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Peter D. Arnott
An Introduction to the Greek World
This lively and readable book provides the uninitiated with answers to everyday questions about Greek literature, history, topography, religion, civilisation, attitudes and achievements. It is a valuable guidebook for both students and travellers.
16 pages of plates  30s

Erich Lessing
The Voyages of Ulysses
'A stunning photographic evocation in the Mediterranean'—Sunday Times
'Magnificent photographic interpretation'—Listener
'He is supported in this magnificent publication by an eminent array of experts—enough to establish authenticity, not so many as to crush his own imagination under a mound of pedantry—as well as by an enlightened publisher, all of whom deserve high praise. Homeric scholarship has been well served by a book which is also a delight to the eye and hand'—The Times Educational Supplement
115 full-colour illustrations  £8.8s

MACMILLAN

Blue Guide to Greece
Editor: Stuart Rossiter
"...a balanced account of all aspects of the country certain to help the interested tourist."  Country Life
"The result must surely justify the vast amount of research that has gone into it."  The Lady
832 pages  100 maps and plans  70s

Aegean Turkey
An Archaeological guide  George E. Bean
"...a welcome and precious aid, for no other such systematic account of the sites and ruins of western Asia Minor exists."  50s  Times Literary Supplement

Benn  154 Fleet Street  London EC4
A HISTORY OF GREEK LITERATURE
Albin Lesky
"This magnificent book . . . his description of the contents and significance of the different works are masterly and he traces a sure path through the tangles of scholarly controversy . . . the book should be in every classicist's library." The Times Educational Supplement 105s

GREEK AND ROMAN GOLD AND SILVER PLATE
D. E. Strong
"Dr. Strong is Assistant Keeper of Greek and Roman antiquities at the British Museum, and writes with authority on the subject. What is almost as important, especially for the non-specialist, is that he writes with clarity and force." The Illustrated London News
With 68 half-tone plates and 42 line illustrations 84s

METHUEN'S HANDBOOKS OF ARCHAEOLOGY

MOSAICS
H. P. L'Orange and P. J. Nordhagen
"A study of this excellent and well-illustrated book can only stimulate one's imagination and generate renewed admiration for the Byzantine mosaicist." Arts Review
With 4 colour plates, 112 half-tone illustrations and 10 figures 63s

METHUEN'S HANDBOOKS OF ARCHAEOLOGY

GREEK TERRACOTTAS
R. A. Higgins
The first English work for over sixty years; it describes statuettes and small reliefs of terracottas made in Greek lands from the earliest times down to the first century A.D., and is copiously illustrated with photographs from museums throughout the world.
With 4 colour plates, 64 half-tone plates, 31 illustrations and a map 7 7s

METHUEN'S HANDBOOKS OF ARCHAEOLOGY

GREEK POTTERY IN THE BRONZE AGE
A. D. Lacy
The first comprehensive study of the pottery of the Aegean Bronze Age, a period in which superb work was produced both in Crete and the Greek mainland and islands.
With 4 colour plates, many monochrome illustrations, and a map 6 10s
To be published in October.
Epirus

The geography, the ancient remains, the history and the topography of Epirus and adjacent areas

N. G. L. HAMMOND

The author has correlated for the first time the results of recent excavations in Albania and Greece to provide this comprehensive history of the tribal, political and cultural life of Epirus in the classical and Hellenistic periods. 25 plates, 18 maps, 23 plans, 34 text figures £12 12s net

Lord Elgin
and the Marbles

WILLIAM ST. CLAIR

The first detailed account of the extraordinary circumstances in which the marbles were acquired, of their part in Elgin's career, and of their great impact on English taste of the period. 11 plates, 1 map 42s net

Euripides: Helen

Edited with Introduction and Commentary by A. M. DALE

'Miss Dale's criteria for determining textual—and also literary—questions are based on her very close knowledge of Euripidean style and metrics. In the latter field she is an unchallenged authority and her text will clearly supersede all previous versions.' THE TIMES EDUCATIONAL SUPPLEMENT 28s net

Augustus
and the Greek World

G. W. BOWERSOCK

'. . . an excellent example of the larger view that can be drawn from prosopographical research, the fruits of which are too frequently left in their discrete form . . . a book notable both for the detailed information made accessible and the careful judgement with which the details are interpreted.' THE CLASSICAL WORLD 30s net

A History of the
Ancient World

CHESTER G. STARR

'. . . amazingly successful . . . it will be read with pleasure and enjoyment by laymen and scholars alike. A full and up-to-date bibliography and a few excellent plates complete a remarkable work of synthesis and selection.' THE TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT 32 plates, 20 maps, end-paper maps 63s net

Hesiod: Theogony

Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary
Edited by M. L. WEST

'. . . a magnificent contribution to classical scholarship.' ASSOCIATION OF CLASSICAL TEACHERS HANDBOOK 90s net

The Meaning of
Stoicism

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN

'This elegantly written, well documented and closely argued study is warmly recommended to anyone who has even the slightest interest in ancient Greek philosophy. It can be surprisingly topical at times . . . ' ASSOCIATION OF CLASSICAL TEACHERS HANDBOOK 21s net

Harvard University Press

A Handbook of
Classical Drama

PHILIP WHALEY HARSH

In this critical compendium of the entire field of classical drama, the author includes sketches of the lives of the dramatists, summaries of the remarkable features of their works, and an individual treatment of each of the extant Greek and Latin plays.

Reprint, paper covers 26s 6d net

Stanford University Press

Oxford
UNIVERSITY PRESS
ROMAN SILVER COINS
by H. A. Seaby

PRICE 40/-

Vol. 1 Republic - Augustus
A type catalogue with values, arranged according to Babelon
and Cohen. Original published in 1952, now reissued with
revised prices. 166 pages. 846 line illustrations in text
—a revised edition of Vol. II is in preparation—

B. A. SEABY LTD.
59-65 GREAT PORTLAND STREET
LONDON W1

MASTER BRONZES
FROM THE CLASSICAL WORLD
David Gordon Mitten and Suzannah Doeringer

A 320-page scholarly catalogue of the exhibition held at the Fogg Art
Museum, December 3, 1967 through January 23, 1968, and then shown at
the City Art Museum of St. Louis and the Los Angeles County Museum
of Art. The catalogue illustrates and describes each object, and includes
six colour plates. There is an introduction on the techniques of working
bronze, by Arthur Steinberg; introductions to Greek Bronzes by David
Gordon Mitten; to Etruscan Bronzes by George M. A. Hansmann;
and to Roman Bronzes by Heinz Menzel. Soft cover edition. $4.00.

Orders limited to five copies. For each catalogue, please add $.50 for postage and handling
within the United States; $1.00 for postage and handling outside the United States; or
$5.00 for air mail postage and handling outside the United States. Please address all
orders to: Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 02138, USA.
Please make cheques payable to Fogg Art Museum.
When I went to the Bar as a very young man,
(Said I to myself – said I,)
I'll work to a sane and intelligent plan
(Said I to myself – said I).
If I'm to survive on the fees of the Law
Then the money I earn must itself
earn some more,
So the first step I'll take is to
Barclays' front door,
(Said I to myself – said I).

BARCLAYS
BANK
Money is our business
With apologies to the shade of W. S. Gilbert
Holidays in Greece

WINGS Limited offer many varied holidays to Greece and the Aegean and also Hellenic Air Cruises, which visit at leisure three or more centres such as Athens, Rhodes and Crete. During the past ten years, over 7,000 people have taken part in these cruises.

A coach tour of the Peloponnesse (flying first to Athens by One-Eleven jet) visits Olympia, Sparta and Mistra, Epidaurus, Tiryns, Mycenae and Old Corinth, accompanied by a leading Greek archaeological guide. Visits are also made to Delphi, the island of Aegina, and Cape Sounion, and the tour throughout is escorted by our own representative.

Charges are very reasonable and full details will be found in the WINGS programme, available on request.

WINGS LIMITED
124 FINCHLEY ROAD LONDON N.W.3
Telephone: 01-794 5611
MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF BRITISH TRAVEL AGENTS

The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by
E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Each volume 25s. net.

NEW VOLUMES 1967

442 PLOTINUS III. Ennead III. Translated by H. Armstrong

432 LUCIAN VIII. Translated by M. D. Macleod

428 PLUTARCH’S MORALIA XIV. Translated by B. Einarson and P. H. De Lacy

423 DIODORUS SICULUS XII. Translated by F. R. Walton
General Index by R. M. Geer

WILLIAM HEINEMANN HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Subscriptions are invited for a reprint of

Fragmenta comicorum graecorum
Collegit et disposit Augustus Meineke
5 vol. Oktav. 1839-1857

Vol. I. Historia critica comicorum graecorum – XVI, 621 Seiten. 1839
Vol. II. Fragmenta poetae comicorum antiquae
Pars I. 608 Seiten. 1839
Pars II. S. 615–1298. 1840
Vol. III. Fragmenta poetae comicorum mediae 739 Seiten. 1839
Vol. IV. Fragmenta poetae comicorum novae – XVI, 876 Seiten. 1851
Vol. V. Comicae dictionis index. Compositus Henricus Jacobi. 1857
Pars I. A–I. Praemissae sunt ad fragmenta comicorum addenda et corrigenda
CCCLXXVI, 484 Seiten
Pars II. K–Ω. S. 485–1223

Subscription price – cloth DM 580.—

Vol. V. contains a famous index still indispensable for the study of Ancient Greek Comedy. Of course, this index can be used only in connection with the above quoted edition.

WALTER DE GRUYTER & CO. – BERLIN 30

ARCHAEOLOGY

SUDDENLY YOU ARE PART OF THE PAST

when you subscribe to this unique magazine. Lavish illustrations—in both colour and black and white—add to the impact of articles written by archaeologists who dedicate their lives to digging through the layers of past civilisations.

Published by the
ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

1 year £1 16s. Make cheques or money orders payable to ARCHAEOLOGY

ARCHAEOLOGY, Dept. Y5
100 Washington Square East, New York, N.Y. 10003

Send ARCHAEOLOGY for ___ year(s) to:
Name ________________________________
Address ______________________________
Plato's Progress
GILBERT RYLE

Professor Ryle proposes a basic reconstruction of Plato's career as a teacher, writer and public figure, and of his relations with Aristotle. 'Professor Ryle's exploration in this field is scholarly and stimulating, and will send readers back to the writings of the two philosophers with fresh critical attention.'
The Times 32s. 6d. net

Poiesis
Structure and Thought
H. D. F. KITTO

This book is designed to encourage and facilitate critical understanding of Greek literature. Professor Kitto maintains that much criticism is inadequate because modern values are applied to past literature. Contradictions and distortions result. Instead the good critic should question his own assumptions and consider the author's choice and arrangement of material. Professor Kitto illustrates his theme with a detailed examination of the Odyssey, Persae, Trachiniae, Tyrranum and Thucydides' History, with Shakespeare's Coriolanus as a more recent example. 50s. net

The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy
Editor: A. H. ARMSTRONG

A detailed survey of philosophy from the neo-Platonists to St Anselm. The dominant figure is Plotinus but full attention is given to the most important Greek, Latin, pagan, Christian, Jewish and Moslem thinkers. 95s. net

The Sanctuary of Hemithea at Kastabos
J. M. COOK and W. H. PLOMMER

A fully illustrated account of the excavation of a Greek sanctuary in the south-west corner of the mainland of Asia Minor opposite Rhodes. This is the first Greek sanctuary of any size discovered in this area, and the identification of the site has entailed the resiting of several ancient towns. 80s. net

Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies
Edited by L. R. Palmer and John Chadwick

The fourth international colloquium in Cambridge, 1965, was attended by most of the leading scholars concerned in the edition and interpretation of the Linear B tablets. This record of the papers presented covers a wide range of subjects from epigraphy to more general questions of interpretation. 84s. net

Discontinuity in Greek Civilization
RHYS CARPENTER

An exciting new solution to a mystery that has puzzled scholars for centuries—why did the Mycenaean civilization collapse in the twelfth century B.C.? Professor Rhys Carpenter argues that this collapse, and also the early Byzantine decline in 400-750 A.D. were due not to invasion but to cyclical climatic change in the Mediterranean Basin. His bold approach includes a new interpretation of Plato's account of the destruction of Atlantis, and a re-examination of the tribal migrations which troubled Egypt. 20s. net

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Catalogue of the Gennadius Library

AMERICAN SCHOOL of CLASSICAL STUDIES at Athens

The Gennadius Library’s collection of nearly 50,000 volumes is concerned exclusively with Greece, from antiquity to the present; emphasis is on the medieval period and on modern times to 1900.

Particularly fine holdings include: Renaissance editions of the classical and Byzantine authors, and of Greek grammars; early Modern Greek literature; the beginnings of classical archaeology (1750–1825); travellers to the Greek East (to 1900); Greek Bibles and the Orthodox church; early printed materials on Turkish history; Greece under Turkish domination; the Greek War of Independence (including Byronic); the early Kingdom of Greece; and the “Eastern Question.”

Estimated 100,000 cards reproduced in 7 volumes

Price: $467.50

Price includes 10% additional charge on orders outside the U.S.
Descriptive material on these titles and a complete catalog of publications are available on request.

G. K. HALL & CO. 70 Lincoln Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02111

SWANS HELLENIC CRUISES

GREECE, TURKEY, YUGOSLAVIA, SICILY, MALTA, NORTH AFRICA, MIDDLE EAST, CYPRUS BLACK SEA...to mention but a few fascinating places to be visited during our fifteenth cruise season. Since 1954 there have been 70 cruises.

Each cruise is accompanied by a team of experts who will make the ancient world come alive for you with on-board and on-site talks.

In 1968 there are eight 15-day cruises:
2nd April, 16th April, 30th April, 14th May, 28th May, 6th August, 20th August, 3rd September

Currency regulations allow ample spending money on board and ashore. Accommodation is available at a variety of prices fully inclusive of shore excursions and air travel from London to Venice or Athens and return.

PRICES FROM 115 to 345 GNS.

36-page illustrated brochure available from:

W. F. & R. K. SWAN (Hellenic) LTD.
260-261 (X 2) TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, LONDON, W.1
Telephone: MUSEum 8070 (20 lines)
DIE ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFT
Einführung in Gegenstand, Methoden und Ergebnisse ihrer Teildisziplinen und Hilfswissenschaften.

DIE ÄGYPTOLOGIE

ARCHÄOLOGIE
Die Studenten der Klassischen Archäologie ebenso wie die Studierenden der Nachbardisziplinen (Vor- und Frühgeschichte, Orientalistik und Ägyptologie, Kunstgeschichte, Alphiologie und alte Geschichte) sollen mit dieser Einführung über Umfang und Grenzen des Faches orientiert werden. Die je nach dem Gegenstand einschlägigen Methoden werden am Beispiel charakteristischer Forschungsergebnisse erläutert und bibliographisch dokumentiert.

RÖMISCHE METRIK

DAS LATEINISCHE MITTELALTER
Einführung in Sprache und Literatur. Von Karl Langosch. 96 S., kart., DM 6,30. Bestellnummer 3019 (lieferbar)
„Umso mehr ist der Lehrer des lateinischen, der guten Willen hat, sich auf dem Felde der mittelalterlichen Literatur ernsthaft umzusehen, auf eine Einführung in die Art des alten Streckers angewiesen . . . . Streckers Einführung zu ersetzen hat nun dessen Schüler K. Langosch unternommen. Daß er gut daran getan hat, nicht etwa durch anflicken von Literaturangaben zur Forschung der letzten 20 Jahre Streckers Büchlein zu einer weiteren Auflage zu verhelfen, davon überzeugt schon ein erster Blick in das Inhaltsverzeichnis . . . . Geschickt ist die Art in der der Verfasser an die wissenschaftliche Literatur, auch an die von anderen media-

Visticallyen Disziplinen (z. B. Geschichtswissenschaft, Philosophie) beigesteuerte, heranführt und dabei zugleich über die Hauptgebiete der Forschung und den Stand der sie erschließenden Arbeiten (Wörterbuch, Grammatik, Literaturgeschichte,Gattungs- und Formengeschichte) zuverlässig unterrichtet . . . . Hier muß schon für eine Einführung das Material von Grund auf selbst erarbeitet werden. Das ist hier geschehen und so verfügen wir über ein Hilfsmittel für die Annäherung an das Mittelalter, daß soldeste wissenschaftliche Fundierung mit großem Wert für die Praxis verbindet“ (Gymnasium 1965, Seite 131)

ANTIKE NUMISMATIK
Inhalt: Allgemeine Einführung (Gegenstand und Methoden; Organisation der wissenschaftlichen Arbeit)—Griechische Numismatik (Vorgeldformen; Herstellungstechnik; Münzpublikationen; Geschichte der Münzzeit; Ausgewähltes Verzeichnis von Monographien—Hellenistische Numismatik (Prägungen der Hellenistischen Königreiche; Prägungen der Perser usw.; Jüdische Münzprägung; Münzprägung der Kelten)—Römische Numismatik (Münzprägung der römischen Republik; der Kaiserzeit; Ausgewählte Bibliographie; Organisation der Münzprägung; Prägungen der Spätantike; Medallions)—Spezielle Forschungen (Münzfunde; Fälschungen)—Register.
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LANTERN SLIDES

The Slides Collection contains 3000 coloured slides (2" × 2") covering a wide variety of subjects, including sites on the Greek mainland, the Greek islands, Rome, Italy and the Roman Empire. Etruscan tomb paintings, Roman frescoes and mosaics, Greek vases, and objects from the Greek and Roman Life room of the British Museum are well represented. Coloured sets (2" × 2") are also available, with notes, on the Athenian Agora, Athens, Pompeii, Lerna, Greek Papyri, Greek Gods and Heroes, Art in Roman Britain, Classical Costume and Sicily and Magna Graecia. There is a 2" × 2" black and white set on Greek and Roman Architecture.

The collection of 3½" × 3½" black and white slides, numbering 10,000, covers a similarly wide range of subjects, and there are about 40 sets of slides on specific subjects.

A catalogue of coloured slides is available at 7s. 6d. a copy.

Slides may be hired by members of each Society at a charge of 10s. a set or 4d. each for individual slides, plus postage.

Copies of coloured slides may be bought for 5s. each.

The annual subscription to each Society is £3. SCHOOLS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR MEMBERSHIP.

For particulars apply to the Secretary of either Society at 31–34 Gordon Square, W.C.1.

THE BRITISH ACADEMY
CROMER GREEK PRIZE

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

The next Prize, which is ordinarily a sum of £150, will be awarded in 1968 under the following Rules:

1. The competition is open to all British subjects and citizens of Eire of either sex who will be under thirty-two years of age on 31 December preceding the award.
2. Any Essay which has already received or is in competition for another prize of the same nature will be inadmissible. A candidate to whom the Prize has been awarded will not be eligible to compete for it again. But an Essay which has not received the Prize may be submitted again (with or without alteration) in a future year so long as the writer remains eligible under Rule 1.
3. Consideration of the adjudicators shall be limited to work submitted to them, whether published or unpublished, not exceeding 20,000 words in length.
4. Essays must be sent in to the Secretary of the Academy on or before 31 December of the year preceding the award. They must be typed or printed and should have a note attached stating the main sources of information used.

Communications should be addressed to 'The Secretary of the British Academy, Burlington Gardens, London, W.1'.
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
INSTITUTE OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
31–34 Gordon Square, London WC1

PUBLICATIONS

BULLETIN NUMBER 14 (1967)  Price 25s. Published annually

BULLETIN SUPPLEMENTS

No. 4 CATALOGUE OF THE MSS OF OVID'S METAMORPHOSES
By Franco Munari (1957)  Price 10s.

No. 5 THE TELPHUS OF EURIPIDES
By E. W. Handley and John Rea (1957)  Price 12s 6d.

No. 6 THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF DOCUMENTARY PAPYRI—
PROLEGOMENA
By Herbert C. Youtie (1958)  Price 10s.

No. 9 MONUMENTS ILLUSTRATING OLD AND MIDDLE COMEDY
By T. B. L. Webster (1960)  Price £1

No. 10 STUDIES IN THE SIGNARIES OF SOUTH-WESTERN CYPRUS

No. 11 MONUMENTS ILLUSTRATING NEW COMEDY
By T. B. L. Webster (1961)  Price 30s.

No. 12 MYCENAEAN CIVILIZATION, PUBLICATIONS 1956–60 A
bibliography compiled by Brenda E. Moon (1961)  Price £1

No. 13 A SURVEY OF CLASSICAL PERIODICALS
Union Catalogue of
periodicals relevant to classical studies in certain British Libraries.
Compiled by Joyce E. Southan (1962)  Price 30s.

No. 15 THE KNOSSOS TABLETS (Third Edition)
A transliteration by

No. 16 A GAZETTEER AND ATLAS OF MYCENAEAN SITES
By R. Hope Simpson (1965)  Price 50s.

No. 17 NEW FRAGMENTS OF THE MISOUmenos OF MENANDER
Edited by Eric G. Turner (1965)  Price 25s.

No. 18 MERTON PAPYRI VOL. III
By J. David Thomas (1967)

No. 19 PHYLAX VASES
Second edition revised and enlarged
By A. D. Trendall (1967)

No. 20 MONUMENTS ILLUSTRATING TRAGEDY AND SATYR
PLAY
Revised edition with appendix illustrating particular plays
By T. B. L. Webster (1967)  Price 40s.

STUDIES IN MYCENAEAN INSCRIPTIONS AND DIALECT XI—1965
By John Chadwick, L. R. Palmer and L. J. D. Richardson  Price 5s. (Volumes
V—X also available)

Publications distributed by International University Booksellers, 39 Store Street,
London, WC1
Robert S. Brumbaugh

The Philosophers of Greece

This brilliant survey of the key ideas of Greek Philosophy covers a period and scene unmatched by any other. It was a time when the germinal forces of Western culture were formulated by the world's great classical thinkers. It was the age of Thales, Anaximenes, Empedocles, Heraclitus, Parmenides, Zeno, Anaxagoras, the Sophists, Plato and Aristotle. It produced the great philosophical writings of metaphysics, cosmology, politics and logic—a unique record of man's use of reason to explain the world about him. 35s.

William Chase Greene

Achievement of Greece

A CHAPTER IN HUMAN EXPERIENCE

Professor Greene's instructive and entertaining history, first published in 1923 and long out of print, traces the development of the ancient Greek civilization and the spread of Greek culture from the earliest times. 52s. 6d.

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD

Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama

G. M. SIFAKIS

This study disputes the widespread belief that Greek drama made little if any progress after Menander. Basing his argument on evidence from Delos and Delphi, the two great centres of Apollo’s cult which provide ample material for reconstructing the history of drama in the last three centuries B.C., the author aims to answer the questions: ‘When did dramatic performances take place in the two cities, what plays were performed, by whom, and how were they produced?’

‘[Dr Sifakis] has put together an enthralling picture ... its publication is an important scholarly event, its subject matter is fascinating, and its results penetrate the darkness of the Hellenistic age like a beam of new light.’ Sunday Times pp. 200 55s

Death, Fate and the Gods

The Development of a Religious Idea in Greek Popular Belief and in Homer

B. C. DIETRICH

‘... a notable contribution ... in these pages a good deal of light is thrown on the salient features of the nature, worship and functions of the daemon, the hero, Moira and Erinys, and their application to the working of Fate and the Olympian gods in the Iliad and the Odyssey.’ Journal of Hellenic Studies Second impression pp. 390 75s
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A NEW INTERPRETATION OF THE PORTLAND VASE
(PLATES I–VIII)

For three hundred years and more the meaning of the figures on the Portland Vase has been a matter for speculation of the most strange and varied character.

During the first half of this century there was something of a lull, but ten years ago Professor Erika Simon, after a wide-ranging and sensitive study of all the evidence, put forward a highly ingenious theory connecting the scenes with the ancestry of Augustus, and, shortly after, Professor L. Polacco embroidered it further. In 1964 Mr Denys Haynes produced the excellent little book which is on sale at the British Museum; this was reviewed by Professor H. Möbius, who had his own theory, elaborated since in a longer article; and Professor H. Biesantz has exposed the weaknesses of all the solutions, without however propounding one of his own.

The wide differences of opinion among these scholars have prompted me to place on record some observations I made twenty years ago, when we first acquired the vase at the British Museum; and I shall take Mr Haynes’ book as a starting-point, because it is the latest comprehensive account, and, being persuasively argued, bids fair to hold the field.

However, before we begin to examine the vase in detail, a few words must be said on its technique, its date, and the circumstances in which it was made (PLATES I–IV, VI–VII). The technique was to make a bubble of very dark blue glass, clear but so thick that it cannot be seen through, and over it a skin of white translucent glass reaching as far upwards as the base of the neck: then to join two deep-blue glass handles from the middle of the neck to the shoulder of the vase; and, finally, using the technique of the cameo-carver, to carve, and carve away, the white glass layer in order to produce figures and landscape. The blue glass becomes the background of the scene where the white has been completely removed: where the white has been thinned but not completely removed, the blue provides suggestions of shadow and distance.

The date is generally agreed to be the late first century B.C. or early first century A.D., which was a time of ferment in religion, and of eclecticism in art.

The vase must always have been a precious object, made to order, and perhaps for some special purpose or occasion. The technique was not only rare, but it was also costly, dangerously delicate and slow. It was not possible to make serious alterations when work was in progress, or to insert an extra detail at the last moment, as can often be done, for instance, in a drawing or painting. We can therefore assume that a great deal of thought went into the choice of subject and into its exact meaning. That meaning is no longer clear, and perhaps never was clear except to the initiated: there are many other examples of this at that time: the funerary altars dedicated to the Manes, and decorated with masks of Bacchic symbolism, eagles of apotheosis and other significant emblems.4 there are the

1 Erika Simon, Die Portlandvase (Mainz, 1957): with bibliography to 1953. I have to thank Professor Simon for her kindness in allowing me to use six of the fine plates from her book, and the Römisches-Germanisches Zentralmuseum of Mainz for their generous loan of the blocks. All photographs of the Portland Vase are by courtesy of the Trustees of the British Museum. Fig. 1 is from Furtwängler-Reichhold, Griechische Vasenmalerei: Fig. 2 from the British Museum Catalogue of Vases: Fig. 3 from the Catalogue of the Museo Capitolino, British School at Rome and Oxford University Press: Figs. 4–7 from Robert, Die Antiken Sarkophag-reliefs: Fig. 8 from Brunn, I Rilievi delle Urne Etrusche: Fig. 9 is by courtesy of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: Fig. 10 is from a Museum postcard by Photo-Pan, Thasos.

2 L. Polacco, Athenaum n.s. (Pavia) xxxvi (1958) 123–41.


VOL. LXXXVII.
stuccoes of the Underground Basilica near the Porta Maggiore in Rome, and the stuccoes and paintings in many Roman tombs, full of double meanings. There are also, later, hundreds of sculptured sarcophagi which bear subjects from Greek mythology, and no one any longer assumes that this was merely because the Roman patron had a taste for Greek art; it is quite certain that he saw in these scenes allegories of the life after death. The fate of the soul was likened, for instance, to that of Endymion visited by Selene or Ariadne discovered by Dionysus, and this is proved by the heads of the protagonists sometimes being carved into portraits of the deceased. We may therefore expect that any scene from mythology on the Portland Vase will not only tell the familiar story, but also carry some esoteric meaning; and we have to be on the alert for every hint, however slight; have to remember that no detail is negligible, and that, as always in ancient art, both gesture and posture are significant.

This brings us to the second point, that of eclecticism. Artists at that time had a long tradition behind them, and a whole repertory of artistic types. The history of Greek sculpture had been largely the history of the gradual establishment of types of statues, especially those of the gods; until by the end of the fourth century B.C. every Olympian deity had at least one easily recognisable type, sometimes two or three. With lesser deities, or heroes, the process is not so definite, and some never acquired a generally accepted type at all. In painting, which is a more flexible medium, there is naturally less rigidity in the type and more variety in details; whilst relief-sculpture in these respects comes somewhere between free sculpture and painting. In our days of desperate originality, it is not easy to find an analogy for this persistence of types, but perhaps one can get some idea of it by considering the artistic types of Napoleon in French and in English art, or those of the beings who personify the various countries of our modern world.

Types were originally created by leading painters and sculptors—sometimes they were paintings in public buildings or cult-statues in temples—but since in antiquity travel was not so easy as it is now, and art galleries not so numerous, artists, unless they lived in a city such as Athens or Rome, where public works of art were abundant, must have had recourse to pattern-books of some kind, by which I mean sketches or models, or casts, of older works of art; and these they must have used when they were creating a new work. In beginning a new painting or sculpture they started with the basic formula which the public might be expected to recognise.

So much for generalities. Now let us turn to Mr Haynes' book. My main criticism is that his major premise is incorrect. There are two scenes, one on each side of the vase (plates I and II); but these two scenes are, he maintains, in fact one scene; and this scene represents Peleus on the extreme left of one side, approaching Thetis, his bride-to-be, who is in the middle of the other side. Haynes identifies the figures as follows,\(^9\) starting from the left (plate I): Peleus, Eros, Doris, the mother of Thetis, or Tethys her grandmother; Nereus the husband of Doris, or Okeanos the husband of Tethys: and on the far side (plate II), Hermes or Ares, Thetis, Aphrodite.

Of this major premise, that the two scenes are one, which was first put forward by Venuti in the eighteenth century and has recently been maintained both by Polacco and by Haynes,\(^11\) I can only say that if the artist intended to depict a single incident, then he has gone an extraordinary way about it. Instead of stressing the continuity of the composition, which you would expect him to do in order to overcome the handicap of the figures being distributed

---

9 On a sarcophagus in the Louvre, otherwise completely carved, the heads of Diana and Endymion have been left rough, presumably in order that they might be finished as portraits of the eventual occupants: Robert, *Ant. Sarkophag.*** iii, 86–9, no. 72, pl. xviii.
11 Haynes, *op. cit.*, 27, no. 5; 31, no. 19.
on two sides of the vase, he has done exactly the opposite, and has made the scene on each side self-contained, with the two outer figures in each turned towards the central one, and in a marked manner averting their heads from their neighbour on the other side of the handle (Plates III and IV): he has created a strong vertical division, consisting of a tree and a column, between the scenes, and has even bent one of the dividing elements, the tree, inwards in order to form a closer frame to the first picture. If the two scenes were intended to be continuous, the faces under the handles form a further and gratuitous interruption.\textsuperscript{12}

One figure only seems somewhat detached, and that is the right-hand figure (Plates IV and VII\textit{b}), who appears to survey and even to dominate the scene. It might be claimed that her survey includes the other scene too, and, as will be seen later on, the two scenes not only balance one another both in subject and in design, but are also linked in composition in such a way as to indicate, not their continuity, but their chronological order.

There are then, in my view, two separate but complementary scenes, the beginning and the end of a momentous cycle of events, perhaps the most famous in the Greek world, and one well known to the Romans too. That there may also be a Roman historical application is not impossible, though for my own part I cannot see the faintest resemblance in any of the figures to any Roman historical personage: but whether there is or not, the original myth, like the style and the iconography, is Greek, and I shall concern myself only with that and with its allegory.

The only way to a correct understanding of any work of ancient art is to examine everything in it; so let us see exactly what there is. We begin with the handles (Plates III, IV, VI\textit{b} and VII\textit{b}). These were added in such a way that the lower end of each was attached on top of the layer of white glass; so that you have in effect a sandwich of white between two layers of blue. Below the two handles are two heads or faces, which resemble one another so closely that they can be considered duplicates: their interpretation does not seem to me difficult, yet they have prompted the wildest surmises. They are now usually thought to be heads of Pan, and Simon, in her attempt to associate the scenes with the royal house of Augustus, has suggested a connexion with Capricornus, the sign of the Zodiac under which Augustus was born.\textsuperscript{13} Haynes says poetically ‘the goat-god knits his brows in brooding melancholy’,\textsuperscript{14} though why Pan, who is not melancholy by nature, should be in this mood on this occasion is not clear, especially since Haynes considers that the scene was a joyous one, and the vase a wedding-present.

Let us look at these faces a little more closely. The lower ends of the handles were attached, as we have said, on top of the layer of white glass, so that when the carver came to carve away the white glass at this level on the vase in order to reveal the blue, he could not remove it here because it was sandwiched under the end of the handle: he was bound to leave a white layer of some kind (Plate I). Nor could he risk cutting away too much of the white, for in this way he would weaken the attachment of the handle. Accordingly, he cut away as much as he dared, but still leaving a band of white, which he bevelled down gently on to the blue. Because this band follows the curved edges of the handle, and touches the head below, it has been widely, and of late universally, assumed that the head has horns: but in fact no attempt was made by the carver to carve this band at all; its surface is flat and featureless. The horns are an illusion.

In 1949, when Mr J. H. W. Axtell, the technical expert of the Greek and Roman Department in the British Museum, took the Portland Vase to pieces in order to re-mend it, I had

\textsuperscript{12} Surely all this is obvious even in the rolled-out drawing of the two sides of the vase at the end of Haynes' book: and if rolling out into a continuous picture on the flat cannot make the two scenes look like one, how can they be expected to read as one when they are on opposite sides of the vase?
\textsuperscript{13} Op. cit., 28 f.
photographs taken of the fragments (Plate Va), and these show clearly (as do plates III, IV, VIb and VIIb) that there is no attempt at carving.16

An analogous problem arose on the so-called Blue Vase from Pompeii in Naples,16 an example—in fact the other main example surviving complete—of the same technique, which is probably a generation later than the Portland Vase (Plate VIII). Here, on one side, the carver has carved the blue and white sandwich round the base of the handle clumsily, leaving something which does vaguely resemble a pair of horns, and would no doubt have been, however mistakenly, identified as such had there been a head below to fit it on. On the other handle of the Blue Vase the artist has carved the white residuum into a decorative element: the attempt is manifest, and serves to point the contrast with the uncarved residuum on the Portland Vase. We shall return to the Blue Vase later, but in case any doubt remains, here is one more confirmation of the absence of horns on the Portland Vase: the gem-engravers Tassie and Pichler cast the Portland Vase about 1780; the cast was in white plaster, there is no contrast between the colours, and the alleged horns, being completely without modelling, naturally disappear (Plate Vc). The head cannot then be Pan.

Of course there do exist heads of Pan on vases, and a precious vessel often cited as a parallel is the Rubens vase in Baltimore, which is carved from a single piece of onyx (Plate Vb). This certainly is Pan: about these horns there can be no doubt; and the face takes its characteristic features, as do most heads of Pan, from a goat—the narrow, wrinkled muzzle, the prominent incisor teeth, and the lips slanting sharply up from the centre. How utterly different are the heads on the Portland Vase, with their fleshy, gaping lips (Plates III, IV, VIb and VIIb). We have seen these before, not on the hill-side but in the aquarium: they are those of a fish. A similar conformation of the lips can be seen in the handle-attentions of the great marble basin from San Spirito in the Terme Museum in Rome, where the scene on the basin itself is a rout of sea-monsters, and the handle-attentions are the heads of sea-gods.17

The heads on the Portland Vase are also of a water-deity, very great and very ancient—the lord of all the waters, Okeanos. This would be appropriate enough to the legend of Peleus and Thetis, since Okeanos was the grandfather of Thetis. There is, however, more to it than that. The belief that Okeanos was the source of all life goes back at least as far as Homer, and it was also believed very early in Greece that the stream of Ocean was the means by which the souls of the dead reached the life after death. A century later than the Portland Vase that belief was certainly widespread in Rome, and this explains the exceedingly common theme on sarcophagi, of a head of Okeanos in the centre flanked by sea-creatures, sometimes carrying human beings on their backs, and indicating the means of transport into Elysium.18

The Portland Vase was once thought to have been found, containing ashes, in a sarcophagus.19 This has been doubted: but whatever its final use, and whether it held the ashes of the dead or not, this head of Okeanos is a hint, and the first of a series of hints, that its subjects, like the mythical scenes on Roman sarcophagi, have a religious significance in

15 Any careful draughtsman setting out to draw the vase soon notices not only this, but also that not one of the alleged ‘horns’ matches another in either shape or size, and he therefore either ignores them, as in the dal Pozzo drawing reproduced by Haynes, op. cit., pl. xiv, or draws what he sees, as in the folder at the end of Haynes’ book.
16 Simon, op. cit., 3 (with references), pls. 21–3. Professor Simon has since published an important article on other vases in this technique (Journal of Glass Studies vi [1964] 13–30).
17 W. Fuchs, Die Vorbilder der neu-attischen Reliefs, pl. 30, 32.
addition to their evident mythological one, and, more specifically, that they refer to the life after death.

Now let us turn to the figures, starting on the left (plates I, IV and VIa). We can agree with Winckelmann, who first suggested it,²⁰ and with Haynes, that this is Peleus. He has entered through a gateway. Even this is not generally accepted, and he has been said to be ‘passing a shrine’. If it were a shrine, and if he were walking past, it would be natural to show it frontally: the point of setting it at an angle is in order to show that he has just come through it. Ask yourself where he can have come from if not through the gateway, and you will see that this must be the correct solution. The gateposts, which support a Doric lintel, are rectangular, perhaps because this form tells better than a rounded one in this particular medium of cut glass. Those who are prepared to see symbolism in this—and it almost certainly is symbolic—will recognise here the gateway through which the mortal enters the world of the gods,²¹ as Peleus did when he married Thetis; and there is general agreement among scholars that the Peleus–Thetis myth is one most commonly used in antiquity to symbolise apotheosis.²² The tiptoe gait of this figure has often been remarked, and it does not seem too far-fetched to regard it as the hesitating approach of a human being to this new domain. In his right hand he holds the end of a cloak, which he is probably laying aside rather than taking up, because normally in ancient art, when a person is putting on a garment, he or she holds it firmly and the next part of the action is implicit (plate VIa).²³ Here it is difficult to see how he would be able to do anything further with the cloak except let it fall, since he is already involved in another and more serious action. I suspect not only that he is putting off the cloak, but that the act is symbolic:²⁴ in a scene like this, where attributes are sparse, any action and any attribute is important, and a trivial motive, such as the casual picking-up of a cloak, or its casual discarding, would be incongruous.

In front of Peleus is Eros (plate I): this is quite certain, for he holds a bow. In his other hand is a torch, and this is surely a reference to marriage, for the torch was a feature, in both Greece and Rome, of the nuptial ceremony. Eros looks back just as Hesperus does when he conducts Hymenaeus to the wedding of Peleus and Thetis on the sarcophagus in the Villa Albani,²⁵ or as Hymenaeus himself does in scenes of Roman marriage on other sarcophagi.²⁶ He does so because it is the duty of a guide in the dark to look not only forward but backward, in order to make certain that his charge is still following. The position of the wings of Eros is significant: the right wing is behind him, but the left is extended to our right of his head. He is, therefore, not flying past in order to conduct Peleus further, but is about to turn towards us, because they have arrived at their destination.²⁷

We now have to answer the crucial question of the identity of the young woman whose right arm is entwined with the left arm of Peleus. According to Haynes this is either Doris, the future mother-in-law of Peleus, or Tethys, his future grandmother-in-law. Peleus, says Haynes, has been sitting on the plinth of the shrine and ‘one would say she had just helped him to his feet’.²⁸ It is not at all clear to me how a woman sitting on the ground can help to his feet a young man who has been sitting at a higher level, especially when she has her back to him: nor is it clear why a healthy young man should need such help. The woman

²⁰ Haynes, op. cit., 28, no. 6.
²² Metzger, Représentations 420: Picard, Annales Gand ii 139.
²³ Even in copies of the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles the action has sometimes been in doubt; yet it is certain that she was discarding her garment (C. Blinkenberg, Knidia 52 f.)
²⁴ See J. Heckenbach, De nuditate sacra (Giessen, 1911), and references there given. I thank Professor Morton Smith for his notes on the use of garments in initiation.
²⁵ Robert, Ant. Sarkophag. ii, 2 ff. no. 1, pl. i.
²⁷ This is clear on the vase, and in Bartolozzi’s engraving (Simon op. cit., Abb. 1) but the wing is omitted in the drawing at the end of Haynes’ book.
is shown to be young by her flowing hair and by her build, distinctly lighter than either of the other two on the vase. The action of her right arm, clasping his at the elbow in the presence of Eros, is surely one of love and acceptance. There is nothing exactly like it elsewhere, but the nearest parallels are in lovers' meetings—of Ares and Aphrodite, of Perseus and Andromeda, of Zeus and Hera. Can a young woman with whom Peleus is on such intimate terms as this be anyone but Thetis?

She is seated on some low rocks which may stand for the sea-shore, and this is confirmed by the presence beside her of a small sea-monster: no doubt about it being a sea-creature rather than a snake: there are many parallels. The carver has been a little half-hearted about the rocks, which are barely visible, and he has failed to be quite explicit with the monster, for it is not clear whether she is just fondling it, or whether it is part of her (PLATE I). At first sight it looks as if her left hand were on her knee, but if that were so the upper surface of her left thigh should extend backwards from that point, leaving no room for the animal's body: it may be that the hand is resting on a coil of the animal, and that her leg comes in at a lower level. This problem has a certain importance, for if the monster were in fact part of her, it would show that she was Thetis; although it not being part of her would not show that she was not.

Although this is a non-violent version of the Peleus-Thetis myth, an artist could not ignore the by now universally familiar element in the legend, the transformations of Thetis, and it is possible that in addition to the head of the sea-monster there are also other traces of what Ovid describes as the 'hundred forms' she could assume at will: the rocks beneath her, which as we noticed were somewhat indeterminate, may be one of them. Then, too, one of her feet is stretched out so as to lie at the base of a small tree, the action extending her left leg to an unnatural degree (PLATE VIb). The designer of the Portland Vase has been at some pains to differentiate his trees, and even if he has not managed in this medium to give them botanical accuracy, his choice is careful and meaningful: this small tree is not essential to the composition, and seems to have been squeezed in. Could it be that into which Thetis had changed at one phase of the courtship? Near the centre stands another tree, and Eros is among its branches. It is a bay-tree, and the bay is an emblem of victory—here, then, of victory in love.

It is reasonable to ask why, if the two are lovers, Thetis has her back to Peleus. The reason will become clear in a moment, when we study the next figure (PLATE VIb). This is undoubtedly Poseidon: it is based on one of the best-known sculptural types in antiquity, and it cannot be just any sea-god, but only he. It differs from the marble replicas in two ways, and both are significant. The god has his hand to his chin in a gesture which is used in ancient times to indicate deep thought or disquiet, and like many ancient gestures it is based on a natural one which comes naturally to us still. What is causing Poseidon such concern? Pindar's version of the Peleus-Thetis myth, found also in other authors, is that

---

29 Herrmann, Denkmäler der Malerei plates 2, 11 and 129. Compare also the terracotta of Perseus and Andromeda from Egnazia: A. Levi, Terrecotte del Mus. Naz. di Napoli 94, no. 400, fig. 78. In another painting of Perseus and Andromeda (Mus. Borbonico vol. vi Tav. xl.) as in the relief of the same subject in Rome (Stuart Jones, Mus. Capeit. 218, Imp. no. 89, pl. 53) Perseus places his hand under the forearm of Andromeda; but this is so natural a gesture in helping someone down from a higher level that no special significance need be attached to it. On a cup by the Brygos Painter in the British Museum (ARV 2 no. 24. Richter, Furniture of the Greeks . . . [1966] fig. 282) it is not easy to decide whether the gesture is one of encouragement or of token resistance: the ultimate intention is the same. I thank Professor P. von Blanckenhagen for his most helpful observations on this and on other points.

30 Metamorph. xi 253.
31 Metamorph. xi 244.
32 In this peaceful composition there is possibly a reminiscence, how transmitted we can only guess, of one of the less peaceful versions, for instance those on Kereh vases three centuries before, where, however, Eros is already present and the capture of Thetis, though still forcible, is not violent: Metzger, Représentations 268, nos. 2 and 3; pl. xxxvi; and 273 f., where the changes of tone are analysed.
33 For the type see Helbig, Führer 2 ii 25, no. 1188.
Zeus and Poseidon both desired to wed Thetis, but when Themis proclaimed that Fate had decreed that Thetis should bear a son who would be mightier than his father, both thought better of it.  

It was therefore decreed that Thetis should be married to a mortal, and Peleus was selected as being the holiest man in the plain of Iolkos. This explains Poseidon’s gesture of doubt: it explains why Peleus, stepping hesitantly, is looking across at the Olympian god whom he is to supplant; and it explains the attitude of Thetis: the sea-god, as Haynes acutely observes ‘was evidently conversing with her before she turned to help the young lover’. I do not see how that sudden change of situation could be more clearly demonstrated than in the composition and attitudes of these three figures.

