but unusual in having a pattern-band below the picture. Two of the best vases have already been published in greater detail by Johansen himself: in black-figure, the big fine and unusual lip-cup signed by the potter Epitimos (pls. 324–5), described, with its twin in New York, as ‘probablement des oeuvres tardives de Lydos’; and in red figure the peculiarly interesting lugged bell-krater, decorated a century later by the Kleophon Painter with a picture of a dithyrambic chorus (pls. 347–9). Most important are the fine fragments of a very early calyx-krater by the Kleophrades Painter with Anacreon and his boon-companions, already partly published by Breitenstein and widely discussed, but only here fully available; (a fragment lost since it was in Curtius’ possession is illustrated in the text). The red-figure and white-ground pieces could not be collated with ARV3, which appeared about the same time; and it may be convenient to supply the references here. Pls. 331–3, calyx-krater fragments: 185, Kleophrades Painter no. 32. Pls. 334–5, cup signed by the potter Kachrylion: 59, Oltos no. 57. Pls. 336–7, unpublished cup with love-names Hektor and Leagros: 1593, Hektor no. 2; 1592, Leagros no. 33; 1654 (to 455) ‘may be by the Ashby Painter: it would come between nos. 7 and 8 in the list’. Pl. 337, 2, cup-fragment: 1648 (to 367) ‘not far from the earlier work of the ‘Triptolemos Painter’. Pl. 337: 3, alabastron: not in ARV, but assigned by Johansen, surely rightly, to the Group of the Paidikos Alabastra. Pl. 338, unpublished Nolan amphora: 655, Dresden Painter no. 1. Pl. 339, pelike: 990, Achilles Painter no. 47 (obverse); 1006, Westreenen Painter no. 3 (reverse); also 1676 (to 990) belongs to ‘Class of Achilles Painter’s pelai’ (defined by shape and patterns). Pl. 340–1, loutrophoros-amphora: 519, Syracuse Painter no. 21 (a follower of Makron, to whom Johansen had formerly ascribed it). Pl. 341–2, loutrophoros-hydria: 841, Sabouroff Painter no. 75, restored—but now cleaned. Pls. 343–45, loutrophoros-columns (unpublished) and lebes gamikoi (one unpublished): not in ARV. Pls. 345, 2–346, unpublished column-krater: 566, manner of the Pig Painter no. 2—‘may be by the painter himself; also near Myson’. Pls. 347–9, lug krater: 1145, Kleophon Painter no. 35. Pl. 350, 1–3, unpublished bell-kraters: not in ARV. Pl. 350, 4, bell-krater fr. 1154, Dinos Painter no. 26. Pls. 351–2, skyphos: 1301. Penelope Painter no. 5, ‘much restored (repainted)’—but now cleaned: the number, not given in ARV, is 597. Pl. 352, 2, unpublished skyphos: 924, Montlaurer Painter no. 1. Pl. 354, 3, unpublished skyphos fr.: not in ARV. Pl. 354, 2, unpublished hydria fr.: 1100, Naples Painter no. 59. Pls. 353, 1 and 2, choes: not in ARV. Pl. 353, 3, unpublished lekythos: 652, Nikon Painter no. 33; the number, not given in ARV, is 1379. Pl. 354, 1 and 2, squat lekythos: not in ARV. Pl. 354, 1, unpublished cup fr.: 1403, Painter of London E 106 no. 36. Pl. 354, 2–8, various unpublished fragments: not in ARV. Pl. 355, 1; 356, 1, bell-krater, inv. Chr. VIII.291: this answers the description given in ARV of ‘Copenhagen 270,’ 1425, Telos Painter no. 8 (obverse); 1427, R.T. Painter no. 2; reverse. Pl. 355, 2–3, bell-krater: 1343, Black-thrusys Painter no. 31. Pls. 356, 2–357, alabastron: 1455, Painter of the London Griffin-calix no. 3. Pl. 358 (all unpublished), 1, pelike; 2, hydria; 3, fr.: none in ARV; 4, cup: 1526, Group of Vienna 116 no. 4 (the full inv. no. is Chr. VIII. 43); 5, interesting plate: not in ARV; 6, guttus, not in ARV. Pl. 359, unpublished white lekythos: 1 and 3: not in ARV; 2: 1233, Bird Painter no. 21, 4; 849, Sabouroff Painter no. 236. 

MARTIN ROBERTSON.

Lincoln College, Oxford.


The third fascicle of the Metropolitan Museum of Art contains 56 Attic black-figured amphorae of various types, all cleaned, many rephotographed. We are thus presented here with a coherent body of vases, connected in shape, technique and fabric. Undoubtedly the quality of the work in text and plates will set a standard for years to come. Von Bothmer has taken great pains to produce as near perfect a presentation as possible, having made use of the
conclusions of the Lyons colloquium in the majority of instances. We are given large views, printed on one side only, drawn graffiti, consistency in terminology, attention to minute details of glaze change, variation in proportion, etc. Two points are to be noted, first, the use of A/B and B/A for the relation of graffiti and other marks to the handles, A/B being the handle to the right of side A, B/A the one to the right of side B; second, the numbering of characters, continuous from A to B, if the subject is continuous, otherwise restarting the numbering on B. Von B. is striving for a settled form for the description of all vases, each description following a set pattern and a set order within that pattern. We are given an extremely handsome volume; layout, typography and proofreading are all well done. The criticisms in general and in detail which follow are for the most part dropped in the ocean and are not intended to reflect on the excellence of the volume as a whole.

The scale is purposely omitted from the plates, and it is often an untidy appendage, but to say that measurements in the text render the printed scale superfluous mistakes the purpose of that scale. Its presence in a photograph or the addition of the proportion at the bottom (as 1:2) helps in a more visual way to judge the actual size than turning to text, finding a ruler and reading off can do. Care has been taken to mention a particular detail whenever it occurs, and so one is puzzled when an item is omitted; for instance, mention is usually made of the high or low crest of a helmet, so when this is not done on plates 33, 36 and 37, is this merely an unintentional omission or has it less significance than elsewhere? When so much insistence is made on terminology, such words as 'element', 'unit' and 'member' must be kept distinct. This, together with the emphasis on dimensions and parts, indicates the need for a profile drawing to clarify terms, as Blosch did for the kylix in Formen attischer Schalen. But what one chiefly misses is the setting. Von B. has been strict with himself and with us; few notes which relate the vases to others, which place a particular piece in its historical setting. What is usually given is a spare reference for minor points. All this criticism is to some extent invalidated by von B.'s preface where he states that this fascicule has to do duty for a museum catalogue as well as a volume in the CVA series, but even so this does not mean it must be restricted to a bald recital of facts.

A few criticisms and corrections in detail follow. Where accuracy is the keynote, should there be any place for plater feet? Pl. 4. Added red on the hair and beard and round the nipples of the centaur on A is not mentioned. Pls. 6 and 7. All figures on A do not advance their left legs, the three on the right advance their right. Pl. 11. The Minotaur on A sinks down on his right knee, not his left. And is not Theseus' robe folded upon a rock, as on pl. 5, 3? Pl. 14. The added red on the maiden's peplos on B is not mentioned. Pl. 15, 1–2. The fact that on A Heracles and Iolaos are bearded should be mentioned; this labour, of the Nemean lion, is after all the first. Pl. 16. On A I see no sword in the scabbard of warrior 6. Also, this warrior has added red on crest, alternate pleats of the chitons, greaves and shield rim, none of which is mentioned. Pl. 19. Another beard not red is the old man's on A; it is white, as von B. notes below. Pl. 28. On B the three satyrs are 1, 2 and 5, not 1, 2 and 4. Pl. 35. The charioteer mounts with his left foot, not his right. Pl. 44. 3. The use of dots to indicate missing text has no place here and is epigraphically maladroit. An index of proveniences would have helped, especially as the work of Plautus is particularly mentioned in the preface. Many of them, though based on deductive evidence, have more authority than the fictions of antique dealers.

University of Southampton.

B. A. Sparkes.


The two volumes under review represent extremes in the CVA series. The Heidelberg corpus contains only Italian vases, though the range in date and place of origin is large, from examples of pottery produced in the Sicilian early bronze age to a Hellenistic 'Canosa' askos. Fabrics are varied too: unpainted, impasto, bucchero, red ware, black-figure, overpainted red-figure, Gnatia. The plates are printed on one side only, and individual items are large and clear. Only a few of the vases had been published before, and of those few none so well. The text is beautifully set out, maintaining the very high standards we have come to expect of the German volumes. There are discussions and comparative material given for most items, and S. gives general bibliographies for each separate section, indicating what older studies she has used and found worth while. The only major addition is the publication (since S.'s volume) of Hampe and Simon's Griechische Sagen in der frühen etruskischen Kunst, which treats the bf. Etruscan amphora pls. 55 and 56, 1–3. S. has put together one of the best collections of Italian pottery in its many facets, and Heidelberg University is indeed fortunate in having a teaching collection of such range and quality. It is equally fortunate in having S. as its able exponent.

What can one say in defence of the Ferrara volume? Not even the fact that it has appeared can be held to its credit, as we are once again given the same old favourites that we have come to expect in every Ferrara production. Why must we be presented with the mixture as before? The best from Spina are
unrivalled but they have received a disproportionate amount of space and verbiage over the years, and we still have no straightforward record of tomb groups excavated. Industry and funds, especially over the last few years, have been grossly misdirected. What is needed is a publication of each tomb group in its entirety with equal emphasis given to the smaller vessels, whether figured, patterned or plain. Until then we cannot begin to understand the real value of the Spina finds. Here the reproduction of the plates is patchy and both sides of the plate are used. There is no scale on the plates (this is a drawback in the Heidelberg volume as well) and many vases are shown too small. There are no indexes or concordances, the latter especially unfortunate, as A. uses inventory numbers as well as tomb numbers. The text is very spare, the bibliographies thin and defective, the proof-reading bad, and the methods of reference inconsistent. It has seemed best, as it will add up-to-date information and correct mistakes most quickly, to list Beazley’s new references in ARV².