The other abnormality about Poseidon is the absence of his customary attribute, the trident. In love-making a trident is neither useful nor convenient, and by omitting it the artist has shown that he is here not primarily as god of the sea, but as would-be lover.

Having explained the first scene, we now turn to the second, which ought to be a sequel or a pendant to it (Plate II). A man and a woman are seated on a large rock: on a separate, smaller rock is seated another woman (Plates IV and VIIb). Since the setting is oceanic, these are islands. That is the regular vocabulary of symbolism: rocks stand for islands in much the same way in the apse of the Underground Basilica near the Porta Maggiore in Rome. On the extreme left is a rectangular column surmounted by a square capital. The column cannot be part of a building, since it is not of sufficient height: this, and the slots in the sides of the capital, perhaps for attaching offering, show that it is an independent monument. Beside the column sits a young man with his head turned back (Plates II and VIIa). This is one of a long series of pictures of the same subject, stretching over at least four centuries: it represents the dead seated by his grave. The formation of the scheme can be seen in vase-pictures of the fifth century B.C. from Athens, and it then recurs many times on vases, both there and in the West, also occasionally on reliefs. The grave-monument can be a stele with acanthus top, or a column of one kind or another—Doric, Ionic or fanciful. It becomes the commonest formula—column, dead man seated by it, sometimes relatives bringing offerings.

The carver here was concerned to depict a famous hero, and it may be helpful if we look for a moment at two Italiote vases a few years on either side of 400 B.C. (Figs. 1 and 2), where painters were faced with much the same problem. They too wanted to depict a well-known hero, in this case Orestes. How best should they show who he is? They knew from drama or epic of the flight of Orestes from the Furies who were seeking to avenge his mother’s death, how he had fled to Delphi and taken refuge at the sacred omphalos. There must have been well-known paintings of this subject, and the vase-painters copied them, either directly or from copies or sketches already made by others. The two vases go back to one of these great originals, some features of which survive and some do not, whilst others have been added by the vase-painters. The original painting must have shown Orestes close against the omphalos, Apollo performing the ritual purification, and the Furies lying about waiting for Orestes, who, wearing a traveller’s cloak, to show that he has been fleeing from one place to another, holds his sword ready to defend himself against them. The famous vase in Paris (Fig. 1) has the air of being a fairly accurate version of the major painting: the other vase, in the British Museum (Fig. 2), derives from the same original, but the painter has a different sarcophagus probably for the same reason that he is present on the Portland Vase, because he has been a suitor of Thetis: he turns his back on the wedding.

For references see Rose, Handbook of Greek Mythology (1959) 39, notes 50, 52.
25 On one of the short sides of the sarcophagus with the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (note 25) Poseidon is shown. He is there not because of the sea-creatures and the head of Okeanos on the lid—Okeanos, and the belief that the souls of the dead pass to Elysium over his waters, belong to a different and perhaps older stratum of ideas. Poseidon is present on the sarcophagus probably for the same reason that he is present on the Portland Vase, because he has been a suitor of Thetis: he turns his back on the wedding.
26 Mon. Ant. xxxi (1927) pl. xi.
28 Furtwängler-Reichhold, ii, pl. 120, 3.
29 B.M., Cat. Vases iv, F 92. The drawing in fig. 2,
purpose: he is painting a funerary vase, and he wants to depict Orestes, not beside the omphalos at Delphi, but seated by his own tomb. The resemblance to the vase in Paris is clear, but Apollo, the omphalos, and the Furies have all disappeared: two mourners have taken their place, one with a vase to dedicate, the other with a ribbon to tie to it or to the tomb. Thus, the excerpt of the larger painting has been adapted for a funeral vase by adding the mourners and their offerings, and by inserting a grave-column. The sword in the hand of Orestes and the peculiar gesture of that hand have been preserved, but they are less appropriate now that there are no Furies. They serve, however, to identify the hero, for this was his well-known pose; but, lest there should be any doubt, the vase-painter took the precaution of writing the name of Orestes on the little column in front. This is the way in which a type crystallizes, and this is the kind of variation it undergoes.

With these thoughts in mind we return to the Portland Vase. The dead man here is taken from this catalogue, shows the column and the sword which, once painted in a lighter colour, have almost disappeared from the vase itself. By the Rehearsal Painter, about 370 B.C.: so named from a vase in the Ashmolean (1944, 15). A. Cambitoglou, Some groups of Greek South Italian Vases 1950 (typescript in B.M.)
seated, one leg forward, one drawn back: he is not entirely naked, but has drapery, presumably a cloak, over both thighs and bunched up under his left elbow (Plate VIIa). The general type is that of a king or hero, and the rock has almost the form of a throne or chair; but artistically it is not such a precise type as are most statues of gods, which, once they have become canonical, are repeated again and again with little variation.  

If this scene is indeed a pendant or sequel to the first, it ought to be connected in some way with Peleus and Thetis. Now the son of Peleus and Thetis was the greatest of all Greek heroes, and one whose memory and cult flourished in Roman times—Achilles. The dead Achilles, in the most generally accepted version of the myth, and one commemorated by Scopas in a famous group eventually set up in the Circus Flaminius in Rome, was carried away by his mother Thetis to the White Island in the Euxine Sea, where his soul lived on. This goes back as far as the Aethiopis (eighth or seventh century B.C.) and is mentioned by Pindar, Euripides and many later authors. Can this, then, be Achilles? To determine this we must study the types used to depict him in painting and sculpture. One of the most memorable incidents in his life is that with which the Iliad closes, when Priam comes by night to beg for the return of Hector’s body. It was naturally a theme in art too, and it recurs many times from the sixth century onwards. One of the best known, about contemporary with the Portland Vase, is on a silver cup found in a chieftain’s grave at Hoby in Denmark. The type used is not exactly that of the Portland Vase, but it has marked points of similarity—the left leg forward, the right drawn back, the right hand forward and a cloak draped over the thighs. The scene on the Hoby cup is usually claimed to have a Roman connotation, and the head of Achilles to be the portrait of a Roman prince; a Greek scene has been adapted for Roman propaganda and modified because it was important that the prince should be shown as displaying clemency towards his suppliant. But the Greek traditional design, or at least the most popular, shows Achilles with his head turned, not towards but away from the suppliant: it is an attitude expressing not only his grief for Patroclus, but his refusal to listen to Priam’s plea.  

One might expect that the tradition of the turned-back head would persist into Roman times; and so it does, for it appears on three sarcophagi, one in the Louvre, a second from Tarsus, and a third in Rome (Fig. 3). I suggest that the maker of the Portland Vase, setting out to depict

\[\text{Fig. 3 Sarcophagus, Capitoline Museum, Rome.}\]

---

40 A similar type is sometimes used in Pompeian wall-paintings for Meleager.
41 Pindar, Nem. iv 49: for other references see Roscher, Lexikon i 51, 4.
42 Simon, op. cit. pl. 37, 1.
43 R. Brilliant, Gesture and Rank in Roman Art, index s.v. clementia Imperatoris.
44 On many vases from the later sixth century B.C. onwards: e.g. by Oltos ARV² i 61, no. 74; by the Brygos Painter id. 380, no. 171: on an Etruscan vase, Beazley, EYP 52 f. pl. x, 2. Cf. K. Bulas, Illustrations antiques de l’Iliade (1929) 23 ff.: A.J.A. liv (1950) 112–118.
Achilles, and wishing to characterise him by some distinctive feature, reproduced, from what I have called the pattern-book, the general lines of the type, and also the turned-back head. Neither he nor the sculptors of the sarcophagi invented it: they were drawing on a common tradition. He did, in short, what the painter of the Orestes Vase in London did (Fig. 2)—reproduced a well-known type whilst omitting some of its surroundings and giving it a different setting. The sword in the hand of Orestes was less significant when the Furies were not there, the turn of Achilles’ head is less significant when Priam is not present; but it still expresses sorrow, although no longer the sorrow for Patroclus but the sorrow which was by tradition appropriate to a dead man seated by his tomb.

In the third of these sarcophagi, now in the Capitoline Museum, the Portland Vase was said to have been found, and perhaps it is worth saying a word about this problem, although it does not greatly affect the validity of my theory. If the connexion were proved, it would have some corroborative value as showing that this family, which was sufficiently interested in the esoteric meanings of the myth of Achilles to use a sarcophagus covered with scenes from it, had in their possession, presumably as an heirloom, a vase which bears at least one or, as I believe, two scenes connected with Achilles.

The facts are briefly these. In 1582 a magnificent marble sarcophagus, nine feet long, was found in the great Roman tomb which occupied the whole of the little hill called the Monte del Grano, near Rome, three miles outside the Porta San Giovanni. The scenes on the front, sides, and back of the sarcophagus are from the life of Achilles: reclining on the lid are two marble figures in the round, which were thought, soon after the discovery, to be Julia Mammea and her son the Emperor Severus Alexander. An antiquarian writer, Flaminio Vacca, who remembered the finding of the sarcophagus twelve years before he wrote, says simply that there were ashes in it. The Portland Vase is first mentioned in 1642, sixty years after, when G. Teti published a book called ‘Aedes Barberinae’ to celebrate the new palace built by the Barberini Pope Urban VIII, elected in 1623: the vase, known at the time as the Barberini Vase, was one of its greatest treasures. Teti conjectures that the vase had originally been the cinerary urn of the Emperor Severus Alexander, and that the scenes on it had to do with his birth. Fifty-five years later still, in 1697, the antiquarian Santo Bartoli, in his book on ancient tombs, says—and he is the first to print it—that the vase was found in the sarcophagus; and this was generally believed throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In 1909, however, Stuart Jones, speaking at an open meeting of the British School at Rome, claimed that this was not a statement of fact but a guess—an attempt to combine the conjecture that the figures on the sarcophagus were Severus Alexander and his mother, with the conjecture of Teti that the vase had to do with the ancestry of Severus Alexander: Stuart Jones concluded that the provenience of the vase was therefore unknown. His arguments seem to have been accepted without scrutiny, and they are far from conclusive. If Vacca’s account is correct, and the sarcophagus contained nothing but some loose ashes, we are bound to assume that it had been plundered; and if this happened

45 Dr Donald Strong points out that there has probably been some modern re-cutting of the vase, for example where the right knee of this figure has been made to coincide exactly with the left edge of the column. The abnormal length of the left thigh suggests that the prototype which served the artist as model displayed, as the sarcophagi do, some of the weapons of Achilles beside him, which would mask the length of the thigh. I do not think they were actually shown on the Portland Vase, although the surface here has been damaged and perhaps re-cut.


48 Gli antichi sepolti (1697) xii, pls. 84–6.

49 Athenaeum (London) 4244 (1909) 265.
at the time of its discovery (which in the circumstances is quite possible, for the tomb was a chance find by a single ‘cavatore’, who is likely to have opened the sarcophagus and may have removed what was portable before divulging his secret). The contents may well have come on the market independently: and yet, through dealers, the connexion of the vase with the sarcophagus may have been well known, so well known that Teti did not trouble to mention it. Surely it would have been a most surprising conjecture for Teti to make, that the scenes on the vase had to do with the ancestry of Severus Alexander, unless he knew that it had been found in the sarcophagus supposedly of that Emperor? Furthermore, the suggestion that Bartoli invented the connexion between vase and sarcophagus in order to support Teti’s theory, is singularly unhappy, because Bartoli did not believe in Teti’s theory: he does not even mention it, and has a completely different theory of his own. It looks, therefore, as if the connexion between vase and sarcophagus must already have been generally accepted. Whichever way one reads the evidence, the argument ultimately rests on an inference ex silentio, and since my interpretation does not stand or fall by the conclusion reached, perhaps we may leave it at that.

Achilles, after death, was not alone on the White Island: Helen was there with him, and they were wedded. We do not know the origin of this legend, but Pausanias associates it with Stesichoros, which would take it back to the sixth century B.C. As early as the Kypria these two, Achilles and Helen, were marked out as the main characters of the Trojan war, and there is even a hint that he was enamoured of her, for there is that curious incident of which one would like to know more than the bald summary of the Kypria by Proclus tells us. Achilles was too young to have been one of Helen’s suitors: he had never seen her, and was not bound by the oaths which her suitors and the Greek leaders had taken to avenge her abduction; but, during the siege of Troy, at the moment when the Greeks, having made a formal demand that the Trojans should surrender Helen, had been refused, and had then made an unsuccessful attack on the city, Achilles, in the words of the summary, ‘desired to see Helen, and Aphrodite and Thetis arranged a meeting between them’. Apparently as a result of this, when the Greeks lose heart and are for returning home, Achilles prevents them. Whether the story of this meeting contributed later to the idea that Achilles and Helen were united after death one cannot say, but certainly it was believed that they were together on the White Island. This union may or may not seem a tasteful idea to us, but that is irrelevant: what concerns us is that it was the legend most widely current, and could thus readily be turned to symbolic use. The same process can be seen in the Underground Basilica, where the most varied myths are used for symbolic purposes.

We have then to discover what are the sculptural and pictorial types of Helen, and we begin with one about which there can be no doubt whatever, the sarcophagus, of Roman date, found at Kephisia near Athens (Figs. 4–7). On this is presented the creation of Helen, and her destiny, presumably with some symbolic connotation which does not directly concern us. On one end is Eros, who sets things going (Fig. 4): on the other the swan and Leda, from whose egg Helen was hatched (Fig. 5). On the front of the sarcophagus is Helen herself, standing between her brothers Castor and Polydeuces: she is a stately figure, fully draped in chiton and himation, a fairly distinctive sculptural type not quite like any one of the gods (Fig. 6). On the back there is the soul of Helen being carried into the after-life by

59 On the other hand, to judge from the restorations and re-working, the sarcophagus must have been damaged, and therefore perhaps plundered, in antiquity.
61 iii 19, 13.
62 F. Jouan, Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cyriens 41 with other references, 44.
63 καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀθηνᾶς Ἑλένην ἐνθημεῖ θεᾶσαθαι, καὶ συνήγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ Ἀφροδίτη καὶ Θέρας. Proclus Christomathy i (Hesiod, Loeb edn. p. 494). We may recall also the remark in Hesiod, Catalogues i 102 ff. that no man on earth would have won Helen, had she been a maiden, except Achilles. Cf. Euripides, Helen 98 ff.
64 Roscher Lexikon i 56, g. (1) (c) s.v. Achilles (Fleischer): cf. id. i 1951 s.v. Helena (Engelmann).
65 References in note 7.
66 Robert, Ant. Sarkophag. ii 9, no. 9, pl. iii.
a triton with oar and shell: she is reclining and is naked to the waist (fig. 7). The type is fairly near the reclining woman on the Portland Vase, but it is not a distinctive type, because this fashion of undress is affected in antiquity by a whole range of beings, chiefly nymphs, maenads and nereids. However, so far as it goes the evidence is not unfavourable, and there is some corroboration from two earlier sources, Etruscan cinerary urns and Greek vases. On the Etruscan urns, which are of Hellenistic date, there are two types used for Helen,
when she is leaving Sparta and is being led down to the ship by two of Paris’ companions. One type corresponds fairly closely to the front of the sarcophagus from Kephisia; but there is also another type in which the general scene is much the same, but Helen is naked to the waist (fig. 8); and since this is unsuitable for a long sea-voyage, we must assume that it is not practical but symbolic. The meaning is not far to seek, and here both literature and vases help us. Helen was surpassingly beautiful, but above all in the beauty of her breasts. In Aristophanes’ Lysistrata, the Spartan envoy, thinking of the well-known occasion when, at the taking of Troy, Menelaus pursued Helen in order to kill her, exclaims ‘yes, and Menelaos when he somehow saw the breasts of Helen naked, threw away the sword, I think’; and the scholiast comments ‘the account according to Ibycus: Lesches the Lesbian has the same in the Little Iliad. Euripides quotes Pherecrates “when he saw her breasts, throwing away the sword”’.  

When this incident is depicted on Greek vases, Aphrodite sometimes intervenes to save Helen, but more often it is simply the sight of Helen’s breasts which causes Menelaus to drop his sword. The story was evidently well known in Etruria, and in the fourth century B.C. there is a delightful vase-picture of it by the Nazzano Painter, which has been described inimitably by Beazley: ‘This is the most successful part of the picture, and the artist has drawn the group with relish, and even, one might fancy, with some personal feeling. Helen, in a himation only, trips away mincingly, with much white showing, and a perfect air of injured innocence.’ Similarly, to judge from some of the Athenian vases, it was this particular aspect of Helen’s beauty that enthralled Paris. Certainly on the Portland Vase both the pose, and the artist’s exquisite carving, combine to focus attention on this area. The pose, it has often been remarked, resembles that of Ariadne as the bride of Dionysus on vases, wall-paintings and reliefs; and this is appropriate, for the scene on the Portland Vase has an erotic side, however much sublimated (plate II).

Behind this figure is a tree, and the artist has made it quite clear that it is a plane-tree: it should therefore have some particular meaning. The eighteenth idyll of Theocritus, which

---

57 Brunn, I rilievi delle urne Etrusche pls. xvii, 2; xxv: L. B. Ghali-Kahil, Les enlevements et le retour d’Hélène pls. xcvi, 1; xcvi, 2; xcviii, 1, 2; xxix, 1–3.
58 Brunn, op. cit. pl. xvii, 1 (our fig. 8); xxiv, 15: Ghali-Kahil, op. cit. pl. xcvii, 1.
62 E.g. Metzger, Représentations . . . 280, no. 33, pl. xxxviii: Ghali-Kahil, Les enlevements . . . . pls. xxi (the same vase); vi, 1; xxiii, 1.
is sometimes thought to be based on a poem by Stesichoros, is in the form of an epitalamion of Helen, in which her erstwhile girl-companions sing that they will hang a lotus-crown on a tree, and will carve on it the words ‘Worship me, I am Helen’s tree’. It was, I need hardly say, a plane-tree. The whole passage shows how the emphasis falls on it being a plane: ‘We first will twine a wreath for thee of the low-growing lotus and will set it on a shady plane: we first will draw from the silver flask, and let drip, smooth oil beneath that shady plane. And on its bark shall be inscribed, in Dorian fashion, that passers-by may read, “Worship me: I am Helen’s tree”’.63 Andrew Gow, the latest editor of Theocritus, writes: ‘These lines plainly account aetiologically for a cult of Helen in which she is associated or identified with a plane-tree’; and it is commonly accepted that Helen is an ancient tree-goddess.64

This figure, which we have identified as Helen, holds in her left hand an expiring torch, reversed. On sarcophagi this attribute is commonly held by Thanatos and is a symbol of death: its meaning can hardly be different here, and it confirms the ultramundane setting.65 One other feature, perhaps the strangest thing on the vase, may point in the same direction, and that is the almost square block which lies beneath the woman’s foot (PLATES II and VIIa). This is carefully carved and must have some special significance. We have to settle two points about it: first, ‘What exactly is it?’ And second, ‘What does it mean?’ It is intended for a worked piece of stone, quite unlike the natural rocks on which it rests: it has a slot in the centre, presumably for a dowel, and is therefore an architectural piece, and, by comparison with the column on the left, perhaps a capital, although it has not the same slots on the side. This strange object is not unique: it recurs on the Blue Vase which we have already cited (PLATE VIII), and there again it is placed in a closely similar position, namely, on the ground nearly in the centre between the two principal figures, and beneath the foot of one of them. It has been thought to be a kind of trade-mark or an artist’s signature, but neither is likely, since the point of a trade-mark is that its meaning should be known; and it can hardly be an artist’s signature, for the two vases are clearly of different styles, and the Blue Vase, according to the generally accepted opinion, at least a generation later than the Portland.

It seems much more likely that the object has some meaning connected with the scenes of which it forms part. Now the Blue Vase was found, according to a contemporary account, in a tomb, and containing ashes: but whether this is true or not,66 its meaning is written all over it. There can be no doubt of the significance of these scenes: they give promise of a life after death. The souls of the dead, as children—a common Roman belief—are vicing and making music among the vines. In the lower frieze is a quiet pastoral scene, and on the two main faces of the vase a mystic vine runs riot, springing not only from the ground but also from the head of the god Bacchus himself. It is the Bacchic paradise. If the architectural block does have some bearing on the subject, then it may well be an esoteric sign of death: and if that is its meaning on the Blue Vase, it presumably bears the same meaning on the Portland Vase, and indicates that the two persons between whom it is placed are in the next world.67

63 xviii, 43-8.
πράται τοι στέφρανον λυστό χιμίαν αδιρμόνων
αλέξαισαν ακιάραν καταθήκως εν πλετάνων
πράται δ’ ἄργορλαξ ὑλίδος ύπραν ἄλλω
λαζύμων νταςέμας ὑπὸ ακιάραν πλετάνων
γραμματί δ’ ἐν φλοίῳ γεγοφαίνω, ὡς παρὼν τις
ἀνείηρας Δωράτης ἀσείμην μ’. Ἐλένας φρήν τῶν εἰμὶ.

65 Cumont, Mystères de Mithra i 211 f.
66 Haynes (op. cit. 21 n. 21), like Schulz, has doubted it.
67 A similar but not identical object appears on a cameo in Naples (Simon, op. cit. 3 f., pl. 20, 1). The subject is Daedalus and Icarus: on the right is a goddess generally supposed to be Britomartis, who is seated on rocks beside which the object rests. Its presence could be explained by her being an underworld goddess. The cameo has been thought to be false by L. Curtius, AA 1944-5, 5 f. In a picture from Pompeii of a symposium of Erotes and Psychai below a statue of Psyche (as Hekate), an Eros on the left of the scene has one foot on what looks like a fallen block of masonry, and a Psyche on the right has one
There is one little monument which does seem to display not identical, but analogous symbols, the altar of Amemptus in the Louvre.\(^{68}\) This is a sepulchral altar of about A.D. 20, on which the scene is certainly symbolic, and certainly refers to the life after death. It consists of a pair of centaurs, male and female, the male playing a lyre, the female a double flute: on the back of the one, Cupid is mounted, also fluting; on the back of the other, Psyche accompanies him on the castanets. These are generally agreed to be emblems of the soul and of celestial music; but more closely relevant to our present enquiry are the two objects lying on the ground between the centaurs—an empty drinking-horn reversed, and an empty mixing-bowl on its side. These are emblems of life ended, but ended in the hope of a Bacchic after-life; and the fallen capitals on the Portland Vase and the Blue Vase seem to belong to this kind of imagery.\(^{69}\)

Is there another representation of Achilles with Helen? One candidate, though a doubtful one, is the fragment of a mould for an Arretine bowl in Boston (FIG. 9).\(^{70}\) It comprises about a quarter of the total circumference of the bowl, with two figures and the remains of a third. One is a man, seated on a rock: he is naked, but a slight furrow in his hair suggests that he may be (or a prototype may have been) wearing a diadema. His head is turned sharply back to look at a woman, who is half-draped and appears to have a low stephanie on her head: it is not possible to say whether she too is on a rock, but the ground-line does seem to connect the two. The remains of the third figure are on the left: they consist of a twisted sceptre, common in Arretine ware, and some folds of drapery. This figure also may be seated, since there does not seem to be head-room for a standing figure on this scale. In short, there is a

---

\(^{68}\) Altmann, Grabaltäre pls. i–ii: Strong, La scultura Romana 60–2, fig. 39: Simon op. cit. 46, pl. 20, 2.\(^{69}\) One end of a marble urn of early Imperial date, from the tomb of the Volumnii at Perugia, is carved with a relief of various funerary symbols, one of which is a single Corinthian column supporting an overturned vase: G. Körte, Das Volumniergrab bei Perugia (Abb. Wiss. Göttingen N.F. xii, 1) 31 f. pl. vii, 2. Mrs Noel Oakeshott draws my attention to two passages in Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris (lines 50–3, 57) where a man is compared to a column; in the first, which describes a dream, the capital sprouts human hair. It is not a long step from this to regarding a fallen capital as an emblem of death, but I can find no ancient authority for it. The broken column, commonly used in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with this meaning, also seems to lack any ancient prototype.\(^{70}\) G. H. Chase, Catalogue of Arretine Pottery 69, no. 61, pl. xxvi.
superficial resemblance to the group on the Portland Vase, and although the types are not by any means identical, the evidence cannot be ignored.

We come now to the last figure on the Portland Vase, a goddess, because of the sceptre she holds (Plates IV and VIIb). Just as Peleus, by his movement inwards through the gateway, marks the beginning of the narrative, so this static figure, set somewhat apart, with a strong emphasis upon the vertical elements of the design—the rigid right arm, the sceptre—brings the sequence to a full stop. In this sense the two scenes on the two sides of the vase, though not continuous, are shown to be linked; and here, as on the other side, the group of three figures has an Olympian deity on the right. The effect of closure is strengthened by the plant which springs out from the base of the gateway and fills the space under the head of Okeanos: some of its leaves are white, some blue, and, as with the trees, this produces admirably the effect of foliage: it almost touches the knee of the goddess, and seems to belong as much to her as to the other scene. Haynes suggests that it may be a myrtle, which is possible;71 it could, alternatively, be a rose. Myrtle and rose are equally appropriate, for this majestic, sceptred figure must surely be Aphrodite, to whom both are sacred. This identification, confirmed by the statuette found in the sanctuary of Poseidon on Thasos (Fig. 10),72 has been suggested before, and suits my theory perfectly. She holds this dominating position for an evident reason, the same reason which made the title Kypria appropriate to the epic describing the events which led to the fall of Troy: Aphrodite was the chosen instrument of Zeus in his plan to rid the earth of its weight of impious mortals.73 Initially, the plan had two main elements, interdependent, the marriage of Peleus and Thetis, and the birth of Helen: and the author of the Kypria, whether Stasinos or another, had for his theme, as a scholiast tells us, the evolution of the plan, and the glorification of the two protagonists, Achilles and Helen.74 Aphrodite played a part throughout: it was she who united Peleus and Thetis; it was she who caused a feathered Zeus to mate with Leda: it was she who promised Helen to Paris: it was she who turned away the sword of Menelaus. On the Portland Vase it is she who now looks back, from her island shrine of Paphos, over the cycle of events which began with the union of Peleus and Thetis and ended with that of Achilles and Helen.

Nor is it difficult to guess the ulterior meaning with which the designer of the vase endowed this dominant figure: on the symbolic plane Aphrodite personifies the all-pervading power of love.

I have now discussed all the figures, attitudes, attributes, and elements of landscape. I have tried to deal with every one, and to show that all are significant, because a sound theory should fit all the facts, and not just an arbitrary selection of them. There is, however,

---

71 Ovid (Metamorph. xi 234) speaks of a myrtle-wood near the grotto of Thetis.
72 BCH li (1927) 489 f., fig. 7.
73 At the end of the Alexandros of Euripides, Aphrodite explained that her actions were the will of Zeus: Jouan, Euripide 52.
74 Scholiast on Iliad i 5 (Hesiod, Loeb edn. p. 496): Ghali-Kahil, op. cit. 28.
one more to add, and that is the handles; not their attachment, which we have already studied, but the handles themselves (Plates III and IV). They are carved in a series of V-shaped layers suggesting vegetative growth: the form, summary but quite unmistakable, is that of a palm-frond. The palm was the commonest emblem of triumph, and, in sepulchral imagery, of the triumph over death: nothing could be more apt.

Similarly with the persons represented, we must deal fairly with every one, and they must all fit in. They are few enough, only seven on the whole vase, and, if the interpretation is correct, each one of them must be seen to be essential: there must be neither supers nor intruders, by which I mean that to have anyone there who could be omitted without loss, would be as damaging to the interpretation as to have anyone there who was discordant. For instance, Möbius believes that the scene on one side is Theseus under the sea claiming Poseidon for his father: but in that scene Eros acting as guide would be quite inappropriate. Möbius believes that the other side shows Theseus, on Naxos, about to desert Ariadne; but apart from the fact that Ariadne should be asleep, Athena should be present, not Aphrodite, who at that moment is the last person to be needed. Thus both Eros and Aphrodite would be intruders. Haynes is in doubt about the identity of three of the seven persons, this shows that it would not much matter whether they were there or not, so little do they add to his interpretation. They are supers.

The merit of my own theory is that no one could be omitted: everyone plays an essential part, and adds something to the meaning. Under this interpretation the two scenes form perfect pendants to one another from all three points of view—the artistic, the mythological, and the symbolic, or, if one prefers to call it that, the religious.

From the artistic aspect, because in each the beloved is in the centre, with the lover on the left and an Olympian deity on the right. From the mythological, because in the one scene you have the origin, in the other the destiny, of the greatest of all Greek heroes: in the one, the beginning of the great Trojan story—Peleus married Thetis and begot Achilles; at their wedding-feast Eris threw down the apple of discord, which led to the judgement of Paris and the abduction of Helen: in the other, the end of that story, with the union of the two principal characters.

From the religious aspect the two scenes are equally satisfying: under the gaze of Celestial Love, one shows the entry of mortal man into the world immortal, the other the apotheosis of perfect valour and perfect beauty.

Bernard Ashmole.

75 For the stylization of the palm cf. Adriani, Coppa paesistica, pl. xliii, fig. 129, and pl. xliv.

76 In the time of Pausanias 'most of the games have a crown of palm, and everywhere a palm is placed in the victor's right hand' (viii 48, 2.) On the sepulchral meaning of the palm see Cumont, Symbolisme funéraire des Romains (1942) index s.v. palme.


TROJAN LEAP AND PYRRHIC DANCE IN EURIPIDES’
ANDROMACHE 1129-41

ος δὲ νυν περιστατόν
κύκλω κατείχων οὐ διδόντες ἀμπυνόας,
βωμοῦ κενώσας δεξιμηθον ἐσχάρας,
τὸ Τρωικὸν πῆθημα πηθήσας ποδόν
χαρεὶ πρὸς αὐτοῖς: οἱ δ’ ὅπως πελειάδες
ιέρακ’ ἱδοῦνα πρὸς φυγήν ἐνώτιον.


NEOPTOLEMUS, after defensive action with his shield against the missiles of the Delphians, decides to break away from the altar and try to escape—making in so doing ‘the well-known Trojan leap’, as Euripides says. This phrase plainly implies knowledge of a notorious incident of such a sort, associated, one might presume, with Neoptolemus himself. The schol. ad loc. however refers to a leap made by Achilles from the invasion ship on to Trojan soil, when a fountain of water shot up at the place he landed with his prodigious jump.¹ This incident may be alluded to in El. 439, where the invasion fleet is said to have brought τὸν . . . κοῦζον ἄλαμα ποδῶν Ἀχιλῆ . . . ἐπὶ Σιμωνίδεας ἀκτὰς. In later literature the legend is confirmed by Lycurphon Alex. 245 (with schol.) Πελειαγὸν ἄλαμα λαγηροῦ ποδὸς, and Antimachus fr. 59, where Πηλείους ἀπόροσαν ἐλαφρῶς ἡπτε κύρικος. The fact that Antimachus uses a simile which resembles ὅπως πελειάδες ιέρακ’ ἱδοῦνα of the Delphians in the Andromache might also be thought to connect the two passages, but the image is a common one and Antimachus seems to borrow more directly from Achilles’ leap on Hector in II. xxii 138-9 Πηλείους δ’ ἐπόρονε . . . ἡπτε κύρικος δρεπανί, ἐλαφρότατος πετενίων.

But although this explanation of ‘the Trojan leap’ is plausible enough,² and Norwood in his edition observes ‘obviously Neoptolemus leaping down from the altar suggests Achilles leaping down from the ship’, there is also evidence for a Trojan leap of Neoptolemus himself, and if this story (like the leap to shore of Achilles) came from a familiar Epic Cycle account of the war at Troy, it would be reasonable to suppose that Euripides had in mind an incident involving Neoptolemus rather than his father. The leap in question was the one made from the Trojan horse, in a version which made Neoptolemus the first to emerge: the schol. B on Hephaestion (p. 299.1 Consb.) recounting the tradition that the Pyrrhic foot and Pyrrhic Dance were named after Neoptolemus/Pyrrhus, says ἄλλοι δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ Πήρου παρομοιόμασθαι φασὶ. πρῶτο γὰρ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ δοῦρου ὑπὸ τηθήσαντι, ἐπικίκιον ὑμοῦ συνέβητο τοιοῦτον ἐχουτα μέτρον.³ His eagerness to leave the horse is familiar from Od. xi 531-2 (cf. 515), and doubtless his jump was told in the Iliou Persis or some other cyclic version of the wooden horse episode.⁴ Apollodorus,⁵ it is true, preserves a rival version in which one

¹ οἱ γάρ αντεταχότες τὰ Τρωϊκὰ φασίν ὡς τόπος ἐστὶν ἐν Τρῳ καλούμενος Ἀχιλλέως πῆθημα, ἔπερ ἀπὸ τῆς νεότης ἐπηθήσαν, οὕτως δὲ, φασί, μία ἡμέρα ἡ ὦ καὶ ἄχρον ἀναβάθησαι. Tzetzes in his note on Lyce. 245 refers to the Andromache passage in connection with Achilles’ leap.
² Of the editors of the play only Hermann seems to have expressed doubts about the traditional explanation. Wecklein observed that a reading πατρός for ποδῶν in 1139 would clarify the reference.
³ This note is given also in the Tractatus Urbanus p. 59 Koster, Nicetas de metris p. 111 Koster, Eust. 1697.3.
⁴ Neoptolemus, who achieved great prominence in the Cycle, enters the wooden horse first in Quintus Smyrnaeus xii 314, Tryphiodorus 152, Tzetzes Posthomerica 643. In Q.S. xiii 49 it appears that Odysseus leaves first. The references to this subject in a wide range of authors have been set out most recently by M. Ervin, A relief pithos from Mykonos (Arch. Delt. xviii 1963) 24 ff., who identifies the two main armed figures standing by the horse, in this early representation of the scene on a magnificent seventh-century pithos, as Neoptolemus and Odysseus.
⁵ v. 20.
Echion was the first to jump, killing himself in so doing—πρῶτος μὲν Ἐχῖων Πορθέως ἀφαλλόμενος ἀπέθανεν, and I suspect that this unique reference to a hero who is otherwise an ‘inscrutable nonentity’ may lie at the root of the notorious eccentricity in Verg. Aen. ii 263 Pelidesque Neoptolemus primusque Machaon. Any attentive reader of the Cycle might have remembered that Machaon could not have been in the horse, as he had already died in battle at the hands of Eurypylus; but, as one can scarcely countenance the possibility of Vergil’s having simply substituted for Echion a similar sounding, but better known, name which scanned, it seems that he was conversant with a list of the Greek heroes in the horse in which the unknown Echion’s name had been altered to the tolerably familiar Machaon. This hypothesis is curiously confirmed by the only other statement (apart from Hyginus 108, which probably depends on Vergil) that Machaon was numbered among the members of the Greek ambuscade, although Vergilian scholars appear not to have observed its significance in relation to the pre-Apollodorean Echion and Vergil’s Machaon. In one of the ‘letters of Hippocrates’, which is actually addressed to the Athenians by his son Thessalus (p. 318 Hercher), it is said that the sons of Asclepius benefited the Greeks οἱ τέχνη μόνον ἄλλα ὄψλοιο. Μαξάων γε τοι ψυχὴν κατέθετο ἐν τῇ Τροώδε, ὀτὲ, ὃς οἱ ταῦτα γράφοντες λέγοντα, ἐξ ἐπον ἐς πόλιν τὴν Πριάμου ἐνήθε. It can hardly be doubted that Machaon here who ‘laid down his life’ when entering Troy ‘from the horse’ has, as in the Aeneid, usurped the place of Echion, who somewhere in earlier literature broke his neck in his ill-fated Trojan leap. There is therefore no need to invent theories to explain Machaon’s priority in leaving the horse in Vergil, among which Austin’s ‘the surgeon would naturally precede in case of accidents’ is something of a collector’s piece. (In view of the background to his presence on this occasion at all, it would apparently have been a case of ‘physician, heal thyself’.)

It is tempting to conjecture that the mysterious Echion son of Portheus—‘Snake-man, son of Sacker’—may essentially be none other than Neoptolemus himself, arising from a misunderstanding of, or invention based upon, some Lycephon-style riddling phrase in which he was so described. Neoptolemus is the Σκύριος δράκων of Lyc. 185, a δεῖνος ἀρταμος δράκων (327), and son of one who is himself ἄγριος δράκων (309); in Verg. Aen. ii 469 ff. (where incidentally Pyrrhus is said to exultare, as Pindar in the same context makes him ἐπειθορεῖν [Pae. vi 115])—it is interesting how prominent the ‘leaping’ motif is in his Trojan exploits) he is compared in a memorable simile to a coluber mala gramina pastus, etc., renewing its youth and emerging from hibernation, resplendent in the sunlight, as befits the successor of Achilles in the ultimate destruction of Troy. Finally, in the famous portent of the three grey snakes which forecast the successful and unsuccessful attempts to sack Troy (Pind. Ol. viii 37 ff.), the third snake which ‘leaped over with a shout’ (ἀνάρρησας βοῶν) was Neoptolemus, and is to be imagined scaling the wall at the point where the horse was ultimately dragged in. As to ‘Echion’s’ father ‘Portheus’, πτολπροβὸς is of course a traditional epithet of Achilles (Hom. II. viii 372, xv 77, xxi 550, xxiv 108). The theme of an expendable warrior jumping from the horse to his death—before even the chief avenger Neoptolemus—may have been inserted in the tradition in imitation of the story of Protesilaus preceding Achilles in landing on Trojan soil at the beginning of the invasion.

Although we have only the evidence of late metrical scholia and Eustathius for Neoptolemus’ leap from the horse, its relevance for the Τρωικῶν πτῆμα of the Andromache

---

* A story which recalls the fate of Protesilaus who preceded Achilles in his fatal leap on to Trojan soil.
* Paus. iii 26.9 (referring to the Little Iliad), Hyg. Fab. 113, Q-S. vi 391 ff., Eust. 1697.
* Athen. 610ε shows that the identification of the Greek chief tains in the horse was a matter for speculation.
* On which see most recently D. E. Hill’s article in CR n.s. xiii (1963) 2-4.
* Schol. on 52a: ὅνο μὲν δράκωντα 'Ἀγγέλλα καὶ Αἴαντα ὁ δὲ περιγεγυμένου 'Ἀγγέλλων τόι.
* Schol. on 52b: εἰσῆλθαν ὁ δράκων, ὃ ὅ οἱ Ἐλλήνες εἰσῆλθαν διὰ τοῦ δοντικοῦ.
is made more striking by the fact that it comes in an account of the attribution of the Pyrrhic dance also to Neoptolemus, since a few lines earlier Euripides manifestly alludes to this same tradition.  

πυκνή δὲ νυφάδι πάντοθεν σποδούμενος προύτεινε τευχή κάφωλασσεν’ ἐμβολας ἐκείσε κάκειον ἀστίδ’ ἐκτείνων χερ.’ ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν ἦνεν· ἀλλὰ πάλι’ ὁμοὶ βέλη, οἰστοί, μεσάγγυλα ἐκλυτοὶ τ’ ἀμφώβαλοι αφαγής ἐγώρουν ὑποφόροι ποδῶν πάροι.  

dεὺνας δ’ ἄν εἴης πυρρίχαις φρουρουμένοιν βέλεμα παιδός.  

(Andromache 1129–36).

In fact Euripides in this passage refers to two features of the Pyrrhic dance which seem to have been especially characteristic, the manipulation of the shield in defence (1131) and the leap in the air (1139). Plato mentions both in his account of the dance (Leg. 815a) τὴν πολεμικὴν (sc. ὀρχεσίαν) ... πυρρίχαιν ἀν τῶν ὁρθῶν προσαγωγοὺς, τὰς τε εὐθαλείας παρὰ πληγῶν καὶ βολῶν ἐκκνεύσεα καὶ ὑπετείξα τάση καὶ ἐκπονήσεαν ἐν ύψει καὶ σὺν ταπευσώσει μμουμένην.

Arthurianus (Nub. 988–9) criticises the effete youth of Athens who cannot in their dancing wield the shield above groin level.

ὅστε μ’ ἀπάγχεσθ’ ὡστ’ ὁρκεσίαν Παναθηναίους δέον αὐτοὺς τὴν ἀστιὰ τῆς κυλῆς προεχών ἀμελὴ τις Τριτογενεῖς.

Xenophon (Anab. vi 1.10) records the identical characteristics in an armed Persian dance: τέλος δὲ τὸ Περσικῶν ὀρχεσίαν κρούσων (κροτῶν Ἀθην. 16a) τὰς πελτὰς καὶ ὀψάλακε καὶ ἔξαντας, and they appear to be described in a corrupt passage of Diomede Ars Gramm. i 475.15 Keil in an attribution of the invention of the Pyrrhic dance to Neoptolemus ... vel a Pyrrho Achillis filio, qui crebris et citis exultationibus bis breviter prominentem clipeum genibus incumbens et per hunc hostibus terrem inmittens inferebatur, sicut versus inlustrat ὑπασπίδα προβεβάντι [II. xiii 807].

13 Cook (Zeus i 483) quotes a letter from Jane Harrison suggesting that Neoptolemus’ Trojan leap ‘may stand in some relation to the game of Troy’. I do not propose to follow up this speculation, but observe that an equation of the lusus Troiae and Pyrrhic dance is made by Servius on Aen. v 602, quoting Suetonius, lusus ipse, quem vulgo pyrrhicam appellant, Troia vocatur, and implied also by Plotius Sacerdos (vi 497.16 Keil) who quotes Aen. v 585 ciebant simulacra pugnae in deriving the pyrrhic foot a pyrricha, lusus genere.


15 On the importance of the shield in the Pyrrhic dance, see Downes, CR xviii (1904) 101 ff., and my article ‘Notes on the Plutarch De musica and the Chiron of Pherecrites’ (to appear shortly in Hermes).

16 So Athens at the moment of birth πιθή καὶ πυρριχίζει καὶ τὴν ἀσπίδα τυνίσασε (Luc. D. Deor. 8); and cf. σακεπαλὸν ἀλλὰ χορεῖς of Cnossian Corybants (Nomn. D. iii 63), with whom armed dancing is conventionally associated.

17 Cf. the description of an Assyrian dance in Hld. Aeth. iv 17.1 ἀσκίματοι ἀρτὶ μὲν κούροις ἄλμας εἰς φόρος αὐρώμενοι, ἀρτὶ δὲ τὴ γεγαυκές ἐπικλέσεωιν καὶ στροφὴ ἄλμασιμα ὁπαρει οἱ κάταροι δεινοτοικές, and the recommendation of dancing as a form of physical exercise in Gal. san. tund. vi 155 K ἐν αἷς (κακαῖς) ἀλλοτρία μέγατα καὶ περιδορών τάραμα καὶ ἀκόλουσεν ἐξαντάζεσεν καὶ προσανολόμειον καὶ διασειροῦσε ἐπὶ πλῆθος τὰ σκέλη. Agathias (Hist. ii 1) uses περιδόνεσθαι of the armed Pyrrhic dance.

18 Keil records emendations of prominentem to promovens, or incumbens to incutiens, but both words seem sound in this context, promover being equivalent to the use of προέχειν and προ (ἐκ—) teineōn of the shield in Aristophanes and Euripides, while genibus incumbens recalls the ὁδοίας referred to in the Greek accounts of armed dancing. Bis breviter in Diomede —an attempt presumably to ‘explain’ the double-short of the pyrrhic foot with reference to some feature of Neoptolemus’ steps or gestures—is, however, ill connected with either the previous or subsequent words; so perhaps an additional participle, e.g. vibrans, has fallen out, of which prominentem clipeum is the object. Diomede later uses vibrationis (corrupted
According to Athen. 631c an alternative name for the Pyrrhic was *cheironomia*, καλεῖται δὲ ἡ πυρρίχη καὶ χειρονομία, and there is other evidence that actual weapons might be dispensed with and represented instead by mimetic movements in the performance of armed dancing. For example, the movement or dance called εὐφωμὸς featured mimetic *cheironomia* (Suid. ἐυφώμως τὸ χειροτονεῖν, παραπλήσιον ἔξει εὗ τὸ τῆς χειρὸς σχήματα ποιεῖν). And although the iconographic evidence includes representations of Pyrrhics manipulating their shields in traditional fashion, I should like to draw attention to a motif in which a combatant drapes the fold of his *chlamys* over the extended left arm bent at the elbow, as if imitating the position of the shield. The gloss in Hesychius πυρρίχα· χλαμὼς ἡ πελτάριον might well refer to the use of cloak in lieu of shield in the Pyrrhic dance.

It is therefore worthy of note that a line of the *Hermione* of Pacuvius (186 Ribbeck) has been preserved which almost certainly will have come from the same incident in this play as described in the *Andromache*, where Neoptolemus attempts to protect himself from the missiles of the hostile Delphians:

currum liquit: clamide contorta astu cleipeat braccium.

If this description is imitated from Sophocles’ *Hermione*, as seems a likely enough hypothesis, one could add this to the references which associate the Pyrrhic dance and its origins with the person of Neoptolemus. But in addition one could surmise that in contemporary Athens a sophisticated version of the dance was prevalent in which the performer made play with cloak movements of the left arm in imitation of the actual shield. This in turn might explain Aristophanes’ contemptuous reference in the *Clouds* 987 σῦ δὲ τῶν νῦν εὖδος ἐν ἱματίοις προδιδάκτες ἐντευκλύθης, when he goes on in the following lines to refer to the sorry mess that the young Pyrrhics get into when they endeavour to wield their shields themselves in the once approved manner.

The attitude described in Pacuvius’ line is faithfully reproduced in a scene showing Neoptolemus’ murder at Delphi by Orestes on a red figure Apulian amphora. His left arm is raised in the chlamys-shield posture, although it has failed to protect him. Although the scene has been taken to reflect the description in the *Andromache*, the absence of the real shield, of which so much is made by Euripides, is against this, and Sophocles’ *Hermione* may have been the source of this motif.
A final point of interest in the association of the Trojan leap with the incident of the wooden horse, which might suggest that it was part of the epic tradition on which the Attic tragedians drew so heavily both in broad outline and small detail, is the memorable passage in the *Agamemnon* 824 ff. about the Argives' leap on Troy:

πόλιν δημάθησεν 'Αργείων δάκος,
ίππου νεοσοσ, ἀσπιδήστροφος λέως,
πιθήκο' ὄρυκας ἀμφί Πλειάδων δύον·
ὑπερθόρων δὲ πύργων ὀμπατής λέων
ἀδὴν ἔλειξεν αἵματος τυραννικοῦ.

Two points may be remarked on here, in view of the background of the epic tradition and its rich associations which I have hypothesised: first, that there is a real point in calling the Greeks (with Neoptolemus even though unnamed here familiar as the leader of the leap from the horse) 'the shield-twisting folk'—beside the MS. ἀσπιδήστροφος (־στροφος), Blomfield's ἀσπιδήσφος, printed by Fraenkel and Denniston-Page, is colourless. Secondly, the expression 'Ἀργείων δάκος will suggest to most Greek readers (though apparently not Aeschylean editors) a reference to a lurking serpent, an image which I have shown above to be especially associated with Neoptolemus in the episode of the sack of Troy. For although δάκος may be used of dangerous, biting animals in general (Eur. Ἰππ. 646, Cyc. 325, Callim. H. iii 84), in Aeschylus it is almost always used of the snake,24 and most memorably elsewhere in the *Orestes*: in Ag. 1232–3 Clytaemnestra is δυσφίλες δάκος, ἀμφίβολα, in Cho. 535 the δράκων to which she dreams she gives birth is νεογενὲς δάκος (cf. δειγμένον in 995 where she is compared to μῦραν or ἔχοντα, as also in 249). In Supp. 894 ff., although the text is doubtful, the sons of Aegyptus are referred to successively as δῆφες, ἔχοντα, δάκος.25 Similarly, when Euripides (Tro. 284) calls Odysseus παρανόμῳ δάκει the area of meaning is narrowed immediately by the following διπτόχος γλώσσα—he is the 'spotted snake with double tongue'. Fraenkel is surely over-cautious when he says (in his note on Ag. 824) that Aeschylus uses δάκος in the sense of 'dangerous animal'. Nicander's use of the word is equally specific—of snakes in general (Ther. 115),26 of the asp (158), of the dipsas, a kind of echidna (336), of the haemorrhoids (282), while the Hesychian gloss δίκη· θηρία καὶ δάκος· ἐρέτος refers both to its general and particular uses.27 It should be recognised, therefore, that δάκος in Ag. 824 is not simply the lion of 827, as seems to be assumed by over-literary commentators who seek to press Aeschylus' brilliant, kaleidoscopic series of images into a single rational pattern: one moment the Greek force is the treacherous snake lurking in a hollow ready to bite.28

art in connexion with Heracles and the Nemean lion (cf. Theoc. xxv 253 ff.)

24 Or creatures with serpentine associations, such as the sphinx (Sept. 558), offspring of Echidna (Hes. Th. 326, Apollod. i 5.8, etc.) and sometimes depicted with a snake's tail (cf. A.P. xiv 63, schol. Eur. Ph. 1760). In P.V. 583 (πονίτως δάκες δος βορας) there may be, as Paley observes, an allusion to the story of Andromeda and the sea-serpent (usually called κῆτος, and the whale is βλασφινον δάκος τ' ἀμφετρίτης in Opp. Hal. ν 333, but in art the monster is shown rather as a sea-draco). Fr. 186 Mette, βῆμα τ' ἀπτερον δάκους appears to refer to the Nemean lion, also born of Echidna (Hes. Th. 327) and perhaps imagined as snake-tailed, and it is possible that Aeschylus could even refer to it as χωρίτης δράκων in fr. 185 of the same play (Leon Satyriakes)—see Mette, Der verlorene Aischylus 152–4. So too when snake-tailed Cerberus is called δάκετον in Callim. fr. 515 one feels the choice of word is to some extent influenced or coloured by the adj. ἔχοντα, referring once more to its snaky parent. In Sophocles δάκος appears to occur only once, in fr. 210.52—oddly enough of wounds inflicted by Neoptolemus, possibly on Eurypylus. I am reminded of Aeschylus' use (Eum. 181) of δῆφες as an arrow, while Sept. 399 λόφον δὲ κόκων τ' ἐν δάκους' ἀνειρός διστάτω, sustains the earlier image of Tydeus as a hissing serpent (381).

25 And perhaps also βος, if the word is to be interpreted as referring to the snake of this name (see Plin. N.H. viii 14.36 cited in Murray's app. crit.).

26 Also 121, 146: the only use of a creature other than a venomous snake seems to be 818 (of the salamander).

27 Cf. id. i.e. ἀκονταίς, Ar. Av. 1069, and schol. Ar. Plut. 884 (and adnot. in Dubner p. 590) on the syphonatic δήμημα . . . ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρπτών ἐλημένην.

28 When Quint. Smyrn. (xii 314) calls the wooden horse κηρύκος, his image suggests the belly of a sea-monster (see n. 24, above)—the πολυκανθάρα νηθὸν of
then emerging as though born of the horse, it is transformed into the ravening lion which gluts itself on the princely blood of Troy. At the same time ‘the jump of the shield-twisting folk’ has the more human associations which I have shown to allude, if even only faintly, to Neoptolemus, the author of the Trojan Leap and the Pyrrhic Dance.

A number of the authorities who refer to the latter invention, state that the occasion of the world premiere of the Pyrrhic dance took place after Neoptolemus had slain Euryphylus (the same Euryphylus, incidentally, whose own previous victim, Machaon, gained his unmerited posthumous glory by asserting his dubious precedence to Pelides Neoptolemus in leaving from the horse). Alternatively, he is said to have danced it at his father’s funeral. The ‘excerpta Juliuni’ (v 322.11 Keil) states ... a Pyrrho, filio Achillis, eo quod ad funus patris armatus eodem metro lusert; sive quoc interempto Euripide [sic!] eodem metro saltavit armatus, mentis gaudia exultatione confirmans. ‘Euripide’ here is another amusing example of mistaken identity; and although Keil prints it, with the curious observation that there may be a reference to Cinesias the Attic dithyrambist, who is associated with the Pyrrhic in Ar. Ran. 153 (mentioned in Diomedes op. cit. i 475.23 Keil) and might be thought (one presumes) to have greeted the news of the tragedian’s death in this unsympathetic fashion, clearly the name is a corruption of Euryphylus, and Keil withdrew his suggestion in his note on Audax vii 334.8, where Euryphylus is again mentioned.

Here too, however, Neoptolemus has a rival for his invention, in the person of his own father Achilles, said to have danced the Pyrrhic round the pyre of Patroclus (Arist. fr. 519 Rose, ap. schol. Pind. P. ii 127). Forced to live under the shadow of so great a name, it is only fair that in compensation he should in his last hours at Delphi, in the lines of Euripides, be allowed to re-enact the celebrated leap, not of his father, but of his own. Moreover, if Lucian is to be trusted, it was Neoptolemus’ dancing which overthrew Troy, a fact which would have caused Achilles some satisfaction: πολυθύνω δὲ καὶ ἄλλωσ τῶν ἤρων εἰπεῖν ἐκὼν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐγγεγυμνασμένους καὶ τέχνην τὸ πράγμα πεποιημένου ἰκανοῦ ἱγούμια τὸν ἕνοπτολεμον, Ἀχιλλέως μὲν παιδα ὡντα, πάντω δὲ διαπέμπασ αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ῥηχτικῇ καὶ εἶδος τὸ κάλλιστον αὐτῷ προστεθεικότα, Πυρρήχων ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ κεκλημένον καὶ ὁ Ἀχιλλέως ταῦτα ὑπὲρ τοῦ παιδὸς πυθαλαμένου μᾶλλον ἔχαρεν, οἷς μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ κάλλε χεὶς τῇ ἄλλῃ ἀλήκτικω ἄλλως, τογαροῦν τὴν “Πλοῖον τέως ἀνάλωτον ὡνταν ἡ ἐκείνην ῥηχτικὴν καθελε καὶ εις ἐδαφὸς κατέρρυσε. (Luc. Salt. 9).

University of Edinburgh.

Opp. Hal. v 331. Quintus himself uses πολυθύνω of the horse a few lines before (307). Knop. loc. cit., refers to the serpent imagery found in Latin poets in connexion with the horse, which includes not only the fairly obvious latebrae (cf. Verg. Aen. ii 38, 55 with Stat. Theb. ii 413), but other words and phrases naturally used of snakes, like serpere equum (Prop. iii 13.64).

As contemporary taste is notably different in its attitude to puns from that of the Attic tragedians, I may refer to three verbal associations in this passage which, if accidental, form a curious coincidence: the λέων becomes a λέων, the δάκος is 'Ἀργεσίος (ἀργης) or ἀργάς is a kind of serpent, and Harpocr. 32.16—cf. Ach. trag. fr. 1—says that the Argives especially τῶν ὄρων ἀργάν ἐκάλοντο), and is ἀσπαξάμενος (ἅσπις is attested of the snake in Hdt. iv 191—the ἄνδροκράτων δάκος ἄλλος of Nic. Ther. 158—and is the subject of a humorous γραφής in Ar. Vesp. 23. Fraenkel himself, loc. cit., refers to this passage as containing a characteristic Aeschylean gryphos.) Incidentally Eur. 181 πτήνους ἀργητήν ὄρων, referred to in p. 22, n. 24, appears also to allude to ἀργης.

As was noticed by Moriz Haupt (Opuscula iii 540).

ORIGINS OF GREEK SCULPTURE

These notes on the beginnings of Greek sculpture contain little that has not been said before, but aim at applying a severer logic to the evidence and the conclusions drawn from it. The problems may be defined as what models were used by early Greek sculptors, why they chose those models, where the choice was made, and what the impulse was that induced them to take up this new art.

The earliest surviving Greek sculpture worth the name is of the Daedalic style, which Jenkins has analysed neatly in his *Dedalica*. This style began in the second quarter of the seventh century and continued into the last quarter. So much is fairly generally accepted.

The artistic influence of Egypt on Greece has been propounded since the eighteenth century, and there are still many students who see its effects in sculpture. Usually their arguments are very general, asserting similarity of types and technical methods rather than of style. Of the Archaic Greek types the kouros is most apparently comparable to Egyptian—an upright, four-square figure with arms held to its sides and one foot in front of the other. Except for the stance this is the most obvious pose for a standing figure, and there are essential specific differences, well defined by Schrader. The stock Egyptian male has a support behind the forward leg, tilts backwards, and wears a kilt; the Greek kouros stands free, has a more mobile poise and is naked (except in the Daedalic style for a belt). As for resemblances in detail, Richter and Carpenter single out the roll of stone clenched in the hand of some Greek kouroi; this does not seem a regular or very early feature, and it may be a technical coincidence to avoid hollowing the inside of the closed fist. The 'layer wig' of course, though of Egyptian origin, is not so common in Egyptian sculpture and was already naturalised in Phoenician and Syrian art. The Greek kore is still more distinct from the standing female of Egypt and it is more usual to look for Asiatic prototypes. The third common type of Archaic Greek sculpture is the seated figure; here the pose is simple enough for casual invention. Anyhow, for a general stylistic reason any close dependence of the earliest Greek sculpture on Egyptian sculpture is inherently unlikely. The effect of a sophisticated art on craftsmen whose tradition is still simple or undeveloped is normally a clumsy sophistication, especially in detail; the Daedalic style is remarkable for its uncompromisingly abstract simplicity.

In spite of these difficulties few recent writers on early Greek sculpture reject completely the influence of Egyptian sculpture. Some still find that influence at the beginning of the Daedalic style. Others prefer to shift it to the end of Daedalic in the late seventh century, when the profile view was studied more attentively and statues of superhuman size became observed (Kr. Br. 249–50), the original Egyptian form is a kilt, which in Phoenicia is changed into a hanging palmette; the Greek form follows the Phoenician.

1 Some students disapprove of the term 'Daedalic' as implying a fallacious connexion with the sculptor Daedalus; but it is convenient and clear, and till Daedalus is brought down to earth cannot confuse even pedants.
5 It is generally impossible to demonstrate whether details of Egyptian origin reached Greece directly or indirectly, but there is one very clear instance of indirect transmission. This is the appendage below the sphinx's forelegs on Cycladic amphorae of the Heraldic group, datable probably to the early seventh century (*Délcos* xvii, pl. 5-7a and 8a). As Kunze observed (Kr. Br. 249–50), the original Egyptian form is a kilt, which in Phoenicia is changed into a hanging palmette; the Greek form follows the Phoenician.
6 R. Heidenreich, *die Antike* xiv (1938) 349 (I have not seen this review). R. J. H. Jenkins in *Dedalica* and T. J. Dunbabin in *the Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours* seem by their silence to exclude Egyptian influence.
fashionable. This later dating of Egyptian influence means that the kouros type must be excluded, since it had appeared already in Daedalic, and though after the foundation of Naukratis—apparently in the last years of the seventh century—Greek familiarity with Egypt must have become widespread, the development of Greek sculpture towards a more natural representation of anatomy proceeds straightforwardly through Daedalic to Cleobis (as Jenkins’s analysis shows) and on from Cleobis through the later kouroi of mainland Greece. For this reason perhaps the New York kouroi is more often chosen to illustrate the impact of Egypt. In our present state of knowledge the sculptor of the New York kouroi must be considered eccentric and, though the emphasis on the side view appears earlier in Attic work, that does not explain away his originality. Comparison with Cleobis makes it look as if he was deliberately going counter to the old Daedalic recipe for the head, substituting depth in profile, ovoid forms and a low focus of interest, and there are contrasts in the body too. Yet there is nothing here that is specifically Egyptian, unless one counts the roll held in the hand, and the supposed resemblance seems to reside in ‘monumentality’ or, more simply, in the impressive size and greater respect for depth. Neither of these qualities needs to be attributed to intervention from outside Greece.

It seems to me that for reasons of style there can have been no direct influence of Egyptian sculpture on Greek in the seventh century and that no Greek sculptor of that time shows any sign of having observed an Egyptian statue. The most that can be allowed is that the affinities of Greek and Egyptian are of a very general kind that might have been transmitted by hearsay. Diodorus’s description of a kouros in Samos (which should be of the later sixth century) is sometimes quoted to support Greek dependence on Egypt—κατά τὸ πλεῖον παρειμφέρει τοὺς Ἀιγυπτίους, ός ἣν τὰς μὲν χεῖρας ἔχουν παρατεταμένας, τὰ δὲ χερσὶν διαβεβηκότα. It shows rather that the similarities between Greek and Egyptian standing male statues

9 References in Richter, op. cit. 26–27. Curiously, though she describes these Daedalic males as kouroi, she excludes them—as ‘forerunners’—from her catalogue of kouroi.
10 Though there are no earlier Greek finds in Egypt, that does not exclude earlier Greek acquaintance with Egypt, since one would be lucky to find traces of occasional visitors; but presumably close relationship began with Naukratis.
12 Attic kouroi of the sixth century belong generally to the tradition represented by Cleobis and the assimilation can be considered as beginning in the Sunium kouroi (cf. Homann-Wedeking, op. cit. 82–4), even if—or so I suspect—its face has been restored with Cleobis in mind. Though the influence of the New York kouroi has been discerned in the next generation of Attic sculpture or even longer (cf. H. Payne and G. M. Young, Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis 2–3) yet I doubt if without the New York statue and its companions such a preliminary stage would have been suspected in Attic sculpture. There is more in Homann-Wedeking’s contention that they affected development in the Cyclades (op. cit. 86–91).
13 Notably the terracotta sphinx from the Ceramicus (AA 1933, 271 fig. 6; Homann-Wedeking, op. cit. fig. 17).
14 The New York kouroi is usually said to be a few years older than Cleobis but its stylistic peculiarities make close chronological comparisons hazardous. E. P. Harrison has now proposed a later dating of the New York, Dipylon and Sunium kouroi, but brings down Cleobis too (Ath. Agora xi, 3–5, 12).
15 These characteristics are still more strongly marked in the Dipylon head, to which Harrison has attributed other fragments (Hesp. xxiv [1955] 290–304). Harrison suggests that, contrary to the usual view, the Sunium kouroi may be earlier than the New York and Dipylon kouroi and shows that the stylistic criteria are not compelling. If (as is generally agreed) these three figures are by one sculptor or from one workshop, this would mean that the first stage was the more orthodox and the later the more original, a development that seems to me reasonable.
16 How much thought early sculptors gave to aesthetic proportion and balance can be seen very clearly in the length of arm of these two statues.
17 i 98–9.
can be defined adequately in a short verbal description. This is also what may be inferred from the half avenue of lions at Delos. The notion of an avenue probably came from Egyptian sanctuaries, since such avenues are not known elsewhere, but the lions themselves are altogether un-Egyptian.\(^\text{18}\)

The technical arguments for Egyptian influence are the use of a standard grid (or 'canon') for planning a statue and the special methods of carving hard stone. That the Egyptians used a grid is certain; but though Archaic Greek sculptors naturally had some rough rules of proportions, no systematic and detailed canon has been deduced from the measurement of surviving statues, and in the Daedalic style at least it is plain that proportions changed quickly.\(^\text{19}\) There is of course the story in Diodorus (just referred to) about the kouroi in Samos: its two sculptors, who lived in the later sixth century and had been in Egypt, each did a (vertical) half and the two halves fitted perfectly.\(^\text{20}\) In spite of the impracticability of this procedure Diodorus is cited as a witness, admittedly confused, for the Greek use of the Egyptian canon, although his own comment (usually not cited) states expressly that the procedure was Egyptian and not Greek. The story must in part and could in whole be based on the observation that Archaic statues are vertically symmetrical. Nor is the correspondence of the twin statues of Cleobis and Biton evidence of a generally accepted canon, and indeed their proportions appear unusually heavy.\(^\text{21}\) There is more solidity in a suggestion of Adam's about the roughly blocked out kouroi found in quarries on Naxos and in Attica, that if the blocking out was done by the quarrymen, they must have used a recognised canon;\(^\text{22}\) but a quarry canon for blocking out an elaborate kore would have been difficult to devise (as Adam herself remarks), the colossal draped male blocked out and abandoned at Apollona in Naxos\(^\text{23}\) is uncanonical, and the economic organisation of Greece in the sixth and still more in the seventh century was not advanced enough to encourage such specialisation of labour as the partial prefabricating of statues.\(^\text{24}\) So the alternative solution remains more likely, that the sculptor went himself to the quarry to choose a block and for easier and cheaper transport removed some of the surplus weight.

According to Carpenter, the technical methods by which the Greeks carved marble must have been learnt in Egypt.\(^\text{25}\) Adam seems to support him.\(^\text{26}\) I do not know enough to judge about technical differences between carving soft and hard stones; but if the first Greek sculptors of marble had learnt their technique in Egypt (or even from an emigrant

\(^{18}\) Cf. Homann-Wedeking, op. cit. 68–70. The date of the lions is probably around 600 B.C.

\(^{19}\) A general canon derived from Egypt is asserted by Karo (op. cit. 109), Carpenter (op. cit. 9 and 99–100), Boardman (the Greeks Overseas 161–2), and perhaps E. Iversen (Mitt. Kairo 1957, 134–47). Iversen examines the New York kouroi, which is of course later than Daedalic, finds that it conforms with the Saite Egyptian grid vertically (though not horizontally), and concludes that early Greek sculptors used a canon, but were independent in style, taste and mode of expression.' Levin doubts any 'consistent or fixed Greek use of the Egyptian canon' (op. cit. 19).

\(^{20}\) j 98.5–9.

\(^{21}\) G. Kaschnitz-Weinberg proposed an Argive master for Cleobis with a Cycladic ('Ionian') pupil for Biton (Studies presented to D. M. Robinson i, 525–31) and Homann-Wedeking concurs (op. cit. 8). They seem to me to have exaggerated the differences between the two statues; but even if the modelling of Biton is less firm than that of Cleobis, this could be because the practice of copying was unfamiliar.

\(^{22}\) S. A. Adam, the Technique of Greek Sculpture 7–8. C. Blümel, Gr. Bildhauerarbeit 48–51, nos. 1, 2, 4, 5.

\(^{23}\) Blümel, Greek Sculptors at Work, figs. 2–4.

\(^{24}\) As Adam says (op. cit. 8), a standard canon for blocking out by quarrymen, unsupervised by the sculptor, would certainly not have been practicable for statues of the Classical period, when economic organisation was more advanced.

\(^{25}\) Op. cit. 4, 7, 8–9, 13–16. This, I suppose, is why (ignoring Jenkins's demonstration) he makes the Nikandre statue no earlier than the New York kouroi (op. cit. 22): Egyptian influence appears with the New York kouroi, but Nikandre's statue is already of marble. He leaves himself a further way out, by postulating transmission of Egyptian influence through lost Samian and Milesian statuary (op. cit. 13–16); yet Samos has been prolific of Archaic statues and evidently the Daedalic style was current there (E. Buschor, Altsam. Standbilder v, 76–81).

\(^{26}\) Op. cit. 12 and 28. Blümel allows a choice between Egyptian and Asiatic influence (Greek Sculptors at Work 26).
Egyptian sculptor), they should have picked up something of Egyptian style as well.\textsuperscript{27} Perhaps marble was already being carved or dressed for other uses and the Daedalic pioneers used and improved on existing methods.\textsuperscript{28}

Syria and the adjacent parts of Asia also practised the art of sculpture, and it is claimed by some that the Greek kore had its origin there.\textsuperscript{29} There are details of Daedalic figures that are possibly or even probably taken from Asiatic statues,\textsuperscript{30} but general resemblances only appear plausible after the Daedalic period. Besides, the objection to a close Egyptian connexion holds also for a close Asiatic connexion, that the early Greek statues make no attempt at sophistication.

These conclusions from the style of early Greek statues are reinforced by economic probability. If one considers the status of the pioneers of Greek sculpture, it is very unlikely that such craftsmen had the opportunity or means to visit Egypt or Syria to study there, or that some rich benefactor brought over an Egyptian or Syrian master to teach them. Nor is there the slightest evidence, material or literary, that foreign statues were imported.

Presumably the Greeks had some idols of deities before the seventh century, but most students do not consider them as sculpture or relevant to the Daedalic style.\textsuperscript{31} This is reasonable. First, no style suitable for large sculpture is visible in Greek Geometric and Subgeometric figurines. Secondly, the four sizable stone figures that have so far been claimed as earlier than Daedalic show not only little or no sense of sculptural style but also no unity among themselves;\textsuperscript{32} and though one must allow that wood usually perishes it is uneconomical to postulate without some valid need a distinct and coherent style of sculpture in wood. Thirdly, the abstract simplicity of the Daedalic style does not appear to have a long evolution behind it. Fourthly, even the ‘plank-like’ form of the Nikandre statue is against imitation of wood; stone is cut in rectangular blocks or slabs, but till the power-driven saw came into use logs were easier to produce than boards and no less convenient as blanks from which to carve a human semblance of largish size.\textsuperscript{33} It would, of course, be absurd to deny the existence of any carving of wood, but it appears to have had no special importance in the formation of Daedalic sculpture.

If these arguments are accepted the Daedalic style of sculpture is not derived from nor appreciably indebted to any other style of sculpture, and must be either an original invention

\textsuperscript{27} Carpenter, who seems wide awake to the difficulties of his position, shrugs this one off (op. cit. 8–9).

\textsuperscript{28} If the relief from Paros (see n. 32) is Late Geometric, marble was in use before Daedalic sculpture began.

\textsuperscript{29} Matz, op. cit. 183–4 (he derives the seated figure too from Asia). Schrader allows only a vague connexion, transmitted through minor arts (op. cit. 25–26). Carpenter finds the origin of the kore in Egypt (op. cit. 20).

\textsuperscript{30} Richter, op. cit. 2–3. V. Poulsen in Lindos iii 2, 540, mentions the belt, but does not derive it specifically from sculpture.

\textsuperscript{31} G. Lippold (Gr. Pl. 14), Matz (op. cit. 85) and Lullies (op. cit. 14) assert without argument the importance of earlier figures. Homann-Wedeking’s opinion is not clear to me (op. cit. 94). No one, it is pleasant to record, urges an influence of surviving Mycenaean work, such as the relief of the Lion Gate at Mycenae.

\textsuperscript{32} (1) The crude limestone figure found casually near Levidhi in Arcadia (D. Burr [Thompson], AJA xxxi [1927] 169–76) has to be dated on style: it is usually thought earlier than Daedalic, though Carpenter suggests a Medieval date (op. cit. 3–4) and it might even—I suppose—be a rustic version of Daedalic (cf. F. R. Grace, AJA xlv [1942] 342 n. 1).

(2) The rudimentary limestone stele from Kimolos, unfortunately headless, has some vague Late Geometric context (N. M. Kondoleon, Θεοπλη 129–37).

(3) A marble stele found in Paros with a seated figure silhouetted in very shallow relief looks from the illustration as if it might be Late Geometric (A. Zaphirooulos, A. Del. xvi B, 243, pl. 215—he suggests the beginning of the seventh century).

(4) The lower part of a limestone statue from Megara Hyblaea might also be of around 700 B.C. (P. Orsi, BCH xix [1895] 312a–7a, fig. 4; cf. Homann-Wedeking, op. cit. 123).

\textsuperscript{33} The Hera of Cheraumye should have more affinity than Nikandre’s statue to a wooden tradition in sculpture, though I imagine that the Hera’s approximation to cylindrical form comes by way of ivory figurines from the natural shape of the elephant’s tusk. For the relation of the Hera to the Hawk Priestess from Ephesus cf. Homann-Wedeking, op. cit. 29.
or adapted from some other art. Painting, which might be suggested by the lack of depth in such statues as that of Nikandre, is excluded by the regular aspect of the face—frontal in Daedalic sculpture, profile in vase-painting throughout the Late Geometric and Archaic periods. So there remains only the art of small figurines.

Terracotta plaques, figurines and small heads of Daedalic style appeared in Greece about the middle of the first half of the seventh century. They were made regularly in shallow one-piece moulds—a technique evidently imported from Syria—and so normally have abbreviated profiles and roughly done backs. We do not know yet how completely this miniature Daedalic style was accepted by Greek workshops. It became dominant in Corinth, Sparta, Crete and Rhodes, though not in Athens; a weaker version was current in Samos, alongside a more traditional style; for other East Greek cities, the Cyclades and Euboea our evidence is not sufficient. The new style is in character sharply distinct from its Late Geometric predecessor (often—more conveniently than correctly—called Subgeometric) and no clear transitional stage has been detected. On the whole students do not commit themselves about the causes of the change. Some seem to think of a transformation affected by Greek originality, a few openly assert the influence of Syrian art and particularly of the Astarte plaques, miserable though their artistic quality may be. Admittedly Syrian art of this period is not well understood, but there appears to be a sufficient similarity between Syrian and Protodaedalic plaques and figurines both in style and in types; and since the new style and types are associated with the new technique of the mould, one might expect that they were imported together. Further, the apparently close contemporaneity of the earliest Daedalic in Corinth, Sparta and Crete tends to favour more or less independent borrowing from a common source, though the parallel development of these schools shows that they must have had fairly close contact. Where Greek originality came in was in refining the clumsy Syrian prototypes.

Jenkins in his *Dedalica* has demonstrated how intimate is the relationship between the Daedalic terracotta figurines and the earliest Greek statues of stone. Yet very few students have explicitly derived the statues from the...
assume that they are parallel manifestations of the same style though on different levels. The fact that we have figurines of a stage of development prior to that of any statue cannot be decisive, since figurines were much more numerous and their chances of survival much better. Yet there are indications, cumulatively telling, that Daedalic sculpture had its origins in the moulded Daedalic figurines. First, though there appear to be Syrian terracotta figurines close enough in style to Daedalic, there does not appear to be Syrian sculpture that is so related. Secondly, the sparsity of detail in early Daedalic sculpture is more appropriate to small figurines. Thirdly, shallowness of the side elevations has a technical explanation for figurines made in a single mould, but not for statues designed to be free standing. Fourthly, the frontal faces of figurines represented in profile on stone reliefs suggest the influence of an art where faces were normally frontal; this cannot have been contemporary Greek painting, though the connexion between relief sculpture and simple painting—so evident in Greek art in the sixth century—is almost natural. The reasonable conclusion is that Daedalic sculpture started, so far as style is concerned, as an enlargement of the small-scale art of moulded figurines. Once started its greater scale and importance encouraged it to develop on its own.

The origins of the Daedalic types are less simple. The best Greek Geometric and Subgeometric figurines are almost all male and there was no stock formula for the female. The Syrian figurines, on the other hand, were dominantly female, and this rather than some religious change explains the preponderance of females in the Daedalic style. For the standing female the Syrian figurines offered draped and naked versions, both of them frontal and symmetrical except for the arms. The Greeks, though still allowing some freedom to the arms, soon decided on the draped version (the kore) anyhow for statues. This may have been the result of social convention (as Carpenter says), but not necessarily a direct result; in vase-painting women had covered their nakedness by the end of the eighth century. For the standing male some earlier Greek figurines of the generation before Daedalic have one foot in advance of the other, and the stance of the kouros could have come from them. There may also have been some feeling that the male requires a presumably other Daedalic statues) to grow out of the figurines, but does not count it as sculpture or even as a stage towards sculpture (op. cit. 5–6 and 22).

Karo is refreshingly frank on this: he describes the Daedalic style as essentially sculptural and postulates Protodaedalic sculpture of stone (op. cit. 89).

The Early Daedalic seated figure from Malles is particularly instructive (ASA ii [1915] 312–4; figs. 1–3; Jenkins, op. cit. 32): so shallow a side view would hardly have been produced deliberately by anyone who thought of sculpture as an independent art of constructing free-standing figures, but is intelligible (if inexcusable) in figurines made in shallow moulds (cf. ASA xxxiii–iv [1955–56] 255, fig. 51). Jenkins has another explanation, more witty than convincing, of the flat frontality of Daedalic statues (op. cit. 18).

Such frontal views occur on the Prinias relief with riders, the Mycenae relief of a woman, and the Gortyn triad of a male and two females (ASA xxxiii–iv [1955–56] 301, fig. 17). In terracotta plaques too of Daedalic style heads are sometimes illogically frontal—e.g. the 'Peleus and Atalante' plaque from Tegea (P. Jacobsthal, die Melischen Reliefs 91, pl. 68; Jenkins, BSA xxxiii [1932–33] 73–4)—though the profile view is more usual (Jenkins, Dedalic 10). Further, there is the relief head from Mallesina (Mon Piot xx [1913–16] pl. 3; Jenkins, op. cit. 71); a head detached from a body—as here—is abnormal in Greek sculpture, but frequent in the small terracotta production of Daedalic style.

The shallowness of the side views of statues might be attributed to the influence of reliefs, or frontal faces in reliefs to the influence of statues; but both explanations cannot fairly be used together.

Jenkins takes the opposite view (op. cit. 17).

On experiments see Boardman, the Cretan Collection 109, and for illustrations ASA xxxiii–iv (1955–56) 207–88.


Cf. Knoblauch, op. cit. 44 n. 115, though perhaps one should omit the Mantiklos (Tyszkwiewicz) bronze; further examples—handle supports for kraters—are cited by E. Kunze in OIB vii, 153–4. Mr A. G. Woodhead has suggested to me that stability in mounting may have been another reason for using this stance for naked male statues: it may be relevant that generally with draped statues a similar stance is introduced when their drapery no longer reaches the ground to serve as a support. Yet it still remains possible that the stance of the
more active pose than the female; that would explain the curious arrangement of the Gortyn relief where a central male figure clasps two frontal and passive females, but is represented in profile below the waist, as if striding between them. Admittedly in the position of the arms the male statue is more restricted than the female, but since this restriction does not apply to reliefs, the reason was probably technical; in early statues—to economise labour—arms were normally laid on the body, and the gestures so permitted were suitable only for women. The third type, the seated figure, had no forerunners either in earlier Greek or in Syrian figurines, and from the extreme compression of the thighs of the earliest example appears to have been an original and unhappy invention of some maker of moulded figurines. Contrary to the accepted opinion it seems to me that the seated type provides another argument against the direct influence of Egyptian or Asiatic sculpture, where seated figures were regular.

We can only guess why, when so many Oriental models were available in Greece, it was the style of the Daedalic figurines that was chosen for large sculpture. To argue that this had the greatest sculptural potentiality is at best a dubious piece of hindsight; and, anyhow, at the beginning of the next century East Greek sculptors chose to make a fresh start from other models. The most reasonable explanation is that in the place or places where sculpture began the Daedalic style was already fashionable for figurines and so was the obvious choice for larger figures. As has been said, we do not know how widely the Daedalic fashion extended. At present most students plump for Corinth or Naxos as the original home of Greek sculpture: Corinth had the finest known school of figurines, Naxos a handy supply of marble and a claim to the first marble and full-size statues. If the use of marble and a natural scale are criteria of what is called ‘monumental’ sculpture, then Naxos has the advantage. But though those innovations were important, it was because of their effects rather than their causes, and the first marble and the first life-size statues—which need not have appeared together—were intended presumably only as improvements on figures of softer stone and smaller scale. In fact what so far are the earliest Daedalic figures of stone come from Sparta and Crete.

There remains the question why Greek sculpture—specifically the carving of the kouros was taken from small Egyptian figurines or imitations of them. It might help if we could discover whether Greek male statues acquired the wide stance suddenly or gradually: anyhow the Delphi bronze figure, like the pre-Daedalic supports and unlike the normal Egyptian types, has its feet fairly close together.

ASA xxxiii–iv (1955–56) 301, fig. 17.

Technical convenience was evidently the reason why the kouroi continued to keep its arms by its sides. Projecting forearms were permitted, as on the Apollonia colossus (see n. 23) and the Phigaleia kouros (Richter, op. cit. figs. 144–6); but they were economical only where, as on the later korai, the projection could be a separate piece with the join masked by drapery.

The Malles relief (ASA ii [1915] 312–14, figs. 1–3; Jenkins, op. cit. 32).

E.g. ASA xxxiii–iv (1955–56) 255, fig. 51.

For example the styles imitated or adapted by the Dipylon ivories, the bronze cauldron attachments, and the ivories from Ephesus (for a new and particularly instructive piece of this class see A. Greifenhagen, Jb. Berliner Mus vii [1965] 125–56; Antike Kunstwerke, pl. 1). Boardman (the Greeks Overseas 80–100) gives a good conspectus of Oriental imports. It is important to remember that Greek craftsmen could adopt details at different times and combine details from different sources.

Cf. n. 33.

So Richter (op. cit. 28–29) finds the home of Greek sculpture in the Cyclades and the East Greek region: Karo (op. cit. 98 and 318 n. 4) has Daedalic art begin in the Argolid and marble sculpture in Naxos; Matz (op. cit. 183) thinks the first monumental sculpture Peloponnesian and probably Corinthian; Homann-Wedeking (op. cit. 67 and 118) assigns the invention of marble and life-size statues to the Cyclades (with a preference for Naxos); Altscher (op. cit. 114) also speaks of the North-East Peloponnesian; and Carpenter (op. cit. 15–16) deduces the precedence of Samos and Miletus. Earlier, Jenkins (op. cit. 29) considered that the Daedalic style originated in Crete, according to the theory of Cretan pre-eminence that was current in the thirties; so too Lippold (Gr. Plastik 18).

The Mistra figure (Jenkins, BSA xxxii [1932–33] 69–70, pl. 8.6) and the Malles relief (ASA ii [1915] 312–14, figs. 1–3), classified by Jenkins as Early Daedalic (Dedalica 32): both are of limestone.
figures in stone—began when it did, in the second quarter of the seventh century. It was not that the Greeks had just become acquainted with the art of sculpture, since specimens were to be seen in Syria and Greeks had been visiting Syria for a century or more. Nor is it likely that some religious reform or innovation demanded more accomplished representations than the old idols; the old idols remained as venerable as ever. To say that the cause was a new impulse towards the monumental has more meaning as a psychological inference than as an explanation and is anyhow, I think, untrue. The purpose of Greek sculpture in the Archaic and Classical periods, anyhow for the client, was compounded principally of piety and self-advertisement. These motives were not new in the seventh century. They are evident in the big amphorae and kraters set up on graves in the second half of the eighth century (some of which can surely be defined as monumental) and also in the bronze cauldrons with plastic attachments which were dedicated in sanctuaries before and at the same time as the earliest sculpture. Further, the cauldrons at least must have been as expensive as most of the early statues. It looks as if—still at the level of the client—the early stone statues were one of several equivalent forms of dedication. Certainly the Greeks of the later eighth and earlier seventh centuries were eclectic in their taste, but two constants they appear to have required were good craftsmanship and generally some neatness (though not uniformity) of style. So I should expect that already in the late eighth century and perhaps a little earlier there would have been Greek customers for sculpture in stone, if satisfactory sculpture had been offered. That it was not is less likely to be because of technical incompetence, since the earlier Daedalic figures—anyhow those of limestone—required no skill beyond that of a mason; rather it was because none of the styles for figurines then current proved suitable for enlargement by a beginner. On this hypothesis one would expect that from time to time some enterprising mason, who had heard about stone statues set up in foreign countries, tried his hand at a stone figure—and there may be relics of such experiments in the pieces mentioned in note 32—but it was only with the application of the Daedalic style to large figures that the innovation caught on. Even so, to judge by the remains—and there is no reason to suppose them altogether unrepresentative—for the first forty or fifty years sculpture was a struggling art, and its popularity was not established until the last years of the seventh century, when the profile view was becoming more presentable and so large statues acquired an appearance of solidity. With this new popularity came a sudden fashion for colossal statues, a fashion inspired or at least made possible by clients, whether because they had seen or heard of colossi abroad or simply from a natural (if vulgar) desire to outdo their rivals. No sculptor of that time is likely to have had enough capital to risk making a marble statue of more than life-size to satisfy his creative impulses or even as a speculation.

Dr R. A. Higgins, Mr A. W. Lawrence and Dr J. R. Green were kind enough to read and criticise a draft of this paper: I am most grateful to them.

Cambridge.

62 Though monumental architecture—that is building of careful design and execution—began at much the same time as sculpture, the circumstances were not the same. Architecture was not only much more expensive but apparently reserved for civic buildings, and so presumably depended on civic spirit and funds.

63 The first sculptors can hardly have been economically independent artists who were able to ignore their clients.

64 So an increase in prosperity cannot either be a sufficient explanation for the emergence of sculpture.

65 Or carpenter (subject to the proviso made above); but stone had the advantage of greater durability, especially out of doors. Bronze-workers can be excluded, since the technique of hollow-casting large objects was not yet in use and hammering is not satisfactory; one need only look at the stove-pipe effect of the Dreros figures.

66 Such a craftsman could not have afforded to
risk more than an occasional and relatively inexpensive essay in sculpture without an order from a client.

In the seventh century anyhow only those craftsmen could afford to experiment or amuse themselves occasionally who produced objects that cost little in labour and material. Among such craftsmen were vase-painters, the painters of small wooden plaques (if they were different persons), and the makers of terracotta figurines (though the use of the mould encouraged a rather mechanical attitude as well as practice). So one should expect that vase-painting was an unusually lively art and not be too ready to look in it for imitation of other arts.
DEMOSTHENES ON LITURGIES: A NOTE

In 355/4 Demosthenes asserted that there were ‘perhaps sixty or slightly more’ recurrent liturgies performed every year in Athens. Böckh doubted this figure, thinking it a serious underestimate, but neither he nor any later scholar has pressed this doubt to the point of tabulating the relevant evidence in detail. It may therefore be found useful if I do so here, for it will emerge with some clarity that Böckh’s doubts were well-founded.

Demosthenes’ word ‘recurrent’ (ἐγκυκλικὸς) achieved some currency in the last century as a quasi-technical term. By it he meant the civilian liturgies—chorégia, gymnasiarchy, etc.—in contrast to the military liturgies the imposition of which was irregular and unpredictable; but since every known civilian liturgy in Athens formed part of the celebration of a festival, it may perhaps be clearer to think of them as festival liturgies and to arrange the evidence not according to the category of liturgy but by festival. I begin with the certain cases.

A. City Dionysia

The evidence is well known, and can therefore be treated summarily. From 502/1, the probable era-date of the Fasti (IG ii2 2318) and of the liturgical organisation of the festival, there were ten dithyrambic choruses of boys and ten of men, each under one choregos, annually and uninterrupted till Demetrios. (The alternative view, that there were only ten choruses in all, five of men and five of boys, will not stand for the fourth century and is hardly more plausible for the fifth century.) Tragedy similarly had three choregoi annually from 502/1 till Demetrios, and comedy, probably instituted in 487/6, had five choregoi annually till 431/0 or later, three annually by 424/3 through 415/4 and probably until the end of the war, and five again by 389/8 and thereafter till Demetrios. The institution of the synchoregia for tragedy and comedy in 460/5 may have doubled the relevant figures, but it was evidently permissive rather than mandatory and did not survive 399/8. Hence, the liturgical organisation of the contests at the Dionysia called for 23 choregoi annually from 502/1 till 488/7, and for 28 from then on until Demetrios, with some fluctuation during the Peloponnesian War down to 26 and up to a theoretical maximum to pursue the investigations of which this is a part; and to Mr D. M. Lewis, who read and improved this article in draft form.

1 Dem. xx 21.
2 A. Böckh, Die Staatsaufzeichnung der Athen (Berlin, 1886) 538.
3 V. Thumser, De cecium Atheniensian muneribus eorumque immunitate (Vienna, 1886) 53; K. F. Herrmann, Griechischer Staatsattiser (Freiburg-i-B., 1889) 690.

VOL. LXXXVII.
of 32. To this figure must be added the ten *hestiatores* who financed the tribal banquets.\textsuperscript{14} The only uncertainty concerns the production of old tragedies from 387/6 onwards\textsuperscript{15} and of old comedies from 340/39 onwards.\textsuperscript{16} It is difficult to see how they can have been financed save by a choregos, but no reference to such a choregia survives.

**B. Lenaia**

Liturgical financing of comedy at the Lenaia appears to have begun about 440 or a few years before.\textsuperscript{17} With three comedies annually from 426/5 at latest until 406/5 or after,\textsuperscript{18} at least four annually in the middle of the fourth century,\textsuperscript{19} and five in 290/89,\textsuperscript{20} the probability is that the same pattern held as for the Dionysia, there being five comedies annually from c. 440 until Demetrios save during the Peloponnesian War. The contest in tragedy may have begun c. 432;\textsuperscript{21} the only figures we have indicate that there were two competitors annually in 420/19 and 419/8,\textsuperscript{22} and there is no means of telling whether this had been a war-time reduction or whether the number was later increased. It is similarly unknown whether the institution of the synchoregia in 406/5 applied to the Lenaia as well. Provisionally, the total number of choregoi at the Lenaia can be taken as five between c. 440 and the end of the war (the addition of tragedy cancelling out the reduction in comedy), and seven thereafter till Demetrios.