Pl. 1, 1–3 ARV² 205/114 and 1633; Pl. 1, 4–5 ARV² 554/83; Pl. 2, 1–2 ARV² 293/34 and 1642; Pl. 2, 3–5 ARV² 1093/11 and 1679; Pls. 3, 1–2 and 4, 1–2 ARV² 589/3 and 1660; Pl. 5, 1–2 ARV² 590/10; Pls. 5, 3–4 and 6, 1–4 ARV² 556/1 and 1655; Pl. 7, 1–4 ARV² 599/6; Pl. 8, 1–2 ARV² 608/3; Pl. 8, 3–4 ARV² 511/2; Pls. 9, 1 and 10, 1–4 ARV² 621/3 and 1662; Pl. 11, 1 ARV² 1052/25 and 1680; Pl. 12, 1–5 ARV² 1171/1 and 1685; Pl. 14, 1–2 ARV² 593/31 and 1660; Pl. 15, 1–2 ARV² 271/1 and 1641; Pl. 16, 1–4 ARV² 601/18 and 1661; Pls. 17, 1 and 18, 1 ARV² 602/4 and 1661; Pl. 19, 1–2 ARV² 104/16 and 1679 Manner of the Peleus Painter; Pl. 20, 1–4 ARV² 991/53 and 1677; Pls. 21, 1–4 and 22, 1 ARV² 1680/1 ‘a puzzling vase’; Pl. 22, 2–4 ARV² 1093/1 and 1679; Pl. 23, 1–2 ARV² 1260/2; Pl. 23, 3 ARV² 1260/3 The Shuvalov Painter; Pl. 23, 4–5 ARV² 1260/4; Pl. 24, 1 ARV² 1260/8; Pl. 24, 2 and 3 ARV² 1260/17; Pl. 24, 3–4 ARV² 1260/12; Pl. 25, 1–3 ARV² 1207/16; Pl. 25, 4–5 ARV² 1336/1 and 1691 Painter of Ferrara T. 271; Pl. 26, 1 ARV² 1207/19; Pl. 26, 2 ARV² 1207/14; Pl. 26, 3 ARV² 1207/20; Pl. 26, 4 ARV² 1207/18; Pl. 26, 5 ARV² 1355/9; Pl. 27, 1–2 ARV² 1313/12 The Meidias Painter; Pl. 27, 1 ARV² 1330/1 The Makaria Painter; Pl. 27, 6–7 (VT T. 88, not 89) ARV² 1390/1 bottom not the Makaria Painter; Pl. 28, 1–2 (VP T. 15 B, not Erratico doso B) ARV² 1175/12 Aison; Pl. 28, 3–4 ARV² 1175/13; Pl. 28, 5–6 ARV² 1208/4 The Shuvalov Painter; Pl. 29, 1–3 ARV² 490/25 and 1655; Pl. 30, 1–4 ARV² 1032/58 and 1679; Pl. 31, 1–3 ARV² 861/19; Pl. 32, 1–5 ARV² 880/12, 891/3 and 1673; Pl. 33, 1–2 ARV² 532/55; Pl. 33, 3–4 ARV² 565/6 and 1659; Pl. 34, 1–4 ARV² 511/3 and 1657; Pl. 35, 1–2 ARV² 1166/99; Pl. 35, 3–4 ARV² 290/11; Pl. 36, 1–3 ARV² 541/7; Pl. 37, 1–2 ARV² 517/6; Pl. 37, 3–4 ARV² 548/36; Pl. 38, 1–2 ARV² 1680/40; Pl. 38, 3–4 ARV² 1104/8 and 1683 The Orpheus Painter; Pl. 39, 1–2 ARV² 1166/87; Pl. 39, 3–4 ARV² 1118/17; Pl. 40, 1–2 ARV² 524/19; Pl. 40, 3–4 ARV² 1124/8; Pl. 43, 1 ARV² 1306/1 The Painter of Ferrara T. 13; Pl. 43, 2 ARV² 1307/6; Pl. 43, 3 ARV² 1308/2; Pl. 43, 4 ARV² 1308/4; Pl. 43, 5 ARV² 1307/3; Pl. 44, 1 ARV² 1307/8 or 9; Pl. 44, 2 ARV² 1307/10; Pl. 44, 3 ARV² 1306/11; Pl. 44, 4 ARV² 1307/1 The Painter of Ferrara T. 143 A; Pl. 44, 5 ARV² 1307/2 The Painter of Ferrara T. 143 A.

The volume claims to contain only Attic red-figured vases, yet certainly the phialai on pl. 41 were not made at Athens, nor yet in Greece; see Beazley EVp p. 117, C. And surely we are here dealing with a pair of vases only, not quads.

B. A. SPARKE.


In this extremely useful and well-illustrated account, Mr Haynes gathers together what is known of the history of the Portland Vase since its rediscovery in the seventeenth century, and deals also with the archaeological and iconographical problems which it raises. Moreover, he succeeds where others have failed in giving a sensible and credible account of the subjects of its frieze.

An amphora of white-on-blue ‘cameo-glass’, incomplete since the loss of its tapering lower part (cf. the Blue Vase in Naples, Pl. xii), the Portland Vase was made in Italy in the time of the Emperor Augustus, perhaps by immigrant Alexandrian craftsmen.

Haynes’ identification of the subject of the frieze is the most convincing that has yet appeared. (The more notable of previous attempts are listed here in a select bibliography.) Haynes accepts the contention of L. Polacco (Athenaeum n.s. xxxvi [1958] 132–141) that the two sides of the vase contribute to a single scene; and certainly the three figures on the back of the vase do not seem to form a self-sufficient composition. In fact the nude young man who enters through the portico is advancing not to the woman who greets him, seated on the ground, but to the reclining woman on the back of the vase. Granted the correctness of this basic judgment, the rest follows. Haynes observes that the seated woman who greets the young man fondles a reptile; it is not a snake, as others have thought, but a sea-serpent, kotos. With this indication of locality, the possibilities become narrow indeed; and Haynes recognizes the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, a ‘bourgeois love-story’ ever since the work of Catullus or his model. Their story was one of the favourite themes of nuptial recitation, and Haynes concludes that the Portland Vase was itself designed to be a wedding present.

Haynes adds a short discussion of the disc which was formerly fastened to the base of the vase, and concludes that though it too is Augustan it certainly comes from a different source. The thoughtful young Asian upon whose disc is identified as Paris, pondering his Judgment.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

Whether its conclusions are accepted or not, this little book forms an excellent basis for further discussion. Mr Haynes is to be congratulated on the rare feat of having provided at once for both the scholar and the general reader.

John P. Barron.

University College London.

Wiederverwendung alter Statuen als Ehrendenkämler bei Griechen und Römern.


Though there have been a number of specific studies on the re-use of statues in antiquity—e.g. by Köhler, Ross, Friedländer, Stenersen and Fr. Poulsen—H. Blanck's dissertation is the first comprehensive treatment of this subject. It is comprehensive in the inclusion of the extant material, and important for the deductions made therefrom. The material consists of (1) the literary sources (pp. 3-22); (2) the extant statues that show re-use (pp. 23-60); and, above all, the inscribed bases (pp. 61-92).

The most explicit among the literary sources is the 31st oration by Dion of Prusa (dated in the second half of the first century A.D.), in which he inveighs at length against the reprehensible practice by the Rhodians of employing a statue which had been used in the past for honouring some other personage (cf. pp. 3 ff.). In addition, Blanck quotes casual mentions by different Latin authors, for instance, by Cicero (Ad At. vi, 1, 26), who somewhat ingenuously says that he would like a monument erected to himself in his beloved Athens, but that it must not be a statue already inscribed for someone else (odi falsas inscriptiones statuarum alienarum); and the references by Statius and others to the statue of Caesar in the Forum converted from one of Alexander by Lysippus; to the colossal statues of Eumenes and Attalos in Athens, converted into monuments for Marc Antony; and to the statues of the family of Isokrates, also in Athens, of which the inscriptions had been changed to serve for others. The custom continued throughout the Roman period. Not only were Greek original statues, dating from the fifth century B.C. to Hellenistic times, used to honour Roman personages, but Romans were converted into other Romans, even one emperor having to serve for the likeness of another, e.g. Augustus for Tiberius (p. 8), Domitian for Nero (p. 86), Hadrian for Constantine (p. 70), Caracalla for Gordianus (p. 88), etc. Furthermore, when old bases were re-used, the inscriptions were sometimes erased, at other times they were left and the new inscriptions placed on another side of the base. (One may add to Blanck's long list a newly discovered base in Athens, used several times, right side up and upside down, from the fourth century B.C. on, and finally serving in the second century A.D. for a statue of Demosthenes (Epigr. Mus., Athens, no. 1927; Mitzos, Eph. Arch. (1963) 38 ff.).

As Blanck points out, there were of course many reasons for the re-use of statues and bases. First, the saving of money (cf. the graphic description of the poverty of the Greek communities in the East after the Roman plunderings and civil wars, pp. 98 ff.); then the saving of time when the monument to some grandee had to be erected in a hurry; and third the appropriateness of a former composition for a newly planned monument. In addition, there were so many 'orphaned' bases, (of which the statues had been carried away to Italy by the Roman conquerors but the heavy bases left behind,) which it was only natural to re-use for some new purpose.

From all this carefully collected evidence a revealing historical picture emerges. In Greek times there apparently are no instances of real 'conversion', the re-uses that exist stemming from aesthetic reasons, as when a charioteer by Praxiteles was added to the chariot group by Kalamis (Pliny, N.H. 34. 71). The statues carried to Pergamon from Athens and elsewhere were not converted, but re-erected on new bases. The converting of one statue into another was essentially a Roman practice, accounted for by the circumstances of the time. It was widespread in the East during the late Republic and the beginning of the Empire; then it subsided; in the time of Commodus it again came to the fore; and it was especially popular in the third and fourth century A.D. In these practices the human element becomes dramatically evident—the revulsion from admiration to the reverse after a damnatio memoriae, the eagerness to curry favour with the mighty, and also the natural desire to honour a benefactor.