To these figures one qualification must be added. For the Lenaia, as for no other liturgically organised festival, metics could serve both in the chorus and as choregoi.\textsuperscript{23} Consequently not all the five or seven choregoi need have been citizens, though it should be added that only two metic choregoi, the brothers Lysias and Polemarchos, are so far attested.\textsuperscript{24} If this facility for metics could be taken to have held good right from the start of liturgical financing at the Lenaia, this would be a valuable indication of the impact which they were making on the social and economic life of Athens at the time.

**C. Thargelia**

There were five dithyrambic choirs of men and five of boys annually, each chorus representing two tribes and under the superintendence of one choregos. This arrangement certainly held by 420/19 and throughout the fourth century;\textsuperscript{25} since there is no good reason to suppose that the early fifth century dedication \(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 772, which records a victory for Kekropis alone gained by Aristokrates (I), either came from the Python or was the dedication of his grandson Aristokrates (II) referred to by Plato,\textsuperscript{26} the two-tribe arrangement can safely be supposed to have held good right from the (unknown) era-date of the liturgical assuming that Kallippides' victory as tragic actor at the Lenaia in 419/8 (\(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 2319, line 83) was the first of his five such victories (\(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 2325, line 252), and this, as D. M. Lewis points out to me, is a gratuitous assumption.

\textsuperscript{14} Schol. Patm. Dem. xx 21 (= BCH i [1877] 147); Dem. xx 21, Dem. xxi 156 and Athen. v 185 C refer either to the Dionysia or to the Panathenaea. Dem. xxxix 7 indicates that *hestiatores* were appointed by the tribes.

\textsuperscript{15} \(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 2318, lines 201–203.

\textsuperscript{16} \(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 2318, lines 316–318.

\textsuperscript{17} \(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 2325, lines 116 f.; E. Reisch, *Zeitschrift für die österreichische Gymnasien* lviii (1907) 308; E. Capps, *AJPh* xcviii (1907) 186 f.

\textsuperscript{18} Hypoth. i to Ar. Acharnians; hypoth. ii to Ar. Knights; hypoth. i to Ar. Wasps; hypoth. i to Ar. Fregi.

\textsuperscript{19} \(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 2322, lines 92–96.

\textsuperscript{20} \(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 2319, line 56.

\textsuperscript{21} Thus Reisch (note 17) 308, but this depends on

\textsuperscript{22} \(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 2319, lines 70–83.

\textsuperscript{23} Schol. Ar. *Plutus* 953.

\textsuperscript{24} Lys. xii 20.

\textsuperscript{25} Antiphon vi 11; for the date see K. J. Dover, *CQ* xlv (1950) 44 and 60. \(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 770, which may well be earlier if the identification of Kekides is correct, also manifests the same arrangement. For the fourth century cf. *Hesperia* xxix (1960) 85 no. 165; \(IG\) ii\textsuperscript{2} 3063–3072; *Ath. Pol.* lvi 3.

\textsuperscript{26} Gorgias 472 A-B. See D. M. Lewis *ap. Dodds ad loc.* and *JHS* lxxxiv (1964) 156 f.
organisation of the festival until Demetrios. Ten choregoi annually can be taken as the regular practice.

D. HEPHAISTIA

The determination of the liturgical organisation of this festival is peculiarly awkward. According to the transmitted text of the Old Oligarch, choregoi were annually appointed for five festivals, including the Promethia and the Hephaistia. This, taken in conjunction with the language of IG ii² 1138, has prompted the inference that there were musical contests for men and boys at the Hephaistia. However, the basic document concerning the festival, IG ii² B4 of 421/0, refers (probably) to gymnasiarcs (lines 20–21) and nowhere to choregoi or choruses; Andokides’ liturgy at the Hephaistia between 403 and 400 was as gymnasiarcs, the general heortological tradition, which made the Hephaistia one of the three festivals at which there was a torch-race under the superintendence of gymnasiarcs, knew nothing of musical contests; and the only surviving record of a victory at the Hephaistia, probably just after 350, refers to a gymnasarχy and shows conclusively that the contest was tribal. Given this last fact, the tribal nature of the torch-race contest, the case for choregoi dissolves. There is no difficulty in supposing that the drafter of IG ii² 1138 could have included the gymnasiarcs and can have intended to refer to tribal victories in any kind of contest organised tribally and liturgically, and we can either take the Old Oligarch to have been blurring his categories or adopt Kirchhoff’s attractive emendation in the text of the Old Oligarch.

However, the difficulty remains of determining the era-date of the liturgical organisation of the festival, since the surviving text of IG ii² B4 leaves it entirely uncertain whether there were gymnasiarcs and a torch-race at the Hephaistia before 421/0 or not. Fortunately the latter point can be determined independently. In describing the Persian relay system of transmitting messages, Herodotos drew a domestic analogy, ”κατὰ περ ἔλθα στὴν ἁρματα διδότω καὶ ἐπιτελεύων”. Since the only other known instance of a torch-race associated with Hephaistos is that attested on a third-century coin from Mothon in Messenia, it is highly probable that Herodotos must here have been thinking inter alia, if not indeed primarily, of Athens, and that the torch-race at the Athenian Hephaistia therefore predated 421/0. However, this does not by itself entail the presence of gymnasiarcs before 421/0, and the other evidence on the point, the text of the Old Oligarch, is itself of so disputed a date that no safe conclusion can be drawn. A lower limit for the annual gymnasia can be available from the statement of Ath. Pol. liv 7 that the Hephaistia became a quadrennial festival in 329/8, one may surmise that the new organisation of

[27] [Xen.] Ath. Pol. iii 4: . . . γυμνασίων διαδικάσεων εἰς Διονύσα καὶ Θαρρηλία καὶ Παναθήναις καὶ Προμηθία καὶ Ἡφαιστίας διὰ ἔτη.
[28] IG ii² 1138, lines 9 f.: ἀναγράφει δὲ καὶ εἰ τις ἄλλοι νενεκτίκαν ἀπ’ Ἕλληνης ἄρθροντος παινὸς ἡ ἀνδρότης Διόνυσα ἡ Θαρρηλία ἡ Προμηθία ἡ Ἡφαιστία. The absence of the Panathenaia from this list is curious.
[29] Stengel, RE viii (1913) 290; Deubner (n. 4) 212.
[31] Poelomon ph. Harp. s.v. λαμπάς; Istrus, FGH 334 F 2(a) and (b); Schol. Ar. Fros 131; L. Bekker, Anecdota i 228, lines 11 f.; schol. Patm. Dem. lvii 43 (= BCH i [1877]:11); Suda A 88.
[32] IG ii² 3201, lines 7–11: οἱ ψυχίται γυμν[ας] ἄρθρησαν τε Ἡφα[ϊστία]. The date derives from the fact that the honorand is recorded in lines 1–5 to have been taxiarχ in 346/5.
[33] . . . καὶ Παναθήναις ὡς ἔτη καὶ γυμνασίων διαδικάσεως εἰς Παναθήναις καὶ Προμηθία κτλ.
[34] Hdt. viii 98. 2.
[36] Thus the now vulgate text, but the reading and restoration are very uncertain (see Kenyon, ed. major 166 note) and Aristotle’s language is more than a little odd as a reference to a festival which indubitably existed before 329/8. ‘I have always hoped that the Amphipoliare stood here’ (D. M. Lewis) (cf. SIG 3 298 and sect. J, p. 39 below). There is a reference to [γυμνασίων] εἰς Ἡφαιστία] in the 320’s (IG ii² 4332, line 5 [p. 294]) but the year is not recoverable.
the ephebate by Epikrates' law of 335 had made some of the older forms of ephebic activity superfluous.

Tentatively, then, the Hephaistia required ten gymnasiarchs annually from 421/0, and possibly before, until 330/29, and may (though this is pure guesswork) have required them quadrennially from 329/8 till Demetrios.

E. PROMETHIA

The torch-race at the Promethia was organised liturgically under gymnasiarchs by 421/0, though I do not know the basis for Deubner's statement that it was the oldest of the three festival torch-races. The case for choregoi and choruses at the Promethia rests on the same ambiguous grounds, and is open to the same objections, as the case for them at the Hephaistia; here again, the only liturgical contestants certainly known in connexion with the festival are gymnasiarchs. That the contest was annual is implied by the ὅσα ἐτη of the Old Oligarch, and that it was tribal is implied by IG ii3 1138 and demonstrated for the 350's by the language of Isaios vii 36. It is a safe inference that there were ten gymnasiarchs annually from before 421 until the law of Epikrates at least, and perhaps until Deme-

F. GREAT PANATHENAEA

Of the three tribal contests at the quadrennial Great Panathenaia, the torch-race, the best attested and perhaps the best known, was certainly tribal and called for ten gymnasiarchs on each occasion. The euandria contest was similarly tribal, even though the one known successful contestant spoke of himself as the winner rather than of his tribe. The boat-race ἐν Ἑστιαῖ, which must be distinguished from the theoria to Sounion, was also tribal. The form of the entries in IG ii3 2311 suggests that the tribal banquets attested for the Panathenaia stood in some close association with the boat-race: I do not know whether it can thence be inferred that the trierarchs for the boat-race were also the hestiaiores.

The contests of pyrrhichistai were organised in three divisions (men, youths, and boys) by the end of the fifth century with the financial support of choregoi. An erroneous emendation in Isaios v 36 has given the impression that all these contests were organised

37 IG ii3 84, line 37: see notes 27, 28 and 31 above.
38 Deubner (note 4) 211.
39 Cf. IG ii3 84, line 37; Lys. xxi 3; Isaios vii 36.
40 ἕνεκαν ἔργας ἔρημος ἀρχοντῶν ἑννατῶν ἐφορίων, ὡς ἐν φυλήπταν πίστει ἑσπερίων.
41 IG ii3 84, lines 6 and 33, where ἡ πεντετέρας is generally supposed to be the Great Panathenaia; Polemon ap. Harp. s.v. λαμπάδες; schol. Ar. Frogs 131; Suda 88.
42 IG ii3 3019; IG ii3 3023; IG ii3 2311, line 76, "Ἡ ἀνεώδυς φυλήν ἐκκύσεως βοῶς", where Jacoby's doubts about the supplement ἡ λαμπάδα (Commentary to Philochorus, FGH 328 F 102, n. 6 sub fn.) are ill-founded in view of the entry in line 77, which records the prize to be given to the winning lampadephoros.
43 IG ii3 2311, line 75.
44 IG ii3 3022. [And.] iv 42 manifests the same phraseology and can safely be taken as evidence for Athenian practice.
45 For the phrase ἐν Ἑστιαῖ cf. Lys. xxi 5; for the theoria see sect. K (b), p. 39 below. That the boat-race existed in the 390's is demonstrated by Plato.
tribally, but correct punctuation alters the picture, and victor-dedications and the list of prizes give no hint that the winning group was a tribal group. All that can be inferred from the word σωταρος in Isaios is that the number of competing groups of dancers in each division was at least three, and that there were therefore at least nine choregoi involved.

For none of these contests can the era-date of its liturgical organisation be determined even conjecturally. The case may be a little different with the one other liturgically financed event of the festival which remains to be noticed—the choral competition in dithyramb. It is a guess, but a plausible one, that the re-institution of the musical contests by Perikles at the Panathenaia of (probably) 446/5 was also the era-date of the liturgical organisation of the dithyrambic competition. The number of competing choruses is unknown, and there is nothing to suggest that they competed tribally.

Hence, with thirty men involved liturgically in the tribal events (forty if the hestiaioi were separate appointments), at least nine choregoi for the phyrhchistai, and an unknown number for dithyramb, the total number of liturgical appointments for the quadrennial festival must have been over forty, and possibly nearer fifty.

G. LESSER PANATHENAIA

The euandria and the boat-race did not form part of the annual festival. The contests in dithyramb and for the pyrrhchistai certainly did, and though the banquet and the torch-race are not attested for the annual festival, a good a priori case can be made out for supposing that the torch-race at least was annual. The number of liturgical appointments for the annual festival can therefore be tentatively taken to have been at least nineteen.

H. ARREPHORIA

The speaker of Lysias xxi counted the arrhephoria among his liturgies (§ 5). From what is known of the festival the financial outlay involved must have been the maintenance of the two or four arrhephori during their part in the cult and (in the year preceding a Great Panathenaia) during their work on the peplos of Athene. Only one man need have been involved annually, and the cost would be small.

I. FESTIVALS OUTSIDE ATHENS

The archetheoroi who were sent to the four Panhellenic festivals counted as liturgical appointments and must therefore be included here. Athenian theoroi are also attested in the first half of the fourth century in connexion with the oracle of Ammon, but since deletion of δι, which entailed a comma after τραγοδοις and allowed τη... ημογια της to be coupled with πιερχη-σταις, leaves the μεν suspended and implies quite wrongly that the tragic contest at the Dionysia was tribal and involved more than three competitors. See W. Wyse, The Speeches of Isaeus (Cambridge, 1904) 454, for the correct interpretation.

---

51 IG ii² 2911, lines 72–74; IG ii² 3025 b; IG ii² 3026.

52 Lys. xxi 2; IG ii² 3025 a.


54 Lys. xxi 2 and 4.

55 See Ziehen (n. 50) 487 f. Kirchhoff’s emendation in the text of [Xen.] Ath. Pol. iii 4 would, if accepted, provide positive evidence for it (see nn. 27 and 33).

56 See Deubner (n. 4) 9–12.


58 And. i 132; Lys. xxi 5; Aristotle, Nik. Eth.

59 IG ii² 1642, revised by A. M. Woodward, BSA lvi (1962) 5 f.
there is no reason to suppose either that this was a regularly recurrent *theoria* or that it was liturgically financed it is best left out of account. The *theoria* to Delos, however, is another matter, and a much more complicated one. The Athenian claims on Delos made the cult-link between them politically sensitive in a way in which the fully domestic or the fully international festivals were not, and the consequences of this sensitivity, in the shape of instability of organisation and discontinuity of observance, raise well known and intractable problems which cannot even be touched on here except in so far as they concern the demands made upon the Athenian upper class. Nothing useful can be said about the liturgical organisation of the cult-link between Athens and Delos before winter 426/5. Information and difficulties begin thereafter, for while it is now clear that the first *penteteris* in spring 426/5 was attended by a college of either six or seven Athenian *archetheoroi*, the dedications made individually by the Athenians Euthydikos, Nikias, Kallias, and Autokles combine with the literary tradition about Nikias to create a general presumption that for the fifth-century *penteterides* down to 406/5 the organisation was such as to allow, or to require, one man as *archetheoros* to take the primary financial and executive responsibility for the Athenian *theoria*. Difficulties of another kind arise for the period after 406/5, for it is necessary to assume a break in the series of *penteterides* in order to account for the fact that, though a crown was dedicated by Athens to Apollo at each *penteteris*, in 364/3 there were only twelve such crowns in the Athenian temple. To meet this, Courby argued that the quadrennial festival was resumed in 394/3 immediately after Knidos, and Coupry outlined the case for a further interruption after 386/5 until the celebration of the tenth *penteteris* in 375/4 initiated a new series which continued without interruption until 331/0 or later. Here too the evidence for the liturgical organisation offers inconsistencies. For the celebration of 375/4 the Amphiktyones made a grant of one talent to a college of at least two—probably Athenian—*archetheoroi*, but they also made a grant of 7000 dr. to an Athenian trierarch for the conveyance of the *theoroi* and of the choruses. Exactly the same arrangement can now be seen to have held good for the next *penteteris* in 371/0, but by the 320’s the liturgical appointments made for Delos were of at least two choregoi and of (probably) a single *archetheoros*. I know of no means of deciding when the change occurred.

These variations and uncertainties in organisation and observance preclude any hope of giving a meaningful figure for the liturgical establishment of the Delian *penteteris*. There is, too, the further difficulty that it is impossible to determine whether the annual *theoria* to Delos attested in 399, and the sexennial *theoria* attested in the 320’s, were liturgically organised or not. All that can be said is that the number of persons liturgically involved in festivals outside Athens did not normally fall below six every Olympiad, and could well have risen to ten or more. An average of about two per year in Demosthenes’ time is probably accurate enough.

---

60 Though cf. the Athenian refusal to send *theoroi* to the Pythian festival in late summer 346 (Dem. xix 128).  
61 The most recent résumé is that of J. Courby, *Atti del 3° Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia* ... (Rome, 1959) 55 f., in anticipation of his long-promised but still unpublished study *Les Amphiktyons d’Athènes à Delos*.  
63 *IG* ii 1638, lines 43-47; etc., etc.  
65 *BCH* x (1886) 465, lines 107 f. Consistently, the crown dedicated in 355/4 was the fifteenth (*IG* ii 1640, lines 4 and 9-10).  
66 *BCH* xlv (1921) 179 f.  
67 Coupry (n. 61) 56 f. The case for 331/0 as the terminus depends on the fact that the 21st penteteric crown was the last of the series (*IG* xi 2, 161 B, line 114, etc.), but there is room for doubt and for a lower date (Coupry 57 f.).  
68 *IG* ii 1635, line 34; Coupry (n. 62) 289.  
69 *IG* ii 1635, lines 34-35.  
70 *BCH* xxxv (1911) 5 no. 1, lines 40 f., revised by Coupry in *BCH* lxii (1938) 91 f. and *BCH* lxxviii (1954) 289.  
71 *Ath. Pol.* liv 3, where the usual restoration is *αψυχεία[πορ]*. The choreic dedications *I. Delos* 44-46 may reflect this later arrangement.  
J. Amphiareia

A liturgy named *eutaia* is attested once, in the years c. 330 (IG ii² 417). Since the word recurs in precisely the same period in the decree of 329/8 concerned with the Amphiareia, it might be worth hazarding a guess that the liturgy was part of this festival. Its nature is obscure: from IG ii² 417 it appears that two men from each tribe were involved, each paying a subscription of 50 or 100 *dr.*; but there are clearly a number of ways in which a sum of up to 2000 *dr.* could be used for the Amphiareia, or indeed for any other festival.

There follow some doubtful or mistaken cases.

K. Poseidonia

(a) Lykourgos is said to have introduced a dithyrambic contest in Peiraius in honour of Poseidon, at which not fewer than three choruses were to compete. Nothing more is known of this, nor is the participation of choregoi necessarily involved.

(b) Herodotos (vi 87) records that there was a quadrennial *theoria* by sea to Sounion. There has been a general tendency to suppose that this is the same cult-act as that described by Lysias xxi 5, but whereas Herodotos speaks of one ship on a ceremonial *theoria*, Lysias speaks of a contest between several ships and must be referring to the Panathenaic boat-race, while our fairly full knowledge of the Panathenaia knows nothing of a *theoria*. I suspect that the *theoria* and the boat-race should be dissociated, and that the *theoria* taken to be in honour of Poseidon while the boat-race is left with Athene. We do not know whether the *theoria* required a separate trierarch: the *tamias Paralou* is an obvious possibility.

L. Oschophoria

A passage of Aristodemos led K. F. Hermann to infer the existence of choregoi at the Skira. However, it is clear that Aristodemos has confused the Skira with the Oschophoria, and though we hear of choruses and of a race between youths at the Oschophoria, organised tribally, even in the late fourth century the contest remained under the supervision of *hieromenones* of the *genos* associated with the festival, the Salaminioi, and there is no positive evidence that any part of the festival was liturgically financed.

M. Thesmophoria

The *hestiasis* known from two passages of Isaiaos (iii 80 and viii 19) to have taken place at the Thesmophoria has been seen since Wyse to have been organised on a local basis at deme level. Consequently it does not qualify as a state liturgy.

---

73 SIG² 298, line 45 (see n. 36 above).
74 [Plut.] Mor. 842 A.
75 E.g. Deubner (n. 4) 215; A. Andreewes, BSA xxxvii (1936–37 [1940]) 6 n. 4.
76 As G. F. Schoemann suggested (Opuscula Academica i [Berlin, 1854] 317) and Deubner (n. 4) 215 accepted.
77 Aristodemos, FGH 383 F 9 ap. Athen. xi 495 F; Hermann (n. 3) 691.
78 Deubner (n. 4) 144 f.; W. S. Ferguson, Hesperia vii (1938) 36 f.
80 IG ii² 1232, lines 16–20, with the restorations of Ferguson (n. 78) 62 f.
81 Wyse (n. 50) 305 f.
N. FESTIVAL OF PAN

Herodotus records that as a result of Philippides’ vision in 490 the Athenians instituted a cult of Pan which included annual sacrifices and a torch-race. Part of the heurvalogical tradition took this up by making Pan rather than Athene the honanord of one of the three Athenian torch-races, but nothing is known of the event from fourth-century sources and it may not have been liturgically financed anyway.

O. VARIA

There remain three fourth-century epigraphic references to gymnasarchs which fail to fit any of the festivals so far mentioned. They are:

(a) IG ii2 3024, from the Akropolis, a dedication by four men described in the heading as [οἱ ᾿Αγριαῖοι Πανομότοι] εἰς τὰ ναόν τῆς Ἑρέσθεος. Kirchner compared IG ii2 84, line 37, and surmised a reference to the Promethia, but the event at the Promethia was competitive and tribal, whereas on IG ii2 3024 four men dedicate as a college.

(b) IG ii2 3105, from Rhamnous, is a dedication, with a list of 42 lampadephoroi all of Erechtheis set up by two gymnasarchs of Erechtheis, after a victory in a torch-race, probably in the early 340’s. Because of the find-spot the event is universally referred to the Nemeseia, but this explains nothing, and the little that is known of the Nemeseia renders a torch-race singularly inappropriate as part of the festival.

(c) In the second half of the fourth century, but before 318, a man whose name is lost received an honorary crown from the Athenian demos for having been gymnasarch. As Kirchner noted ad loc., the terms of the honour, from the demos rather than from a tribe, imply that the gymnasarchic had become a magistracy in the Hellenistic style rather than a liturgy. However, though the ephebic reform of 335 is the obvious time for such a change, it is discouraging that the surviving ephebic inscriptions of the 330’s and 320’s never have cause to name a gymnasarch as one of the supervisory officials.

Böckh’s doubts about Demosthenes’ figure of just over 60 liturgies a year can now be given quantitative substance. Even if the doubtful cases are set aside and if the Panathenaic hestiatore is not counted separately, the figure which stands in our texts of Demosthenes cannot be taken any longer as an accurate report of the contemporary facts: the sum-total of annual liturgical appointments appears to have been over 97 at the time of Demosthenes xx, rising to over 118 in a Panathenaic year. The discrepancy is startling, yet no plausible emendation suggests itself in any system of notation: one is more or less bound to conclude either that Demosthenes was very badly misinformed or that he was being grossly disingenuous. The latter is much more likely. It suited his case to minimise the extent of the annual liturgical burden, so that the continuing privileges of the ‘twenty or thirty’ atelis, on behalf of one of whom (Ktesippos) he was speaking, might appear to be proportionally the less important and the less crippling to Athenian festival finances. The surprising and illuminating thing is that Demosthenes thought he could get away with it.

University of St Andrews.

82 Hdt. vi 105.3; Simonides F 133 B; W. Judeich, Topographie von Athen (Munich, 1931) 301 f.
84 J. Pouilloux, in republishing IG ii2 3105 (La Forteresse de Rhamnonte [Paris, 1954] 111 no. 2 bis), has restored lines 1 and 3 from Hesperia ix (1940) 59 no. 8 to give a date in 333/2. This is impossible. The lampadephoroi are indeed presumably of roughly ephebic age, but one of them, Alkimachides of Pergae, served as councillor in 335/4 (IG ii2 1700, line 16), while another, Epikrates of Euonymon, was lessee of a silver mine before 342/1 (IG ii2 1582, lines 123 f.). C. 345 is the latest possible date for IG ii2 3105, and it could well be ten years earlier.
85 See Deubner (n. 4) 230; Pouilloux (n. 84) 82.
86 IG ii2 3266, lines 12–15. The date is an inference from his receipt of a crown from the Athenian demos in Imbros (lines 8–11).
THE ORIGINS AND THE NATURE OF THE ATHENIAN ALLIANCE OF 478/7 B.C.

This article is concerned with the antecedents to the formation of the group known as οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι and correctly styled the (First) Athenian Alliance (in distinction from the Second Athenian Alliance) and with the problems of its constitutional arrangements. So much has been written in the knowledge of subsequent events—by Herodotus, Thucydides and modern scholars—that it is particularly difficult for us to see this topic in its historical perspective, that is to see how the Athenian Alliance grew out of what went before. For example, the hegemony enjoyed by Athens in the Alliance has been described by many as the means by which she was later to fulfill her imperialistic ambitions, but few have studied its powers in relation to earlier examples of hegemony; yet it must have been these earlier examples of hegemony which were active in men's minds in 478/7 B.C. After a section, A, on the nature of the evidence, I therefore keep to the historical order and discuss in section B the campaign of Mycale down to the capture of Sestus; in section C the operations under Pausanias and the change of hegemony; in section D the creation of the Athenian Alliance; and in section E the relationship between Athens and the Allies.

A. THE NATURE OF THE EVIDENCE

There is much more evidence for the years preceding the formation of the Athenian Alliance than for the early years of its existence. This fact is due to the writings of Herodotus and of those other authors before Thucydides who wrote either of Greek events before the Median affairs or of the Median affairs themselves (αὐτὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ, Th. i 97.2), whereas no one described the subsequent period, the Pentekontaetia, until Thucydides and Hellanicus did so. 'The Median affairs' means the events of 490-479 B.C. However, the Persian Wars were described by Herodotus down to the return of Xanthippus with the cables of Xerxes' bridge c. May 478 B.C., and Thucydides himself talks of ὁ Μηδικὸς πόλεμος as including the actual transfer of hegemony from Sparta to Athens late in 478 B.C. (i 95.7 and iii 10.2). Other writers of 'the Median affairs' are likely also to have included the events of 478 B.C. How trustworthy were these writers? They were close to the events. It should be noted that if, as is generally supposed, Herodotus was writing his history at Athens in the course of the First Peloponnesian War and added to it at the outbreak of the Second Peloponnesian War, then he was collecting material within thirty years of 478 B.C. and he was adding to it some forty-seven years after 478 B.C. Thucydides too in collecting material for his study of the Pentekontaetia before or soon after 431 B.C., was within some forty-seven years of 478 B.C. As the analogous intervals for us in 1967 bring us back respectively to 1937 and 1920, it is Athens' refusal was due to her vision of an important 'Machtstellung' in the future (p. 410). Experience of evacuated countries and even experience of Britain after Dunkirk make one wonder whether immediate considerations do not press too heavily for distant views to have much effect.

1 I am most grateful to Professor Sir Frank Adcock and Mr Russell Meiggs for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper. References to A. W. Gomme, A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, are given as 'Gomme' by number of volume and number of page.

2 For instance, recently an interesting article by H. D. Meyer in Historia xii (1963) 405 ff., 'Vorgeschichte des delischen-attischen Seebundes', finds in the policy of Athens during the Persian Wars those imperialistic visions and ambitions which became a reality decades later (2 in the late 450s). To take an example of shorter range, he suggests that, when Attica was evacuated and Mardonius made his offer, he did not consider Athens and her allies to be a threat.

3 Hdt. ix 121; for the month, see my remarks in Historia iv (1955) 384 n. 1, 'Studies in Greek Chronology of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.'

4 I have discussed this point in CR vii (1957) 100 f. τὰ Μηδικὰν καὶ τὰ Μηδικὰ; D. xi 37. 6 ends 'the Median war' with the return of Xanthippus from Sestus to Athens.

5 I have given reasons for supposing that Thue-
obvious that Herodotus and Thucydidides could have spoken to men in Athens who had been Hellenotamiae for instance in the opening years of the Alliance; indeed it is certain that Thucydidides did speak to eye-witnesses and contemporaries of the events he described in his account of Themistocles' diplomacy and the rebuilding of Athens' walls late in 479 B.C.⁶

The evidence is Athens-centred. Herodotus had a strong bias in favour of Athens. This bias was formed probably at the time when the Athenians and the Peloponnesians were at war. It was apt to be projected into the years around 478 B.C. We shall find an example of this when Herodotus sees an Athenian victory over the Peloponnesians in the admission of the islanders to the Greek League (Hdt. ix 106.3-4). Thucydidides was more free from bias. But in his digression on the Pentekontaëthia he was concerned mainly with Athens; for he was deliberately selecting those incidents in the formation of the Alliance which illustrated the later growth of Athenian imperialism (Th. i 97.2 fin.).

The records of events in the 470's which survived and were available for consultation by Herodotus, Thucydidides, Hellanicus and others were no doubt considerable. 'The tribute in the time of Aristides' ὁ φόρος ἐπὶ Ἄριστου was cited in an article of the treaty of 422/1 B.C. (Th. v 18.5). The citation would have been pointless unless the detailed list of payments was on public record in 422/1 B.C. As this tribute was itself based on Aristides' original assessment, made in 478/7 B.C. (Ath. Pol. xxiii 5), it is clear that Thucydidides and the unknown author behind Plutarch, Diódoros and Cornelius Nepos had only to consult this list of payments in order to give us the total. It is almost absurd to doubt the accuracy of this figure, except on textual grounds.⁷ The treaty on which the Athenian Alliance was founded in 478/7 B.C. was certainly recorded at the time, whether on wood or stone or papyrus, and was publicly displayed in the contracting states. We have examples of earlier treaties; and we have remains of the actual treaty on which the Second Athenian Alliance was founded in 378/7 B.C., the pieces having been found in the Athenian Agora.⁸

It is likely that a quota of the Delian monies was paid to Apollo. If so, the payments were recorded at Delos. Whether that is so or not, from 477 B.C. onwards the Hellenotamiae recorded, published and kept the accounts of the monies; for that was their function. The totals of the accumulated funds at various times are given in our literary sources; they are no doubt based originally upon published accounts. The oaths which accompanied agreements between states derived their efficacy from the fact that they were on public record. It is possible that a part of the oath taken before the Battle of Plataea in 479 B.C. has survived in the company of an Athenian Ephebic oath of the late fourth century (Tod GHI nos. 204). The oaths, to which Herodotus refers, when the islanders were admitted to the Greek League were certainly recorded at the time, and the record may have been extant in his own day. Some of Xerxes' cables were dedicated by Athens to Apollo at Delphi. The dedication was recorded; the inscription survives (Fouilles de Delphes ii 110 f.). Deductions of booty won by the Athenians and their Allies and publicly recorded in the years after 478 B.C. must have been very numerous. Memory and records alike enabled Herodotus, Thucydidides and Hellanicus to ascertain a great deal about the early years of the Athenian Alliance, parti-

---

⁶ Beloch's theory in GG ii 1.16 ff. that the whole account is a fictitious anecdote—a theory roundly condemned by Gomme—passes my comprehension; for it shows no sense of time. How could such a fiction have been presented to men who had lived through 479/8 B.C.?

⁷ Doubts were expressed, for instance, by E. M. Walker in CAH v 44 f.; they were well answered by Gomme, i 278. I discuss the procedure of the assessment and the nature of the 'phoroi' later; I assume here that the 'phoroi' or 'contributions to be made' were expressed in money, whether the actual contributions were in money or in ships, and that the contributions came up to the assessments in the opening year. ATL iii 235 accepts the total assessment figure of 460 talents; see also ATL iii 221.

⁸ Tod, GHI no. 5 (Eleans and Heraeans); Plu. GQ v (Sparta and Tegea); Tod, GHI no. 123 (Second Athenian Confederacy).
cularly from the Athenian side; and Hellanicus may have learnt the other side of the picture as he came from Lesbos.

A good deal of our information comes from Diodorus, Plutarch, *Athenaion Politeia* and Cornelius Nepos. The first of these used Ephorus as his immediate source; Plutarch and Cornelius Nepos may have used him too. But Ephorus himself was using an earlier source, who is neither Herodotus nor Thucydides, and it seems probable that his source was Hellanicus or/and one of the writers before Thucydides who took 'the Median affairs' down to the change of the hegemony and the disgrace of Pausanias. The passage in the *Athenaion Politeia* may also come from an Atthidographer, whether it was Hellanicus or Androtion drawing on Hellanicus. Therefore, I consider the information in these later writings not to be inventions only worth discarding but to be based on a writer who, like Thucydides, met eye-witnesses of the actual events of the 470s and could consult records still extant in the last quarter of the fifth century B.C.

A few details are found in Andocide, Xenophon and Isocrates. As Andocide, a man of distinguished family, was born c. 440 B.C., his father was of an age to have served first c. 450 B.C. and his grandfather was of an age to have served first c. 478/7, when the Athenian Alliance was founded. The case is much the same with Isocrates, born in 436 B.C., and Xenophon, born c. 430 B.C., and their fathers and grandfathers. It is most likely that their remarks about the Athenian Alliance were based on the reminiscences and common knowledge of persons who had been contemporaries and even participants in its foundation; and it is interesting to note that when two of them were still writing—Xenophon in the *Poroi* (355 B.C.) and Isocrates in the *Panathenaicus* (342–339 B.C.)—Ephorus was composing his history.

**B. THE CAMPAIGN OF MYCALE DOWN TO THE CAPTURE OF SESTUS**

Hdt. ix 103–121, Th. i 89 and D.S. xi 34–37

During the campaign which included the battle of Mycale the Greeks were faced with the question whether they should admit the Ionian *islanders* and the Ionian *mainlanders* to the Greek League. It was a crucial matter at the time, and that is why Herodotus lays so much stress on Ionia and 'the revolt of Ionia'. His account may be summarised as follows. Six escapees from Chios, who had failed to assassinate the pro-Persian tyrant, had fled to Sparta and had been sent on to the Greek fleet at Aegina, are dignified with the title 'Ιώνων ἄγγελοι and are said to have asked Sparta ἔλευθερον τῷ Ιωνίᾳ (viii 132). They had, of course, no official missio. The next contact was made by three men, ἄγγελοι ... περιπλήντης ὕπο Σαμίων λαβη τῶν τε Περσῶν καὶ τῶν τυφών (ix 90.1). They were representatives of a resistance group in Samos. Their leader, Hegesistratus, claimed that if the Ionians should but see the Greeks, the Ionians would revolt from Persia (οἱ 'Ιωνες ἀπουστήρωντας ἀπό Περσῶν, ix 90.2). At the request of Leotychidas the three Samians gave pledges and took oaths on the subject of a future alliance with 'the Greeks', that is with the Greek League9 as it is usually called (ix 91.2 and ix 92.1, πάντων καὶ ὁρκα ἔποιεσσιν συμμαχίας πέρι πρὸς τοὺς 'Ελλήνες). Just before the battle of Mycale Leotychidas tried to win over the Ionians (ix 98.3–4); the Persians then disarmed the Samians and isolated the Milesians on the suspicion that they would side with the Greeks in the battle (ix 99.1 and 3). During the battle the disarmed Samians and then the other Ionians 'attacked the Persians ἀποστάντες ἀπό Περσῶν (ix 103.2), and the Milesians tricked the retreating Persians (ix 104). 'So', says

---

9 I use the word League in recognition of the corporate name of 'Ελλήνες; so too I regard οἱ Βουικοτάι, οἱ Χαλκοδεῖς, οἱ 'Ιωνες etc. as the names of Leagues. On the other hand οἱ 'Αθηναίοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι or οἱ Μολοσσοί καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι are Alliances in name and in fact, not Leagues at all; and far less should οἱ 'Αθηναίοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι be rendered 'Delian League' or the like, which is a modern misnomer unrelated to the Greek name.
Herodotus, ‘Ionia revolted from Persia for the second time’ (οὔτως δὴ τὸ δεύτερον Ἰωνία ἀπὸ Περσῶν ἀπέτυχ). The Greeks then sailed off to Samos and deliberated about the removal of the Ionians from Ionia (ix 106.2).

The facts in Herodotus’ account are no doubt correct, since he was addressing, among others, older men, who had been at Delos, Samos and Mycale. But the emphasis placed on ‘the revolt of Ionia’—by which Herodotus meant the revolt not only of the Ionian islanders but also of the Ionian mainlanders (cf. ix 96.2, where it is said the Persian army was guarding ‘Ionia’) —is likely to be due to Herodotus, as he is telling the story from the viewpoint of a Halicarnassian. For the mutinous acts of the Samian, Milesian and other Ionian troops during the battle did not in fact constitute ‘a revolt of Ionia from Persia’. On that day the governments of the Ionian states—in some cases pro-Persian tyrannies—were totally unaware of the outcome of the battles of Mycale and Plataea, fought on the very same day in September 479 B.C. If they revolted at all, it was some weeks later. Herodotus has speeded up the narrative for dramatic effect.

During the advance from Delos towards Mycale, the Greek command had hesitated between three possible courses: sailing home from Samos, going to the Hellespont or pursuing the Persians to Mycale (ix 98.1). The victory at Mycale now brought the Ionian mainlanders within the scope of possible operations. The primary matter for discussion by the Greeks at Samos after the victory was not whether to remove the Ionian mainlanders, as Herodotus suggests, but whether or not to admit the Ionian mainlanders into the alliance with ‘the Greeks’ and so accept their defence as a duty of the Greek League. On this primary matter they decided against admitting the mainlanders; for they reckoned themselves unable to protect ‘Ionia’, i.e. the mainland areas occupied by Ionians, for an indefinite period (ix 106.2). The removal or the non-removal of the Ionian mainlanders was a secondary matter. On this head the Greeks offered the Ionians the land of some Medising states in the homeland. Herodotus tells us that Athens opposed this offer. More important, we may assume that Athens—or rather the Athenian captains at the council held by Leotychidas—opposed the non-admission of the mainlanders into the alliance with the Greeks. Herodotus ends his description of this matter with the statement that in view of the Athenian opposition the Peloponnesians readily gave way (ἀντιτεθέντων δὲ τοῦτον προθύμως εἶχαν οἱ Ἑλληνοποννησοὶ). Here we can see his bias in favour of Athens; for the failure of Athens to gain admission for the mainlanders in late 479 B.C. is converted by him into a triumph for Athens as regards the removal of the mainland populations—a colossal task and one not to be achieved even in 478 B.C. In truth, as regards the primary matter, Athens was defeated. Although Athens was able to demonstrate her sympathy with the Ionian mainlanders, it was the Peloponnesians who had their way.

The Greek commanders then admitted into the Greek League Samos, Chios, Lesbos and the other islanders who were now campaigning with the Greeks, binding them with pledges and oaths to remain in the alliance and not to secede (ἐς τοῖς συμμαχικοῖς ἐποίησαν πιστὶ τε καταλαβόντες καὶ ὅρκιοι ημεῖς τε καὶ μὴ ἀποστῆσονται ix 106.4). These alliances

10 Hdt. ix 90.1 and 100-2, stating that enquiry was made into the exact date ‘a short time afterwards’. His statement, addressed inter alios to people who had taken part in the battles, should not be doubted as it has been (see the discussion in How and Wells, Commentary on Herodotus ii 331); ancient historians are apt to forget the difference between ancient history and contemporary history.

11 Some scholars have been carried away by the bias of Herodotus; for instance, J. A. O. Larsen in Class. Phil. xxix (1934) 15 went so far as to comment that the Spartan officers ‘were opposed to admitting the Samians, Chians, Lesbians etc.’—a comment which is entirely without foundation in the narrative of Herodotus, and H. D. Meyer in Historia xii (1963) 418 sees in this a complete defeat for Sparta and a complete victory for Athens. The subject of the sentence in Hdt. ix 106-4 is oi Ἐλλῆνες, resumed through καὶ οὗτο ὅπως ὁμως oi Ἑλλῆνες at ix 106.2 (the intervening sentences giving a summary of the discussion); this point is missed in some translations, e.g. in A. R. Burn, Persia and the Greeks (1962) 552.

12 Samos was now admitted for the first time. Unnecessary confusion has been introduced into
between the individual states and ‘the Greeks’ were no doubt published and put on record. The Greek fleet then sailed to the Hellespont, which had been one of their possible objectives earlier (ix 98.1).

Herodotus does not saddle the Greek commanders with a desire to ‘liberate the Greeks in Asia’. He had more historical sense; for it was not a practical issue until after the victory at Mycale. Diodorus Siculus xi 34 makes that error. In his account the Samian envoys ask the Greek commanders at Delos: ἐλευθερώσα τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἑλλήνας, the Greek commanders in session decided ἐλευθεροῖν τὰς πόλεις, Leotychidas’ attempts to win over the Ionians becomes an announcement of ‘the Greeks’ as ἐλευθερώσατο τὰς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἑλλήνες, and the Greeks in the Persian army are represented as agreeing to revolt. Diodorus gives much more credit than Herodotus does to the Ionians for their share in the victory, and he introduces the Aeolians—who did not figure in Herodotus’ account—and also other Asiatic Greeks as engaging in the battle; for a fierce desire for liberty, he says, entered into τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν πόλεις (xi 36.5). This anachronistic idea of Panhellenic Liberation was probably due to Ephorus, a native of Aeolian Cyme in Asia Minor and an enthusiastic Panhellenist; but for the Aeolians’ part in the battle Ephorus may have derived information from Hellanicus, an Aeolian of Lesbos.

Herodotus, as we saw, did not represent the Greeks at Samos as admitting the mainlanders into the Greek League. Diodorus does so (xi 37.1 τοὺς μὲν Ἰωνας καὶ τοὺς Αἰολες συμμάχους ἐποίησαντο). In his account ‘the Aeolians and the Ionians’ were actually about to sail off to Europe, when the Athenians advised them to stay and caused the Ionians to change their minds. Diodorus is certainly incorrect; the mainlanders were not so admitted, and there would not have been time for the Aeolians and the Ionians to have organised the evacuation of the mainland populations in the days between Mycale and the move to Samos.

The question to which these sources give no clear answer is whether the Aeolian and the Ionian mainlanders did revolt from Persia, when the victories at Mycale and at Plataea became known. One imagines that Herodotus’ phrase ‘Ionia revolted from Persia for the second time’, though mistimed in his context, represented a fact and that the Ionian mainlanders did revolt in winter 479/478 B.C. The Aeolian mainlanders are likely to have done so too since they were nearer to the Greek fleet’s theatre of operations in the Hellespont. The first act of the Ionians must then have been to form again the Ionian League, τὸ κοίνον τῶν Ἰωνων which had fought so long in the 490’s. In 498 B.C. Athens, Eretria and the islanders had fought on their side. Now Athens and the islanders, being members of the Greek League, were not free to ally themselves with the Ionian mainlanders.

According to Herodotus the Greek fleet sailed from Samos to Abydus in the Hellespont.
(Hdt. ix 106 fin. and ix 114). On finding the bridge down, the Peloponnesians in the fleet sailed home. They had now gained the prizes, namely ‘the islands and the Hellespont’, which Herodotus had noted would result from victory at Mycale (ix 101.3); there is no suggestion that Ionian or other mainlanders had joined them. The Athenians crossed to Sestus on the European side of the Hellespont and captured it after a long siege. Herodotus mentions no allies at all in the operation at Sestus; in his pages Athens alone has the glory of this victory. Diodorus xi 37.4–5 gives Athens two lots of allies, both serving under her command, ‘the Ionians and the islanders’; his source Euphorus, and perhaps ultimately Hellanicus, may have defined these Ionians, but Diodorus leaves them undefined, except that his context implies they were the mainlanders who had ‘decided to remain in Asia’ (xi 37.3 fin.). At this point a new source, Thucydides, enters the picture. He begins with the division of the allied Greek fleet in the Hellespont: ‘Leotychidas sailed home with the allies from the Peloponnesse, but the Athenians and the allies from Ionia and the Hellespont, being already in revolt from the Great King, stayed and besieged Sestus.’ ‘The allies’ here are of course not the allies of Sparta and the allies of Athens respectively, but the allies who made up the Greek League, including Sparta and Athens. It follows then that in Thucydides’ opinion those who had been admitted into the Greek League by late 479 B.C. were οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰωνίας καὶ 'Ελλησποντίων εὑμαχοι ἐδώ αφεστηκότες ἀπὸ βασιλέως. His evidence is more acceptable than that of Herodotus, who mentions nobody except the Athenians. It means that the Greeks had admitted into the Greek League such Hellespontine states as were already in revolt. If Herodotus is correct in indicating that the Greeks had admitted only the islanders into the Greek League, then Thucydides’ word οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰωνίας . . . . . . . ξύμαχοι refer to the Ionian islanders, that is to the Samians and the Chians.

Thucydides used Ἰωνία to include the islands Chios and Samos at vii 57.4 (ἐκ δὲ Ἰωνίας Μιλήσιοι καὶ Σάμιοι καὶ Χίοι); and he described the island of Chios at vii 40.1 as the greatest εὖ Ἰωνία. The meaning which I propose for οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰωνίας . . . . . . . . . . ξύμαχοι ἐδώ αφεστηκότες is therefore possible; for the islanders, led by Samos and Chios, were already ‘in revolt’ and had been admitted as ‘allies’ after the battle of Mycale (Hdt. ix 106.4). It should be noted that Thucydides uses Ἰωνία ambiguously. At vii 6.2 and at vii 20.1 Chios is geographically separate from Ἰωνία, which is the mainland area; at ii 32.2 and vii 31.2 ‘Ionia’ is the part exposed to Persia, that is again the mainland area; and at iii 31.1 the plan to raise ‘Ionia’ in revolt refers probably to the Ionian islanders and mainlanders together. He uses Ἰωνεῖς with similar ambiguity. Racially ‘the Ionians’ extend from Attica and Euboea to the Asiatic coast and to Sicily (e.g. vii 57.2 f.). But most often ‘the Ionians’ are named in contrast to ‘the islanders’ (vi 77.1, vi 82.3, vii 5.4) or to ‘most of the islanders’ (i 12.4) or to particular islanders (iii 104.3). Herodotus, unlike Thucydides, mentions τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἰωνόν (v 109.3), and defines its members as the Ionians of the twelve states. Of these only Chios and Samos were islands; the other states were on the mainland. For him Ἰωνεῖς was a specific political term; the Ionian League had already proved itself in the Ionian revolt, and its allies then, e.g. Lesbos and Eretria, had been distinct from it (Hdt. vi 8.1). In his narrative of the Ionian revolt Herodotus sometimes uses the term ‘the Ionians’ to cover the Ionians and their allies, just as we speak of ‘the British landing’ in Sicily, or as Thucydides spoke of ‘the Athenians’ in the Peloponnesian war. This is a convenient abbreviation in a narrative.14 But it is incorrect to suppose, as Gomme did,15

11 Herodotus used ‘the Ionians’ also to mean those who had migrated from Athens and celebrated the Apaturia (i 147.2—a much larger group in the islands than Samos and Chios, as we see also from Th. vi 76.3 τῶν τοῦ Ἰωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων ἀπὸ σφῶν ἦσαν ἄπωμαχοι) and those who had occupied the Greek mainland in prehistoric times. The uses are neatly expressed by J. Chadwick in CAH2 xxxix 12.

15 Gomme i 271 ‘again the Ionians . . . are taken for the whole of the Asiatic Greeks’. He says ‘again’ because in i 257 when commenting on Th. i 89.2 οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰωνίας . . . . . . . . . . . . ξύμαχοι ἐδώ αφεστηκότες he had stated ‘Thucydides in ἀπὸ Ἰωνίας includes Lesbos, and mainland Aeolis, and presumably the Dorian hexapolis, or at least the Dorian islands as well.’ Gomme’s ex cathedra statement exceeds the
that ‘the Ionians’ in Thucydides i 95.1 stand for all the Asiatic Greeks. Herodotus, Thucydides and Diodorus are all scrupulous in distinguishing Ionians from Aeolians and Dorians (e.g. Hdt. i 141 and 144; Thuc. ii 9.4, iii 31.1, vii 57.5; Diod. xi 37.1–2). In *Ath. Pol.* xxiii 5, where Aristides took the oath τοῖς Ἰωανὶς ἀστεῖ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκθέντι ἐναὶ καὶ φίλῳ, the wording in the paraphrase of the treaty is likely to be precise. Again, when the Spartans and their alliance dedicated spoils won in 457 B.C. from the Argives, Athenians and ‘Ionians’ (*Iares*, Tod *GHI* no. 27 with Paus. v 10.4), we should expect the reference to be precise and not to cover the whole of the Asiatic Greeks, Dorians included. These considerations are important in the next section.

C. THE OPERATIONS UNDER PAUSANIAS AND THE CHANGE OF HEGEMONY

All the operations of 479 B.C., including the campaign at Sestus which lasted into the spring of 478 B.C., were conducted on behalf of the Greek Alliance by its members; this is clear, as we have seen, from Thucydides’ use of ξύμμαχοι at i 89.2. There are no grounds for supposing that Athens acted independently of or at variance with the Greek League. The command of Xanthippus, which ran for the campaigning season from spring 479 to spring 478 B.C., was geared to the system of the Greek League and not to that of the Athenian state. He was the Athenian commander serving under Leotychidas, the supreme commander of the Greek Fleet. His successor Aristides was due to hold office from spring 478 B.C. to spring 477 B.C., serving under Pausanias who had been appointed the supreme commander of the Greek fleet for that year (Thuc. i 94, οστραγ, των Ἐλλήνων). The term of command differed not only from that used by Athens, which was from c. July to July, but also from that used by Sparta, which was from c. September to September. The Council of the Greek League met normally in the spring. It then determined matters of policy. In spring 478 B.C. we may assume that it confirmed (if it had not done so earlier) the action of Leotychidas in admitting the islanders and the Hellespontine states and in rejecting the approaches of the Ionian mainlanders; and that it laid down a strategy for 478 B.C. In fact this strategy disregarded the wishes of the Ionian mainlanders altogether; for, according to Thucydides, Pausanias reduced most of Cyprus and then captured Byzantium (Th. i 94). According to Diodorus xi 44, who speaks incorrectly of the Spartans and not ‘the Greeks’ as the directing force, the Spartans instructed him ἐλεύθερον τὰς Ἐλλήνες πόλεις in the vein of the earlier passages (see p. 45 above). This idea is certainly unhistorical, since the actions of Pausanias did not free any cities in the Aeolian, Ionian and Dorian strips of Asiatic coastland but blocked the entry into Aegean waters through capturing Cyprus and controlled the passage from Asia to Europe by winning the Bosporus as well as the Hellespont. Liberation might follow; but liberation was not the immediate aim either of Sparta or of the Greek League. We see here the anachronistic ideas of Ephorus.

The violent behaviour of Pausanias and its effects are described by Thucydides, Diodorus and Plutarch. The account of Thucydides is much to be preferred. He had mentioned in i 94 that Pausanias was sent from Lacedaemon with twenty ships, and that thirty Athenian ships and a great number of other allied ships sailed with him (τῶν ἄλλων ξύμμαχων πλῆθος).

words of Thucydides and the probabilities even of late 479 B.C.

16 See n. 3 above.

17 This seems to be the view of Gomme i 257. He assumes that between the decision taken at Samos to admit only the islanders late in 479 B.C. and the attack on Sestus also late in 479 B.C. the states on the mainland joined Athens, and that they later, with her, broke away from the Peloponneseans (Th. i 95.1). The difficulties in such a view are that, if the Ionian

states joined Athens, they did not thereby join the Greek League and become ξύμμαχοι in the sense of Th. i 89.2; and that, as they were not members of the Greek League (since according to Gomme i 257 ‘Sparta, the leader of the confederacy, was naturally not prepared to accept them as allies’), they could not be serving under Pausanias at Byzantium (Th. i 95.1). There are also difficulties in supposing that Athens accepted her personal allies those whom the Greek League had just rejected.
Diodorus xi 44.2 mentions ships from the Greek mainland only, namely fifty triremes from the Peloponnesese and thirty from Athens; perhaps he omitted the others in abbreviating his source. Plutarch Arist. xxiii mentions Chians, Samians and Lesbians among the allied contingents and speaks generally of οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν συμμάχων and of οἱ ναύαρχοι καὶ στρατηγοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων. It is likely that the forces of the Peloponnesians and the Athenians (totalling eighty triremes) were considerably outnumbered by the combined forces of the Aegean island states, which were led by the Ionians of Chios and Samos, and of the states in the Hellespont, Propontis and Bosporus. When Pausanias turned violent, οἱ τε ἄλλοι Ἑλλήνες ἐκέλευσαν καὶ οὕτως ἦσσαν οἱ Ἰωνες καὶ δοσ τοὐπολεώς νεωτι ἑλευθέρωντο (Th. i 95.1). We should compare this phrase with that at i 89.2 οἱ ἄφοβοι Ἰωνες καὶ Ἑλλησποντους ξύμμαχοι ἦσσαν ἀποκελεσε επί βασιλεως, where we have seen that the Chians and the Samians were 'those from Ionia'. Here too οἱ Ἰωνες may stand in particular for the Chians and the Samians, and all those δοσ τοῦπολεώς νεωτι ἑλευθέρωντο were the Greeks of Cyprus and of the Hellespont, Propontis and Bosporus. Thucydides goes on to describe the approaches which were made to the Athenians by the Ionians and those recently liberated, asking them to become their leaders κατὰ τὸ εὐγγενές. This argument of kinship applied to a wide range of Ionian islanders (cf. Th. vii 57.4), but not to Lesbos or Byzantium. Meanwhile complaints against Pausanias were made at Sparta by members of the Greek fleet who came to Sparta (Th. i 95.3; D.S. xi 44.6 by the Peloponnesians who deserted him), and Pausanias was recalled. It was while he was being recalled that 'the allies except the troops from the Peloponnesse transferred themselves to the Athenians' (Th. i 95.4); this they did of their own initiative and will, as Thucydides made the Athenian envoys say later (i 75.2, ἧμιν δὲ προσελθόντων τῶν ἔμμαχων καὶ αὐτῶν δεσπότων ἡγεμόνας καταστήσας).

Diodorus, Plutarch and the Athenaion Politia emphasise the diplomatic skill of Aristides at the time of Pausanias' brutalities; he won over the states by his adroitness (D.S. xi 44.6 and 46.4), his kindness and his considerateness gained him the command (Plu. Arist. xxii), his virtues were rivalled only by the virtues of Cimon (Plu. Cim. vi), and he was the man who promoted the revolt of the Ionians (Ath. Pol. xxiii 4). The emphasis on personalities may derive from the Atticohistorical writers. While Thucydides emphasises the Ionians as leaders in the approaches to Athens, Plutarch mentions the commanders of the contingents of Chios, Samos and Lesbos in particular and recounts an episode in which Ouliiades of Samos and Antagoras of Chios with their supporters mutinied at Byzantium against Pausanias and went over to the Athenians (τελος δ᾽ ἀποστάσεις φεύγοντο πρὸς τῶν Ἀθηναίων, Arist. xxiii). This detailed act of ἀπόστασις may be historical; but Thucydides is to be accepted as correct when he puts the transference of hegemony into the period of Pausanias' recall (i 95.4). Diodorus, Plutarch and the Athenaion Politia emphasise the displacement of Pausanias by Aristides and represent the change as due to a mutiny by the Ionians against Sparta (D.S. xi 46.5; Plu. Arist. xxiii; Ath. Pol. xxiii 4). Thucydides emphasises the change similar order of words) and ἄπο Πελοποννήσου to be added in order to contrast with Ἀθηναίων. If Sparta provided twenty (a reasonable figure as she had sixteen at Salamis, when she was deeply committed on land), the other thirty ships needed to reach Diodorus' fifty from the Peloponnesse could have been supplied by Corinth and other Peloponnesian states.

18 It is possible that Diodorus' 50 triremes from the Peloponnesse are not inconsistent with Thucydides' 20 from Lacedaemon. Th. i 94.1 Παυσανίας ὁ Κλεομῖτας ἐκ Λακεδαιμίων στρατηγὸς τῶν Ἑλλήνων εξετήθη μετὰ εἶκος νεόν ἀπὸ Πελοποννήσους ευνέπθεον δὲ καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τρίακοντα ναυαὶ seems to mean 'Pausanias, son of Cleombrotus, was sent out (ἐξ-) with twenty ships from (ἐκ) Lacedaemon as general of the Greeks, from the Peloponnesse; the Athenians joined him with thirty ships'; and not to say, as Gomme i 271 appears to take it, 'with twenty ships from the Peloponnesse', leaving. I suppose, ἐκ Λακεδαιμίων as an unparallelled paraphrase for Λακεδαιμίων. I take ἐκ Λακεδαιμίων to depend on εξετήθη (cf. vii 1.4 and viii 20.1 for a similar order of words) and ἄπο Πελοποννήσου to be added in order to contrast with Ἀθηναίων. If Sparta provided twenty (a reasonable figure as she had sixteen at Salamis, when she was deeply committed on land), the other thirty ships needed to reach Diodorus' fifty from the Peloponnesse could have been supplied by Corinth and other Peloponnesian states.

19 Thucydides may have had this wide range of islanders in mind when he wrote ὁδὴ ἄκματα ἐκ Ἰωνέων at i 95.1; it was a generally accepted relationship (cf. Hdt. i 147). I have already commented (p. 46 above) on Gomme's supposition that 'the Ionians are taken for the whole of the Asiatic Greeks'.

of the hegemony from Sparta to Athens which the allies—apart from the Peloponnesian troops—brought about and then confirmed later when they rejected the successors sent out by Sparta (Th. i 95.6; Plu. Arist. xxiii does not mention any successors). The course of events was probably as follows. The Ionians of Chios and Samos committed the first act of mutiny; the commanders from Chios and Samos and the Aeolian commanders from Lesbos led the appeal to Athens; and all the commanders and crews with the exception of the Peloponnesian troops asked Athens to accept the hegemony. When Dorcis and others arrived from Sparta and were rejected, probably late in 478 b.c., the Spartans accepted the fait accompli and let the matter rest (Th. i 95.7).

D. The Creation of the Athenian Alliance

In theory Athens could have replaced Sparta as the state to which the Greek League granted the hegemony. For the Allies were willing (Th. i 96.1 ἑκότων τῶν ἔμμαχων), and Sparta was friendly to Athens (Th. i 92 and i 95.7). Indeed the Greek Congress was as certain to elect Athens at its spring meeting in 477 b.c. as it had been to elect Sparta in spring 481 b.c., because it was concerned with degrees of real power at the time (cf. Th. vi 82.3 καθ ὁσον ἐν τῷ παρόντι μεῖζον ἴσχυος). In 477 b.c. the war was to be a naval war; the Athenian navy of 200 ships had already proved its power at Artemision, Salamis and Sestus, and now the Athenian commander had the full support of all the member-states outside the Peloponnes. There had been no breach of the Greek League; and there was not to be one until 462/1 b.c., when Athens abandoned τὴν γενομένην ἐπὶ τῷ Μῆδῳ ἔμμαχίαν in the ensuing spring, 477 b.c. The whole Peloponnesian force was then soon recalled; it did not wait for the campaign of that summer.' His view requires us to suppose either that the Peloponnesian forces stayed at Byzantium all winter and were recalled only in early summer 477 b.c., or that the Peloponnesian forces went home late in 478 b.c., their successors went out to Byzantium early in 477 b.c. and were recalled not long afterwards. The former alternative can be rejected because the Peloponnesian forces had gone home in autumn 479 b.c. (Th. i 89.2) and even the Athenians had disliked winter service at that time (Hdt. ix 117). The latter alternative creates many difficulties. If the question of the hegemony was still undecided in spring 477 b.c., the appointment of a hegemon and the decisions on strategy were taken in spring 477 b.c. at the normal meeting of the Greek League Congress; when Dorcis went out, if it was in spring 477 b.c., he went as στρατηγός τῶν Ἐλλήνων, official successor to Pausanias, and the Peloponnesian forces went with him (cf. i 94.1, quoted in n. 18 above), presumably fifty ships or so as in 478 b.c. and not the στρατιά ὑπὸ πολλῆς of Th. i 95.6. There would have been a head-on collision between the Greek League's forces and those of Athens and her East Greek supporters. But such a reconstruction has no support in our sources and is far from necessary. The picture in Thucydides and in the other writers is of personalities active at Byzantium before and during the recall of Pausanias, of a sudden transference of command without consultation of the Greek League Congress and of Sparta's tacit withdrawal. All this happened in autumn 478 b.c.; and it was then that Dorcis was sent by Sparta to take over the remainder of Pausanias' period of command—Dorcis and some others (probably Spartan staff officers) and a small force (Th. i 95.6). The change of command from Sparta to Athens was achieved in time for Athens to reorientate her policy and for Aristides to complete the assessment in the year of Timosthenes, i.e. before c. July of 477 b.c. (Ath. Pol. xxiii 5).

20 Thucydides represents the Spartans as glad to be rid of 'the Median war'. Plu. Arist. xxiii 7 puts their willingness more strongly ἀρέσας ἑκότων τὴν ἡγεμονίαν. Ath. Pol. xxiii 2 reports their unwillingness: ἐξελέι γὰρ αὐτῶν ὅτι ἦν ἡ ἡγεμονία ἡ τῆς θαλάσσης ἡγεμονίας λαβεῖν ἄκοντων τῶν Λακεδαιμόνων. It is true that Gomme i 272 and ATL iii 192, n. 30 interpret the last passage as 'unwilling to keep the leadership', but this is not the normal sense of such a phrase, nor can λαβεῖ be supplied with ἄκοντων because it was a matter of retaining, not taking the hegemony. I support Sandys ad loc. who had no doubt that the Greek meant 'against the wishes of the Lacedaemonians'. Sparta accepted the fait accompli willy-nilly; one can express this by saying that Sparta did not contest the matter (Isc. Paneg. ixxii 1 ἀναμφιβολῶν), had her own reasons for not contesting it after the rejection of Dorcis (Th. i 95. 6–7), and gave up her position unwillingly (Ath. Pol. xxiii 2) and at the same time willingly (Plu. Arist. xxiii 7, stressing Thucydides' point that service overseas might corrupt her men). The Spartan envoys in Xen. HG vi 5.34 said 'willingly' for diplomatic reasons (reading συμβουλημένων which is a variant).
(Th. i 102.4) and joined the Medising states. So in late 478 B.C. Athens had only to wait in order to become hegemon—at least by sea—of the Greek League in 477 B.C.

She chose not to wait. There were, we may conjecture, two main reasons for this: she did not want one vote in a Congress which could not only elect but also depose a hegemon, and she did not want to be tied in all matters of policy to a majority of the Congress, in particular in its recent refusal to accept the Ionian mainlanders. She preferred to create a separate organisation. The first step was to make separate alliances. According to Ath. Pol. xxiii 5 Aristides (on behalf of Athens) took the oath to 'The Ionians' in solemnisation of a treaty of offensive and defensive alliance; this was in the Attic year 478/7 B.C. 'The Ionians' in the context of a treaty has a specific meaning, as we have noted above: namely, the twelve Ionian states. As the wording runs, the treaty is between Athens on the one hand and the Ionian League on the other; consultation must have been between two chambers, the Athenian State and the Ionian League. In making this alliance Athens showed her intention of departing from the past policy of the Greek Alliance. According to Thucydides iii 10.2 Athens made an alliance also with Mytilene, one of the five states in the Aeolian island of Lesbos (ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ Ἀθηναίοις ξυμμαχία ἐγένετο), and this was concluded when the Spartans left the conflict with Persia (πρῶτον ἀπολεπίστων μὲν ὑμῶν ἐκ τοῦ Μικροῦ πολέμου παραμενόντων δὲ ἐκείνων πρὸς τὰ ὑπόλοιπα τῶν ἔργων); his wording refers us back to i 95.7 and places this alliance also within the period between late 478 B.C. and spring 477 B.C. The terms of this alliance are not known except that the Mytileneans envoys said the alliance was made εν' ἑλευθερώσει ἀπό τοῦ Μικροῦ τοῖς 'Ελλησιον (iii 10.3). It is likely that the terms which Athens made for the two alliances were not the same, because the Ionians had greater need of aid and they were related to Athens, whereas the Mytileneans of Lesbos were already safe and were not related to Athens. In particular it is to be noted that whereas Athens made an alliance with the group of Ionian states, she made an individual alliance with one individual state, Mytilene. It seems probable that at the battle of Tanagra 'the Ionians' fought against the Spartans in fulfilment of this offensive and defensive alliance; on the other hand the Aeolian Mytileneans (and other states in East Greece) did not take part, and their treaties probably did not require them to do so. During the winter, we may suppose, Athens made a number of such alliances. She thus became the centre of a group of states which were not necessarily in treaty with one another. Athens and Sparta were now in the position which Thucydides described in general terms at i 18.2: κοινῇ τε ἀπωσάμενοι τῶν

22 Ath. Pol. xxiii 5 (emphasising the importance of Aristides in the negotiations) διὰ καὶ τῶν φόρων νῦντος ἢ στὰς ταύτας πόλεως των πρώτως ... (in 478/7) ... καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑμῶν τοῖς Ἱωάν ὡστε τῶν αὐτῶν ἐβρήν εἰναι καὶ φίλων ἴδιοις καὶ τῶν μισθῶν ἐκ τῆς πελάγες καθεῖσαν. The order is ἐντερον πρῶτον since the treaty preceded the assessment. The treaty with οἱ Ἰωάνες is an offensive and defensive alliance. Its simple terminology is that of the fifth century, known to us from Th. i 44.1, where the obligations on the offensive side are frankly stated (in 433 B.C.), and from Xen. HG ii 2.20, where Athens and Sparta in 404 B.C. form a defensive alliance with Sparta holding the hegemony (an interesting parallel if Athens had the hegemony in the treaty with the Ionians which those who equate this treaty with the foundation treaty must believe). It has been customary to regard this treaty as one made with all the allies who came forward at the first meeting (e.g. ATL iii 227 with n. 9 we take 'the Ionians' as a rough designation for 'the allies, mainly Ionians', and F. R. Wust in Historia iii [1954/55] 149 'die Teilnehmer') and then to water down its meaning by further assumptions. For example, H. D. Meyer in Historia xii (1963) 439 says that Athens monopolised the interpretation of 'enemy' and 'friend': 'die Auslegung aber, ob jemand als Freund oder Feind im Sinne des Bundesedzes zu gelten habe, hatte Athen für sich monopolisiert.' We are concerned with the meaning of the treaty at the time; to say that two sides have the same enemy and friend is to express a reciprocity of relationship (cf. Th. i 44.1), not a monopoly by one side, and to interpret 'the Ionians' as all the allies is inaccurate.

23 Gomme, ii 261–2, Ἑλλησιον ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ.: Hdt. ix 106 and Thuc. i 95.1. There is no need to look for inaccuracies of detail here, or inconsistencies between the two historians. Gomme appears to conflate two different treaties (one between 'The Greeks' and Lesbos, and the other between Athens and Mytilene), made at different times (one at Samos just after the battle of Mycale and the other after Sparta resigned any effort to retain the hegemony, i.e. on Gomme's reckoning six months or more later).
ORIGINS AND NATURE OF THE ATHENIAN ALLIANCE OF 478/7 B.C. 51

βάρβαρον ἄστερον οὗ πολλὰ διεκρίθησαν πρὸς τε Ἀθηναίους καὶ Λακεδαμινούς οἱ τε ἀποστάντες βασιλεῖς καὶ οἱ εὐπολεμησόμεντας. Athens had as her allies the states previously ruled by Persia, and Sparta had as her allies the mainland states which had fought against Persia at Thermopylae and Plataea. Two bodies now existed de facto: οἱ Ἀθηναίοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι on the one hand and οἱ Λακεδαμινοί καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι on the other. The latter had a de iure existence as the Spartan Alliance. The former had still to be brought into formal existence.

In terms of past history the Athenians of 478 B.C. knew two forms of organisation for a group of allies. One was that which had been employed by the Ionian League and was now employed by the Greek League, wherein each state had one vote and the majority could confer hegemony on one member. This system had shown its weakness during the Ionian revolt. At first there had been no hegemony; then, when it was conferred just before the battle of Lade, a mutiny ensued (Hdt. vi 11–12) and disaster followed. Now the weakness of the system was apparent once again in the situation of Pausanias. For a mutiny had temporarily unseated Sparta from the hegemony, and a majority vote at the Congress was likely to make Sparta’s loss of hegemony permanent. This was not a form of organisation which commended itself to Athens. She had no desire to find herself equal in voting power to Siphnos.24 The other form was that of the Spartan Alliance in which there were two chambers, the Spartan state and the Allied Congress. Here the vote of Sparta was equal to the sum of her Allies’ votes; she and the Congress were equal, and each had the power of veto.25 But by treaty right Sparta possessed the hegemony permanently; and she exercised it whenever the two chambers declared war. This bicameral organisation had been seen at work c. 505 B.C. (Hdt. v 91–93). Then the Corinthians had persuaded the other allies in Congress not to go to war against Athens. The veto of the Allied Congress had prevailed against the wishes of Sparta. On other occasions the veto of Sparta may have prevailed against the wishes of the Allied Congress. Whenever a war had occurred, Sparta had exercised the hegemony. For fifty years the Spartan Alliance had been the most powerful force in Greece. When one compares the positions held by Sparta in the Spartan Alliance and by Sparta in the Greek League, the one is as different from the other as chalk is from cheese; and at the time everyone, and particularly the Athenians, could see the advantages Sparta had in the Spartan Alliance.

The names of these forms of organisation revealed their nature. Οἱ Ἑλλῆνες and οἱ Ἑλλήνες were each a unitary organisation of states, in which each Ionian state or each Greek state had an equal vote in one chamber. Οἱ Λακεδαμινοί καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι (in verse form c. 457 B.C., τοι Λακεδαμινοί συμμαχία τε, Tod, GHI no. 27) was a bicameral organisation, οἱ Λακεδαμινοί were each a unitary organisation of states, in which each Ionian state or each Greek state had an equal vote in one chamber. Οἱ Ἑλλῆνες and οἱ Ἑλλήνες were each a unitary organisation of states, in which each Ionian state or each Greek state had an equal vote in one chamber. 24 This point causes embarrassment to those who suppose Athens to have put herself in this position. Thus ATL 227 ‘the powers of making policy rested with the Delian synod’ with note 10 ‘but Athens must have had some control even here’, and ATL 141 ‘the hegemonic power was surely protected somehow against being outvoted and compelled to execute a policy which it disapproved’ and ‘perhaps the simplest is to suppose that neither of them [Sparta and Athens] as hegemones would put a motion of which they disapproved. The hegemon, then, had what in Athens would be called “proboleutic” power.’ This is pure speculation; moreover, it implies in the case of Sparta that on the occasion of the Samian revolt Sparta’s ‘proboleuma’ was for war against Athens—a ‘proboleuma’ defeated by the attitude of Corinth (Th. i 41.2), and this is highly improbable, as there is no mention of so frank a revelation of Sparta’s purpose in the preliminaries to the Peloponnesian War; and again, what was Sparta’s ‘proboleuma’ when Corinth summoned the allies to Sparta and denounced the Athenians? The suggestion of H. D. Meyer (see n. 22), that Athens alone interpreted the meaning of ‘enemy and friend’, i.e. dictated all foreign policy, is intended to meet the same difficulty; but it robs the allies of any ἴσωσια and is a denial of what was usually regarded as a part of ἴσωσια. H. Bengtson, GG 176, makes no suggestion of means but thinks that Athens as hegemon knew how to guide the decisions of the Congress according to her will. 25 I follow U. Kahrstedt, Griechische Staatsrecht i: Sparta und seine Synmachie (1922) and others in the interpretation of the Spartan Alliance; the clearest evidence comes from the preliminaries to the Peloponnesian War (cf. Th. i 120.1 and 125.1).
having an equal say with οἱ σώματα, ‘The Lacedaemonians’ and ‘the allies’ were in fact ἰσόδήμου.

Naturally, Athens chose the bicameral organisation. It was already developing from a basis of individual alliances, as the Spartan organisation had done and as the Second Athenian Alliance was to do a century later. But it needed a formal contract. Plutarch Arist. xxv probably refers to the contract in the words ὁ Ἀριστείς ἀρχικές μὲν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ ὁμοσσεν ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἀθηναίων. For the allies evidently called themselves at first οἱ Ἑλληνες, succeeding as they did to the Greek League, οἱ Ἑλληνες as it was named. They called their treasury officials Ἑληνωταμία. We have evidence here of a treaty, solemnised by oaths, between Athens on the one hand and οἱ Ἑλληνες, that is the corporate group of allies, on the other. This treaty contained as one article a permanent hegemony for Athens (Th. i 97.1 ἠγούμενοι . . . τῶν ἑυμέρακων, vi 76.3 ἠγούμενοι γάρ γενόμενοι ἐκόντων τῶν τῆς Ἰωάννων and vi 82.3 αὐτοῖς τῶν ὑπὸ βασιλέως πρώτερον ὄντων ἠγούμενοι καταστάτης); as another a permanent treasury for the Allies at Delos (indicated by Plu. Arist. xxv ἐπὶ τὰς συνθήκας); and as another a guarantee of permanent autonomy for the allies (Th. i 97.1 αὐτοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ πρῶτον τῶν ἑυμέρακων and i 98.4 πρῶτη τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει ἑυμέρας παρὰ τὸ καθεστηκὸς ἐδουλώθη). The permanency of these features is implied by Plutarch’s statement that Aristides threw metal blocks into the sea (Plu. Arist. xxv). This was probably a common practice. For the same procedure had been carried out by representatives of ‘The Ionians’ and by Aristides when the treaty had been sworn between them (Ath. Pol. xxiii 5), and by the Phocaeans in pledging themselves (Hdt. i 165). It is usually thought that the oaths were intended to hold until the metal rose to the surface, that is for all time. The Mytilenean speakers in 482 B.C. looked back to that formal contract of the Alliance when all members were ἐνοπόδοι (Th. iii 10.6), that is all under the same treaty.

Diodorus preserves an account of what was probably the first meeting of the newly formed Congress of Allies—an account based upon Ephorus and deriving ultimately from an Atthidographer, probably Hellanicus. Aristides, the man of the moment, addressed the delegates of all the allies in their ‘Common Congress’ (of which Athens was not a member) and advised them on the organisation of their own affairs (ὑποθέτους τοῖς συμμάχοις ἀπάτης κοινῆς ἐγοὺς σύνοδον, D.S. xi 47). The word κοινὸς is sometimes misunderstood. The substantive it attends is common to the plural subject of the acting verb: here ‘all the allies’ hold the common congress, and no one else does. Similarly τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἰωάννων (Hdt. v 109.3), ἡ κοινὴ σύνοδος τῶν Βοιωτῶν (D.S. xv 80.2) and τὸ κοινὸν συνεδρίαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων (D.S. xi 55.4) are assemblies common to their own nationals only; and similarly a century later τὸ κοινὸν συνεδρίων ἀπάντων τῶν συμμάχων (of Athens) comprised those allies only and not Athens herself (D.S. xv 28.3). The same expression is used by Thucydides i 97.1 τῶν ἑυμέρακων . . . ἀπὸ κοινῶν ἔυθεν ἔσώμενοι, and it means that the allies conferred in their common Congresses, which comprised their delegates and no others. The advice which Aristides gave on this occasion was that the Allies should make Delos their common treasury; that all contributed monies should be deposited in it; and that the Allies should assess a contribution for all the states according to their means (κατὰ δύναμιν) for the war with Persia, so that the total should be 560 talents.

The Allies—or ‘the Greeks’ as they called themselves at this stage—accepted his advice. They decided to make the contribution (αὐτοὶ γνώτες, Isoc. Panath. lvii). According to

26 E. M. Walker in CAH v 41 realised this and expressed the point admirably: ‘the contract was not between allies on a footing of equality, of whom Athens was one, but . . . between two parties, of which Athens was one and the general body of the Allies was the other’. 27 The emphatic phrase ‘all the allies’, as distinct from the hegemôn, is found also in Thucydides i 125.1,
Plutarch *Arist.* xxiv 1, 'the Greeks asked Athens for Aristides and appointed him to inspect the resources of each state in terms of land and revenue and to define its contribution in proportion to its means (οἱ Ἕλληνες . . . ἦσαν τῶν Ἀθηναίων Ἀριστείδην καὶ προσέταξαν αὐτὸν χώραν τε καὶ προσόδους ἐπισκεφτάμενον ὄριος τὸ κατ' αὐξάν ἐκάστω καὶ δύναμιν) and the amount which he regulated was to a reckoning of 460 talents' (xxiv 4 εἰς ἐξήκοντα καὶ τετρακοσίων ταλάντων λόγων.) Diodorus xi 47 puts it more briefly ταχείς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν διάταξιν τῶν φόρων . . . . τῶν διαμερισμῶν ἐποίησεν. *Ath. Pol.* xxiii 5 is briefer still but gives the date as 478/7 B.C. Cornelius Nepos Aristides iii gives a neat summary: *Ad classes aestimandas exercitique comparandas quantum pecuniae quaque civitas daret, Aristides deletus qui constitueret. Eius arbitrio quadreringa et sexagena talenta quotannis Delum sunt collata.* *Id enim commune aerarium esse voluerunt.* The choice between 560 and 460 talents is decided in favour of 460 talents by Thucydides who gives that figure at i 96.2; for he has superior authority.

The financial arrangements can be summarised as follows. The Allies fixed the total sum to be raised.28 They very wisely asked Athens as an impartial body not a member of their own Congress to send Aristides to define each member's proportional contribution. Aristides made 'the division' (τῶν διαμερισμῶν in Diodorus, and τῆς διάταξις in Plutarch) so fairly that all the states accepted their share and he was acclaimed 'Aristides the Just' (D.S. xi 47; Plu. *Arist.* xxiv).29 The Allies also accepted Aristides' advice to make Delos their common treasury (D.S. xi 47 in which they placed τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Ἕλληνων χρήματα (D.S. xii 54-3 and Plu. *Per.* xii). Plutarch, giving an example quoted by Theophrastus, mentions τὰ χρήματα ἐκ Δήλου (*Arist.* xxv 3) and indicates that under the treaty the treasury had to remain there and could not be moved to Athens. This point arose when the Samians proposed to move the money and Aristides commented on the proposal. It occurred sometime before c. 467 B.C.30 Thucydides i 96 mentions that 'Delos was their treasury': ταμείων τε Δήλος ἦν αὐτοῖς. Here αὐτοῖς must be τοῖς ἕμμαχοι, because it is clear not only from the passages in Diodorus,31 Plutarch and Cornelius Nepos that the treasury was that of the Allies but also from the famous passage in Plu. *Pericles* xii, where the Athenian demos is in ill repute τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Ἕλληνων χρήματα πρὸς αὐτόν ἐκ Δήλου μεταταγμῶν. The money was the common possession of 'the Greeks', i.e. the Allies. It was not the common possession of the Allies and Athens. Had it been, then there would have been less point in the charge of dishonesty and in Pericles' claim that the money did not belong to those who gave it.

The request to Athens that her citizen Aristides should assess the resources of the states was only one way in which she was involved in the financial affairs of the Allies. The financial officers of the Allies' treasury, the Hellenotamia or accountants of τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Ἕλληνων χρήματα were Athenians from the outset, as Thucydides tells us (i 96.2). We are told by Andocides (iii 38) that the Athenians persuaded 'the Greeks', i.e. the Allies, 'to create at Athens Hellenotamiai in charge of the common monies'. Xenophon also refers to Athens obtaining the Hellenotamiai (*Poroi* v 5-7).32

---

28 *ATL* iii 234 sees Aristides acting as 'representing Athens'. If so, Thucydides would have said so, because it would have been another example of Athens enjoying special powers at the outset. But it was in fact a personal appointment and a personal triumph for Aristides, as all our sources indicate. *ATL* *ibid.* suggests that Aristides took over Persia's assessment, made in 492 B.C. and even in earlier years; but fifteen years and more of enemy occupation make a difference in any country's economy.

29 *ATL* iii 234 f., arguing from later assessments, supposes that 460 talents was not the figure aimed at on the basis of need; but the alternative system of pay-as-you-can is not appropriate to the financing of an immediate campaign for liberty and survival. H.

---

30 *Nep. Arist.* iii 3 fin. puts his death in about the fourth year after the banishment of Themistocles.

31 See also D.S. xii 38.2; xii 40.1-2; xii 54-3; xii 21.3

32 The point that the Athenians held this office at the outset is one of several points made by Thucydides to show the first stages of a process which led to the establishment of the empire (i 96.1 παραλαβόντες . . . ἔταξαν, a matter of primary significance; i 96.2
arranged which of the allied states should pay money and which should contribute ships (Th. i 96.1). Here too an outside body was more likely to be impartial than a member-state of the Allied Congress. It seems then that the sequence of events at the first fixing of contributions was as follows. First the Congress determined the total sum contributable by the Allies, no doubt after consultation with Athens as hegemon. The proportionate division of the total sum so determined, ὁ πρῶτος φόρος ταχεὶς, namely 460 talents, was entrusted to Aristides who ruled that Chios, for example, was responsible for x talents. Athens then decided whether the contribution of Chios, for example, was to be in money or in ships, there being of course a scale of equivalence between talents and hulls.\(^{33}\)

The amount of the total sum, 460 talents, has been called in question by those who argue from the later quota lists. But if I am correct in holding that the total sum in 477 B.C. was in money or ships,\(^{34}\) whereas the quota lists represent money only, the figures are not comparable, and little can be achieved by projecting backwards the known tribute of individual states after 454 B.C. The contemporary facts are the ones to bear in mind. Contributions in money had been demanded by Miltiades and by Themistocles, and they had been paid to the Greek League from 481 to 478 B.C. (cf. Plu. Arist. xxiv 1).\(^{35}\) The problem in 478/7 was to maintain a large enough fleet to ensure successful operations throughout the Aegean; for the danger was then present that the Persian fleet might return (quo facilis repellerent, si forte bellum renovare conarentur, Nepos Arist. ii fin.). We shall not be far out if we estimate a total fleet of 300 triremes.\(^{36}\) As I shall indicate later, Athens took a half share of the obligations, that is on my estimate the provision and maintenance of 150 triremes, which was within her capacity as she had had 200 ships at Salamis. The assessed sum of 460 talents was then on my estimate the sum needed for providing and maintaining the Allies’ 150 triremes and for meeting the administrative expenses of the Congress of Allies.

In 483/2 B.C. a new hull was equivalent to one talent (Ath. Pol. xxii 7). This suggests that the maintenance of ship and crew cost rather less than two talents a year. According to Andocides (iii 38) the Athenians persuaded ‘the Greeks’, i.e. the Allies, to hold the muster of the ships at Athens. This was evidently an article in the foundation treaty; for Mytilene sent 10 ships to Athens κατὰ τὸ ξυμμαχικόν (Th. iii 3.4). In the same passage of Andocides it is said that Athens persuaded the Greeks to let Athens provide triremes for those states which did not possess them (δότας δὲ τῶν πόλεων τριήρεις μὴ κτιστησα, ταῦτας ἡμᾶς παρέχεται), and Thucydides makes the point that most of the Allies arranged to pay money instead of ships as their part of the expenditure and the Athenian navy increased with the money they contributed (ι 99.3).

It seems likely that in 477 B.C. the number of

\(^{33}\) Th. i 99.3 χρήματα ἐκατστοῦ ἀκτί τῶν νεών τὸ ἰκνούμενον ἀνάλογα φόρων: “they arranged to pay money instead of ships as their quota of expenditure’ (cf. L-S-J s.v. ἰκνούμενος III 2). This indicates the existence of such a scale at a later date.

\(^{34}\) The alternative view, that 460 talents were supplied by those states which did not contribute ships, means that they alone paid more in 477 B.C. than the much larger group of money-paying states between 454 and 431 ever paid; and this is highly improbable. Moreover it should be noted that Thucydides does not say that 460 talents was the contribution of money, ἢ φοράς τῶν χρημάτων; what he does say is that 460 talents was the first assessed contribution (presumably of the whole alliance and not of the non-ship-contributing members only), ἦ δὲ πρῶτος φόρος ταχεὶς τετρακώντα τάλαντα καὶ ἐξήκοντα, and this seems to be exactly what is meant by the phrase in Plu. Arist. xxiv 4 ὅμοιοι Ἀρεστείδης ἐταξε (κε. φόρων), ἦ εἰς ἐξήκοντα καὶ τετρακώντων τάλαντων λόγων.

\(^{35}\) The paying of money to the Greek League has been doubted (e.g. by L.I. Highby in Klio Beihfelt xxxvi, 77), but it is most unlikely that the provision of supplies for the huge forces deployed across Mt. Cithaeron at Plataea and stationed at Delos in 479 B.C. was not centralised but left to individual states—some of them evacuated.

\(^{36}\) The Greek fleet at Lade numbered 353 triremes.
small states which had pentecotnes (evidently not acceptable in place of triremes) and of states which had been disarmed by Persia was such that the Congress of Allies accepted an Athenian offer to provide triremes. This suited Athens; it enabled her to use the residue of her fleet and to maintain her mobilisation, while the damage in Attica was being repaired. On the other hand the process which Thucydides describes (i 99.3), whereby some states opted of their own will to contribute money instead of ships, was a later development. This implies that it was only at the outset that Athens decided which states should contribute ships (Th. i 96.1).

Another obligation of the Allies was to supply troops. For Thucydides mentions desertion leptoparstion as a cause of punitive action by Athens (i 99.1 and vi 76.3); and in 431 B.C. the allies were divided by Thucydides into those who provided ships (Chios, Lesbos, Corcyra) and the rest who provided pe'zou kai chrímatata (ii 9.5). In the case of Chios we know from a fragment of Eupolis that she provided 'triremes and men' in time of need (fr. 232):

\[ \text{aútê Xíos, kalê pòlis . . .} \]
\[ \text{peímei vàp ýmín vàûs makrás ándras th' òtan deîqî,} \]
\[ \text{kai tâlla peîvarxhê ti kálôs,} \]

that is to say, manned triremes. This is what we should expect; for in a crisis Athens was always able to call up manned triremes, for instance, from Chios and Lesbos in 440 B.C. The Allies then contributed either manned triremes or money. Those who contributed money may have been called upon, where necessary, to contribute infantry (πε'ζων) as marines or assault troops.

Whereas the alliance between Athens and the Ionians was a general offensive and defensive alliance, the foundation treaty of the Athenian Alliance seems to have been specifically directed against Persia. Thucydides i 96.1 states that Athens arranged the contribution in money and ships 'against the barbarian (πρòs tòv bárbarov); for the programme was to exact vengeance for their sufferings by ravaging the King’s territory' (πρòσχημα γàp òn ãmünesmêi òn òpôthou ðêmuôntas tìv basileús xhôran). The aim of freeing the Greeks from the Persians may have been stated; for it is emphasised in speeches in Thucydides (iii 10.3 ἐπ 'ἐλευθερώσει ἀπὸ τοῦ Μῆδου τοῖς Ἐλλησιοῖς and vi 76.4 τὸ Μῆδῳ ἀνέπτεσαν). The aim of exacting vengeance seems certainly to have been stated; for in addition to Thucydides' statement at i 96 this aim occurs in a speech on the foundation of the Alliance ὦν ἐπὶ τοῦ Μῆδου τιμωρία (vi 76.3). Ravaging of the King’s territory, if successful, was highly profitable, if we may judge from the scale of ransom offered by Artaýches (Hdt. ix 120) and from the story about Cimon (Plu. Cim. ix). As Athens contributed half to the Alliance, so she took half of the spoil; we may infer this from the evidence of a contemporary of Cimon, Ion, who reported the Allies' allegation that Cimon's division of the spoil was ánson (Plu. Cim. ix). The Allies' half of the spoil went presumably not to the allied ships' crews but to the Allied treasury at Delos; for the ships' crews did not represent the money-paying members. The accumulated profits from spoil and ransom help to account for the large balance which eventually accumulated in the Allied Treasury at Delos.\(^{37}\)

Another article of the foundation treaty concerned the autonomy of the members. Thucydides i 97.1 stated that 'the Allies were at first autonomous and deliberated in their common Synods' (αὐτονόμων τὸ πρῶτον τῶν ἐνυμαχῶν καὶ ἀπὸ κοινῶν ἔννοδων βουλευόντων), and he marks the losses of autonomy which occurred in some cases (i 98.4 and iii 10.4-5). Autonomy was consistent with the paying of contributions whether in money or in ships, even as late as 421 B.C. (vi 8.5 τάς δὲ πόλεις ἑρωύσας τὸν φόρον ἐπ᾽ 'Ἀριστείδου αὐτονόμους ἔλναι) and with being under Athenian hegemony (Th. i 97.1 ἤγοντοι δὲ αὐτονόμων τὸ

\(^{37}\) D.S. xii 40.2 gives the value of τὰ Μῆδικα σκῆλα at Athens in 432/1 as 500 talents.
πρῶτον τῶν ἔξωμαχῶν). Two forms of autonomy are stressed in *Ath. Pol.* xxiv 2: to have one's own constitution and to control one's own possessions (ἐόντες τὰς τε πολιτεῖας παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἅρχειν ἄν ἐν τοῖς ἄρχοντες). The first form was infringed by Athens' imposition of 'democracies' and of Athenian magistrates in the Allied states. Thucydidcs (i 115.3 and 5) gives Samos as an example. Other examples are known from inscriptions. The 'Old Oligarch' describes the 'democratic' system as general ([X] *Ath. Pol.* i 14 and iii 10, written probably just before 431 B.C.), and the use of Athenian overseas magistrates was already extensive before 440 B.C. (*Ath. Pol.* xxiv 3 ἄρχαι ὑπερόμοι εἴς ἐπισκοπούς, the chapter being dated by its inclusion of Samos among the independent states).²⁸ The second form of autonomy—control of one's own possessions—was infringed in the case of Thasos, which was stripped of its mainland possessions (Th. i 101.3).