In addition to his main thesis Blanck here and there gives interesting information and suggestions regarding related questions: e.g., the prices of statues paid at various times (p. 4), and the reasons for the unfinished portraits on Roman sarcophagi (pp. 115 ff.). And as an appendix is given a list of sculptures wrongly thought by some authorities to be examples of re-use.

Two things this essay lacks—illustrations and an index. To use it one must sit in a library and constantly take out the books and articles referred to. The interest of the subject and its admirable exposition by H. Blanck make a printed instead of a mimeographed publication, with many illustrations and an index of names, eminently desirable.

Gisela M. A. Richter.


The starting-point of this study was the acquisition by the Archaeological Institute of Frankfurt University of a marble head; apart from the conjecture that
it came to light in Rome, anything that can be said about it must be deduced from its technical and stylistic characteristics, and in his examination of these the author takes us far afield. The head, which is beardless, but male, is somewhat under life-size; it is not broken off from its body, but worked separately for insertion into a torso; a series of drill-holes in the hair show that it was once adorned with a metal wreath. From the style the author judges the work to be a Greek original of the thirties of the fifth century—on such a matter, of course, one cannot profitably agree or dissent without autopsy—and compares it with the head of the Apollo in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, arguing indeed that the arrangement of the hair on the two heads is so similar as to suggest that both works came from the same workshop, and even from the same hand. Here one may observe that judgement of this argument is made more difficult because the pictures showing the back view of the two heads are taken from different angles, and the profile views, too, could easily have been poised to match. Indeed, the text says that the hair on the two heads 'einst Locke für Locke über ein stimmt', though if one compares figs. 6 and 7 it is hard to find on the Frankfurt head the counterpart of the two small locks which curl from the crown over the hair on the left side of the statue in Rome.

From the deduction that the head was worked separately, the author then concludes that it belonged to a draped figure, not to a nude (probably valid, if we accept the head as a Greek original); he points out that the modelling of the neck shows that the head was turned to its proper left (in fact such details as the differences in the shape of the eyes support his argument that the original figure was calculated to be seen with its left shoulder forward); 'the severe power of the face' serves as an argument for the identification of the head as Apollo; then, 'the lips are slightly parted...with the last notes of the song', and here the Anakreon and the Kassel Apollo are adduced as parallels. This argument, at least, will not do as evidence for the view that the head originally belonged to an Apollo Kitharoidos, chanian, for one must also observe that the Apollo in the Palazzo dei Conservatori has his mouth part-open, and he, the author argues, is killing Niobids.

The discussion then moves to the Apollo in Rome; after rejecting Stucchi's view that the figure is Pythagoras' 'Apollo shooting Python', the author repeats the conjecture which associates this figure with the Niobids in Terme and in Copenhagen. As it was found in a different place from them, we are asked to conclude that the group must have been separated in antiquity. After this, a lengthy discussion of the theme, 'The death of the Niobids'; extremely interesting, though made obsolete, in part at least, by Professor R. M. Cook's Inaugural Lecture, 'Niobe and her Children'; then a further examination of the treatment of the same subject on the throne of the Zeus at Olympia, which leads us, rather out of breath, back to the starting-point. The Rome Apollo must belong to a group—the Death of the Niobids; the Frankfurt head must be an Apollo; it is a work of the same school as the Rome one, so it must belong to a pendant, i.e. another group; it must belong to a draped figure, therefore Apollo Kitharoidos, so the associated figures must have been the Muses.

The illustrations are excellent; the author's stylistic comparisons are always illuminating, and often convincing; but one reader, at least, is made very uneasy by any argument which proceeds by building hypothesis upon hypothesis.

P. E. CORBETT.

JENKINS (G. K.) and LEWIS (R. B.) Carthaginian gold and electrum coins. (Royal Numismatic Soc., special publ. 2.) London; the Royal Numismatic Society. 1963. Pp. 140. 39 plates. £5 5s. from Spink and Son.

This lavishly produced book serves as a preparatory study for a future Catalogue of the Carthaginian coins in the BM. This fact alone illustrates the extreme scientific care with which the work on this Catalogue is surrounded. Already in the latest volumes the need to supplement the material in the BM with that in other collections has been increasingly felt, in order to keep up the standard of authoritative work of reference which the BMC, as the catalogue of the greatest coin collection in the world, has acquired. But on the other hand this high scientific aim has singularly retarded the progress of the series. The latest volume, that of the Greek coins of Cyrenaica, dates from 1927.

It is to be hoped that this book will make it possible to publish the BMC Carthage in the near future. The book is sufficiently equipped for this purpose. It is, however, not a complete corpus. Although the principal collections are represented, one wonders for instance why Oxford is neglected, while of Cambridge SNG IV. Nos. 1475–6, 1480, 1498–1502; of Copenhagen SNG Nos. 961–3, 989–91, 1000–1; and of the Hunter collection Nos. 24, 26, 49–50, 55, 57–8, 130 have been excluded. Hunter 53 has been included as 406 A, while under 406X 5 additional specimens are listed. This happens fairly often; under No. 446X, for example, no less than 28 coins are grouped, with two die combinations. One is under the impression that the authors at a certain moment decided that they had enough for their requirements; afterwards they could not resist the temptation of adding some pieces they had overlooked, but still they did not think it worth while to alter the framework of their catalogue. In this they were probably right, for the main lines of the development of Carthaginian coinage now seem to be well established, also for the related silver and bronze coinages.

The authors have tested the S.G. of all available pieces to determine their gold content. This simple
method is trustworthy for electrum coins, because the S.G. of gold and silver lie so wide apart, provided, however, that no admixtures of for instance copper spoil the calculation. As shown by subsequent research done in Holland by Dr Das of the Reactor Centrum Nederland by means of neutron activation, the amount of copper is so small in all coins analysed that it seems in this case that the S.G. method has proved to be entirely reliable.

The determination of the alloy has greatly helped classification. Thus, for instance, in Groups III–VII, which form the bulk of the book, and are all of similar types, it appears that Group III is of gold of about 95 per cent and Group IV is of electrum of about 72 per cent, which is reduced to 55–60 per cent in Group V, and to about 43–47 per cent in Groups VI and VII.

At first sight the gold coins and the electrum coins are indistinguishable. But the difference becomes clear by weighing: the gold coins weigh 9.40 gms; the electrum ones only 7.60 gms. It is certainly the most sensible solution to assume that the gold and electrum issues were not of equal value, for the difference in weight must have made the electrum ones recognisable.

There are, however, objections. More than a century ago, L. Müller had already remarked in his Numismatique de l’Ancienne Afrique, a book which was, until the book under review, the only work on Carthaginian coins, that the electrum showed a paler hue at those places where the surface was rubbed. His conclusion that this must have been due to surface enrichment has been confirmed by extremely careful measurements by Dr Das, which will be published elsewhere. This also applies to the Carthaginian and Libyan coins of base silver, which must have looked considerably brighter when they first issued from the mint. The enrichment probably was effected by cementation. This fact betrays a conscious effort of the mint to make the electrum coins alike in all respects—except weight of course—to the gold coins. In both series the fractions $\frac{1}{4}$, $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{3}$ and $\frac{1}{10}$ are the same. If we assume, with the authors, that the gold coins were worth some 25 Attic drachms, and the electrum coins only 15, it would provide the most baffling problems for the interrelation of these fractions. Consequently the gold and electrum coins, which look so much alike, must have been issued at the same value. That the coins of Group III and IV were in circulation simultaneously is proved by the fact that they are found together in hoards.

In general, the authors, throughout their book, seem to have taken account of intrinsic values only. But it is probably true to say that on most ancient coins a profit was made, if only to recover the expenses of the mint for die-sinking and striking. It follows that a distinction should be made between bullion (market) rates for gold, silver and bronze, and the fixed rates at which the coins were issued. The rates for the coins can be deduced sometimes from the weights of the coins alone, and with more probability if the coins in the more valuable metal are marked by a numerical mark of value, stating their worth in terms of related coins in other metals. The bullion rates we can know only from extraneous sources, such as inscriptions or historical texts; they can never be concluded from the weights or metallic content of the coins themselves. To quote a few examples: from the weights alone it has been assumed that the gold coins of Athens of 405 were issued at a gold: silver rate of 12:1, while the bullion rate is known to have been 10:1 at the time; at the same time in Thrace gold coins were issued which retained the official Persian rate of 13:1. In both cases the gold coins were overvalued. On the other hand, we know from numerals on the Roman Mars gold of 209 B.C., that they were issued at a rate of 8:1 to the denarius, while the true market rate at the time was 10:1, which made the denarius overvalued. A similar phenomenon can be observed in the gold coinage of the Libyan allies and the mercenaries who set up a rebel state in the years 241–237. Robinson explained the symbols on some coins as a numeral. If the coins referred to were double shekels, this gives, for the gold and silver coins, a rate of gold: silver of 12:1; if they were shekels, of 6:1. In any case the silver coins were probably overvalued, as they were of a very base alloy.

In general it is, I think, a safe rule to consider all coins in ‘base’ metals, the intrinsic value of which is difficult to establish—electrum, base silver or potin, copper or bronze—as having been tariffed by the issuing state, with the exception of the earliest Ionian and Lydian electrum coins, when electrum was still considered a metal in its own right.

It is not the aim of this book (and still less of the present review) to provide a theoretical discussion of the role of gold and electrum coinages in antiquity. Its principal aim, to give a reliable chronological framework for Carthaginian coinage in general, has certainly been accomplished. And by this achievement the authors have turned an important series, which formerly looked rather dull, and which certainly does not astonish by its beauty, into a very interesting one. The exact nature of the coinage of Carthage, that great merchant state which started its coinage so late, has now come, for the first time, within reach of scientific discussion.