Another aspect of autonomy was evidently the right of any individual state, whether paying in money or in ships, to make war on its own account against another member of the Athenian Alliance. We see this in the case of Samos and Miletus, the latter not enjoying the same favoured position as Samos (see *Ath. Pol.* xxiv 2). For the two states had been at war over the possession of Priene for some time in 441/440 B.C. (Th. i 115.2 ἐκτῶρ ἔτει) and the Milesians had suffered a defeat before they appealed to Athens. As the grounds on which Athens then intervened in 440 B.C. were Samos' refusal to cease hostilities (Plu. *Per.* xxiv i) and to accept arbitration by Athens (*ibid.* xxv) at the command of Athens, it is clear that the original hostilities between Samos and Miletus had not constituted an infringement of the foundation treaty.³⁹ They simply gave Athens a chance, if she chose, to intervene (cf. vi 76.3 τοὺς δ' ἐπ' ἄλληνς στρατεύειν). If each ally had a free hand to act against another ally, it is likely that Athens had a free hand also; and this may account for her ability to intimidate any individual member of her Alliance. This indicates also that the terms of the treaty were not (as with 'The Ionians' originally) 'to have the same friend and enemy' but were restricted, probably to attacking Persia, as I have suggested.

The foundation treaty of the Alliance almost certainly contained a promise not to leave it. Thucydides repeatedly says that an ally 'revolted' (e.g. Naxos at i 98.4 and Thasos at i 100.2). To revolt implies an undertaking to stay within a relationship to Athens, that is the relationship of member of the Alliance to Athens as hegemon. Revolt from Athens as hegemon was tantamount to revolt from the Alliance. The members had probably taken the same oath on entering the Athenian Alliance as the islanders had done on entering the Greek League, µὲν ἀπαντέοις (Hdt. ix 106.4).⁴⁰

The meetings of the Allied Congress were at Delos. Thucydides i 96.2–97.1 makes that clear; for it is the allies who deliberated in their common συνόδου, and it is their συνόδου which were held in Apollo's temple at Delos, just as it was their treasury at Delos (τῶν ἔξωμαχων . . . ἀπὸ κοινῶν ἔξωμαχων βουλευόντων τοῖς δῆλοι ἵνα αὐτοῖς, καὶ αἰ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐκγραφοτ). The removal of the Allied Treasury to Athens in 454 B.C.—a move which was ἐν τοῖς συνήκας (Plu. *Arist.* xxv)⁴¹—was one breach of the foundation treaty.

²⁸ Mentioned also in [X.] *Ath. Pol.* i 14 and i 19 τὰς ἀρχαίς εἰς τὴν ὑπορείαν.
²⁹ P. A. Brunt, *The Hellenic League against Persia* in *Historia* ii (1953/4) 151, takes a different view: 'she (Athens) could reasonably claim that such private wars were breaches of the covenant.' Either it was an article of the covenant—a further limitation of autonomy which is nowhere stated (but is assumed by F. R. Wüst in *Historia* iii [1954/55] 150)—or the reasonableness of the claim that they were breaches of the spirit of the covenant depended on the Alliance being at war with Persia, which was not the case in 441/0.

⁴⁰ The oath at Erythrae 'I shall not revolt from the Athenian democracy and Athens' Allies' (Tod, *GHI* no. 29 lines 23 f.) is a repeat or an expansion of the original oath in all probability. The Spartan Alliance may have had a similar oath; cf. Th. i 71.4–5; v 30.1 σφόν ἀπαντάς ... παραβιάσαται ... τοῖς ὄρκοις καὶ v 30.4 παλαιόν ὄρκον.
⁴¹ The Samian proposal in Plu. *Arist.* xxv is probably to be dated before 467 B.C. as it was made before Aristides died (see n. 30 above) and may have been put forward when Naxos, being close to Delos, revolted.
and the suspension of the meetings of the Allied Congress was another. The date of the latter is not known. It may have occurred c. 454 B.C. when Athens took τα κοινά χρήματα των Ἐλλήνων from Delos and began the process of establishing a stronger control of an imperialistic kind (Th. iii 11.3 ές την ἀρχήν . . . τα πράγματα ἐφαίνετο καταληπτά and i 118.2 την ἀρχήν ἐγκρατεστάνε κατεστήσων). A terminus ante quem is supplied by the Athenian decree concerning Erythrae, in which banishment from την Ἀθηναίων χαυμαχιδα was imposed without reference to the Allied Congress; but the date of this decree is still disputed. However, it should be noted that breaches of the foundation treaty were not held to infringe the autonomy of all members in all respects. Each member had an individual treaty with Athens. It was perhaps in accordance with these individual treaties that Samos, Chios and Lesbos were still ‘autonomous’ before 440 B.C. (Ath. Pol. xxiv 2), and that the Mytilenians of Lesbos noted that Athens left them autonomous while she was taking imperialist control elsewhere in the Aegean (Th. iii 10 αυτόνομοι τε ἐλείφθημεν κτλ.).

E. The Relationship between Athens and the Allies

We have already argued on general grounds that the title of the Athenian Alliance of Ἀθηναίοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι implied a bicameral system in which Athens’ vote was equal to that of the vote of the Allied Congress, and not a unitary system in which the vote of Athens was equal to that, for instance, of Siphnos. We have suggested that for Athens the choice between these systems, as exemplified in recent history by the Spartan Alliance on the one hand, and the Ionian League and the Greek League on the other, was an obvious one, and that the Allies were only too willing in 478/7 B.C. to accept the bicameral system, because

---

42 Such states were ἀπό ἐυμμαχίας αὐτόνομοι (Th. vii 57.3). The states named at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (Th. ii 9.4) as Athens’ ἐυμμαχία, namely Chios, Lesbos, Plataea, Messenians at Naupactus, most of Acarnania, Corcyra and Zacynthos, were clearly allies by individual treaty, whether or not they were relics of the foundation treaty of 477 B.C. Those states which took part in the Sicilian expedition (Th. vii 57) did so by virtue either of individual alliances or of individual obligations dictated by Athens to them as ἐπίκεφος after their capitulation. It is for this reason that in Thucydides’ account the terms were dictated by Athens and not by ‘Athens and her allies’ for Thasos (Th. i 101.3), for Aegina (i 108.4; see my note in Historia iv [1955] 401 n. 1 and D. MacDowell in JHS lxx [1960] 118 f.), and for Samos (i 117.3, against which the first proposal for war was made by Pericles in the Athenian Assembly). In general a state which had revolted and failed entered into a ἐξήμβασις with Athens (Th. iii 46.2 ἐπανάστασις πόλεις . . . ἠθίκα τε ἐς ἐξήμβασια, and the same differing terms of individual treaties with Athens are mentioned in Th. vi 85.2 καὶ γὰρ τοὺς ἐκεῖ ἐξημμαχοὺς ἐκ αὐτοῖς χρηματίζων ζηγρώμεθα κτλ.

It seems from the evidence that Athens could either go to war individually against a state which was a member of the Athenian Alliance or invoke the treaty of the Athenian Alliance and lead a joint force of ‘Athens and the Allies’ against the offender. It is probable that Athens did both in the case of Samos. For in Thucydides’ account, which is to be preferred to that of Diodorus xii 27–28, there were two stages.
for many of them the alternative was suffering at the hands of Persia. It remains to consider some particular grounds for supposing that the organisation of the Alliance was on the bicameral system.

The words of Thucydides which define the relationship between Athens and her Allies seem to me to admit of no doubt, if my interpretation of Greek usage is correct. ἵγοομένοι δὲ αὐτονόμων τὸ πρῶτον τῶν ἔμμαχων καὶ ἀπὸ κοινῶν ἔξυπνῶν βουλευτῶν (Th. i 97.1): 'the Athenians having the hegemony and at first the allies being autonomous and deliberating in (their own) common Congresses.' The nominative ἵγοομένοι (sc. οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι) governs the genitive τῶν ἔμμαχων, and the Athenians cannot be included in the allies. The allies alone—not Athens—were 'at first autonomous' (an autonomy which by implication and in fact they all lost) and 'deliberated in their own common Congresses' at Delos. Further it was their treasury at Delos, and they held their Congresses at Delos. The Athenian state was a separate entity. Its relationship to the Congress of Allies was that of hegemon.

The slogan of the Athenian Alliance at the outset was 'equality' between two partners. At first Athens contributed an 'equal' share, as her allies were the first to acknowledge: καὶ μέχρι μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱσοῦ ἤγοοντο, προθύμους ἀπόμεθα, said the Mytilenians (Th. iii 10.4). Then when she became less active in her enmity towards Persia and more active in subjugating her allies (τὴν μὲν τοῦ Μῆδου ἔκθεσαν ἀνώτατα, τὴν δὲ τῶν ἔμμαχων δοῦλωσιν ἐναγομένους, Th. iii 10.4), she no longer campaigned on an 'equality' (οὕτε ἱσοκτράτενον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱσοῦ) and she found it easy to reduce any allies who revolted. As the Athenians contributed an equal share of the Athenian Alliance's strength, so they took an equal share of the booty; for the Allies complained on one occasion that the division of booty into shares was 'unequal', ἀνισον (Plu. Cim. ix).

The slogan of 'equality' persisted even when Athens was reducing more and more of the Allies to dependence; for she was still on an 'equality' with the dwindling group of autonomous states. The point is well expressed by the Mytilenian envoys in their address to the Spartan Alliance (Th. iii 11.1). 'When the Athenians had the majority (of the allies) under their control and were conversing with us (the autonomous allies) on an equality (ὑποχειρίους δὲ ἔχοντες [sc. οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι] τοὺς πλείους, ἡμῶν δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱσοῦ ὁμολογέοντες), they were naturally likely to resent the equality which our group alone still enjoyed, as compared with the submission of the majority (τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἐπὶ μόνου ἀντισυμμέτρου, ὅπου τὸ ἡμετέρου is the group of autonomous states) especially as they were growing more powerful and we more isolated.'

This policy of 'equality' had two great advantages for Athens:

1. In the early stages Athens was able to use the group of autonomous states against those whom she was reducing to dependence. 'At the same time Athens was not only bringing the strongest powers together against those who were weaker at first, but also was likely to find the last (i.e. the autonomous states) the weaker for having been left until the rest had been dealt with' (Th. iii 11.4). This use of the stronger ship-contributing states against the others was noted also in Ath. Pol. xxiv 2, when Chios, Lesbos and Samos were described as guards of the empire (φόλακες τῶς ἄρχης). They were deployed even against

---

43 This important passage receives no comment from Gomme; the translations by Jowett and Crawley are ambiguous, and the editors Poppe, Classen, Krüger and Arnold make no comment on the meaning.

44 Isonomia, isegoria and isokratia were slogans of the period at Athens and Miletus and probably elsewhere in Ionia, where pro-Persian tyrannies were being overthrown; see my History of Greece 190 and 204.

45 A passage misunderstood by J. Romilly, Thucy- dide et l'impérialisme athénien 85, in regard to sense and date: 'dès l'époque d'Aristide, seules Chios, Lesbos et Samos . . . avaient gardé leurs constitutions et leurs magistrats, n'ayant chez elles que des φόλακες pour les garder dans l'obéissance.'
members of their own group (Th. iii 10.5, ἢμεὶς ... ἐνεστρατεύομεν), e.g. against Naxos before 467 B.C., Thasos in 465 B.C., Aegina in 458 B.C., Samos in 440 B.C. and Lesbos in 428 B.C. As the Mytilenean envoys said, if Athens had started by attacking the ship-contributing states, she would not have mastered the situation so easily, because they would still all have been strong, and they would have had a rallying point (Th. iii 11.5), and because their naval strength, if once united (τὸ ναυτικὸν ἡμῶν ... καθ’ ἐν γενίμενον), would have been dangerous to Athens (Th. iii 11.6).

2. Athens was able to gloss over her attack on any one state by claiming that those with whom she was demonstrably on a basis of equality—that is the sum of her autonomous allies in the Allied Congress—were supporting her in the attack. This was valuable in external diplomacy. ‘We were left independent’, said the Mytilenean envoys, ‘for no other reason than this: the Athenians thought the conversion to empire could be achieved with fair-seeming phrases and with the application of diplomacy rather than violence.’ The argument of the Athenians used to be this: ‘if those we are attacking were not in the wrong, the group of states whose vote is equal to ours would not be joining us in the campaign; for they would be unwilling’ (ἄμα μὲν γὰρ μαρτυρίων ἔχοντων μὴ ἀν τῶν ἰσοφύρων ἁκοντας, ἵν ἡ ἡμῶν κοινὸς ὡς ἐπιθεσιν, ἐνεστρατεύων, Th. iii 11.4).48 The free allies, that is the members of

48 The word ἰσοφύρως is probably one used in the controversies of the 460s and 450s when Athens was abusing the rights of her allies. Its meaning is not just equal in vote but rather equal in voting power: cf. Poppo ad loc. τῶν ἰσοφύρων, de aequalitate suffragiorum, non solum de iure omnium suffragia ferendi videtur accipienda. We see this in Aeschylus Eumenides (458 B.C.) where ἰσοφύρως means that two groups of votes were equal in power: the case of Orestes was an ἰσοφύρως δική (795) and Athena had declared her intention of exercising a casting vote: νῦν δ’ ὄροπτῆς, κἂν ἰσοφύρως κρήθη (741). The sense is clearly shown too in Plato Laws 692 a, where he says that the power of the twenty-eight Gerontes at Sparta was made ἰσοφύρως with that of the two Kings (τὸ τῶν δικτῶν καὶ εἰκοσικραντόν ἰσοφύρως εἰς τὰ μέγατα τῆς βασιλείας ποιήσασα δάκνημι). Here οἱ γέροντες as a group are equal in voting power with the Kings as a pair; it is immaterial that their numbers are 28 and 2. In other words, just as in the trial of Orestes, so at Sparta a deadlock could ensue, because each group had in modern parlance the power of veto. But it should be noted that we cannot say the Gerontes individually were ‘equal in vote’ with the Kings individually, whereas we can say that the Gerontes were ‘equal in vote and in voting power’ among themselves. So too in Th. iii 79.3, though Brasidas and Alcidas each gave one vote in a literal sense, Brasidas was not ‘equal in voting power’ (Βρασίδου παρασκύτωστος, ὃς λέγεται, Ἀλκίδ. ἰσοφύρως δ’ ἐν δύναμιν).

In our passage in the Mytilenean speech we can therefore interpret τῶν ἰσοφύρων as meaning either that the group of autonomous states was equal in voting power to Athens (the subject of the sentence) —like the group of Gerontes being equal in voting power to the Kings—or that the autonomous states were equal in voting power among themselves—like the Gerontes among themselves. It is not permissible (at least I know of no example) to interpret τῶν ἰσοφύρων as meaning that the autonomous states individually were equal in voting power to Athens (the subject of the sentence); and I shall therefore exclude that interpretation. Nor is it correct to take τῶν ἰσοφύρων as referring to the Mytileneans alone. They are speaking of the group of autonomous states of which they are one—e.g. τὸ ἡμέτερον (iii 11.1) and εἰ δ’ ἀρ’ ἡμῶν ἔργασίω, εὔτοιτοι ἐπὶ τῶν πάντων αὐτῶν τε ἱερὰ καὶ πρὸς ὑμὲν στηθέω (iii 11.5). If it should be held that here they are saying Mytilene and Athens had an equal vote, it is not apposite to the argument, because in a Congress of equal members, Athens included, an unwilling state such as Mytilene is one of a minority and is bound by a majority decision. We return then to our first two meanings. The second of these, that the states in the Congress, including Athens, were equal in voting power one with another, makes sense in the context but only with the corollary that Athens was in truth equal in voting power to Mytilene or to Siphnos and could be outvoted on any issue of peace or war; but this is the very point which the advocates of such a Congress rule out as impossible (see n. 24 above). The first meaning is therefore best, that the autonomous allies in the Congress were equal in voting power to Athens in her Assembly. Each body had the power of veto; if the autonomous allies did not exercise the veto, it could be supposed that they approved Athens’ decision and regarded a war as just.

Incidentally, whichever meaning is taken, it follows that the non-autonomous members had no voting powers at all (the suppression of this right being a breach of an aspect of autonomy which is not mentioned by G. E. M. de Ste Croix in his article in Historia iii [1954/55]), and that the Congress is not likely to have had regular meetings when the number of autonomous states became very few. The voting system and the meaning of ἰσοφύρως are discussed in ATL iii 138 ff.
the Congress of Allies, were thus able to withhold support, if they thought fit. The Congress in fact had the power of veto.

Among the Allies themselves equality was a slogan too. That each member-state in the Congress had one vote was an axiom of autonomy. It was so in the Congress of Sparta’s Allies (Th. i 125.1), in the Congress of the Greek League and later in the Second Athenian Alliance (D.S. xv 28.4 πόλιν ἐπ’ ἱστασαν καὶ μεγάλην καὶ μικρὰν μᾶς ψῆφου κυρίαν εἶλαι). Such an equality of vote for large and small states alike is not in practice a bulwark against exploitation by a great state which has its ‘satellites’, whether that state is inside or outside the Congress, as we know only too well from the history of the League of Nations and the United Nations Organisation. What gives the great state an opening is the large number of votes and the equality of votes, that is ἡ πολυψηφία and ἡ ἵστασις. One defect of such a Congress is that it is slow. Another is that it rarely achieves a united policy. Pericles attributed these defects to the Peloponnesian Congress of Sparta’s Allies (Th. i 141. 6–7). The members of the Congress, he argued, were particularly ineffectual because they each pursued their own interest, being all equal in vote and different in race (πάντες τε ἴσοι ψηφοφόροι ὄντες καὶ σύμφωνα). The envoys from Mytilene pointed out the same defects in the Congress of Athens’ Allies (Th. iii 10.5). Referring to the early stages of exploitation by Athens, the envoys said that the Allies were unable to unite and defend themselves against Athens because of the large number of votes; indeed the Mytilenians themselves were an example, since they campaigned in company with Athens (ἀδιόνομοι ὁ διόνομος καθ’ ἐν γενόμενοι διὰ πολυψηφίαν ἅμωνασθαι οἱ ξύμαχοι . . . . . . ἀμείως δὲ αὐτόνομοι ὤν διόνομε τῷ διόνομεν ἐνεπετραπόταςμεν). Here we see the Congress vis-à-vis Athens the hegemon: a body with many and diverse votes, unable to unite, vis-à-vis a body which was one state with a single policy. The Mytilenean envoys also made a strong distinction between Athens and the Greeks, that is, as we have seen, the Allies, when the Mytilenians decided upon a twofold revolt—from the Hellenes, so as not to aid Athens in maltreating them, and from Athens, so as not to be swallowed by her later (Th. iii 13.1).

The idea that throughout the Pentekontaëtia oi Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι was a fundamentally different kind of organisation from oi Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι and that oi Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι in 478/7 B.C. was a fundamentally different organisation from oi Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι in 378/7 B.C., seems to be an entirely modern one. I say ‘fundamentally different’, because J. A. O. Larsen, for instance, who is a protagonist of this idea, emphasises the difference. ‘In the Peloponnesian League, Sparta, and in the Second Athenian League, Athens possessed a half share in determining the policies of the league in question. In the Delian League the policy was determined by the assembly with Athens merely voting as one of the members.’ The votes of the hegemones, he thinks, were respectively 1:1, 1:1 and 1:150 or so. Yet no ancient author mentions this amazing difference. Thucydides treats the Spartan Alliance and the Athenian Alliance of the fifth century as similar and comparable organisations; when he does stress the differences between them at i 18.2–3 and at i 19, he writes of land-power and sea-power, non-payment of tribute and payment of tribute, influence in favour of oligarchy (and by implication influence in favour of democracy). There is only one ancient author who described the beginnings of the First Athenian Alliance and the beginnings of the Second Athenian Alliance. Diodorus, drawing upon Ephorus as his immediate source, described the Congress of the Allies in both cases in exactly similar terms: xi 47 ὁ μὲν Ἀριστείδης συνεβολευε τῶν συμμάχων ὅπως κοινῆν ἀγούση σύνοδον . . . . xv 28 ὁ δὲ δήμος (sc. of Athens) . . . . κοινὸν συνέδριον ἀπάντων τῶν

47 The arguments of the Corinthians in their speech (Th. i 120–124) are directed against those defects, Sparta having already voted for war (i 120.1) and the Allied Congress being free to prevent war by voting for peace.

48 If we take the original membership to be roughly that suggested in ATL iii 194 ff.
Ephorus knew that Athens stood outside the Congress of Athens in 378/7 B.C. It is clear that he believed she stood outside the Congress of Allies in 478/7 B.C. also.
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OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRUS 2390 AND EARLY SPARTAN HISTORY

In 1957 Mr Lobel published, in the twenty-fourth volume of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, a large fragment of a commentary on the Spartan poet Alcman. It is the second column of this papyrus which I propose to discuss; lines 13 to 22 give us some information about the Spartan royal family, and lines 22 to 25 seem to be saying something about the Spartan tribal organisation. Unfortunately, however, much of the left-hand side of the column is missing at this point; and when, from line 22, we do at last have a few letters from the left-hand side, we are faced with a gap running up the right-hand side as well. Because of this, it will be necessary to spend some time in an attempt to discover what the papyrus said, what it might have said, and what it could not possibly have said. Until this is done, no historical conclusions can safely be drawn.

Before starting on an examination of the text, however, it would be as well to state what can be known about the author of the commentary. We can be certain that he had the work of previous scholars before him. In line 4 he refers to Theon, the Augustan grammarian, and in line 5 to Tyrannion; there were two grammarians of that name, and we cannot tell which he means (Lobel 54). Furthermore, in line 28, τῶν λαοὺν ἔκδιδε is best taken as meaning 'the other commentators' (see p. 70). Whether or not he was an intelligent man is a question on which it is better not to dogmatise. He is capable of interpretative remarks of dubious value (lines 9–13, with Lobel ad loc.). There is certainly a muddle in the third column, which may indicate stupidity on the part of the commentator, or carelessness on the part of the scribe. We should not assume too readily that what he says is the gospel truth about early Sparta. On the other hand, we should remember that he might be working from a reliable source.

So much for the commentator. As for the scribe, the papyrus was written in the second century A.D., according to Lobel (49). With the possible exception of the passage to which I have just referred, I can find nothing in the sixty lines we have that we can say for sure is a scribal error.

We can now turn to lines 13 to 28. Up to line 22 we have a commentary on one poem in Doric, and a mark in the margin tells us that what follows is a commentary on a different

---

1 This paper was originally written as a contribution to a series of classes on early Sparta conducted by Professor A. Andrews and Miss L. H. Jeffery. I am greatly indebted to Mr Oswyn Murray for a number of valuable suggestions, and to others present at the class (in particular Mr W. S. Barrett) for rescuing me from several errors; to Mr M. L. West, who is also preparing a paper (see now 'Alcmanica, I: The date of Alcman', CQ n.s. xv [1965] 188–94) on this papyrus, for some additional references, for criticism, and for allowing me to see a draft of his article before publication; to Mr N. G. Wilson; to Mr W. G. Forrest; and to Mr E. Lobel, who was good enough to answer an inquiry on a point of detail. The responsibility for faults which remain is my own.


2 For the trouble over καὶ τρίτος σκότος (col. iii, lines 21 ff.) see Lobel, 55, Page, 20 and Barrett, 689; contra West, 156.
These lines consist of lemma 1, a few words from Alcman’s text; then comment; lemma 2; then comment. Our first problem is, what is the relation between lemma 1 and lemma 2? The obvious answer is that lemma 2 is a phrase which runs on after lemma 1. But lemma 1 is composed of a phrase of Alcman; then the words εος τοῦ, ‘down to’; then another phrase of Alcman. Barrett points out that lemma 2 may similarly contain a εος τοῦ; in that case it does not form one complete phrase of Alcman. Other possibilities exist. Since lemma 1 contains a εος τοῦ, then lemma 2 may be a phrase taken out of the middle of the passage referred to by lemma 1. Alternatively, line 15 tells us that something is ἄδηλον, uncertain. This suggests that lemma 2 may be a quotation from elsewhere in the poem, brought in by the commentator to solve his problem. It will become clear in the course of my discussion which of these hypotheses I believe to be right.

What can be made of lemma 1? νῦν δ’ ἱματος τῷ δαιμόνος: ‘but now let us go . . . of the daimon’. It is the chorus, presumably, who are speaking; we should perhaps supply the missing words—missing in sense, that is; they were never on the papyrus—as ‘but now let us go <trusting in the power> of the daimon’; or, ‘<servants> of the daimon’; or, ‘<to the house> of the daimon’. The next piece of lemma is usually restored as παί[δων] ἄριστον, ‘the best (feminine) of children’ (Lobel, Page, Barrett). This is probably right, though two other readings are also possible: παί[δα τ’] ἄριστον, ‘and the best (feminine) child’, and παί[δων] ἄριστον, ‘of the best (feminine) children’.

Now for the commentary. Λεούχηδας [Ἀ]κεδαι[μον] ἀσαλεῦν: ‘Leotychidas king of the Spartans’. This is followed by ἄδηλον δ’, which shows first, that ‘Leotychidas king of the Spartans’ is a complete sentence; and that, whatever is ἄδηλον, it is not ἄδηλον that Leotychidas was king of the Spartans.

This does not in itself prove that Leotychidas was king of the Spartans; merely that a commentator of whose competence we know nothing believed that he was. But if we take it in conjunction with Plutarch’s explicit mention of Λεούχηδας ὁ πρῶτος in the Moralia (224

---

3 Davison writes: ‘It appears that Alcman spoke of him (i.e. Leotychidas) as δαιμόν, i.e. he was already dead when Alcman was writing’. Despite the evidence of Xen. Lat. Pol. 15.9, this remains conjectural.

4 L. W. Daly (A. J. Phil. lxxxii [1960] 91) wrongly says that Leotychidas appears in the lemma. See, however, n. 3 supra.

C–D) and of ‘Leotychidas the elder’ (πρεσβύτερον) in his life of Lycurgus (13.7), we may safely assume that the commentator is right.

We are now in a position to defend the text of Herodotus viii 131. Here he gives a genealogy of the Euryponidids, and adds: ‘all these were kings except the last two’. To make this square with the list in Pausanias, editors, including the editor of the Oxford text, and How and Wells, have emended this to ‘all these were kings except the last seven’. With this emendation, Leotychidas I ceases to be a king. But we now know that he was king; so the text of Herodotus must be right, and the king-list in Pausanias wrong.

These three words in the commentary, says Page, prove that Alcman referred to Leotychidas; Huxley7 follows him on this. This assumes that Λ]ακεδαί[μον]ων βασιλεύς is explanatory of Λεωνυχίδας, an assumption that is almost certainly correct. It is unlikely that the whole phrase ‘Leotychidas king of the Spartans’ is explanatory of some allusion in the poem, such as ‘(that man who is blessed with) the best of children’.

Note also that the sentence has no connective, and that the proper name Leotychidas has no article. With that, we may leave the three words.

He goes on: ἀδηλον δὲ ‘but it is unclear’: gap: ἦ νυάτηρ ἦ Τιμασιμβρότα ‘daughter Timasimbrota’: gap: αἱ τινος, which no one can explain.

What could have come after ἀδηλον δὲ? Whatever the word was, it must almost certainly have begun with a consonant; otherwise the epsilon of the word δὲ would have been cut off.8 There is only one way in which the epsilon could be the first letter of the next word: the scribe once splits a word after an augment (col. iii, line 16); but he is not pernicious enough to do this to other words after the first letter. This means that ἀδηλον δὲ ἐ[στι] is out, and so is ἀδηλον δ’ ε[ι], ‘it is unclear whether’, and so is ἀδηλον δ’ ἡ[μῖν, ‘it is unclear to me’ (the commentator speaks of himself in the plural, col. ii, line 27). There is still a wide field to choose from:9 ἀδηλον δὲ [τινος, ‘it is unclear of whom’ is as good as anything; and so we might guess ἀδηλον δὲ [τινος ὑστ ἦ νυάτηρ ἦ Τιμασιμβρότα: ‘it is unclear whose daughter Timasimbra is’. This is very slightly shorter than the gap; but the lettering is not stoichedon, and so this need not worry us overmuch.10

This conclusion is the same as that which Lobel (54) arrives at by a different argument. But there is a snag: in line 21 the commentator knows that Timasimbrata’s father is Eurysocrates; how then can he be uncertain here? Here the answer may lie in the relationship between the two lemmata.11 ‘It is unclear whose daughter Timasimbra is’, says the commentator; then he quotes a line from another part of the poem, and concludes that she is the daughter of Eurysocrates.

Two further comments: first, Timasimbra is surely the παι[δων] ἄμπισταν of line 14; secondly, there remains the gap at the beginning of line 16. If τινος is a word, then the αἱ might be a feminine plural, or a feminine dative, or a verbal ending, perhaps an infinitive, possibly εἰσα, more probably a verb taking the genitive; or και αἱ τινος. To this we shall return (p. 66).

For now the second lemma and comment. Here we must start at the end and work

---

6 A procedure rightly condemned by Beloch, Griechische Geschichte (Strassburg, 1913) i 2.179.
8 He elides elsewhere: col. ii, 6, 12; col. iii, 25. But in col. iii, 21 we have πρεσβύ[τερον] δὲ ἀμπίτρι (Lobel’s reconstruction; the scribe himself abbreviated to δ’): should this be πρεσβύ[τερον] δὲ ἀμπίτρι?
9 One possibility is ποτέρον; but if so, I cannot reconstruct the passage as a whole. ποτέρον τοι[τοῦ] θ]υγάτηρ ἦ (instead of ἦ; we have seen that the commentator dispenses with articles with names, above) Τιμασιμβρότα has been suggested; but then we would surely require ποτέρον ἦ τοιτοῦ θ]υγάτηρ etc., which would be too long. West informs me that he proposes ἀδηλον δὲ [ποτέρον τοιτοῦ θ]υγάτηρ ἦ Τιμασιμβρότα, ἦ ἔτερας μὲν μαντοῦ τινος.
10 ‘The writing is very irregular, and for the larger gaps in particular the estimates of letters lost are more than usually approximate,’ Barrett 688, n. 2. For this reason I have not indicated the length of gaps, for which see Lobel.
11 This suggestion, which is central to my argument, is one of several for which I am indebted to Mr Oswyn Murray.
back. Line 20 is in a bad state; but the first upsilon does seem to be an upsilon from the photograph, and not a nu; this, plus the fact that we are dealing with Agiads, as we shall see in a moment, rules out ταῦτα δέ Εὐρυκράτεως. In line 21 Πολυδώρος is confidently restored from line 18. What we need, then, is a name in the genitive singular beginning Eurys-, and a word expressing a family relationship, like θυγατρινή in line 22. In the Agiad family tree (Hdt. vii 204), Polydoros is the father of Eurykrates; but Lobel, Page and Barrett agree that πάγαρ is too long for the gap. The only other possible word is νίκης. Who then is the man whose name begins Eury-? Both Eurykrates and Eurykratidas were Agiad kings, and both have been suggested (Eurykrates: Lobel, Page; Eurykratidas: Barrett). I favour Eurykrates; but I cannot state my reasons for this until I have established what the other names on the papyrus were (see pp. 67–68).

We are now in a position to translate from line 19. 'X is the son of Leotychidas the king of the Spartans'; but of Eurykrates, Polydoros is the son and Timasimbra the daughter'. The writer thus resolves his worry about whose daughter Timasimbra is; but we are left with the worry of who X, the son of Leotychidas, is. Page points out that the only son we know of is Hippokratidas, the next king (Hdt. viii 131); and this name will fit the gap exactly. Lobel (54) and Barrett urge caution: there may, they say, be other sons of whom we know nothing. There may, indeed; but it is unlikely that there were other sons with twelve letters in their name.

Next, the lemma in lines 17 and 18. φιόνδε ἔν [οικ] εν (I accept Lobel’s restoration, as do Page and Barrett), ‘he, she, or even it, is like in nature, or growth’: gap: ‘to the fair-haired child’: then Πολυδώρος[ρ]ν. This last word is followed by a gap at the end of the line, so that the word might be complete, in which case it is a genitive, ‘to the fair-haired child of Polydoros’; or there might have been an iota after it, in which case it is a dative, ‘to the fair-haired child Polydoros’. Page argues that it must be genitive, on the grounds that παίδι suggests that the father’s name was there. He then claims that line 19 proves that the person said to resemble the παίδι τετράθος was a son of Leotychidas; and concludes that we should read: φιόνδε ἔν [οικ] εν ['Ηπποκράτιδας παίδι τετράθος Πολυδώρος[ρ]ν: ‘Hippokratidas is like in nature (or growth) to the fair-haired son of Polydoros’.

This raises two difficulties. It is hard to make sense of the whole passage with this supplement; there is no logic in it. And we have to swallow the fact that Alcman compared a Eurypontid’s son to an Agiad’s son. Page himself finds this odd, and Barrett agrees. Barrett also points out that the article with Εὐρυκράτεως in line 20 suggests that he has just been mentioned. Indeed, only one point in Page’s argument need be accepted, namely that παίδι almost certainly requires a genitive naming the father. But that genitive need not be Πολυδώρος; the genitive may have come in the gap, in which case Πολυδώρος would have to be dative.

This gives us a clue to what seems to be the only possible way out of the difficulties. Read: φιόνδε ἔν [οικ] εν [Εὐρυκράτεως (or -ος) παίδι τετράθος Πολυδώρος[ρ]ν; and everything immediately becomes clear. ‘She’, that is Timasimbra, the last person mentioned, ‘is like Polydoros, the fair-haired son of Eurykrates’. The nu on the end of οικεν duly comes before a vowel, and Εὐρυκράτεως is the right length; the article with Εὐρυκράτεως in line 20 is explained; better still, we are no longer embarrased by a comparison between the two rival

---

12 There is no need to follow Barrett’s tentative suggestion (689 n. 1) that the scribe may have written Λοιπος ηγίδα by mistake for 'Αναγκασμένον (on the grounds that the name Leotychidas, which has just occurred five lines before, might have been in his mind, and that all would then be plain sailing). This proposal should be rejected because (a) the papyrus can be made to yield perfectly good sense as it stands; (b) the scribe does not seem prone to error (but see p. 62 supra). If Barrett is right, and Λεοντυχίδα is a slip of the pen, then we cannot know what the scribe should have written.

Some think the repetition of Λακεδαμνίων in lines 15 and 20 strange, and suggest ‘the Eurypontid king’. I regard the repetition as recapitulatory, and therefore unobjectionable. West favours τοῦ [προεργαστικοῦ] βασιλεύος.
royal houses: the comparison is between brother and sister, and no one could ask for anything more natural than that.13

Best of all, it enables us to make sense of the logic of the entire passage. Here is a translation: "But now let us go, (trusting in the power (or whatever) of the daimon", down to "best of children". Leotychidas is king of the Spartans. But it is unclear whose daughter Timasimbrosa is. Then half a line which I leave for the moment. 'She is like Polydoros, the fair-haired son of Eurykrates'. Hippokratidas is the son of Leotychidas, king of the Spartans; but Eurykrates' son is Polydoros and Timasimbrosa is his (Eurykrates') daughter'. The commentator's problem is solved.14 He has deduced from the fact that Polydoros and Timasimbrosa are said by the poet to resemble each other that they are brother and sister. He knows that Polydoros is the son of Eurykrates: the poem says so. It follows, then, that Timasimbrosa is the daughter of Eurykrates. Q.E.D.

Even now, however, everything is not clear. Two obscurities remain: there is still a lacuna in line 17; and my restorations raise the problem of how Hippokratidas got into the argument. I think I understand the way in which the commentator is arguing: Polydoros is the son of Eurykrates, says the poet. Therefore Hippokratidas is not the son of Eurykrates, but the son of the other king, Leotychidas. That is how his mind seems to be working; the problem is, why does he mention Hippokratidas at all? There has not been a word about him before.

These two problems, I would suggest, solve each other. The lacuna in line 17 contained a question to which 'Hippokratidas is the son of Leotychidas king of Sparta' is the answer. I would therefore read lines 15 to 17 as follows: ἀδηλον δὲ [τινὸς ἐστι θ]υγάτηρ ἡ Τιμασιμβρότα [καὶ τίς ὁ τινὸς ἦν] αἱ τινος: 'it is unclear whose daughter Timasimbrosa is, and who is the "son" the poet mentions, and whose son he is'. Lines 17 to 22 now provide answers to all these questions. It should be emphasised, however, that this supplement is no more than a conjecture. Two things can be said in its favour: it puts the final piece of the jigsaw in, and produces complete sense; and it is the right length for the gap.

This interpretation, moreover, means that the words to be stressed in the argument are Ἀκεδαίον in line 19, and Ἐυρυκράτεος in line 20. Sure enough, these words come in emphatic positions within their clauses: 'Hippokratidas of Leotychidas the son is ... but of Eurykrates the son is ...'; my hypothesis explains this otherwise unnatural word-order.

The complete text of these lines in my view is therefore:

13 ὡς τοῦ παι[δὼν] ἀρισταν· Ἀκεδαίον
15 ἄδηλον δὲ τινὸς ἐστι θυγάτηρ ἡ Τιμασιμβρότα
καὶ τίς ὁ τινὸς ἦν αἱ τινος:
16 Ἐυρυκράτεσσες παιδί ξανθῷ Πολυδώρῳ· Ἰπποκρατίδας
17 Λακεδαμιώνῳ βασιλεῖς: τοῦ δὲ Ἐυρυ[κράτος]
τοῦ τις Πολυδώρῳ καὶ Τιμασιμβρότα

13 Is it unnatural to use the phrase 'Polydoros, the fair-haired son of Eurykrates', if the comparison is between brother and sister? I think not. The probability that Timasimbrosa is the subject might be increased if we knew more about the poem as a whole. (Lines 9–10 show that the poem is not concerned exclusively with girls.)

14 Something indicating that a conclusion is being drawn would be preferable to the bald ἐστι; but there is no room for a particle, and ἐστι ἐν ἑνι is out of the question.
We are now at last ready to turn to historical questions. Who are all these people? It would be as well to set out part of the Spartan royal genealogies at this point.

**Agiads**

13 ALKAMENES ↔ 12 THEOPOMPOS

14 POLYDOROS ←

15 EURYKRATES

13 Archidamos ANAXANDRIDAS

14 Zeuxidamos ARCHIDAMOS

15 Anaxidamos ANAXILAOS

16 ANAXANDROS ←→ 16 Archidamos LEOTYCHIDAS I

17 EURYKRATIDAS

17 HIPPOKRATIDAS

18 LEON ←→ 18 AGASIKLES Hegesilaos

(Croesus) ←→ 19 1=ANAXANDRIDAS =2 → 19 ARISTON Menares

20 Demaratos LEOTYCHIDAS II

Doricos LEONIDAS Kleombrotos KLEOMENES

(Kings in capitals; arrows indicate synchronisms; numbers refer to generations after Herakles.)

Leotychidas king of the Spartans and his son Hippokratidas present no difficulties; we can put them confidently in their place on the Eurypontid family tree. This leaves us with Polydoros and his father Eurykrat-. Polydoros can easily be dealt with: the father of Polydoros, the Agiad king, was Alkamenes; the father of our Polydoros is Eurykrat-; there

15 Davison, whose paper appeared before Page’s and Barrett’s reviews were available, says (34) that Timasimbrotas may be Leotychidas’ daughter, and that Polydoros may be his son. The last letters of line 20 are sufficient to rule this out. (He notes that this would imply that the name Polydoros had changed families. There is nothing wrong with this—Anaxandridas appears on both the Agiad and Eurypontid family trees; but his guess must be rejected on other grounds.)

I agree, however, with Davison, 34, and with Janni, 169, that the present fragment makes the suggestion that the Agido of Alcman fr. 1. Diehl is an Agiad highly probable.

16 Evidence for the genealogies:
(i) For Agiad line: Hdt. vii 204.
(ii) For Eurypontid line: Hdt. viii 131.
(iii) For the family of Anaxandridas the Agiad:
Hdt. v 41.1, 3.
(iv) For making the Eurypontid line from Anaxandridas to Hippokratidas kings, but not

Hegesilaos and Menares: Hdt. viii 131 unemended (see p. 64).
(v) For making Leotychidas I king: Plut. Mor. 224 C-D; Plut. Lycurg. 13.7; Rhianus ap. Paus. iv 15.2; P. Oxy. 2990.
(vi) For making Agasikles and Ariston kings: Hdt. i 65.1; i 67.1.
(vii) For making Archidamos, Zeuxidamos, Anaxidamos and Archidamos kings: Paus. iii 7; for rejecting them, see Huxley, op. cit. 117, n. 252.
(viii) For splitting the Eurypontid family tree after Hippokratidas: see Huxley, op. cit. 117–18, n. 253, where another possible reconstruction (Beloch, op. cit. i 2.189) is also given.
is therefore no question of identification; hence our Polydoros is someone hitherto unknown, as is his sister Timasimbrota. 17

Eurykrat- remains: is he Eurykrates, of the fifteenth generation after Herakles, or is he Eurykratidas, of the seventeenth? Here I must make two assumptions, which may be wrong. My first assumption is that all the people named by the commentator were contemporaries. This cannot be proved. If the poem of Alcman had compared an Agiad with a Eurypontid, we could be pretty sure that they were contemporaries, but I do not believe that it did. I shall nevertheless assume that it referred, either explicitly or by allusion, to all the names which our commentator mentions, and that this is why he tells us about Leotychidas, Hippokratidas, Eurykrat- , Polydoros and Timasimbrota. My other assumption is that either Beloch’s or Huxley’s reconstruction of the Spartan king-lists (see n. 16, viii) is not far from the truth; for our purposes it does not matter which.

Now we know for certain from Herodotus (i 65.1) that Leon, the son of Eurykratidas, was a contemporary of Agasikles. If we make our Polydoros another son of Eurykratidas, he too will be contemporary with Agasikles who is the grandson of Leotychidas. This is improbable. It would also imply (if I may anticipate an argument which I have not yet produced; see p. 69, top) that Alcman wrote in the generation before Croesus, that is, in the early sixth century, for if Eurykrat- is Eurykratidas, Polydoros will belong to the same generation as Leon; and I am not prepared to believe that either. Eurykrat-, then, must be Eurykrates. Polydoros, the son of Eurykrates, will then be a contemporary of Leotychidas, which is what we want; and Polydoros will be named after his grandfather. There are two reassuring parallels for this in the Agiad line, Eurykratidas grandson of Eurykrates, and Leonidas grandson of Leon.

This identification means that we can accept the stemma as printed by Page (20):*  

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\text{Agiads} & \text{Eurypontids} \\
\hline
14 \text{POLYDOROS} & \text{} \\
\hline
15 \text{EURYKRATES} & \text{} \\
\hline
16 \text{ANAXANDROS} & \text{Polydoros} & \text{Timasimbrota} & \text{LEOTYCHIDAS I} \\
\mid \text{παῖς ξανθός} & \text{} & \text{} & \text{vios} \\
\end{array}
\]

with only one alteration: we must erase the ‘fair-haired child of Polydoros’, who never existed (see pp. 65–66). Moreover, there is no need to adjust the synchronisms. Leon and Agasikles were contemporaries, as Herodotus (i 65.1) tells us. It is therefore probable that their grandfathers were contemporaries. This probability is confirmed by the papyrus, for their grandfathers were Anaxandros, the brother of our Polydoros, and Leotychidas.

There is only one problem here. If we go right back and make Theopompos and king Polydoros (not our Polydoros!) contemporaries, as we surely must (Plut. Lycurg. 6), then my arrangement produces an unfortunate concertina effect in the Eurypontid line: rather a lot of Eurypontids have to be squeezed into the same number of years as rather a few Agiads. This is not impossible. The reconstruction which I favour raises no difficulties which were not already raised by the synchronisms of Theopompos and Polydoros in Plutarch, and of Leon and Agasikles in Herodotus; but I admit that by pushing the problem back a couple of generations it aggravates the old ones.

Our next task will be to attempt to date Leotychidas. Herodotus (i 67.1) tells us that

17 So far, this is in agreement with Page.  

* See Addendum, p. 73.
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Ariston was a contemporary of Croesus. So Ariston’s father, Agasikles, will live in the early sixth century. Hippokratidas, the father of Agasikles, then comes at the turn of the seventh and sixth centuries (c. 600); so Leotychidas fits in at the end of the seventh century.

If we assume that the commentator has not made any mistakes, and is interpreting the poem correctly, we can say that we now know that Alcman mentioned, or alluded to, king Leotychidas. He therefore lived either during or after his reign. We can go one better than this: he referred to king Leotychidas, but his son Hippokratidas is apparently not yet king. Alcman therefore lived during the reign of Leotychidas.18 The Suda dates Alcman to 672–669 B.C.; Eusebius dates him to 659.19 Both of these dates must be wrong, if they are intended as floruits: we now know that, since Alcman mentioned king Leotychidas, he lived in the late seventh century. Eusebius offers another date, 609, which Page in his edition of the Parthenion (165) regarded as ‘inexplicable’. This now appears to be more or less right. I cannot account for the mistaken dates.20

We may now turn to the beginning of the commentary on the second poem. Here are lines 22 to 28, in Lobel’s reconstruction:

22 ἐ(ἐ)ρ τῷ Μᾶκαρ Page ὁ Μᾶκαρ Barrett ʨicoυαι π[ανα]ὶ ὁν Lobel, Page ʨicoυαι τ[ε] Barrett ʨicoυαι τ[ε] αἱ ὁν (e.g.) West

23 τὸκ Μούσκε Page -ꙋϲαϲ Barrett Barrett ὁμος Lobel, Barrett


26 φυλ[ις] οὐλογευ lobel, Page Barrett ὁ Πατραῖ Barrett


Let us again start at the end and work backwards. The δ]ὲ in line 25 shows us where the sentence starts. ἐν δ]ὲ ταύτη τῇ ὑπὸ [γ]γ: ‘in this poem’; Ἐ[Ἀ]λκ[μ]να φυρ[. Column iii shows us what Alcman is doing: he is talking about the origins of the world. Lobel therefore suggested φυλ[ις] οὐλογευ; but this means writing in seven letters where there is room for only five or four. He adds that the word may have been abbreviated, and Page follows him on

18 But see n. 3.
20 This conclusion as to the date of Alcman has already been drawn by Janni, 171. The new date does not conflict with Page’s general conclusion, cf. cit. 166. The latest discussion of Alcman’s date is by Davison, who believes (33–4) (i) that Leotychidas was dead when Alcman wrote the poem commented on by our papyrus (see n. 3 infra); (ii) that Eusebius’ first date, 659/8, is nearer the truth than that in the Suda, 672/68; and (iii) that Eusebius’ alternative date can safely be eliminated from the discussion. But (i) and (ii) seem hardly compatible, for it would follow that the reigns of kings Hippokratidas and Agasikles between them covered the greater part of the century between the death of Leotychidas (before 659/8, according to Davison) and the reign of Arston, which according to Herodotus (i 67.1) corresponds with that of Croesus (c. 560–546 [P-W. suppl. v, 437]). This is unlikely.
this; but surely it is highly unlikely that the scribe would abbreviate a word like φυσιολογεῖ. Perhaps he wrote φινο[ικός, followed by a stroke standing for ἐστὶ (see n. 21): εν δὲ ταύτη τῇ ἔστιν φισιολογεῖ. In this poem Alcman is a cosmological philosopher. Then, ἐν τῇ θεον ἠμέν δὲ τὰ δοκοῦντα ἰδ[ίῳ, ‘we shall set out our opinions’ μετὰ τὰς τῶν οἰκιστῶν νεῖλαρίας, ‘following (either in the sense of “after” or “according to”) the attempts of the other commentators’ (Page). Barrett prefers μετὰ τὰς τῶν οἰκιστῶν νεῖλαρίας, ‘at the end of the rest of my remarks about the piece’, following a hesitant suggestion by Lobel. The plural ἐκφοράς is odd. If text, and not a lacuna, followed, a decision might be easier. I resist the temptation to insist that Lobel’s phrase must mean ‘after carrying out the corpses of the other commentators for burial’; none the less, Page’s πειράς is a much more plausible conjecture. We may observe in passing the unquestionable mention of Alcman’s name, and the fact that the commentator (if he wrote πειράς) refers to previous material on his subject, to which he has access.

Before we go any further, we should take note of an important observation made by Barrett. The papyrus strips are slightly dislocated in lines 22 to 29. This means ‘that the gaps will be in places slightly wider than they are on the plate and in Lobel’s transcript’ (Barrett 689, n. 2). We may therefore conjecture words slightly longer than the gaps which Lobel allows, but never shorter.

Line 23 ends ὑπέρ gap -ατρός. Before the alpha, ‘a stroke descending from left to right suggesting λ, but I cannot say μ is excluded’ (Lobel 52). The only suggestion made for this so far has been μιατρός (Lobel, Barrett). But ὑπέρ [τῆς μιατρός is too short for the gap; and if, as is probable, this is commentary and not lemma, we would want μιατρός. ὑπέρ [τῆς θυγατρός, ‘on behalf of the daughter’, would be the right length; but it is hard to believe that the letter before the alpha was a gamma.

After these preliminaries, we can attack the main crux, the -νεῖλαρίας φυλῆ of line 24. What groups at Sparta are described as φυλαί? First, there are the three old Dorian tribes, the Pamphyloi, the Hyliacas, and the Dymanes. But we cannot induce their genitive plurals to end in -νεῖλαρίας: we may therefore discard this possibility.

The other candidates are, of course, the obes. Pitaia is called a φυλῆ by Hesychius; so is Kynosoura; Limnai is called a φυλή in an inscription; Mesoa is called a φυλή by Stephanus of Byzantium. I will not venture an opinion on how many obes there were; but it seems that one more can be added to this list. Oxhrhynchus papyrus 2389 refers to Pitaia unmistakably four times, and possibly a fifth; it also refers twice to Δυμαναίαι. I would accept Barrett’s restoration (687) of col. i, lines 6–8: πο[λ]λακαὶ δὲ [ἐν] μαίνῳ παρθένων ἐν][όντο[ς ἐν] τῆι [τῆι Πίταιας]περισσοῦναι ταῖς Ἐπειδῆσι; ‘often the young girls of Dyme came to Pitaia to sing in chorus together with the girls of Pitaia’. As Barrett says, the girls of Dyme and the girls of Pitaia appear to be mutually exclusive groups. He offers two explanations. The first is that the girls of Dyme may have belonged to the old tribe the Dymanes, and the girls of Pitaia to the new tribe Pitaia. The Rhetra indeed

21 The scribe does, however, abbreviate fairly frequently: ἐφοράς, ἐστιν in fr. 2 col. ii, 24; fr. 39, line 2; but sometimes ἐστιν in full, fr. 2 col. ii, 19; and other abbreviations in fr. 1 (c), line 2; fr. 2 col. ii, 14, col. iii, 14, 21, 23; fr. 33 (c), lines 2–3; fr. 49 col. ii, 13. Alternatively, the dislocation of the papyrus (see above) might perhaps allow the longer restoration. 22 φυσικός is Aristotle’s regular word for the pre-Socratics in the Physics and elsewhere; see L.-S.-J. s.v. φυσικός π. 2.
23 ἐκφορά can mean ‘expression, enunciation’ of ideas (L.-S.-J. sense V). On the analogy of such phrases as ἐκφορά τῶν νομεύσων (Dion. Hal. de comp. verb. 8) the genitive must refer to the thing expressed; so if ἐκφοράς is read, τῶν λογίων cannot mean ‘the other commentators’. There are no doubt other possibilities besides πειράς and ἐκφοράς.
24 Whether -ατρός is lemma or comment, it is certain that τῆς in line 24 must be comment. The lack of a connective after τῆς tells us nothing: cf. lines 14–15.
25 Evidence in P-W. xvii, 1694 (V. Ehrenberg, s.v. Obai).
confirms that tribes and obes co-existed; but if the Dymanes were a racial group, and Pitana a local division, this explanation, as Barrett sees, immediately raises difficulties. Alternatively, Dyme is a local φυλή like Pitana, Kynosura, Linnai and Mesoa. This is surely right; and it is confirmed by the entry in Hesychius Δύμην εν Σπάρτη φυλή καὶ τόπος. This used to be written off as a confusion with the Dymanes; but it now seems fairly clear that Hesychius was correct. 27

So we have five divisions of Sparta, later described as φυλάι. Whether there were any more, and what to do about Amyklai, are questions which I shall not attempt to answer.

We can now return to our papyrus, armed with these five tribes, put them into the genitive plural, and see if any of them fits in the gap. Πιτανατών or Πιτανατιδῶν; Κυνοσύρεων; Λυμναίων; Μεσοατών or Μεσοατιδῶν; Δυμαίων or Δυμαϊών: all attempts end in failure.

One way out is to make the most of a mark which appears on the papyrus above the puzzling -τιδῶν. Page, following a hint of Lobel, says that this is an alpha, which the scribe at first missed out, and then added above the line; and so he reads Πίτανατιδῶν. But this is impossible. As Lobel had already pointed out (55), the mark is not over the nu and tau, but over the tau and the iota; so it is too far to the right. Lobel and Barrett agree that it is questionable for a tribe to be defined by its female members. Barrett says the supplement is too short. We may add to these objections the observation that the scribe appears to make no errors elsewhere (but see p. 62). Πίτανατιδῶν, then, is out; and, of course, if we once say that the scribe has slipped, then almost anything goes.

What is this mysterious mark? It is hard to say, especially as the papyrus is in a very bad state at this point; but it is worth pointing out that there appears to be a similar mark under fragment 30, line 2. Perhaps these marks record nothing more significant than the attempts of the scribe to get his pen to write.

The -τιδῶν φυλή thus seems to pose an insoluble problem. First of all, as far as we can see, it did not exist; and secondly, we are asked to believe that it had a mother, or a daughter: ὑπέρ [τῆς μ]ατρός or θυγατρός [τῆς τ[ῶν] -τιδῶν φυλ[ῆς]. These considerations, together with the fact that at the beginning of line 25 there is a word which clearly names a tribe, beginning Δυμα-, make it almost overwhelmingly necessary for us to put a firm mark of punctuation after -τιδῶν; the -τιδῶν φυλή is a mirage; it is Δύμη which is the φυλή. 28

The word after the φυλή-word is generally thought to be χερός (Lobel, Page, Barrett). With this I agree. But φυλῆς δ' ὀχυρῶσ ἐστι Δυμα[ῖος], which Barrett tentatively offers us, is not very satisfactory: 'and of the tribe the chorus is of girls of Dyme'. The word-order is most curious, and the explanation that φυλῆς is emphatic ('as for the tribe, it is...') is not very convincing. φυλῆς, indeed, seems to be the root of the trouble. Lobel in his literal transcript does not print the phi; there is a hole here in the papyrus, but the bottom of the letter, a hook swinging around to the right, is quite visible, and phi is the only letter that the scribe

27 The entry in Hesychius is rejected by Ehrenberg (P-W. xvii, 1695-6 [s.v. Obai]); it would be easy, but not helpful, to multiply references.

The chief objection to Dyme as an obe is that it would be perverse for anyone naming a set of new tribes to think up a name so similar to one of the old. But perhaps his choice was not free: these are place-names and local divisions, and if there were a place called Dyme, he would have no option. The place could have received this name because Dymanes settled there in early days. A parallel of sorts might be Pamphylia, which Huxley (op. cit., 15) thinks was settled by the same Pamphiloi as at Sparta. However, no one has succeeded in finding a Dyme in Laconia.

The feminine form Δύμαια is confirmed by Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. Δύμαιας, as well as by P.Oxy. 2366.

28 Barrett rightly separates the words -τιδῶν and φυλῆς.

There are other ways out of the impasse. One is to read υπέρ [τῆς -α]τρός τῆς τ[e ...]. Or φυλῆ could mean something other than a 'tribe' (as I have understood the word throughout this discussion): then we might have a Ἐφραίμητιδῶν φυλῆς. But such a usage would be more probable in poetry than in a late commentator. (Hdt. iii 26.1 is not a safe parallel.) He could, of course, have got the phrase from the poem; or he may have been ignorant enough to think that the Euryptoids really were a φυλή.
writes in this way. So phi epsilon lambda are pretty certain. Why not φιλ[ικος δε χο]ρος ἔστι Δύμα s: ‘it is the tribal chorus of Dyme’? Or possibly φιλ[ετας δε χο]ρος, a phrase for a tribal chorus which is used on an Attic inscription of the first century a.d. (IG II² 3114, line 4)? It might be objected that this was too long for the gap; but Barrett has shown that we must enlarge the gap.

We are then faced with the letters -τρα Δυμα- in line 25. Lobel, with caution, suggests πατρα, a Doric form of φρατρία; ‘I do not know’, he adds, ‘how suitable this word is to Spartan institutions’. Page rushes in where Lobel feared to tread, and prints δω ν πατρα Δυμα[νες; which results in strange Greek. πάτρα is a word which is used by Pindar and on inscriptions29 to mean a ‘body of persons claiming descent from a common ancestor’; but there are strong reasons against reading it here. This is a late commentator writing; that he should use a word like πάτρα, which is both technical and Doric, without offering any explanation, seems quite inadmissible. I therefore submit that the πάτρα Δυμάνων, or whatever, is just as mythical a beast as the -τιδων φυλή.

What other words end in -τρα? ρήτρα, of course; but that gets us nowhere. One class of words comes to mind, and that is names of women. The list is a distinguished one: it includes Clytemnester, Electra, Hypermestra, Cleopatra, and no doubt many others. Perhaps we could read a proper name ending in -τρα here, followed by Δύμα[να (see n. 7): ‘Q (whoever she is) is a girl from Dyme’. No connective, and no article, and no verb; to justify this, there is our old friend Λεωτυγίδας [�]ικεδαυ[μοι]ων βασιλείς in line 15 (see p. 64).

This leaves the opening words, which have no historical implications. I accept the general view that Alcman is invoking the Muse. The poem should begin abruptly Μώσα, λισσομαί, ‘Muse, I pray’; attempts to write σε [Μωσα]α (Page) or ὁ [Μωσα]α (Barrett) ignore the fact that the scribe always leaves a space before a lemma. Moreover, ὁ seems not to be used in invocations of the Muse in the early period’ (West 156, n. 2). Then, probably, τ[ε σι]ων μάλιστα (West, following a suggestion of Barrett; this is better than the prosaic τ[ε σι]ων μάλιστα). As for the four letters -νος, they could be lemma or comment, and they could indicate an accusative plural, a genitive singular, or a participle. Page’s Μωσα[νος is not impossible. Although only one woman is mentioned in line 22, she has certainly become plural by line 28; so provisionally we might accept τας Μωσα.

My tentative reconstruction of these lines therefore reads:

22 Μωσα, λισσομαι τε σιων μα-
λιστα. [τας Μωσασ υπερ [της θυν]ατρος (?)
της [των -]ντιδων φιλικος δε χο]ρος (εστι)
25 Δυμα[να. εν δ]ε ταυ-
τη της φω[θη δ]ο τ[ε Αλ]κιμων φωσικος [εστῑ] ε]κη-
των λοιπων[ν πει]ρας.

‘Muse, I beseech you especially of gods.’ He invokes (understood) the Muses on behalf of the daughter (possibly) of the family of the -τιδων.’ Now whereas there are no tribes with this ending, there are any amount of families, and it is impossible to guess which one it was. Those who like bold hypotheses might welcome Barrett’s Ευφυσα[ντιδων (689, n. 3) here; there is nothing against it. ‘And it is the tribal chorus of Dyme. Q is a girl from Dyme.’ Q, I imagine, is the leader of the chorus. Perhaps she is also the daughter of the -τιδων. ‘In this poem Alcman is a cosmological philosopher. We shall set out our opinions following the attempts of the other commentators.’

Even if this reconstruction is wrong—and I put it forward much more tentatively than that of lines 13 to 22—it seems clear that the papyrus confirms the existence of a tribe, or obe, called Dyme; and I hope that I have shown that the commentator need have said nothing about a νηστών φυλή or a πάτρα Δυμαίνων, thereby removing the two main headaches from the interpretation of this passage.

University of Exeter. F. D. Harvey.

Addendum to p. 68: Mr W. G. Forrest has kindly pointed out that since it was the Greek custom to name the first-born after his grandfather, Polydoros, not Anaxandros, ought to be the eldest brother. This is surely correct, and Page's stemma should be amended accordingly. Since Anaxandros succeeded Eurykrates, it would follow that Polydoros died before his father.
AESCHYLUS IN SICILY

Time has done almost its worst with the cultural and social history of Western Greece in the period from Hieron’s succession in 478 to the death of Aeschylus in 456. It has left us no complete work by any Western Greek author; and for a chronicler of the period it has been able to do nothing better than a Diodorus Siculus. As a result, most of those details in the picture that are not missing are obscure. Close observation is fruitless, except only at one or two points where there still falls the brilliant but fugitive light of a Pindaric ode. Even so, if we step far enough back, a general composition emerges about which, I believe, there will not be much disagreement.¹

This was a precocious culture, largely called into being by artificial means, and hence short-lived. But while it lived it anticipated in many ways the culture and the problems of Old Greece a generation and more later. Here already was at least one city-state swollen to outsize proportions, with a fluid population for which the moral and social patterns of the close-knit arcaic community must inevitably have been losing their meaning.² Here already was that violent confrontation of old and new, tradition and free inquiry, which is more familiar to us from the Athens of the late fifth century, from the time of Euripides, Socrates, and Aristophanes. There is a religious background of essentially rather primitive mortuary beliefs—that whole region, of course, is the demesne of the Two Goddesses—though these beliefs themselves are taking on new and far from primitive shapes in the minds of the Pythagoreans and their associates. In abrupt contrast to them stand the utterly modern and sophisticated minds of the native Epicharmus and the immigrant Xenophonès; and half-way between there is a Sicilian who embodies in one man the contradictions of the epoch: Empedocles, poet and scientist, author (to the consternation of the learned in modern times) both of the Περὶ Φύσεως and of the Καθαρμοὶ. The same time, in Syracuse, sees the beginnings of a school of rhetoric—rhetoric, carrying in itself all those fearsome questions as to the relation between the word and the thing, between beauty and truth, which were to perplex Plato well into the fourth century. A pupil of that school, Gorgias, was already a grown man when Aeschylus died, but—significantly—was not to bring the new learning to Athens until 427 B.C., a generation after.³ Some of the conditions of Cleon’s Athens, in short, were already foreshadowed, momentarily, in Hieron’s Syracuse. It is no accident that some of the fragments of Epicharmus anticipate, in tone and perhaps in content, Socratic dialogues;⁴ and there may even be something in the guess that his play Αἴγος καὶ Αἴγινα was the model for that classic document of the late fifth-century intellectual crisis: the contest between the Just and Unjust Arguments in Aristophanes’ Clouds.⁵

I have spent some time in drawing an admittedly impressionistic picture of this culture because one must have its conditions firmly in mind if one is to appreciate the effect that it will have had on a visitor fresh off the ship from Old Greece. Here we reach another subject on which our detailed information is meagre, but which, in general, does not admit of doubt: the flow of poets from Old Greece who arrived during these years—Simonides,

¹ This article is a slightly expanded version of a communication read at the meeting of the Classical Association of Canada in Vancouver, June 1965.
² For the size and mobility of the Sicilian population, compare the operations undertaken by Gelon at Syracuse and Megara Hyblaea (T. J. Dunbabin, The Western Greeks, [Oxford 1948] 416–17); Hiero’s treatment of the Cataneans (Diodorus xi 49); Theron’s of the Himeraeans (ibid.); and the somewhat earlier events at Zankle (Herodotus vi 22–3).
³ Diodorus xii 53.
⁴ Especially inc. fab. 170 and 171 Kaibel.
⁵ For this guess see, e.g., A. O. F. Lorenz, Leben und Schriften des Koes Epicharmos (Berlin 1864), 146, citing G. Bernhardy; and A. Olivieri, Frammenti della Commedia Greca (Naples 1930), 56.
Bacchylides, Pindar, probably the tragedian Phrynichus, and Aeschylus. It is surely no wild exercise of the imagination to suppose that the impact of the Western culture on at least the Theban and the two Athenians was shattering, that it must have been like stepping into the Time Machine and seeing Old Greece as it would be in a generation. Pindar’s reactions we could have predicted, and indeed can almost demonstrate at this day. There is the immediate imaginative grasp of three aspects of Sicily—the archaic magnificence of its courts, the mobility and chanciness of life for its inhabitants, and the mortuary, mystical side of its religion. Yet at the same time there are the signs of dislocation and suspicion, while the poet is gradually alienated from Sicilian affairs—outmanoeuvred (as I am prepared to believe, with the Pindar-scholia) by that pair from Ceos.

On Aeschylus, however—again, as we could have predicted—the impact of Sicily was very different.

The external evidence for his visits there is printed at the end of this paper. None of the material is new (though I believe that it has not before been collected and arranged under a single head), and it has been much worked over by the scholars of the nineteenth and earlier twentieth centuries. Yet by this time even their conclusions seem in need of an airing, and it may prove that a few points can still be added.

Two visits to Sicily are certain, if this evidence can be taken at its face value at all. There is one at the invitation of Hieron, during which the Persae was produced in Syracuse (compare Section C of the Testimonia); this fact is attested by the high authority of Eratosthenes. The date must lie somewhere between Spring 472 (Athenian production of

---

6 If we can trust the Anonymus de Comedia, sec. 9 (Kaibel, C.G.F., 8, with note).
7 Most clearly seen in the twelfth Olympian, for Ergoteles of Himera. This ode is dominated by Tyche Soteira, a surprising figure in Pindar or his era; one would rather expect to find her in a Hellenistic poem. The only close contemporary parallel—and an interesting one, from our point of view—comes in a late play of Aeschylus, Ag. 664 ff.
8 Cf. the second Olympian, for Therón of Akragas—Empedocles’ city.
10 With the exception of item 9, all the testimonia here printed are already to be found scattered in F. Schoeck’s De Aeschylis Vita et Poeti Testimonia Veterum, prefixed to F. Ritschl’s edition of the Septem (Leipzig 1875).

Nearly every book or long article on Aeschylus naturally contains some reference to Aeschylus’ Sicilian visits. But for discussions of the basic evidence, I would refer particularly to: G. Hermann, Opuscula ii (Leipzig 1827) 144–162; E. J. Kiehl, ‘Aeschylus’ Vita’ in Mmemosyne i (1852) 361–74; J. van Leeuwen, ‘De Aeschylis ineribus Siculis’ in Mmemosyne n.s. xviii (1890) 68–75; Schmid-Stählin, Gesch. der gr. Lit. i 2 (Munich 1934), 189–192; W. B. Stanford, ‘Traces of Sicilian Influence in Aeschylus’, in Proc. Royal Irish Acad. xliv, section C (1937–8), 229–40. References to a number of other contributions will be given in later notes, at the appropriate stage.

I should note that this article does not attempt to evaluate or criticize all the numerous theories that have been constructed on the basic evidence; that process would take far too long. I am concerned here, primarily, to set out as clearly as possible what seem to be the extent and the limits of the knowledge afforded by the ancient testimonia; secondarily, to present my own interpretation of it. Something of that interpretation I owe to the excellent article by A. Körte (‘Das Prometheus Problem’ in Neuw. für das Klass. Altert. xlv [1920] 201–213), which explains the ‘modernity’ of the Prometheus as due to Syracusan conditions. But I have come to differ from him on many points, especially on the crucial one: the dating of the play.

11 A good recent survey of the question of the productions of the Persae will be found in H. D. Broadhead, The Persae of Aeschylus (Cambridge 1960), xxviii ff.

The value of Eratosthenes’ testimony has been questioned (e.g. by Schmid-Stählin, op. cit., 190, n. 3), but I can see no good reason, in method, for doing so. Everything we know about him suggests that on a question of fact he was among the most reliable of all the ancient scholars; compare, for instance, his meticulous treatment of the chronological problem raised by Ar. Clouds 553 (a rather similar problem to that in Frogs 1028), quoted by W. J. M. Starkie, The Acharnians of Aristophanes (London 1909), li–lii.

A different, and now almost forgotten, approach to the Frogs scholium was that of E. J. Kiehl, op. cit., 363–5, who pointed out that the word used in the quotation from Eratosthenes is δεδωξα not δεδωξα not δεδωξα δεδωξα (δεδωξα, however, is found in the Vita, para. 18); Kiehl concluded that the original performance of the Persae took place in Syracuse, and hence that Aeschylus’ first visit to Sicily should be
the *Persae*) and *Spring* 467 (production of the Theban tetralogy); the lower of those limits may be put back to *Spring* 468, if that is accepted as the most likely date for the defeat of Aeschylus by the young Sophocles.\(^{12}\) As for the second visit, its duration, as well as its existence, is established with certainty from the following data.\(^{(a)}\) Aeschylus was presumably in Athens in *Spring* 458, for his victory with the *Oresteia*.\(^{(b)}\) He died at Gela in the archonship of the earlier Callias, 456/5.\(^{(c)}\) The *Vita Aeschylis*, paragraph 10 *init.*, reads as it stands: 'and after being greatly honoured by the tyrant Hieron and by the Geloans and having lived on into the third year, he died an old man...'. Clearly there has been compression and omission here; our present text has telescoped into one the visits to Hieron, who died in 467/6, and to the Geloans. The point of reference originally implied by ἐκπεραίωσεν τὴν ἔρασιν αὐτόν can only have been an arrival in Gela soon after the production of the *Oresteia*. This squares perfectly with our data (a) and (b), and leaves us with no good reason to doubt that Aeschylus ended his life with a residence in Sicily that lasted for at least two years.

Whether we should postulate a separate visit for the production of the *Aitnaiai* (*Vita*, paragraph 9, *fin.*)—a visit earlier than either of those two—remains an open question, which has been debated rather fruitlessly for more than a century.\(^{(15)}\) The *Vita* says expressly that when Aeschylus produced the play 'Hieron was then founding Aitna'. And Diodorus, our only authority on the point, dates that foundation on his year 476/5.\(^{(16)}\) Against this, though, we have to set the probability that founding a city may be a lengthy process—especially if, like Hieron, you have to throw out its rightful inhabitants, import 5,000 settlers from Syracuse, and round up another 5,000 from the Peloponnesus—and that the inaugural festivities may reasonably be expected only towards the end of that process, when there is a quorum of citizens present to applaud. We also have to consider the possibility that the celebration would be delayed until Hieron's son Deinomenes, who to begin with was young enough to need a guardian, was able to assume *de facto* his kingship of Aitna.\(^{(17)}\) Finally, and perhaps most significantly, Pindar's first Pythian ode, which also—to use the words of the *Vita* about the *Aitnaiai*—οἰκονόμησε βλέπων ἄγαθον τοῖς συνοικίζοντι τὴν πόλιν, refers to a victory which is dated on good grounds to 470 B.C.\(^{(18)}\) When the evidence is balanced in this way, one obviously cannot be dogmatic. But on the whole it seems more economical to suppose, with many scholars,\(^{(19)}\) that the *Aitnaiai* resulted from the same visit as that which saw the reproduction of the *Persae*, some time between the springs of 472 and 468.

In short, two visits are certain; another, earlier than those, is possible; it is conceivable that there were even more, but there is no solid evidence to suggest them.\(^{(20)}\)
From the facts of the visits I turn briefly to the motives for them. The ancient sources (Section B of the Testimonia) adduce a large number, some chronologically impossible, some laughable, some mutually exclusive; and nearly all investigators have dismissed them *en bloc* as mere guesswork of the Graeco-Roman classrooms. Even so, perhaps something can be salvaged with probability. One might reasonably have guessed, even without direct testimony, that the first visit, to Hieron’s court, was prompted purely and simply by the pressing invitations of that tyrant. There is abundant evidence that Hieron prided himself on being what Pindar calls a *θαυμαστός παρήγ* to his poet-guests (*Pyth. iii 71*), and most of his other visitors from Old Greece are recorded to have come out on such invitations. But in fact we have direct testimony too: the statement of Eratosthenes, the one really reputable name among our authorities, that the *Persae* was produced at Syracuse *σπουδάσωντος Ἴρευς* (Testimonia, no. 6). There is no great problem here. The crucial problem, and the one which no doubt gave rise to those inept antique speculations in the first place, is: why the last migration to Sicily, the long (and, as it turned out, eternal) stay from 458 onwards? This visit drops clear out of the pattern. Since the upheavals following Hieron’s death in 467/6 there was not a potenlate left on the island—and certainly no hospitable potentate, of the sort who would (I fear) have tempted certain lyric poets to brave any number of subsequent trans-Ionian crossings. If we are to believe Diodorus, in 458 every Sicilian community that mattered was a democracy; including, naturally, Syracuse, Gela and Akragas.\(^{21}\)

Why did Aeschylus go back again?

One text is at least worth a glance in this connexion. Plutarch, in his *De Exilio* (Testimonia, no. 2), offers a statement which, if taken in its complete context, is in flat contradiction to all the other witnesses as to motive—including Plutarch himself, or his source,\(^{22}\) in his *Life of Cimon* (Testimonia, no. 1). According to the *De Exilio*, Aeschylus left on his last journey under no external compulsion whatever, but to enjoy what Plutarch claims as the delights of being abroad, and to seek glory. Now one would clearly do wrong to lay too much stress on this passage, especially in view of the fact that it occurs in a *Consolatio*, a genre in which the strict rules of veracity may too often be relaxed for humane reasons. Even so, I cannot bring myself to leave it completely out of consideration, because I still wonder whether Plutarch would have ventured to include Aeschylus in his list of voluntary visits besides the last one. But this is achieved by assuming that almost all the ancient accounts of Aeschylus’ motives for leaving Athens (to be considered in the next paragraph of this article) preserve some memory of historical fact. Thus the *Suda* (Testimonia, no. 4) will show that the poet fled to Sicily very early in the nineties, on the famous occasion of the collapse of the benches; the *Vita*, para. 8, will bring him to the island after his defeat by Simonides in the eighties, and also (supported here by Testimonia, no. 1) after the defeat by Sophocles. None of these visits can be positively disproved; though, since the discovery of the date of the *Septem*, the last becomes highly unlikely. But both the method and the general result are disquieting.\(^{21}\)

\(^{21}\) Diodorus xi 68 *fn.* (year 466/5); xi 72–3 (year 463/2); xi 76 *fn.* (year 461/0). This point is well put by G. Méautis, *L’authenticité et la date du Prométhée enchâlé d’Eschyle* (Geneva 1960) 67 ff., though I do not find myself able to follow all his conclusions from it.\(^{22}\) There is, at any rate, an obvious confusion in the *Cimon* passage. Like the *Vita* (para. 8, *ad init.*), it maintains that Aeschylus fled to Sicily because he was disappointed by the young Sophocles’ victory, that is, not later than 468. Unlike the *Vita*, however, it brings him on this visit not to the court of Hieron, but to his own death and burial. Both accounts are probably worthless guesses, but the *Vita’s* is at least chronologically possible; whereas that in the *Cimon* ignores Aeschylus’ presence in Athens in 467 (September) and 458 (*Oresteia*).

Van Leeuwen (*op. cit., 73 f.*) offers an ingenious explanation of this passage: Plutarch has here misread his source, which will have referred not to the *kplasm* of Aeschylus’ play in 468, but to the *kplas*, i.e. the ostracism, of Cimon in 459. But there is not enough evidence to raise this above the status of an interesting guess. And the same is true of the suggestion, often discussed in the past (e.g. Van Leeuwen, p. 71; Schmid-Stählin, p. 190–1), that the famous trial for impiety was responsible for Aeschylus’ departure from Athens.
and happy exiles without any authority at all. And at all events it is not inconsistent with the explanation which would seem most likely in itself: that Aeschylus went back to Sicily because he had been fascinated by what he saw there on his earlier visit, because—unlike Pindar—he could not keep away from the Time Machine, with the view which it afforded of that coming world which he could not live to see in Old Greece. This is avowed speculation, of course. Yet we may see later on that certain phenomena in his later plays are, at lowest estimate, reconcilable with it.

There, anyhow, we must leave Aeschylus' motives; and at the same time pass from the wavering ancient biographic tradition concerning Aeschylus in Sicily to what I, at least, think of as firmer ground: the evidence adduced by the ancient scholars from Aeschylus' own writings. If these men are to be trusted, we are now dealing with statements that rest on observation of the plays themselves; and on a far greater number than that which we now possess.

Of vital importance, if true, is the famous passage in Athenaeus (Testimonia, no. 7), which quotes an Italiote word ἀοξύζωρος 'wild boar' from Aeschylus' Phorikes; for a reason which will shortly appear, we should take note that that play dealt with the adventures of Perseus. Athenaeus ends: 'It is no wonder that Aeschylus, who spent some time in Sicily, has used many Sicilian words.' But is this last statement true?

One is certainly not bound to believe everything one reads in Athenaeus. But on a question involving mere words he has a strong prima facie case, for he belongs to a breed of scholars, and to an epoch, which collected rare vocables in the way you or I might collect hard gems. Fortunately, however, we can appeal to more than merely general considerations; to some extent it seems possible to verify the statement even on the extant plays and fragments. W. B. Stanford, in an article published with precisely that purpose in 1938, mustered a list of 31 possible Sicilianisms from the work of Aeschylus; and although one might disagree over a high proportion of them, the remaining total of probables is, to me, impressive. Further, the list has been increased since Stanford wrote. In 1941 was published the Oxyrhynchus fragment of Aeschylus' satyrick Diktyoulkoi, which again, of course, is a Perseus-play, and so might well have belonged to the same tetralogy as the Phorikes. Even in the relatively short passage preserved by the papyrus, the Diktyoulkoi shows five Dorisms, which Lobel tentatively, and others more definitely, incline to account for as Sicilian Dorisms.

---

23 In fact, I believe we can say that he did have an authority; but one whose reliability, unfortunately, cannot now be controlled. Pausanias (Testimonia, no. 5) seems to be extracting from the same source for his own purposes. It will be noticed that both Plutarch and Pausanias start from the case of Euripides and work backwards, the word πρότερον being used in both passages. Plutarch, stressing the idea of 'permanent exile', includes Herodotus and Homer; Pausanias, intent on the association between poets and dynasts, omits those two, but includes Anacreon. One might surmise that a handbook of exempla, containing a chapter on 'Famous Literary Exiles', underlies both lists.

24 See note 10 above; the article is to some extent a review of the evidence already collected by W. Aly, De Aeschyli Copia Verborum Capita Selecta (Berlin 1906), ch. iii.

25 Stanford himself, of course, fairly admits the difficulties of demonstrating that any one word is or is not Sicilian, and presents his results with all due caution. To me it seems that eight of his instances (numbers 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 15, 16 and 20 in his list) are probable; about most of the rest we can only say, at the outside, that the meagre evidence as it stands points towards Sicily or Magna Graecia. I cannot bring myself to share the outright scepticism of E. Fraenkel (on Ag. 1507), though he rightly corrects some of Stanford's details.

26 E. Lobel in P. Oxy. xviii (1941) 9; cf. A. Setti, Annali della Scuola . . . di Pisa, Classe di Lettere (etc.) xvii (1948) 327–3; 351 and L. Cantarella, I nuovi frammenti eschili di Ossirino (Naples, n.d.) 64–66. One of the five Dorisms concerned was already known through ancient quotation: θόσθαι (Diktyoulkoi, line 815).

It is interesting to see that both Stanford (p. 231) and Cantarella (p. 66, note 1), writing before the discovery of the Supplaiis-didascalia, were exercised by the number of presumed Sicilianisms which they found in what, at that time, was supposed to be an early play, datable long before any likely visit by Aeschylus to Sicily. Their explanations of this phenomenon, which were not in themselves very
On the whole, therefore, it seems reasonable to assume that Athenaeus' reliability on this point is confirmed, and with almost more evidence than we have a right to expect in such matters. Athenaeus (or his learned sources) had read 'many Sicilian words' in the work of Aeschylus—particularly, as it now seems, in the Perseus-tetralogy—and connected this fact with his residence in Sicily. Now we meet a rather similar situation in the statements numbered 9 and 10 in the Testimonia. Both, again, are from grammarians, and apparently well-informed ones; Macrobius (no. 10), it is true, does not amount to much in himself, but reasons have been shown for thinking that this particular passage in him goes back to the erudite Serenus Sammonicus, and beyond that again, ultimately, to some Alexandrian source, perhaps Didymus. Both our witnesses are concerned, this time, not with points of language, but with the appearance of local Sicilian matters in the work of Aeschylus. The Aristophanes-scholium (no. 9) notices the poet's knowledge of the big beetles that frequented Mount Etna. (The implied comparison of Sisyphus' labours to those of a dung-beetle, incidentally, is a pleasing specimen of Aeschylus' wit—essentially, like so much of his most solemn tragic poetry, visual in its inspiration.) Macrobius, for his part, points to his familiarity with the native Sicel cult of the Palikoi. And both, like Athenaeus, imply that this local knowledge is the result of residence in Sicily. This time, however, the wording is much more emphatic, indeed startlingly so. The Aristophanes-scholium calls Aeschylus 'in a way, a native' of the island; Macrobius, as his text stands in our MSS and editions, actually calls him 'definitely a Sicilian'! But this last seems too ignorant a remark even for a word-hunter like Macrobius to have committed to paper, and I strongly suspect that utique here is corrupt. Comparison with the Aristophanes-scholium (which seems to come from the same stable) might suggest that Macrobius' ultimate Greek source wrote τρόπον των Σικελίων, latinized as vir quasi Siculus, and then at some stage in the tradition (either before or, more likely, since Macrobius) miswritten as vir utique Siculus. At all events, the main point is clear: both writers preserve a tradition that Aeschylus' residence in Sicily was a very long one.

To sum up: this class of the evidence suggests, and perhaps may be thought to prove, that the ancient grammarians found in the Aeschylean corpus available to them many factual and linguistic indications that Aeschylus was extremely well acquainted with Sicily. Athenaeus' remark implies that the number of plays that yielded such indications was considerable, and even we today, in our less privileged position, can name some of them: not only the expected Altainai, but the Perseus-tetralogy too, and the satyr-play (with its tetralogy?), the Sisyphus Stone-roller. Less positively I would add, on the basis of those words in Stanford's list which seem to me fairly well attested as Sicilianisms (see above, note 25), the extant plays, with the exception of the Persae; and also the Glaukos of the Sea (noting Fr. 62 Mette, and Fr. 64—where we glimpse the river and the cliffs by Himera). The ancient grammarians may or may not have had more reliable biographic information available than we do, but in any case their conclusion would have been reasonable even if it was based solely on observation of the dramatic texts: Aeschylus must have spent a very considerable time in Sicily. Now perhaps this conclusion allows us to advance a step further. There is satisfactory proof that Aeschylus spent one long residence there, of over two years, at the end of his life. But that residence alone is not enough to account for the phenomena observed by the grammarians and by us. On average, taking the highest ancient estimate (90) of the plays left by Aeschylus, the poet will have produced one tetralogy convincing, are now unnecessary; and it may perhaps count, in some degree, as a confirmation of the late date implied by the didascalia.


28 I do not claim that the suggested quas is certainly right, though it is not difficult to imagine the process of corruption—especially in minuscule script—which would change utiquatisiculus into virutiquisiculus. But I am confident that utique is wrong.
about every two years over his career. But even if we suppose that he redoubled his efforts in those two years at Gela, that his life ended (as indeed I am prepared to believe) in an unparalleled creative fervour, still he can hardly have written so much in that time as to permit Athenaeus to say, generally, that ‘Aeschylus has used many Sicilian words’. And it is not easy to believe that he could have fitted into this space even the plays named by the ancient grammarians, besides the Prometheia (which, I take it, must belong there). We can only conclude that an earlier residence also, probably that which fell between 472 and 468, was prolonged enough for Aeschylus to become the expert on Sicilian language and affairs which the grammarians represent him to be: τρόπων των ἐπιχώρους, vir quasi Siculus.\footnote{The deep impression that Aeschylus evidently made on the Sicilian theatre deserves at least a mention at this point. Although one might argue that this cannot in itself constitute proof that he resided for a long time in Sicily, it may perhaps be worth considering as a supporting argument to those given in the text. Most of the evidence is collected in F. Focke, ‘Aischylos’ Prometheus’, Hermes lxxv (1930), esp. p. 302, and M. Bock, ‘Aischylos und Akragas’, Gymnasium lxxv (1958), esp. pp. 412 and 439, with notes. It falls into two classes: (1) evidence that Epicharmus parodied Aeschylus fairly extensively; this is shown, e.g., by no. 11 of our Testimonia, and probably by the Epicharmian title Persæ. (2) Evidence that Sicilian interest in Aeschylus endured long after the poet’s death; it is even suggested that he left a ‘school’ of Akragantine tragedians. I note with interest that even when the tyrant Dionysius of Syracuse sets out to write tragedy (Lucian, adv. indoctum 15) he buys up the writing-desk of—Aeschylus!}

In this paper I have spent more time than I could have wished on antiquarian and linguistic details. But the effort may have been worth while if the results show, as firmly as can be hoped considering the conditions of our knowledge, that quite a high proportion of the last third of Aeschylus’ active career was spent in Sicily; that he was much more than a casual witness of that premature blossoming of classical Greek culture (in its best and worst aspects). It would be pleasing to end in a more majestic key, with a demonstration that those Sicilian experiences were of more than mere lexicographical importance to Aeschylus’ career as a poet. Could they perhaps have changed the entire direction of his thinking? \textit{A priori}, such a theory does not seem absurd, if we bear in mind two points: the immense difference, outlined at the beginning of this paper, between the intellectual climate of Sicily and that of Old Greece at this time; and the fact that Aeschylus was clearly not repelled by it, since he returned at least once. Unfortunately a \textit{demonstration} of it is impossible, and will be so unless totally new evidence comes to light; it seems to be the fate of all things Sicilian that the facts should give out at the moment when we are coming to close quarters with some masterpiece either of art or of conduct. And yet the theory is at least not inconsistent with the facts which we possess; it could be worth a few moments’ consideration.

On what seem to me at present the most likely datings of the seven extant plays (see the chronological table, below), we observe a sharp break in development between the two oldest works, the Persæ and the Theban tetralogy, and the three later, the Danaid tetralogy, the Oresteia, and the Prometheia. I am not speaking here of grammatical or metrical minutiae, but of the greatest thing, the universe itself. The difference between the two groups is as fundamental as that. In the Persæ and the Theban tetralogy there is a simple and stable cosmos, one in which, to put it bluntly, the Divine is united against man: let a human being swerve by a hair’s-breadth from the rules, and the Powers of earth and heaven will join together to castigate him. This cosmos, it should be observed, is nearly identical with that found immediately \textit{after} Aeschylus also, in the earlier Sophoclean plays and even in Herodotus; it is the early tragic norm. But in Aeschylus’ three later tragedies...
all is changed. The human and divine cosmos is divided into the enemy camps of male and female, and of the opposites which go with them respectively: light/dark, heaven/earth, new/old; the universal fabric is torn in two. There is a malaise in those last trilogies, more terrifying in its social and religious implications than the worst that Aeschylus can do to us through the medium of the conventional early tragic cosmos in the Septem. Though it is true that he does contrive to reunite the world at the end of the Oresteia (and no doubt at the end of the other two, fragmentary, late trilogies he contrived the same), yet for the greater part of its course we are witnessing, in Aeschylean terms, an anticipation by more than thirty years of Aristophanes’ dialogue between the Just and the Unjust Arguments, between the old and the new society:

--- othē γὰρ εἶναι πάνυ φημὶ δίκην.
--- oik εἶναι φῆς; — χέρε γὰρ ποῦ 'οντιν;
--- παρὰ τοῖς θεοῖς.
--- πῶς δὴ μα δίκης οὐκ ἐστὶ θεὸς
οὐκ ἄπολολεν τὸν πατέρ’ αὐτοῦ
dήμας;

Clouds 903–906

Underlying both struggles, for all the differences in detail, is the same moral and spiritual abyss, the same universe of lost standards. That is an astounding imaginative leap for an Athenian poet who died in 456; to myself, I can only explain it by the glimpses of a coming Greece which he had seen in Sicily.