J. P. Guepin.


Sakellariou (A.)  
_Die mykenische Siegelglyptik_  
(Studies in Mediterranean archaeology, 9.)  
Lund: Dr P. Aström, Klassiska Institutionen.  

The appearance of a monograph dealing with Mycenaean seal glyptic is something of an historic event, since this seems to be the first publication entirely devoted to the subject. By reason of the catalogue work on the Bronze Age seals in the National Museum at Athens for the German _Corpus of the Cretan and Mycenaean seals_, Mme Sakellariou has had more acquaintance with the material than any other scholar. This assignment gave her intimate knowledge of the fine pieces only known to scholars through publications and the cases of the National Museum, and an almost immediate acquaintance with that magnificent group of sealings discovered by Blegen at Pylos.

This short study is, in all probability, of a preliminary nature, for within its short compass it could only treat the subject broadly and select a few examples for detailed analysis. Mme Sakellariou's treatment, in particular in her dealing with the gold seal from the shaft graves of Mycena, seems to have profited from Hagen Biesenta's earlier study on the _Kretisch-Mykänische Siegel-Bilder_; but to this almost basic exposition of the stylistic principles in that group she has added new evidence dealing with the differences in subject-matter between the seal use of Ancient Crete and that of Helladic Greece. This is all of value in a complex subject.

Underlying this studious approach, however, the general distinction between the two seal uses by provenience seems apparent. While this remains a good rule of thumb, the presence of Cretan seals on the Islands and Mainland of Greece, and the presence of Mycenaean or Helladic examples in Crete, spells caution in such a generalisation. It was one of the marks of Evans' genius that whereas an ordinary traveller would have been content to associate seal stones found and acquired in Greece with Greek origin, he was not satisfied with such a conclusion.  
(_Scripta Minoa_ I 9). Place of find as place of origin still dies hard, and if less in favour with regard to seals, is still in evidence with regard to sealings.

Mme Sakellariou safeguards herself against the complete identification of place of find with place of origin by mentioning the occurrence of two talismanic stones on Helladic sites and of the amethyst portrait head from Mycena. With greater space she would no doubt have also mentioned a third talismanic stone from the grave μβ of Papademetriou's grave circle (1957) for the Helladic side, and another portrait head of the Second Transitional Phase of Crete recently identified in the Berlin Collection (Furtwängler, _Beschreibung_ no. 122) in all probability by the same hand as that of the chanting priest (HM 1416) for the Minoan side. This safeguard properly made with the specific mention of one Vaphioe stone, makes it more difficult to understand why the Vaphio deposit as a whole was not dealt with. With its find spot, chronology and composite nature, it would seem to be essential to any discussion of the stylistic and typological differences between Crete and the Mainland. For if, as Mme Sekallariou appears to assert, the work on the gold seals of the shaft graves has little connection with Minoan art, what is the relation of the work of the shaft grave seals to Vaphio nos. 5, 6, 7, 15, 22, 30, 40, or to Vaphio nos. 2, 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 17, 19, 20, 23, 35, 36, 39, groups which could not have come from the same workshop, and which betray such great differences in style and technique as to suggest that they derive from different traditions? Certainly the former group has no connection with Crete, and if, as is believed, they represent an early essay in Mainland engraving, what is their relation to the work in the shaft graves? If it is argued that there is no relation or connection, the problem of the origin of Mycenaean glyptic becomes less acute, since it might help to decide the origin of the gold seals in the shaft graves as partly Cretan. Then the stylistic relationship between the later Helladic products and two of the three groups in the Vaphio deposit becomes even more feasible, for there is little relationship between the work on the seals in the shaft graves with _LH II_ and _III_ seal engraving.

There are admitted difficulties over the attribution of the gold signets with cult scenes, for as Mme Sekellariou rightly points out, there is a common background of religion which affects their style. Moreover, the possibility of an expert Cretan goldsmith using local Mycenaean forms and subject-matter for an Helladic client is not remote. That the later gold signets are Mycenaean there can be little doubt, but the provenience of the gold signet from Mycena ae in _Abb. 8_, does not make this Helladic work any more than the find of _Abb. 7_ in Crete, had it occurred, would have made this signet Cretan.

The comparison between later Helladic and later Cretan work is timely, and opens up immense possibilities. Could, however, certain suggestions be made? That a comparison would be more cogent, if the seals and sealings chosen were of known provenience and stratigraphy; of the same shape (for shape sometimes affects style); of a corresponding milieu; and if drawings are given, by the same artist. For it seems that the griffin in _Abb. 12_ not only reflects a personal idiom different from that in _Abb. 11_, but also, if accurately drawn, shows something of intrusive
Mycenaean elements which are now believed to have been operative during and just after the Palace period at Knossos.

V. E. G. Kenna.

Aylesbeare, Exeter.


The plan of Henry Sigerist’s unfinished magnum opus is well known. Long before the war he decided to write a multi-volume history of medicine which would discuss that subject not only in association with the related scientific developments but also against the cultural and social background of each period. The intervention of the war delayed his start on the project, and shortly after the end of hostilities he retired from his chair at Baltimore to a charming house in the Swiss Ticino. He had a magnificent library, and all seemed set fair towards rapid progress on the work. The first volume was published early in 1951, and Sigerist was then working on the second volume, which was to deal with the whole of Greek and Indian medicine. I saw some of the manuscript of it at his house—as I had previously seen the whole of that of the first volume. In 1953 he told me that he had still not finished the text, and in the late summer of 1954, while we were in Rome at the same time, he said that he thought he had made a mistake by attempting to include Indian medicine in this volume. There were difficulties which he had not foreseen. The book still did not appear, and Sigerist died in March 1957. Professor Ludwig Edelstein, Sigerist’s former assistant and associate, undertook the onerous task of preparing the typescript for the press, and the illustrations were dealt with by Dr Miriam Drabkin.

These remarks are a prelude to the statement that the work as it is published is only a part of what Sigerist certainly had in mind as his second volume. Indeed, so far as Greek medicine is concerned it extends only as far as the Hippocratic Corpus, and that is only partially treated. The same applies to Indian and Persian medicine, and the great works by Charaka and Susruta are hardly mentioned.

In the long chapter on the cult of Asclepius the various legends concerning the origin of the healing god are adequately discussed. Professor Edelstein is of course the greatest authority on the testimonies and Sigerist naturally made much use of the work of the Edelsteins. But he also quotes Hausmann’s interesting suggestion that the votive offerings in the temples were not merely tokens of gratitude, but were meant to keep the donor and the particular organ affected continuously under the watchful supervision of the god. Sigerist also makes the suggestion that the hostels attached to the Asclepieia were the first hospitals in the Western world.

The relatively short chapter on the Pre-Socratics is very well written, and brings out clearly the fundamental differences between the different schools. The chapter opens with a discussion of folk-medicine in Hesiod, and then proceeds to Thales and his successors. In the section on Empedocles Sigerist mentions that philosopher’s analogy between the action of a water-clock and the function of the blood in causing respiration through the skin, but he does not include Leonard’s beautiful translation of that fragment—although he does quote Leonard’s translation of some other fragments.

Following this chapter there is a break of nearly 100 pages in which Sigerist deals with the ancient civilisations of India and Persia. These are very well done, and the author again shows his mastery in assembling a great deal of evidence. These chapters, may, however, not be of the same interest as the rest of the book to readers of this journal. The remaining 120 pages are devoted to the birth of scientific medicine against the background of the Greek world of the time. In the preliminary section a good summary is given of the conditions in the silver mines, but the emphasis in the section is naturally rather on the health of the population as a whole. In this connexion a long paraphrase is given of an illuminating but not too well-known passage from Diocles of Carystus.

The chapter dealing with Hippocrates and the Hippocratic Corpus is a very thorough synthesis of the work which has appeared on this subject in the last half-century or so. Sigerist gives an excellent résumé of what is known of ‘Hippocrates’ from contemporary sources. So far as the ‘genuine’ works are concerned, there has possibly been no real unanimity regarding the value of the various philosophical and other methods which have been employed, and the instinctive feeling of a scholar who is also a medical man and deeply read in the ‘Corpus’ must of itself carry some weight. In this connexion Sigerist, who possessed these qualifications, wrote: ‘Personally I incline to the belief that the Corpus Hippocraticum does contain books written by the master himself, although I cannot prove it and cannot tell which books must be his work. But it would be difficult to understand why the whole collection should have been named after him rather than after Herodicus, Euryphon, or any other physician, unless his own writings were a part of it.’ In this connexion Sigerist does not seem to have been aware of the fact that two theses dealing with the application to the Hippocratic Corpus of Udy Yule’s methods for the statistical analysis of literary style were since the war presented for degrees in the University of London by Dr W. C. Wake.

The chapter on ‘Patient and Physician’ contains Sigerist’s discussion of the Oath, in which he follows Edelstein’s views closely. The conditions of medical practice and the question of fees are also briefly discussed. In the final chapter on ‘Medical Theories’
the doctrine of the humours is more fully considered than is usually the case in writings on the classical period of Greek medicine, and Sigerist introduces a very interesting discussion of the emergence of 'black bile' and its subsequent history.

As it stands this book leaves unsaid many points about Hippocratic medicine on which Sigerist would undoubtedly have had much to say had he lived—such as detailed discussion of the contents of the surgical books, a full consideration of Hippocratic drugs, and a more extended study of Hippocratic epidemiology, to mention a few. Had Sigerist completed even this volume of his great work we would have also had his views on the School of Alexandria, and, most important of all, on Galen. There are several passages in the book in which he refers to later chapters which in fact have not materialised. It was of the impression that Sigerist had in fact drafted some of these chapters. But if he had, he must have destroyed them; for on going through his papers Professor Edelstein discovered nothing that could be used, but attached to the last page of the existing typescript was a pathetic note in Sigerist's handwriting which ran: 'Here my legacy ends.' Truncated as it is, this book is a great work, and a fitting ending to Sigerist's own greater legacy. We must accept it gratefully, and with due recognition of the admirable way in which Professor Edelstein has carried out his difficult task and of the excellent illustrations which were chosen by Dr Drabkin.

E. ASHWORTH UNDERWOOD.

University College London.


Professor Wegner's Das Musikleben der Griechen, published in 1922 (and reviewed in this Journal, vol. 136, p. 236), was notable among other things for the excellence of its illustrations, and he was obviously the right man to prepare the fascicule on Greek music in this new enterprise. His collaboration with the publishers and printers has produced a noble volume. There are seventy-six reproductions, mostly on a large scale, all of superb clarity. Facing the pictures are interpretations of varying length, together with bibliographical details (particularly valuable to the layman in archaeology): if the comments are occasionally repetitive, this is no doubt so that each can be read on its own. The pictures are prefaced by an essay of some seventeen pages in which the history of Greek music and the place of music in Greek life are skilfully summarised; they are followed by a map, a table of comparative chronology, a copious bibliography, and indexes. All is well done, but the pictures are the thing; and there has been nothing like this collection before. It is notorious that 'anthro-


In the year 1847 the Sultan Abdul Madjid employed two Swiss brothers, the Fossati, on the restoration of Hagia Sophia. In the course of their repair work they uncovered a great number of Byzantine mosaics long hidden under Turkish plaster, they made drawings and water-colours of them and notes and all these were forgotten and preserved in the family house at Bellinzona. The mosaics were once more covered in 1847. They are now being slowly and finally cleared and cleaned. These Fossati documents form the basis of Professor Mango's study. Throughout he compares them with the recent discoveries by American archaeologists. It is tragic to note how many mosaics must have been destroyed since 1847. If the area now uncovered is studied in relation to the Fossati documents over half the mosaics would seem to have vanished. Thus the Fossati record thirteen mosaics of bishops in the tympana, only three now survive and only a section of Isaiah is left from their prophets. Professor Mango is inclined to attribute the destruction to the results of the earthquake of July 10, 1894. But contemporary accounts suggest that Hagia Sophia was only slightly affected by it. It seems not impossible that some of the loss was caused by the Fossati workmen; cubes could well have been loosened when the mosaics were being stripped of their covering and have fallen as they were being re-covered.

Professor Mango has compiled a series of extracts from travellers' accounts of the mosaics since 1453. This forms a most interesting appendix and proves that there was much visible as late as the eighteenth century. The volume is admirably illustrated with 118 plates and diagrams.

Blackfriars, Oxford.

GERVASE MATHEW


Dr Nicol has written the first systematic book in
English on the Meteora, and written it well. One would imagine that many years will pass before it is supplanted. Yet I must confess that I closed it with some disappointment; not that it was a poor book or a dull book, but that it was the wrong book.

To write on Greek monasteries you must be theologian, historian, and cicerone combined. In the second of these roles Dr Nicol leaves us no doubts. His chapter on *Thessaly in the Middle Ages* is an expert account of a difficult subject. The unedifying manoeuvres of Greek, Serb, and Italian in this Balkans of the Balkans are described as clearly as the complexity of the subject will allow, and the bibliography is large and accurate.

As a theologian he reveals unsuspected talent. The clarity of his account of the Hesychast controversy is one of the best parts of the book. Indeed, he understands it so well that he may exaggerate its political significance. Before this, the origins of monasticism are skillfully treated. The parts played by Antony, Pachomius, and Basil, the meanings of *laora, coenobium, skete, idiorhythmy*, are sketched neatly and with insight. A particular virtue is the stress laid on Basil's belief that the *coenobium* has spiritual advantages of its own, and is not merely a compromise with the ideal. This is tacitly forgotten by many Orthodox thinkers. The more intellectual Athonite monk of today measures the strength of his monastery not by how many it holds, but how many it has sent out to hermitage.

We turn next to the particular history of the Meteora and individual accounts of each monastery. At this point the author cancels out much of the goodwill won by his preliminary chapters, by failing to provide a map. This omission is symptomatic of what is disappointing in the work, and perhaps I should explain here why I think Dr Nicol has written the wrong book.

He 'aims to provide an introduction to their history and a general description of the monasteries as they exist today'. This is all very well for the rare student of Mediaeval Greek history sitting in his library, though even he might want a more careful assessment of the value of the sources than the author, who knows them so well, has given. What sort of documents lie in these archives? Are there contracts and deeds of gift, as there are in Crete, to tell us something of the social history of the area? Are we defeated by the absence of evidence or by the plan of the book?

But in fact the readers of this volume will be mainly those people who go to the Meteora for something more than the casual tripper. Shunning the grotesqueries of the tourist guide, they will look for information of rather richer texture than Nicol provides. If they have not travelled on Athos they will not appreciate how much the Meteorite monasteries resemble, and how much they diverge from those ideal self-contained cities of prayer. Without some knowledge of Byzantine painting they will find incomprehensible such statements as 'the attempt to read the influence of Serbian artists into the style of the wall-paintings at the Meteora has perhaps been mistaken; the example of artists from Athos, particularly of the so-called Cretan school, is more readily apparent'. A paragraph of explanation here would have been of rare value.

I am not asking for the number of bathrooms in Kalabaka hotels: but the interests of the historian and of the intelligent traveller are closer to each other than many authors suspect. They both like to get close to their sources. Sitting on the rock of Barlaam, they would like to hear the poem Gerasimos wrote about it in 1775, and the ballad of how the priest-klepth Euthymios tricked his way into the stronghold: and when the whole account of Athanasios the founder is based on the early *Life*, there would surely be pleasure and merit in allowing us some of the quaint flavour of that work.

But at least we have the classic accounts of the net and the rope, and perhaps it seems graceless to go on criticizing a good book for not being the right one. Curzon is still with us.

Dr Nicol's publishers have served him well, with clear typography, a laminated dustjacket that more should copy, a sensible index, and proof-reading so good that the only errors detected are in words that seem to ask for it—Geanakoplos, *μουσελον*, *καταφωντικός*.

G. Morgan.

*Raynes Park School.*


The present volume, edited by Professor Bompaire of Rennes, marks the resumption after a lapse of eighteen years of the series *Archives de l'Athos*. It comprises an introduction on the history of the monastery and on its archives, and a diplomatic edition, with commentary, of thirty genuine documents and four forgeries. The portfolio of plates contains photographs of all the documents edited. Some are not easily legible—conditions are not ideal for photography on Mount Athos—but most of them provide a check on the editor's work, which appears to be impeccable.

There is much here to interest the historian of agrarian relations in the last five centuries of the Byzantine empire, in particular in the set of six *praktika* (rent-rolls) which form item 18. Incidentally, Bompaire has succeeded in arranging these in chronological order from a careful study of the names of the tenants. In the earliest document, of 956, we find Romanus Lecapenus handing over lands near Hierissos to the monastery, as a result of a curious and somewhat obscure financial transaction. And yet only twelve years earlier the same emperor had legislated to protect the 'poor' against such encroachments...
NOTICES OF BOOKS

by large landowners. This is a salutary warning against taking such legislation at its face value.

Some of the documents contain demotic words not recorded, or only recorded much later. E.g. in the διαγωμέας of the Protos Hilarion of 7 April 1056 (item 5) I note the following: ζωθρία, ποταμίτζον, ποικίλεις, διαφάνειας, καταφάνειας. These and similar words are not listed in the very full index—45 pages—at the end of the book.

Professor Lemmerle, the general editor of the series, announces in a foreword that plans are now on foot to publish the archives of Dionysiou, St Panteleimon, Xenophon, Pantocrator, Chilandar, and Dochiariou. This is very welcome news, as the Athos archives are a unique and priceless source for the economic and social history of the empire, as well as for history of the monastic communities themselves. The earlier corpus of Athonite documents, published in a series of supplementary volumes to the Vizantijiskii Vremennik, pestered out in 1913. May the present corpus enjoy better fortune. Its progress will be eagerly awaited.

ROBERT BROWNING.

University College London.


The publication of a volume of the Dumbarton Oaks Papers is always an event in Byzantine and at times in Hellenistic studies. This volume follows a familiar pattern; the results of a seminar, some articles that are almost monographs, the summary of recent archaeological discoveries. Mr Arthur Megaw provides nearly forty pages on the recent work of the Byzantine Institute of Istanbul. They are admirably illustrated and include a lucid report on his discovery of stained glass fragments in the church of the Pantocrator, the Zeyrek Camii. This is the most important single discovery to be made in Byzantine art and archaeology during the last five years. For the fragments include those of figures and establish that there was a mature stained glass industry at early twelfth-century Constantinople. This brings with it the new possibility that medieval western stained glass was of Byzantine origin. Dr Semavi Eyyice writes of recently discovered pavements of the eleventh century and of the use in decoration of an interlace pattern surrounding circular plaques. This is one further indication that the ‘Cosmati’ work of southern Italy was of direct Byzantine origin.

In 1962, the Dumbarton Oaks Symposium was one on the Hellenistic origins of Byzantine civilisation. Six of the papers delivered at it are now published in this volume. They are, of course, of unequal value but all tended to be vitiolated by the ambiguities of the term Hellenistic. For the true problem is the relation between Byzantine civilisation and the Imperial Hellenistic culture of the second and third centuries A.D.; not the relationship with the Alexandria of Callimachus. Very surprisingly one of the least satisfying papers is by Professor A. H. M. Jones on 'The Greeks under the Roman Empire' but he had been set an impossible task since he had to cope with such a subject in nineteen pages. Professor Romilly Jenkins writes of the Hellenistic origins of Byzantine Literature. His analysis of the influence of Polybius on Byzantine historiography is specially convincing. It is odd to find such wholesale condemnation of most of Byzantine literature but perhaps such value judgements must to some extent be a matter of taste. The most important single contribution is that by Dr Ernst Kitzinger on the Hellenistic heritage in Byzantine art. In it he traces the survival of such Hellenistic genres as the pastoral idyll and the Child’s first bath. His paper devoted admirably with Dr Hanfmann’s stimulating reflections on some aspects of Hellenistic art. Professor Mango writes with massive erudition on 'Antique Statuary and the Byzantine Beholder'.

Besides the results of the symposium, there are three isolated articles. One deals with the eleventh-century guilds. In another entitled 'Oriens Augusti—Lever du Roi' Professor Ernst Kantorowicz flickers from the principate of Hadrian to Napoleon’s return from Egypt. The third by Dr Irving Lavin is essentially a separate monograph; it may prove one of the most important studies in art history to be published in recent years. It is entitled 'The Hunting Mosaics of Antioch and their Sources'. It is 108 pages long. It is in fact a study of the principles of composition in late Imperial Hellenistic art. It demonstrates an unexpected North African influence on the stylistic revolution at Antioch. Many of its own implications will be found revolutionary.

GERVASE MATHEW.


The study of Latin in England has a long history. When St Augustine landed in 597 he held in one hand, the story goes, the service-book of the Church, and in the other the key to that book, a Latin grammar. Greek came much later, and we do not see it beginning to exert genuine and direct influence till the sixteenth century. Much work has been done in recent years on the classical background whether to European culture at large or this island's in particular—one thinks of the writings of such scholars as E. R. Curtius, Gilbert Hig Het, R. R. Bolgar, J. A. K. Thomson and M. L. Clarke. Now Mr Ogilvie presents his contribution, an interesting survey with a distinctive approach. His 'England' is not, after the common, ethnocentric usage of many southerners, a synonym for 'Britain', but is deliberately restrictive. A prologue and an epilogue enclose five chapters of which the first discusses Ovid's influence on the
seventeenth century, the second Horace's on the eighteenth century, the third 'the switch from respect for Rome to admiration of Greece' which is also discernible in the eighteenth century, the fourth Plato, Thucydides and the Victorians, and the fifth Homer and the Edwardians. O.'s purpose is 'to follow certain trends which can be observed in the popularity of classical authors from time to time and to indicate how these trends may be related to corresponding changes in fashion in English literature and in English outlook'. He economically sketches the ethos of each age with reference to historical and social factors and skilfully digests the testimony of a large number of witnesses.

By thus tracing parallel phases in classical taste and general sensibility the book sheds light from a new angle on these three centuries in England's past during which Latin and Greek formed, as they never will again, a common standard of reference for the educated. But though O. quite reasonably chooses to focus attention on Horace's ascendency and emblematic status in the eighteenth century, the claims of Virgil who played a large and significant part in shaping the spirit of that age deserve more consideration than is here allowed. Virgilian inspiration is manifest in the nature-poetry so typical of it, the pastorals and georgics which proliferated, and it extended to writers of prose also—for the whole topic see Geoffrey Tillotson, *Augustan Studies*, 1961.

In the epilogue (p. 176) O. sweepingly asserts that Virgil has never appealed to English character and intemperately declares that his English editors have been for the most part either lunatic or incompetent.

About the great favours enjoyed by Ovid there is no question. An early immigrant, here certainly by the tenth century when we discover St Dunstan with a copy of *Ars Amatoria* I, he was widely read in England till the end of the seventeenth century, his special hold on which is well analysed. The people then, being themselves wide-ranging, critical and inquisitive, naturally found the Latin poet's society congenial.

On the Victorians' *penchant* for Plato and Thucydides and the Edwardians' for Homer, O. breaks fresh ground with stimulating vigour. Derby's version of Homer (1864) is justly commended; it merits rehabilitation.

In the epilogue the narrowing effects of postgraduate research in the arts (which have been permeated by scientific notions of procedure) are deplored. In the arts concentrated specialisation leads, O. states, to proprietary exclusiveness and not, as in science, to ultimately wider results. There is clearly something in what he says, but on the whole he is probably taking too gloomy a view.

Misprints occur in some of the Greek and Latin quotations and elsewhere. Murray's *The Rise of the Greek Epic* first appeared in 1907, not 1924 (p. 167). But such blemishes hardly detract from the value of what is an instructive and enjoyable book.

H. MacL. Currie.

*Queen Mary College, University of London.*


This is a fine addition to the Budé series, deserving to be ranked with the best editions of the *Dyskolos* that have yet appeared.

J.'s sizeable introduction, which discusses the play and its text from many angles, is well-informed, sound in judgment, and completely au fait with the vast array of scholarship surrounding the *Dyskolos*. The discussion of the plot and its subtleties leaves little to be desired; accordingly, it seems almost churlish to single out those details which appear disputable (p. 11, cf. pp. 41, 82 n. 2); is Sostratos really characterised as 'timid'?—contrast van Groningen, *RecPep* 1.105 ff.; Post, *TAPhA* 1960, 158 f.; p. 20 and n. 1: on Menander's general fidelity to real-life passage of time, J. ought perhaps to have distinguished between on-stage and off-stage action, since in the latter even Menander strains reality for dramatic purposes, though never to the extent that the author of the Greek original of the *Captivi* does when he allows barely 300 lines for a journey from Aetolia to Elis and back; p. 22: the identification of the prologue-speaker in the original of the *Aulularia* as Hestia is too dogmatic, cf. Abel, *Die Plautustprolog*., 42; p. 39 n. 3: was Demea really 'converted' at the end of the Menandrian *Adelphoi*?—see Rieth, *Die Kunst Menanders*, 101 f.; and at p. 17 n. 3, the title *Thretta* must now be corrected to *Misounmenos*). The possibility that Pan's influence on the plot may have extended beyond the prologue, as Miss Photiades maintains, is stringently denied by J.: but may not Menander have been aiming at a deliberate ambiguity (cf. the prologues of the *Aulularia*, *Rudens*?)

There follows an admirably clear discussion of editorial principles, and many will be grateful to J. for printing in his *apparatus* all variants, even those merely orthographical. Unfortunately, house-rules prevented the use of subscript dots for the recording of doubtful letters in the papyrus; the effect of this will perhaps be to produce uncritical acceptance by the unwary of highly uncertain readings (e.g., τὴν at 656), and here the rules should have been waived in the interests of scholarship.

Taken as a whole, J.'s text is conservative and eminently sound—more loyal to the Bodmer papyrus perhaps than the Oxford text, and less indulgent of metrical anomaly than J. Martin's edition, to name the two editions to which J.'s seems to come closest. J. often wisely refrains from over-speculative supplementation where the papyrus is torn, and he is not afraid to acknowledge the existence of unsolved and probably insoluble *crucées*. There appear to be just under twenty new suggestions, mainly relegated to the *apparatus criticus*. Of these,1 two are palmary (the punctuation of 257 as two questions; and μήκος ἐκθέσεως at 940, improving on an earlier idea of Diano's, and clinched by reference to *Epitr.* 64), while two more (982 ὁδός 581, ὁμοιούσιος 942)
deserve the most serious consideration by future editors. Of the remainder, several are supplements which I find difficult to fit to the traces (e.g. συνετος[αποστατους]), 48, does not match the space; cf. 245, 549 [perhaps one may read τα Κεφάλες, νη το[στον]), 836, 839, 935]; at 114 J.'s text of μεικαλει produces a doubtful split anapaes; and at 425 the conjecture νοι τι ιερι και is hardly necessary, since the papyrus' νοι is easily defensible: the verse is a logical inference from 424. But these are anomalies; J.'s text generally is instinct with critical insight. Correct decisions are often supported by reference to correct usage (e.g., 89, cf. K.-G. i 623 ff.) or to other passages of Greek comedy (454, 523, 565). Inevitably with an edition of this play there are a few lapses: two may be instanced. At 616 προτ ιδειν is assigned (with J. Martin) to Getas, against the indications in the papyrus and against contemporary moral views (cf. Post, AJP 1963, 204). At 111 ἀφρον is printed, but there is no evidence for such a corruption in Menander: at Epit. 754 ἀφρον gives a perfectly tolerable split anapaest, with the break after the second short in the second foot of a verse with penthemimeral caesura: cf. Meineke, FCG iv 652; and CQ 1957, 189.

The edition is supplied with abundant notes, which provide much valuable interpretative matter and many useful parallels of phrase or motif. These, together with testimonia drawn from a variety of sources, but especially from second-sophistic writers, sometimes help to underpin a suspected text. Here, however, much more remains to be done; Browning's reference to Aristaenetus, 2.17, solves the problems of 345. and future editors would do well to ask whether (e.g.) the Greek novels may shed similar rays of light.

J.'s translation seems to me as careful as his text; only one slip is immediately obvious—at 26 J. reads αυτοιν but translates αυτων. There are few misprints, none troublesome; and at p. 48 n. 3 and p. 61, it is to be noted that the Oxyrhynchos scrap is now published (xxxvii 2467).

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

1 At 905, J.'s προστημην is anticipated by Fraenkel (CR 1959, 191).

2 For instance: 116, Heliodorus, 4.7, supports δινηται...τι against Zuntz; 333, cf. the Ninos Romance A. iv; 378, Heliodorus, 4.4, might be used to support ἀδειωσαι; 484 f., for ἐνα ταυτ...των τολμων, cf. Heliodorus, 10.12; 687 f., cf. Achilles Tatius, 1.5-2.


This is an important book which will certainly claim the attention of all who are interested in Aristotle. In the limits of a short review it seems impossible to do more than indicate the range of the subject-matter (a fuller criticism by the same reviewer may be found in Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie xlviii [1966]). The volume contains sixteen papers originally presented at the second meeting of the Symposium Aristotelicum in Louvain in August 1960. The publisher worked rapidly, and the book is well produced as well as prompt (the reviewer regrets that he has been more dilatory). The papers of this second meeting, unlike those of the first, are published in their original language.

General Problems of Method. Pierre Aubenque writes on the Aristotelian notion of ἀνοπλα, particularly in the Metaphysics; his fellow-countryman Jean Moreau writes on 'la vérité antédécative', making some connections with the philosophy of Heidegger. Mlle Susanne Mansion briefly reviews Aristotle’s criticisms of his predecessors and their methodological importance, and Mgr. A. Mansion works out a chronology of the development of the theory of the syllogism. G. E. L. Owen discusses Aristotle’s use of τα φανομένα in the sense of what would normally be said about a subject, or what had been said about it, and applies this concept to Aristotle’s use of Plato’s Parmenides in writing his Physics.

Method in Metaphysics. Gérard Verbeke discusses the distinction between τὸ γνωρίσιον τὸν ήμιν and τὸ ἀκλός γνωρίσιον and its significance for Aristotle’s view of metaphysical knowledge. Olof Gigon seeks for the principles of structure in the early books of the Metaphysics. Miss C. J. De Vogel examines the first two chapters of Metaphysics A, and attempts to make Aristotle into a believer in a providential Mind situated near the sphere of the moon.

Method in Natural Philosophy. Paul Moraux comments on the rhetorical element in De Caelo A and B. D. M. Balme returns to the problem of Aristotle’s method in biology, and suggests that it is a mistake to look in the zoological treatises for any systematic classification of all animals. I. Düring contrasts Aristotle’s philosophy of τέλος in biology with the empiricism of Theophrastus. H. Dörrie contributes an adventurous article on the structure of the De Anima.

Method in Ethics. Father Monan seeks to elucidate Aristotle’s view of moral knowledge from his use of it in the Nicomachean Ethics, as opposed to what he says explicitly about it. W. G. Rabinowitz construes N.E. II 1-6 as an attack on a definite group of Elipticising members of the Academy. D. J. Allan examines instances of ‘quasi-mathematical’ method in the Eudemian Ethics.

Finally, there is an article by F. Wehrli which looks into the relations between the Aristotelian dialogues and Socratic and later Peripatetic literature.

D. J. FURLEY.

University College, London.

Besides giving an account of the various fabrics and styles (including black-glazed and relief ware) the book has chapters on the shapes of pots, on technique, on vase inscriptions and on the evidence for chronology. Particularly interesting are the sections on the status of potters (though the curt dismissal on p. 272 of the evidence from names for foreign origin or even servile status of some of the potters and painters cannot be counted as a useful contribution) and the organisation of their craft for work and trading. These latter points are again taken up by chapter 13 ("Uses for other Studies") in the section on 'trade' and further developed in the author's paper in *Jdl* 74, 1959, 114 ff. Chapter 14, 'Practical Comments', is perhaps the most sympathetic section of the book. Hints on how to hold vases (not by their handles!), holding fragments at the right inclination, drawing them, photographing and even collecting them are given without the slightest trace of patronising, though the unwary reader should be warned that Professor Cook's statement that sherds can be picked up by any visitor in Greek lands does not hold for any designated archaeological zone, where such action could lead to serious trouble.

The final chapter gives us a 'History of the Study of Vase-Painting' in some 40 pages, which in its detailed specialisation cannot be found elsewhere. Here at last Cook uses the Italianate word 'vase', by century-long convention the word in European languages for 'Greek painted pottery' and so far largely avoided by Cook in a deliberate effort no doubt to keep his text 'uncluttered by professional or art-historical patter' (as the publisher's blurb puts it so charmingly). We must be specially grateful for this chapter and it is perhaps churlish to complain that the excessively sane and censorious tone which informs this 'history' shows little sense for the climate of opinion at any particular time or for the possibilities of knowledge despite some tip service to both these principles in the text. As an essay in intellectual and cultural history Cook's chapter is therefore negligible, a feeling its writer may have shared to judge by his remarks on p. 330. However, the chapter rightly stresses that residual Etruscanism rather than the locality of finds caused these vases to be called Etruscan; again Gustav Kramer's pioneer work of 1837 is given its due but often forgotten credit. In the paragraphs devoted to studies on various styles the early but occasionally still basic literature is cited as a complement to more recent work collected in the bibliography. One will look in vain, however, for anything more than the most casual reference to the long disputes over the interpretation of vase-paintings. Yet there a historian's view would have been particularly valuable. Symbolism and the mysteries were the key to Gerhard and his early nineteenth-century predecessors, particularly Creuzer. This may strike us as fantastic, yet our own refusal to see more than fashion or sociological force in the choice of subjects by vase-painters is equally biased, if only through our positivist heritage—and this may change. Even now we begin as never before to pay attention to such factors as the customer's choice. One thinks not only of rather hazardous arguments by Langlotz (Freundesgabe R. Boehringer, 1957, pp. 397 ff.) but also of remarks by Beazley (JHS 68, 1948, p. 48—on tyrannicide representations; elsewhere on a possible 'Spartan subject' on an Attic fragment found in the grave of the Lacedaemonians in the Kerameikos), by Corbett (JHS 80, 1960, p. 60—on the choice of Dionysiac subjects in grave furnishings) or by Schauenburg (Gymnasium 1960, p. 176 ff.—on the choice of Aeneas and Anchises on vases found in the West). Again the self-restraint not to say more than can be proved absolutely is even now giving way to a renewed mood for speculation. Amasis is again a half-Egyptian from Naucratis (cf. p. 320), Douris once again a Samian (cf. p. 326)—and who will say that Phintias was not a Sicilian by origin?

For a survey informed by a historian's feeling we shall do well even now after Cook's chapter to turn to older works by Stark and Jahn which are given a place in the bibliography, to Rumpf's slender but tightly packed Gösschen volume (Archäologie I, Berlin 1939) not mentioned by Cook, and also to the sole volume of Bulle's prematurely demised *Handbuch* (Munich, 1913, with good chapters on interpretation by Bulle and on the history of the study by Sauer). On a different point, but still in the same chapter, Greiffenhagen's paper in NGG 1939 on eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century collectors of Greek vases ('Griechische Vasen auf Bildnissen der Zeit Winckelmans und des Klassizismus' now supplemented in Jahrb. Berl. Mus., 5, 1963, pp. 84 ff.) should have left its mark in Cook's account. These eighteenth- and nineteenth-century portrait paintings assembled by Greiffenhagen present us with stylistically accurate representations of vases at a time when such were hardly known in scholarly publications. Has Beazley not been able to attribute a lost vase to the Niobid Painter (or more cautiously to his manner) from J. S. Copley's portrait of the American revolutionary Ralph Izard and his wife (1774–5)?

Cook's book ends with a full bibliography (brief, sometimes pert appraisal of each item); and as two unexpected extras we are given a few pages of intelligent 'museography' and a glossary of terms which is much to the point.

The plates are mediocre in reproduction, but the selection is skilfully done and includes a number of unpublished or little-known pieces especially from British collections, most notably perhaps the Jena Painter's Orestes pelike in Exeter University (pl. 50), which the reviewer will publish more fully. The plates are integrated into the text through a full register of page references. There is a good index to the book.

The book is well informed, the information
intelligently disposed, the judgements are often acute and individual, the text reads easily enough. Each class of pottery is dated, its general character singled out, characteristics of clay and appearance are noted and there are useful though not always accurate remarks on distribution (but none for sixth-century Attic black-figure and for Attic red-figure). There is no other book at present available which will do all this, and Cook's work will be widely and profitably used as a reference book for anyone seeking information on a particular class of pottery without wishing to get too deeply involved, or again for someone who already knowledgeable would like a tautly written consideration of a particular style. The plan of the book is not, however, suitable for giving a coherent view of the development of Greek painted pottery. Too rigid an adherence to a self-imposed scheme has made the chapter on 'Orientalising and Black-Figure' disproportionately long and unhomogeneous. Sections on fifth- and fourth-century Boeotian jostle along unhappily next to 'Theran Subgeometric'. The author might well have written a better organised account, if he had followed his own felicitously expressed judgement (p. 219) that 'utility and habit are more compelling than pedantry'. Again, obstinately adhered to eccentricities have made the book, even where its strength lies, less useful than it deserves to be. The reader may just bear with Midias, Clitas, Epictetus (but Oltos, Euphronioi!), soothed by the cryptic appeal to the genius of English spelling on p. xxi; ii he will take much less kindly to the author's self-imposed ordinance never to quote the evidence for statements which might evoke curiosity or even protest from the reader (thus on p. 231 the surprising statement about the earliest appearance of the volute-krater should certainly have been accompanied by a reference to Mrs. Karouzou's paper in BCH 79, 1955, p. 195-6).

Finally, can one fairly write a book on painted pottery without considering the contents of these paintings? Some 20 lines are devoted to the subject under 'Uses for other Studies', and one paragraph in the historical section. The name of Carl Robert never occurs once in a book which sets out to give an account of the study of painted pottery.

I append some comments on points of detail:

P. 27. Export of Laconian late geometric has been claimed for Taranto (Annuario 33-4, 1955-6, pp. 8 ff.; cf. also Boll. d'Arte 1964, p. 76; & fig. 28, 1).

P. 89. Cook translates the caption on the Panathenaic prize-amphora 'from the games at Athens'—possible, but much less probable than 'one of the prizes from Athens', for which compare JHS 75 (1955), p. 154 fig. 1b; p. 155 (Boardman). Still on Panathenaics—566 B.C. serves for Cook as terminus post quem of the Burgh amphora, although it is commonplace nowadays that the date cannot be pressed into this (most recently Corbett, JHS 80, 1960, p. 57-8).

P. 108. Christening the well-known group of Cycladic animal-figure amphorae as the Leyden Group is inept, since the Leyden piece is the odd man out. We may add here—apropos of Cook p. 244—that a preliminary incised sketch is found on the Leyden amphora, not noted so far, and probably also on other Island vases of similar date (cf. the remarkable detail photograph of 'Theseus and Ariadne' on the Cretan Afrati jug in P. Demargne, Agoge Art, London 1964, frontispiece). These must be amongst the earliest occurrences of the practice.

P. 111. We miss any mention, apart from an uninformative reference on p. 345, of the group of seventh-century polychrome vases by one hand from Naxos and Delos, of which the Aphrodite amphora is best known. Recent finds by Kondoleon (Ergon 1961, p. 187, fig. 210; BCH 85, 1961, p. 851, fig. 3) have produced further fragments including one with the painter's signature, though the name is lost. It is the earliest painter's signature in Western art. Egyptian and Near Eastern artists did not apparently sign their works (cf. Arias-Hirner-Shelton, Greek Vase Painting, p. 279).

P. 147. Some mention should have been made of the seventh-century figure style which has turned up in the French excavations at Megara Hyblaea, for which also the puzzling 'Melanianizing' signed fragment from Selinus (p. 115) has been claimed.

P. 152. No Italo-Corinthian at Perachora (see Perachora II, p. 386, n. 1).

P. 154. The fan pattern on Etruscan bucccher was not pricked with a notched stick; see now Perachora II, p. 540 (on nos. 4121-7).

P. 155-6. The account of Pontic is a jumble, largely because early and late are all mixed up together in the characterisation. What goes for the Etruscan epigones will not necessarily apply to the Judgment Painter, who presumably founded the school and whose style must be the prime object of analysis, if the origins of the school are to be found. He may turn out to have been a remarkable mixture of eclectic and purist. (I much prefer Llewellyn Brown's name for this painter to Dohrn's Paris Painter. In German the stress accent at least will distinguish between the capital of France and the Trojan prince!)

In an extreme reaction to Panionism Cook refuses to see any direct Greek influence except Attic, he even refuses to be assertive on the Fikellura connection of the partridge, where he, if anyone, could have told us. Dohrn's more level-headed analysis of 1937 is to be preferred. It also happens to be borne out by the recent discovery of Corinthian type work in early Pontic (Münzen und Medaillen, Basle, Sale of 29. 11.1958, no. 141; cf. also the figure work on the recently acquired amphora by the Judgment Painter in the Ashmolean Archaeological Reports 1963-4, p. 55, fig. 13, whose decorative pattern, however, shows East Greek influence).

P. 157. The Micale Painter, the most delightfully lively and Etruscan of later black-figure artists in Etruria, is sadly misrepresented. Little excuse that one of his best works turned up after the book was

P. 159. It is not true that Chalcidian pots were in general dipped to blacken the mouth and handles. This was only done for the simpler pots.

The localisation of Chalcidian is a notorious problem. Rumpf even now is unrepentant of his views. Cook follows H. R. W. Smith in placing the workshop in Etruria. There were never any good arguments for this view and the bibliography should have made reference to Rumpf's detailed refutation of Smith's thesis in BWJ 1934, p. 680. Nor does Cook mention Vallet's work on the Polyphemus Group in REA 58, 1956, nor his discussion at length of Chalcidian in his Rhégion et Zancle (1958) where the claims of Reggio are urged (on the Reggio evidence, see also Arias-Hirmer-Shelton, p. 310 bibl. note).

P. 166. The Andokides Painter 'himself did not master the use of the relief line'. How unjust to the inventor of Red-Figure. In his earliest works, the amphorae Berlin F 2159 and Louvre G 1, the technique is experimental; no 'quarter-inch stripe' to make the figure stand out, no relief contours, but relief lines used for the fall of drapery. The contours of figures and some other lines are drawn with the brush to produce a rather grainy line, which comes out well in recent photographs (Greifenhagen, Antike Kunstwerke, pl. 30-32, and Arias-Hirmer-Shelton, pl. 83-86). It is the heavy glaze applied by brush instead of the special relief line instrument. Turn now to plates 88 and the colour plate xxix of the latter volume, the same painter's Louvre amphora F204, (Herakles and Cerberus). Here hesitation has gone, it is full-blown Red-Figure with all its tricks, relief lines for contours and the quarter-inch stripe (so one would suppose from the photographs). It is a late work by the same hand—he has mastered the relief line. Another problem whether he, the presumed inventor of Red-Figure, was the first to master the use of the relief line or whether one of his colleagues or rivals beat him to it. On the bilingual amphorae in London and Munich, which are midway in his career, we find relief contours, but no quarter-inch stripe yet.

Pp. 193 and 199. Campanian. Owl Pillar Group—it is difficult to think of these vases as products of immigrant Athenian craftmen, as Cook seems to suggest. Yet technique, shape and glaze of these vases are very good. Much of the odd—and attractive—look of these vases is the undisciplined, childlike brutality with which the relief line is used. They do not know when to leave well alone; brush work is neglected, the advantages of the warm dilute brush are never discovered. Who were these artists? Campania until the battle of Cumae (474 B.C.) had been Etruscan and Etruscan influence continued there for a long time after. Now in Etruria we have a curiously parallel phenomenon of a group of gauze yet rather attractive apings of Attic red-figure. The work of the Painter of London F 484 (Beazley EVP pp. 43-6; 297; idem, Festschrift Rumpf p. 11; Rumpf BJ, 158, 1958, p. 253 ff.), who is the best of these imitators, is rather later than the Owl Pillar group but not by much. Could there have been connection between the Campanian workshop and the Etruscan one further north? The answer is given by an Owl Pillar class oinochoe in Oxford (1935, 228), all black but for a frieze of egg pattern on the lip and a band of encased dumb-bells just below the shoulder. Both these ornaments could come straight off the Etruscan painter. There is a connexion then, as one might have suspected, but the precise nature has yet to be found. Owl Pillar is more Greek than the Etruscan apings.

P. 237. Shapes of cup. The definition of the 'bolsal' misses out its differential characteristic, the concaving just above the foot! Worth noting that one of the parents of the name (Bologna—Salonica; cf. Beazley BSA 41, 1940-45, p. 18, no. 2), the Bologna bolsal PU 349 from Athens, is a miniature, red-figured with a chous type scene of child life, which should perhaps have been noted in studies on 'Choes and Anthestheria'.

P. 240. Fish-plates. The date for the first appearance given by Cook seems too early. To Scheufel's two examples of early, red-figured ones in Leningrad (Untersuchungen fig. 1) and in Istanbul (Larisa III, pl. 59, 10) a fragment in Uppsala (8 red) of similar date can be added. Though all three seem earlier than the other Attic red-figured ones, none can safely be put into the fifth century; cf. Corbett, BSA 50, 1955, p. 265. Spina tomb 136, Valle Pega, (which gave us the big Iliouperis-Centauromachy krater) has a set of four Attic fish-plates, all black; but the contents of the tomb take us well into the first quarter of the fourth century (RIASA 1955, p. 149, fig. 66 and p. 159 fig. 106).

P. 277. Having made some admirably sane remarks on Greek pots as objects of trade, Cook sidesteps the issue. He warns us rightly against the illusory value of distribution maps (several of which, he might have added, have been his own work) and then gives up. Yet Greek pottery is widely imported to areas outside the Aegean, and, as is getting increasingly clear, imported selectively. To get at this pattern is a task hardly yet begun, though French scholars, Vallet and others, have made a useful beginning by defining some of the categories of classification and by teaching us to look at the problem not from the point of view of the exporter, but of the importer. This French work is entirely ignored, also in the bibliography.

From a different point of view, Miss Richter in one of her earliest papers (BSA 11, 1904-5, p. 224 ff.) asked some pertinent questions on the distribution of different shapes of red-figure at different periods. At that time material and criteria were limited, but nothing has been done on these lines since, though the time is now ripe and the most interesting, and at times startling, points are likely to come out. None of these possibilities are within Cook's horizon.

P. 280. One of the nicest examples of the way vases should be handled is to be seen in the
picture of Sir William Hamilton and Emma Hart, the Lady Hamilton-to-be, examining the contents of a freshly opened tomb at Nola. It is the title engraving of Tischbein’s Collection (1791), which is derived from the pen and ink drawing done in Naples in 1790 by Ch. Kniep, friend and travel companion of Goethe in Southern Italy (see now Greifenhagen, Jahrb. Berl. Museen, 1963, pp. 86 ff, and also the back cover of H. Sichtermann, Die griechische Vase).

Pp. 295 ff. Room should have been found in the account of nineteenth-century exploration and collecting for the Marchese Campana, the dispersion of whose vast collection of vases and fragments (mostly from Cervetri) causes even now problems and surprises.

P. 362. Under Leyden the three catalogues by Roulez, Brants and Holwerda (Gebruiksarchief) are culpably omitted; similarly under Madrid the catalogues by Alvarez-Ossorio and Leroux.

P. 369. Pyxter. The glossary’s description will seriously mislead if taken in conjunction with page 156 (Chalcidian), the only other occurrence in the text.

Many more points of criticism could be made, but they would not offset the real merits of Cook’s work. The price is excessive for a book which is likely to have a steady sale for a number of years to come.

B. B. Shefton.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

CORRECTION AND APOLOGY

In reviewing Professor D. L. Page’s Poetis Melici Graeci (JHS lxxxiv, 160–1) I stated that Professor Page, in dealing with Alcman fr.3.62, had changed the papyrus reading θανάτω to σανάτω without warning his readers that he had done so. I have since discovered that this statement was entirely untrue (see PMG p. 13, line 10 from the bottom), and I wish to withdraw it unreservedly and to apologise most remorsefully to Professor Page, and to any reader of the Journal who may have been misled by my untrue statement.

J. A. Davison.

SUPPLEMENT TO REVIEW

The following supplement to Mr. E. W. Whittle’s review of R. D. Dawe, The collation and investigation of manuscripts of Aeschylus on pp. 177–8 reached the press too late for inclusion in the text of the review:

A test check of the collation against microfilms (not always clearly decipherable) of C and P (each over 3 sample passages averaging 100 lines each) revealed some further apparent errors, corrections to which are appended: Th. 847—πημαται’ C. Th. 869:

λαξεν C (et sine dubio rall.). Th. 912: σαμηρόπληκτοι C. Th. 930: ἐτετελείσθαι C. Pers. 612: ἰδαμορίŋ δέμπαρν C. Pers. 1022 βελένσας P. Pers. 1055 et 1061 (lemmata): ἀνία ἀνία. Divergence in the MSS from Murray’s part-assignment (as in e.g. Th. 822 ff., Pers. 928 ff.) is not recorded. Some slips and omissions are inevitable in a book of this kind; these do not detract significantly from the surpassing value of Dr. Dawe’s achievement.
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