This, to be sure, is no proof. Perhaps a little nearer to proof, though, is the fact that these three late trilogies, unlike the earlier, each contain details which seem fairly certainly to betray an awareness (to say no more than that) of contemporary Western Greek thinking. The famous fragment of the Danaides on the marriage of Heaven and Earth (a keynote, this, of the late trilogies) is very like a passage of Empedocles.29 Apollo’s perplexing biology in the Eumenides (658 ff.: the mother is no parent to the child!) touches on what is known to have been a debating-point among six philosophers of the middle fifth century, of whom four were Italiotes or Sicilians and none was an Athenian.31 Finally, some students of Aeschylus have supposed that what I believe to be the last work of all, the Prometheia, was shot through with Empedoclean thinking;32 but more, perhaps the majority,33 are agreed that the reference to the excellence of number in Prometheus 459 can hardly be a mere coincidence with Pythagorean doctrine. Even these are no more than hints, traces. But I submit that they may be tell-tale traces, evidence of an absorption in the intellectual and social eruption of early fifth-century Sicily which in the end brought the poet back there—unlike Pindar, unlike any of his contemporaries—for a second long stay when the tyrannies were over; and also to the tomb at Gela.

Assumed Chronology

475/6:
472, spring:
date given for foundation of Aitna by Diodorus, xi 49.
Persæ tetralogy (Athens)

Whatever nuances of interpretation be put on it, two points emerge beyond question. First, the curious problem is not touched on by any other classical Athenian writer except Euripides (Or. 552—an obvious parody of the passage in Eum.—and, more doubtfully, inc. fab. fr. 1064 Nauck). Second, it was discussed, favourably or otherwise, by the following non-Athenians: (for), Diogenes of Apollonia, Hippon of Metapontum; (against), Anaxagoras (?), Alcmaeon of Croton, Parmenides, Empedocles.
32 Or, more precisely: with ideas like those of Empedocles. Cf. Phoenix xvii (1963) 192-5, and the references given there.
33 They include Stanley, Bergk, Sikes and Willson, and Thomson.
re-production of Persae at Syracuse, and (?) production of Aithnaiai.

Sophocles defeats Aeschylus.
Theban tetralogy.

death of Hieron.

Danaid tetralogy.\(^{34}\)
Oresteia. Aeschylus leaves for Sicily.

Prometheia\(^{35}\)
Aeschylus dies at Gela.

**Testimonia\(^{36}\)**

A. 'Vita Aeschylus' in the codices MBVQ (etc.) of Aeschylus

Paragraph 8 (Wilam., Murray): ἀπήρε δὲ ὡς 'Τέρωνα, κατὰ τινὰς μὲν ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων κατασπούδασθει καὶ ἠσσηθεῖς νέῳ ὡντι Σοφοκλεὺς, κατὰ δὲ εὖνοις ἐν τῷ εἰς τοὺς ἐν Μαραθώνι τεθηκότας ἔλεγεν ἠσσηθεῖς Σιμωνίδη ...

9. τινὲς δὲ φασίν ἐν τῇ ἐπιδεῖξε τῶν Εἰμενίδων ὑποράθην εἰςαγαγόντα τὸν χορὸν τοσοῦτον ἐκπλήξας τὸν δήμον, ὡστε τὰ μὲν νήπια ἔκφραζον, τὰ δὲ ἐμμεροῦς ἐξαμβλυθήναι. ἕλθον τοῖς εἰς Σικελίαν, Ἴπερων τὸν τὴν Αἰθήνη κτίσθησα, ἐπεδείξατό τάς Αἰθήνας οἰονιζόμενος βίον ἀγαθὸν τοὺς συνοικίζοντι τὴν πόλιν.

10. καὶ σφόδρα τῷ τυπάνῳ Ἴπερων καὶ τοῖς Γελάμοις τιμηθεὶς, ἐπιζήσας τρίτον ἐκ ηλικίας ἐστελεύτα τούτων τὸν ἄνδραν, ἀληθῶς γὰρ χειλῶν ἀρπάζει, ὡς ἐγκρατεῖ τῆς ἄγρας οὐκ ἰσχύει, ἀφήσει κατὰ πτερόν αὐτῶν συνθέλον πόλεμῳ, ἡ δὲ ἐνεχθείσα κατὰ τοῦ ποιητοῦ φοινεύει αὐτῶν' χρηστηματισθεὶς δὲ ἦν οὐραίον σε βέλος κατακτεῖν.

11. ἀποθανόντα δὲ Γελάμοι πολυτέλεος εἰς τοὺς δημοσίους μνήμασι θάβαντες ἐτίμησαν μεγαλοπρέπως, ἐπιγράφαντες οὕτως:

Aἰσχύλου Ἐνδορίμωνος Ἀθηναίων τοῦδε κείθεται
μνῆμα κατασβημένον πυροφόρῳ Γέλας
ἀλλεὶς δὲ εὐθύκειμον Μαραθώνιον ἄλογον ἀν εἰποι
καὶ βαθυπαιντεῖς Μήδος ἐποιστάμενος.

εἰς τὸ μνῆμα δὲ φοιτώντως ὅσοις ἐν πραγματίσει ἢν ὁ βίος ἐνεχθείσεν τε καὶ τα ὀραματα ὑπεκρίνοντο ...

\(^{34}\) The evidence for the date is of course the Oxyrhynchus hypothesis; see, e.g., Lloyd-Jones, op. cit. 595–8, for bibliography and discussion, and compare, perhaps, supra, note 26, end.

\(^{35}\) This is not the place for a discussion of the date of the Prometheus. For the moment, the present writer would only say that the more familiar he becomes with the language, metre, composition and outlook of the play, the more meaning he sees in Körte's paradox (op. cit., 204): 'were there no obstacles, one would certainly place the Prometheus ten or twenty years later than the Oresteia.' Compare also C.R. n.s. xiii (1963) 5–7, and C.R. n.s. xiv (1964) 239 ff.

\(^{36}\) This collection was originally based on the material printed by F. Schoell, op. cit., but it has been entirely rearranged, one item has been added, and the texts have been revised against the more recent critical editions. I have not judged it necessary to give an apparatus criticus, since none of the variant readings affects the substance of what is said, at least from our point of view.

I should add that I have deliberately excluded Aristophanes, fr. 618, from the collection. As edited by J. M. Edmonds, The Fragments of Attic Comedy, i (Leiden 1957) 749, it might appear to be valuable fifth-century evidence for the death of Aeschylus at Gela:

ΑΙΣΧΥΛΟΣ ὑπὸ τοῦ γέλατος εἰς Γέλαν ἁρίζομαι.

But the fact is that neither the name of Aeschylus nor any reference to him is found in the source of the fragment (Plutarch, Comp. Ar. et Mem., 853 b). And the mere mention of Gela (itself due to emendation here) does not necessarily imply that Aeschylus is being referred to; cf. Acharnians 606.
Aeschylus in Sicily

17. ἐπιγέγραπται τῷ τάφῳ αὐτοῦ:

αἰτεῖ δὲ ὁ νόμος βρέχει τυπεῖς ἔθανον.

18. φασιν ὑπὸ Ἰέρωνος ἄξιωθέντα ἀναδίδαξα τοῖς Πέρσασ ἐν Σικελίᾳ καὶ λιὼν εὐδοκιμεῖν. [Cf. no. 6 infra.]

B. Alleged motives for Aeschylus’ departure(s) from Athens

Compare Vita, paragraphs 8 and 9.

1. Plutarch, Vita Cimonis 8, p. 483 f (archonship of Apsephon, 469/8):

... μικρόσαντος δὲ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους λέγεται τὸν Αἰαχύλον περιπαθῆ γενόμενον καὶ βαρέως ἐνεγκόντα χρόνον οὗ πολὺν Ἀθηναῖον διαγγέλει, εἰτ’ οὕχεσθαι δι’ ὅργην εἰς Σικελίαν, ὅπου καὶ τελευτῆσαι περὶ Γέλαν τέθαται.

2. Plutarch, De Exilió 13–14, pp. 604c–605b (Plutarch has been speaking of the advantages of exile: leisure, freedom, the chances to satisfy one’s curiosity):

διὰ τοῦτο τῶν φρονεμομάτων καὶ σοφωτάτων ὕλης ἐν εὐροῦ ἐν ταῖς ἐπί τῶν πατρίων κεκριθεὶς μένουσι: οἱ δὲ πλεῖστοι μηδὲν ἀναγκαζόμενοι, αὐτοὶ τὸ ἀγκυρὸν αράμενοι, μεθαρμάσαντο τοὺς βίους καὶ μετέτησαν, οἱ μὲν εἰς Ἀθήνας, οἱ δὲ εἰς Ἀθηναίων. τίς γὰρ ἔφηκε τῆς ἐπί τῶν πατρίων ἐγκώμιων τοιοῦτον οἰνόν Εὐρίπιδος; (Plutarch here quotes Eur. Frr. 360 [part] and 981). ἀλλ’ ὁ ταῦτα γράφας εἰς Μακεδονίαν ὑχέτε, καὶ παρ’ Ἀρχελάω κατεβίωσεν. ἀκόμης δὴν καὶ τούτῳ τὸ εἰπογραμμάτιον:

Αἰαχύλον Ἕφοροίνως Ἀθηναίον τὸδε κεύθει
μνήμη καταβαθμίσεως πυροφόροι Γέλας:

καὶ γὰρ καὶ οὕτως εἰς Σικελίαν ἀπῆκρε καὶ Σιμωνίδης πρότερον ... (Then follow the instances of Herodotus and Homer.) εἰ δὲ φησί τις ὅτι δοξάν οὕτοι καὶ τιμᾶς ἐθήνεν, ἐπὶ τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐδέ, καὶ τάς σοφᾶς Ἀθηναίως σχολάς καὶ διατρῆθας ... (Then follows a list of migrant philosophers.)

3. Diodorus, in Anth. Pal. vii 40 (gentle name not given in the MS, but the three Diodori of the Anthology all seem to have written approximately within the limits 100 b.c. to A.D. 100):

Αἰαχύλον ὑδε λέγει ταφῆν λίθος ἐνθάδε κεῖσθαι
τῶν μέγαν, οἰκεῖς τῇ ἀπὸ Κεκροπίης,
λευκὰ Γέλα Σικελοῖο παρ’ ἔδαμα· τὰς φθόνος, αἱ, αἱ,
Θρησκείας ἀγαθὸν ἐγκότοις αἰὲν ἔχει. 37

4. The Suda, s.v. Αἰαχύλος:

... φιγών δὲ εἰς Σικελίαν διὰ τὸ πεσεῖν τὰ ἱκρα ἐπιδεικνυμένον αὐτοῦ, ἔλθεν δευτέρης ἡμείσς αὐτῷ ὑπὸ ἄρτι αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν θεὸν διά τὰς ἐπικρίσεις αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ κατατέθετο τῆς ἐκείνης ἐπισκευής ἐτῶν νῆ(?') γενόμενοι.

C. Association with Hieron, and re-production of Persae in Syracuse

Compare Vita, paragraphs 8, 9, 10, and 18.

5. Pausanias, i 2. 3 (Euripides died at the court of Archelaus):

συνήκαν δὲ ἠρα καὶ τότε τοῖς βασιλείσια πυνητά, καὶ πρότερον ἐπὶ καὶ Πολυκράτει Σάμου τυραννοῦντι Ἀνακρέον παρῆν καὶ ἐς Συρακούσας πρὸς Ἰέρωνα Αἰαχύλος καὶ Σιμωνίδης ἐστάλησαν.

37 The end of this epigram is used by K. O. Müller, Dissertations on the Eumenides (Engl. tr., London 1853), 80, as an argument for supposing that Aeschylus’ final emigration was due to unpopularity at Athens. But it seems likely to be no more than a repetition of a commonplace current since Euripides, and Plato’s Apology.

D. Evidence bearing on the length of Aeschylus' residence(s) in Sicily

Compare Vita, paragraph 10 init.


ἐδώ δὲ ἐστὶν ἀσχέδωρος ὅσις,
καὶ Σκῆρας—ἐὰς δὲ ἔστιν οὕτως τῆς Ἰταλικῆς καλομένης κοιμοδίας ποιητής, γένος Ταρακτίνος—
ἐν Μελεάγρῳ φησὶν.

ἐνθ' ὀυτε ποιμήν ἄξιοι νέμειν βοτά, ἐνθ' ἀσχέδωροι νεμόμενοι καταρρίζονται.

ὅτι δὲ Αἰσχύλος διατρίφας ἐν Σικελίᾳ πολλαῖς κήρυχται φωναῖς Σικελικαῖς οὕτω διαμισθῶν.

8. Eustathius, ad Od. xix 439: ὁ δὲ οὗς, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸ ἐν ἔρτορικῳ κεῖται λεξικῷ,38 καὶ ἀσχέδωρος λέγεται. φησι γὰρ ἀσχέδωρος, ὁ σύγχρονος παρὰ Ἰταλικώτατος... χρῆσις δὲ, φασίν, ἀσχεδόνως παρ' Αἰσχύλῳ διατρίφασθαι ἐν Σικελίᾳ καὶ εἰδοτί. φησι γὰρ:

ἐδώ δὲ ἐστὶν ἀσχέδωρος ὅσις.

λέγει δὲ καὶ ἣ κοιμοδία:

ἐνθ' ὀυτε ποιμήν κ.τ.λ.

9. Schol. Venet. in Ar. Pac. 73: "Ἀλλως: μεγάλοι λέγονται εἶναι κατὰ τὴν Αἰτίνην κάθαροι. μαρτυροῦσιν δὲ οἳ ἐπίχωροι. Ἐπίχωρομοι ἐν Ἡρακλεί τῷ ἐπὶ τῶν ξωτικῶν:

... Πυγμαίων λοχαγὸς ἐκ τῶν καθαρῶν
tῶν μειζόνων, οὗτος φασὶ τὴν Αἰτίνην ἕχειν.

τρόπον δὲ τινα καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐπίχωροις: λέγει δὲ ἐν Σισύφῳ Πετροκυλιστῇ:

Αἰτίναιος ἐστὶ κάθαρος βλα ποιῶν.

10. Macrobius, Sat. v 19. 17: Ita et di Palici in Sicilia coluntur, quos primum omnium Aeschylus tragicus, vir utique (?) Siculus, in litteras dedit... (24) Aeshyli tragodia est, quae inscribatur Aeta; in hac cum de Palicis loqueretur, e.q.s.

utique] malim quasi vel sim., cf. supra 9, τρόπον δὲ τινα... ἐπίχωρος.39


E. The death in Sicily

Compare Vita, paragraphs 10, 11, 17; and nos. 1–4 supra. The story of the eagle and the tortoise is also to be found in the following passages: Sotades ap. Stob., Floril. 98. 9; Pliny, N.H. x 3; Valerius Maximus, ix 12. ext. 2; Aelian, N.A. vii 16.


38 The 'Rhetorical Lexicon' is almost certainly that of Aelius Dionysius (temp. Hadrianus), which is often appealed to by Eustathius. Compare E. Schwabe, Aelii Dionysii et Pausaniae Fragmenta Lexicorum Rhetori-
corum apud Eustathium laudata (Leipzig 1890), esp. his comments on this passage, p. 230 and note 2.
39 Cf. supra, p. 79.
13. Antipater of Thessalonica, in *Anth. Pal.* vii 39:

ο τραγικόν φώνημα καὶ ὀφρυόσσαν ἄοιδήν
πυργόσας στιβαρῇ πρῶτος ἐν εὐεπίῃ,
Ἀλκιδῆς Ἐνφορίωνος, Ἐλευσινῆς ἐκὰς αἴης
κεῖται, κυδαίνων σήματι Τρινακρίην.

C. J. Herington

The University of Texas.
THE Earliest Preserved Greek Map: A New IONIAN Coin Type
(Plates IX—XI)

Because our knowledge of ancient cartography is extremely limited, owing to the lack of surviving examples, the discovery of an accurate and competent map as the reverse type of a rare series of coins dating from the fourth century B.C. is of enormous significance. For this is the earliest Greek map to come down to us in any form and the first physical relief map known. Hitherto we have had to rely on the descriptions of maps in the ancient authors as our sole source of information about early Ionian cartography, whereas now we have an actual example. One would not normally expect to find a map as a coin type; most ancient maps were presumably drawn on vellum or papyrus. Even today, with much more sophisticated techniques of engraving, maps are very rarely found on coins, although they are common on postage stamps. Babelon, Head and Imhoof-Blumer were consequently not likely to consider this solution in trying to decipher the reverse type in their discussion of this series around the turn of the century; the map has so far remained unrecognised.

Appropriately the coins are from Ionia, the home of Thales and Anaximander, the early geographers. Only 35 examples of this series of Rhodian-weight tetradrachms and 6 of the bronze of the same type have been traced (Plates X—XI). The obverse type is the figure of the Persian king, running or kneeling right, wearing the kidaris and candys, and holding a bow in his left hand and a spear in his right. The reverse is a rectangular incuse with irregular raised areas and is usually heavily stippled. The style of the reverse changes considerably, but the type is recognisable throughout as a map depicting the physical relief of the hinterland of Ephesus, an area of approximately 90 square miles (Plate IX). It is unique both as a coin type and as a map.

* * * * *

Three considerations have led those concerned with these coins to assign them to western Asia Minor. One is the Rhodian-weight standard which was widely adopted in the cities of the western coast from about 400 B.C. onwards; Samos, Colophon and Ephesus, for example, all used it during the fourth century. A second consideration is the signature ΓΥΘΩΛΟΡΘΕΣ (found on some specimens), an Ionic form which was used only in the coastal area of western Asia Minor and the nearby islands.

A third consideration is provenience. Head, who first accepted the attribution to Ionia, later rejected it on the basis of the provenience of the examples in the British Museum.

The author wishes to thank Kenneth Jenkins and Colin Kraay for their assistance, together with the Cabinets of Paris and Berlin. She also acknowledges a particular debt of gratitude to Professor T. V. Buttrey for his patient help and encouragement. The map on Plate IX is reproduced by kind permission of the Controller, HMSO.

1 E.g. Brazil 1945, 2 cruzeiros; Formosa 1949, various denominations; Greece 1963, 30 drachmas.
2 The exact definition of the Rhodian standard is not clear: Babelon (Traités i 500) gives the tetradrachm weight as 13.00 gm., but he is willing to accept our series and the Ephesian bee/stag issues as Rhodian, although their medians are much higher. B. V. Head (Historia Numorum, [2nd ed. 1911] 962) gives the range 15.88-14.90 gm., which is too high, but he too accepts these coins as Rhodian. He does mention the possibility of the series being struck to the Phoenician standard, which overlaps with the Rhodian, but the other evidence suggests that the series must be Rhodian rather than Phoenician.
3 B. V. Head, The Coinage of Lydia and Persia (1877) 48-49; BMC Ionia (1906) 323-4.
THE EARLIEST PRESERVED GREEK MAP: A NEW IONIAN COIN TYPE

Of the six pieces in the collection, two were known definitely to have been acquired in India by Sir Alexander Cunningham and two others came from an Indian dealer. Head felt that it could not be coincidence that such a high proportion of the coins should have Indian origins, and this evidence of provenience, together with the knowledge that there were long-established settlements of Ionian Greeks in Bactria, persuaded him that the whole series must be Bactrian. But Cunningham, in describing the hoard from which the British Museum examples came, makes it clear that the find was by no means specifically Bactrian, although the hoard was found in the River Oxus. The Greek coins in the hoard were all fourth century or later and they included 3 Athenian tetradrachms, a tetradrachm of Lysimachus of Thrace and a drachm of Byzantium; there were also several Persian royal issues (darics and sigloi) and satrapal issues of Tiribazus, Datames and Pharnaspes. In addition Cunningham mentions, without noting varieties, about 100 tetradrachms and 100 drachms of Alexander, and 25 pieces from Tarsus dating from 400–250 B.C. Clearly the hoard was a very mixed one and its contents were not purely local. Schlumberger comments that local dealers and not archaeologists were involved in the find, and since they were none too scrupulous about introducing some of their Bactrian stocks into the hoard, he would be inclined to accept only the non-Bactrian coins as genuinely part of the Oxus hoard. Consequently Head’s evidence of itself would not suggest that the coins were Bactrian. Besides, if the attribution is to be made on the basis of provenience, all the other evidence points to western Asia Minor. Babelon asserts that the examples in Paris came from dealers in Smyrna, and Sestini lists a Pythagorēs piece, apparently the London specimen, as having come from Samos. Furthermore Imhoof-Blumer, in answering Head, points out that some of the bronze examples of the same type were found in western Asia Minor, and bronze coins are less likely to travel from the place where they were minted than gold or silver. All the evidence taken together, therefore, indicates that the series originated in Ionia and that Head’s proposed Bactrian origin cannot be sustained.

The problem of identifying the mint within Asia Minor is bound up with the whole question of the circumstances in which the coins were issued, the date and the authority responsible. Nothing can be deduced from the figure of the Persian king on the obverse to help in dating the series. Babelon’s attempt to identify portraits on the darics and sigloi has not been generally accepted; the figures seem rather to be abstractions of a Persian king, so that Head’s recognition in our series of Artaxerxes II and Babelon’s of Darius III Codoman have, in all probability, no foundation. However, the figure of the Persian king with bow and spear—a type virtually identical to that found on darics and sigloi—indicates that our series was issued by a Persian official, normally identified as a satrap. The system of government by satraps had been established in various parts of Asia Minor towards the end of the sixth century; their organisation was far more flexible and the royal control over them much less rigid than in the satrapies closer to Persia. It is still not clear what degree of authority the satraps had over their territories. Several satrapal issues have been identified: there are signed portrait coins of Orontas (362–348 B.C.) and Spithridates (died 334 B.C.), each of whom held the satrapies of Lydia and Ionia simultaneously. There are other coins which are obviously satrapal, although unsigned, as they bear a portrait of someone wearing the satrapal tiara. Some of these have been attributed to Tissaphernes,
Satrap of Lydia (c. 400–395 B.C.). There is, therefore, no doubt that the satraps had the authority to issue coins.

Provenience, weight standard and the Ionic form of the signature Pythagorēs, suggest that our series must have been struck in the Ionian satrapy with a signature in the Ionic form on a Rhodian-weight tetradrachm. There are various possibilities as to the authority responsible. Cunningham listed the examples from the Oxus hoard under ‘Persian royal issues’, but these are all unsigned and are struck on the Persian, not the Rhodian, standard. Nor is it likely that the issue was authorised by members of a dynasty named Pythagorēs Π and ΔΗ, because of the preponderance of anonymous pieces. The general assumption has been, therefore, that the signatures were those of city magistrates who were asked to authorise the issue for some reason, and that the satrap was ultimately responsible. Since a magistrate named Pythagorēs signed one of the bee/stag tetradrachms and a bronze issue at Ephesus, which was in the Ionian satrapy, it has seemed plausible that the coins were issued at Ephesus. Ephesian tetradrachms also exist with signatures beginning Π and ΔΗ, for instance Agenoridēs, Dēmoclēs and Dēmophōn. Head concluded that the authorisation of coinage at Ephesus was in the hands of a board of officials, rather than the responsibility of one individual, and this would explain the three different signatures on one type, and the similarity in style (see below) of the coins of Π and ΔΗ, which makes it improbable that they were magistrates in successive years.

The attribution to Ephesus is strengthened by the similarity of the fabric of our issue to that of the bee/stag series. The flans are in both cases 3 mm. thick, the diameters vary between 22 and 25 mm. and the edges are gently rounded with small striking cracks. The series with the reverse of the riding satrap, by contrast, has a flan thickness of 5 mm. and a slightly smaller diameter. Furthermore, our series fits into the system of denomination used at Ephesus: the Rhodian-weight tetradrachm and two or three sizes of small bronze. When set side by side our series and the Ephesian urban issue would appear to be the products of the same mint.

However, even if the mint is satisfactorily identified, the question of authority remains. Could this series have been struck by a satrap? The satrapal coins in Lydia and Ionia were differently conceived: the coins of Orontas and Spithridates do not carry the royal figures, and they bear the satrap’s name rather than that of a city magistrate. The satraps farther east did put the figure of the king on their coins, but the king was often relegated to the reverse while the satrap’s own head was used as the obverse type. The only similarity between the satrapal coins and our series is the use of types with local significance. But the satraps used the conventional numismatic symbols: protome of Pegasus at Lampsacus, a lyre at Cyzicus, a boar at Clazomenae. Our series does not have the Ephesian bee or any other traditional type; but the reverse does have local significance (as will be shown below), and therefore it fits into the corpus of coins bearing both a local type and the figure of the Persian king, like the series from Sidon, Tarsus and Mallos, rather than into the satrapal series.

The conception of our series is not consistent with that of the other satrapal issues that we know from Ionia; yet the Persian allegiance is plain. A possible solution is to review the history of Ephesus and try to identify the circumstances in which such an issue was most

---

12 *Traité* plates lxxviii, xci and cvii. Schwabacher (Charités [1957] 27–32) has questioned the identification of the portraits.

13 Head’s idea that Pythagorēs was himself a satrap can be discounted for the same reason.

14 *AR Hunterian* ii 328 no. 10; *SNG von Aulock* no. 1834.


16 *AR Hunterian* ii 328 no. 10; *SNG von Aulock* no. 1834.


18 Attributed by Babelon to Evagoras II of Cyprus, *Traité* ii 2, 162 no. 117, pl. xci, 7, but more probably of Carian origin.
likely to have been struck. Leaving aside the exact dating of the series for the moment, we can work on the assumption that the coins were issued sometime during the fourth century, before the arrival of Alexander. The Rhodian-weight standard was adopted in most of the cities about 394 B.C. so it is safe to presume that the coins date from between 394 and 334 B.C.

At the beginning of the period the city had just shaken off Spartan domination and had made an alliance with Rhodes, Cnidus and Samos, which was marked by a joint coinage with the type of the infant Heracles strangling two serpents. Then in 390 the city was taken again by the Spartans, who held it until the Peace of Antalcidas in 387, when they handed it over to the Persians. The Ephesians apparently retained some measure of autonomy and choice in their form of city government, under the ultimate control of the Persians, whose main concern was that the Greeks should pay their tribute. In fact, the allegiance seems to have changed depending on which party was predominant in the city. In 338 the Greek faction under Herophytos revolted and called in the help of Philip of Macedon to rid them of the Persians, but the Persian party also summoned aid and the city was occupied by the Persian army under Memnon the Rhodian, who established an oligarchy, until the arrival of Alexander in 334. Ephesus appears to have issued only one type of coin during this period, apart from the alliance coinage of the 390s. There is no way of proving or disproving that the series of Rhodian-weight tetradrachms with the bee/stag types and the magistrate’s signature was issued continuously throughout the period, despite the political upheavals of the century; we can merely note that it is the only series to have survived.

Against this historical background the suggestion of Six that our coins were struck by Memnon the Rhodian is most consistent with the types of our series and the political circumstances of the century. A Persian general would have had the necessary authority to strike money to pay his troops, and he would have been more likely to use the figure of the Persian king as his obverse type than would the satrap. The Persian army occupied Ephesus in 336 B.C. and fought a campaign in the area until the final defeat at the Granicus in 334. Six suggested that Memnon, needing to pay his men, made Pythagoras, one of the city magistrates, authorise the necessary issue from the Ephesian mint. Subsequently Θ and ΔΗ, other members of the board of magistrates, also signed dies for Memnon. The issue must have been a very large one, given that there are so many different dies, and this would be consistent with paying the vast army that the Persians must have maintained for a two-year campaign. Arrian mentions 20,000 Persian cavalry and almost the same number of infantry at the Granicus; whatever the exact statistics, the Persians presumably mustered as large a force as possible against Alexander.

Given the sparse evidence, this conjectural attribution of Six cannot be proved, though it is the most satisfactory attempt to fit the series into the political context of the fourth century. Consequently it was adopted by Babelon and the catalogues which follow his Traité, and is now generally accepted.

---

18 See footnote 21.
21 Schlumberger’s suggestion (op. cit. 58-62) that Alexander was responsible for this series is dubious. The obverse type of the Persian king does not, on the face of it, seem likely to be found under Alexander; though there are instances of Alexander having permitted Persian types to continue, as in Babylon under Mazaris, he also introduced his own types. Babelon devotes a chapter (Traité ii 2, 478-96) to the issues attributed to Alexander’s generals which bear the obverse type of the running king and Greek monograms, but the validity of this attribution remains in doubt. The Greek monograms do not necessarily suggest post-Alexandrian date since local languages were used on the coinage of the Persian empire. Schlumberger presumably considers this series to be similar to the darics and sigloi, with the
The description by the cataloguers of the reverse type is almost invariably ‘granulated incuse’, and they give the impression that they believe the reverse to be a meaningless punch rather than a type. Schlumberger even refers to the series as ‘sans type de revers.’ Nonetheless others have tried to recognise animals: a boar being strangled by a serpent, or an animal looking over its shoulder, its body partly incuse and partly in relief. Babelon comments that some have seen ‘waves, constellations, serpents, clouds and heaven knows what else’. Clearly, although there has been difficulty in identifying the reverse, some have felt it to be a deliberate type rather than a formless incuse. Now a reverse punch is either totally lacking in design or else it follows some kind of standard pattern: swastika, windmill or cross. Obviously this particular reverse does not fall into the latter category since the formation is unique and the overall effect is far too detailed for the reverse to be considered as a punch of this sort. On the other hand, neither can it be a random incuse, because of the continuity of the pattern from die to die in both silver and bronze, with features that are recognisably the same in the different styles. Such continuity could not be accidental and suggests that the design had some definite meaning for the successive copyists. Therefore the reverse type is a deliberate type and not a formless incuse.

The stippling is a distinguishing characteristic of the series and cannot be explained as random embellishment; stippling is a relatively rare numismatic phenomenon, doubtless because of the labour involved, though there are instances of stippled reverse punches at Acanthus, Byzantium and Teos, and a peculiar stippled reverse at Mallos. In these cases the stippling is purely decorative, whereas on our series it appears to be an integral part of the design. It is noticeable that the degree of granulation varies as the style of the dies changes, and this raises the question of stylisation.

Any attempt to identify a progression of style in the dies can only be conjectural, since there are few die links and they do not bridge any substantial change in style. (It is a curious feature of this series that there is only one die duplicate out of the 33 examples traced.) Nevertheless, if one uses the criterion of the degree of elaboration, in the sense of the labour involved, it is possible to group the examples in some kind of hypothetical order (plates X–XI). The London Pythagorēs, no. 1, could reasonably be postulated to be among the earliest, if not the first, on these grounds: there is heavy stippling and a considerable amount of detail on the relief, and the small ridge above the loop is clearly marked. That the loop is symmetrical and central, and that the ridges below are not isolated, is relevant for the later development of the type. If this Pythagorēs example is an early one, then it is likely that the others signed by Pythagorēs must have followed closely on it or round it, before the anonymous ones. The three other examples signed by Pythagorēs are indeed heavily stippled and detailed, even if not to the same extent as the London specimen. No. 4 has a line between the left-hand and middle ridges, and between the ridges and the central loop. Nos. 5–8 are very similar in style, detailed and heavily stippled. Gradually the forms become distorted until, on no. 17, the loop is elongated with much narrower arms and the lower ridges take up half the die, and much of the detail at the edges has disappeared.

same obverse and no reverse type and hence believes it to be a continuation of an old type rather than the introduction of a new one, which we can see it to be now that the reverse type has been recognised. Another consideration is the date of operation of the Ephesian mint, which Bellinger and Thompson (‘Greek Coins in the Yale Collection, IV: A Hoard of Alexander Drachms’ in Yale Classical Studies xiv [1955]) believe to have been closed by Alexander because of the disturbance in the city following his victory. Therefore the coins must have been struck before Alexander arrived, if the attribution to Ephesus is valid.

22 Schlumberger, op. cit. 58.
24 Babelon, Traité ii 2, 133.
25 Traité ii 2, 133.
26 Babelon, Traité plate liv, 17.
27 Charles Selman, Greek Coins (1955) plate lxi, 1.
28 Babelon, Traité plate xiii, 5.
29 Babelon, Traité plate xxv, 12.
The style of no. 19 is peculiarly precise, with considerable detail on the relief but the upper arm of the loop has become very narrow. These features recur with modification in the group 20–23, less detailed but with more conspicuous stippling. Nos. 24–26 are distinguished by the peculiar shape of the middle ridge, with an indentation on the right-hand side. The right-hand ridge has become narrower and pointed and remains this shape throughout the rest of the examples. Lines appear between the lower ridges very distinctly on nos. 27–29, and the lower arm of the loop has broadened. On nos. 29 and 30 the curve of the loop has become accentuated and the middle ridge is detached from the lower edge of the die as a distinctly defined island. This is much more noticeable on no. 31, where the shapes are very clear but distorted in comparison with no. 1, the arms of the loop stringy, the middle ridge an oval island and the surface very lightly stippled. In the last example, no. 33, the type is barely recognisable. The loop has disappeared into a series of thin lines, the three ridges are just distinguishable but they are not carefully defined, and the stippling, which has disappeared completely, has been replaced by streaking.

A comparison of the London Pythagorës with the last example suggests that the elaborate and careful style of the former could not have developed from the haphazard design of the latter—rather it seems that the last is an extreme stylisation of the Pythagorës example and that the development moves in that direction. It would appear therefore that successive dies were copied from their immediate predecessors and not from a prototype, as for instance the Ephesian urban issue of the bee/stag types must have been.

The type of the obverse of this series is the conventional figure of the Persian king carrying bow and spear, but the style differs slightly from that of the darics and sigloi. There are, in fact, two distinct styles in our series: one showing the king in a very full robe, in a kneeling position, as on the London Pythagorës example, the other showing the king in a robe pulled tight about his legs and apparently running rather than kneeling, as on no. 18. The coins were arranged in stylistic order purely by the style of the reverse, but it transpired that, with the exception of the examples signed by $A$ and $AH$, all the obverses with full-robed king came together in the first group (nos. 1–17), which is perhaps to be expected. This would appear to confirm the suggested stylistic progression of the reverse, although $A$ and $AH$ do not fit in; the inconsistency of these three pieces could be explained by a return to the earlier style for some reason. It is interesting that the bronze coins are all of a very similar style. There are also slight variations in the style of the crown—in the number of points and the height—but the total variation is much less than that of the reverse, presumably because the engraver had a known pattern on the darics and sigloi.

The reverse is plainly a deliberate type; that it is a relief map showing the hinterland of Ephesus is best proved by putting a coin alongside a modern relief map of the area and pointing out where they correspond (PLATE IX). The London Pythagorës is the most detailed example and so the most fruitful for comparison. The feature most clearly recognisable is the central loop, with the Tmolus range in the north and the Messogis range in the south, divided by the valley of the Caýster (now the Kuçük Menderes) running towards the sea to the west. Also running east-west are the rivers Hermus (the modern Gediz) to the north of the Tmolus range and the Maeander (Büyük Menderes) to the south of the Messogis range. The tributaries of the Maeander, the Harpasus (Ak) and the Mor-synas (Vandalas), divide the southern mountain block into three ridges, visible in the lower part of the reverse. On some of the examples the rivers are shown as raised lines, for instance no. 28, though only the valleys are shown on the Pythagorës example. The broad valley of the Aksu can be seen opening out in the lower right-hand corner of several examples. The 'foot' on the upper right-hand side corresponds with the spur of Dibek Dagi, the 1122 m. peak that rises between the Gediz and the Gordos. The deeply dissected nature of the upland is most clearly depicted on the London Pythagorës and on no. 18. The stippling must have been an attempt to show surface phenomena,
almost certainly vegetation, and perhaps it represented the forests that at one time covered the area.\textsuperscript{30}

The three ridges to the south can be distinguished by the main peaks: Madranbaba Dağı in the west, Karincali Dağı in the centre and Akbaba Tepesi in the east. The separation of the central ridge from the edge of the design on the later examples can be explained by looking at the contours of Karincali Dağı and the area to the south of it. Karincali Dağı rises steeply from the Menderes valley to a height of 1699 m., beyond which the land flattens out into a plateau at about 500 m. in the south. This formation would explain the way that the central peak becomes detached; the peak of Akbaba Tepesi is not similarly treated since there is a long ridge of high land that is not dissected at all. Other contour details are visible, particularly on nos. 1 and 18. For instance, the 1840 m. peak rises between the Büyük Menderes and the Aksu can be seen on no. 1, as well as the continuation of Umurbaba Dag to the north. The long narrow ridge of Akbaba Tepesi is distinctly shown on both pieces, as is the SW–NE orientation of the central ridge to the north of the peak of Karincali Dağı, which lies on a NW–SE axis. The degree of topographical detail on these coins is extraordinary and must reflect a developed cartographical technique.

It is remarkable that only natural phenomena are shown and again the explanation has to be conjectural. The area depicted would have included the cities of Ephesus to the west on the Cayster, Magnesia on the Maeander to the south and Sardis near the Hermus to the north, on the lower slopes of the Tmolus range. The two great roads of Asia Minor would both have run across this area—the Royal Road from Sardis to Susa and the southern highway from Ephesus to the Cilician Gates;\textsuperscript{31} Ephesus and Sardis were also linked by road. Yet on the early examples not even the rivers are shown. The reasons for the omissions may have been in part technical: the difficulty of marking a town clearly on such a small scale map would be considerable, and the same applies to marking the roads. The rivers were easier to show in that the valleys were there already to put them in. However, the omissions could also have been a deliberate part of the conception of the type; the authority responsible was perhaps more concerned with showing the territory under his jurisdiction, or the area he claimed to possess, even if he did not in fact do so, than human additions to the landscape. (It is interesting that the modern coins with map types usually confine their details at most to these same physical phenomena of rivers and heights, for instance the Brazilian and Formosan examples). At this stage we cannot say more than that the map must have had a peculiarly local, Ionian, significance.

\textsuperscript{* * *}

The map is of interest for two main reasons: its form and its Ionian origin. The form of the map was to a certain extent dictated by the medium, which limited the possible amount of detail and yet permitted the illustration of relief features which would have been difficult to depict in drawing the map on a flat plane. Most of the early maps mentioned in the literature are world maps and this has led historians of cartography to believe that ‘the geographers and philosophers of antiquity were principally occupied with theoretical schemes of the ‘orbis terrarum’, considering it beneath their dignity to work out really practical, detailed maps.’\textsuperscript{32} Yet there must have been such maps, particularly for fiscal, military and navigational purposes. If such an accurate and detailed map could be conceived of as a coin type, the maps for ordinary use must have been the products of a highly developed technique. Mediaeval maps invariably showed the mountains as seen from the side, though the outlines of the coasts were drawn as seen from above; the totally

\textsuperscript{30} British Naval Intelligence—Turkey (1942) i pl. 114.  
\textsuperscript{31} M. Cary, Geographic Background of Greek and History of Cartography (1889) 35.  
\textsuperscript{32} A. E. Nordenskiöld, Facsimile Atlas to the Early Roman History (1949) 151.
vertical conception on the coins may have been the result of the ability to portray relief in another dimension, a problem unsolved by the mediaeval cartographers and their successors until the introduction of contour lines by Général Dufour in his map of Switzerland in the nineteenth century. Since the engraver of the coin type presumably used at least a sketch in designing the die, one can surmise that there was some technique of showing contours current in the fourth century, and the whole conception is remarkably close to that of a modern plastic relief map.

It should not be surprising that map makers were so competent in Ionia in the fourth century B.C., since the area was renowned for its tradition in geography and cartography. The earliest map we have is in fact Babylonian, a clay tablet map of northern Mesopotamia showing crudely the Zagros Mountains, the Euphrates and the Wadi Harran, dating from the dynasty of Sargon of Akkad around 2400–2200 B.C. The Greeks must have had maps long before Anaximander of Miletus, who was credited with drawing the first map in the sixth century B.C., but Ionia nevertheless had the reputation as the centre of Greek geography since some of the most eminent geographers lived there. There seems to have been an Ionian School, established by Thales, though few of their works have survived and we know only of Hecataeus, Anaximander and Herodotus. Maps must have been in common use by traders, travellers and soldiers, and an instance of their use in diplomacy is given by Herodotus in relating the story of the visit of Aristagoras of Miletus to Sparta to seek the aid of Cleomenes, taking with him a map of the known world engraved on bronze. In the reverse type of this series of tetradrachms we have an idea of what these maps could have been like, and we can now see that the Ionians had achieved a degree of sophistication in the cartography of small regions that was not equalled for two thousand years.

CATALOGUE

*obv.* Persian king kneeling or running r., wearing candys and kidaris, holding a bow in his left hand and a spear in his right; ground line. Some examples are signed, the majority are anonymous.

*rev.* Map of the hinterland of Ephesus; at r. the Tmolus and Messogis ranges, at l. the ridges of Madranbaba Daği, Karincali Daği and Akbaba Tepesi; between, the valleys of the Caýster and Maeander.

Die position: usually upright (i.e. with west at the top), with exceptions ↓. The Ephesian mint always used upright die positions for the bee/stag issue; presumably our series tended to follow the same pattern.

Admittedly there is no one way of looking at the map; if west is at the top, it perhaps reflects a different convention from ours of putting north at the top of a map, or a total lack of any such convention.

The silver coins are arranged in their stylistic order, the bronze by weight.

**AR**

Brackets to the left indicate obverse die links; to the right, reverse die links.

1. 14-77 I'vq dangers [Σ] London, BMC Ionia 323 no. 1
2. 14-84 I'vq dangers Paris = Hirsch 25 (1909) 2231
3. 14-33 I'vq dangers Munich = Hirsch 33 (1913) 846
4. 14-84 I'vq dangers Berlin 17917/1856
5. 14-40 Luynes 2902, Babelon Traité pl. 89, 9

---

23 This totally vertical conception is also to be found on the type of certain drachms of Zancle, which shows the harbour with buildings along the quays as seen from above.

34 Herodotus v 49.
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6. 14.15 Hamburger (11.vi.30) 472
7. 14.83 Berlin 7073/1846
8. 14.09 Hôtel Drouot (Nov. 1957) 138
9. 15.05 Munich
[10a. 14.11 New York (Gunther coll.)
[10b. 14.36 Paris, Babelon pl. 89, 8
[10c. 14.71 Berlin 10186/1852
11. 14.8 Hess 194 (Vogel 1929) 457
12. 14.75 London no. 3
13. 14.56 Berlin (Imhoof-Blumer coll.)
14. 14.19 London no. 6
15. 13.68 Brussels (Hirsch Coll. 1528)
16. 14.15 Nanteuil 481 = Florange & Ciani (1923) 33
17. Cahn stock 1950s
[19. 15.28 Berlin (Löbbecke coll.)
20. 15.03 New York (Miller coll.) = Naville 5, 2888 = Pozzi Sale (1921) 3138
21. 15.25 Weber 6237 = Naville 4,977 = Cahn 16, 1458 = Sotheby (1894) 265
22. Sherman Benson (8.ii.1909) 693
24. 15.20 Paris, Babelon pl. 89, 11
25. 12.92 Paris, Babelon pl. 89, 12
26. 14.92 Weber 6238 = Naville 13 (1928) 929 = Naville 7 (1924) 1783 (Bement coll.) = Hess (1917) 1314
27. 14.83 Glendining (April 1955) 628 (de Laval coll.)
28. 15.42 London no. 4
29. 15.12 Luynes 2901, Babelon pl. 89, 10 (‘15.42 grams’ incorrectly)
30. 14.68 ΔH London no. 2
31. 14.97 Α Egger (1904) 1337 (Prowe coll.)
32. 13.84 Α Monnaies et Médaillés (1951) 321
33. 15.27 Λ London no. 5

AE

1. 2.38 BA Berlin (Imhoof-Blumer coll.) = Imhoof-Blumer, Kleinasiatische Münzen ii 520, pl. 19, 22. Counterstamp: star
2. 2.06 BA Berlin (Bernhard, Imhoof-Blumer coll.) Counterstamp: star
3. 1.84 BA Berlin (Bernhard, Imhoof-Blumer coll.) Counterstamp: star
4. 1.43 BA London, BMC Ionia 324 no. 7
5. 0.92 London no. 9
6. 0.80 London no. 8

A. E. M. JOHNSTON.
THRASYBULUS, CONON AND ATHENIAN IMPERIALISM, 396-386 B.C.

I

The London fragment of the Oxyrhynchus historian begins with a narrative of the voyage of Demaenetus to Conon and the reaction which it provoked. This is the last incident with which P deals under the winter of 396/5, and he describes it as approximately contemporaneous with some other incident, not improbably the mission of Timocrates. With one ship Demaenetus sailed off to join Conon, lacking the authorisation of the people, but not before secretly communicating his plan to the boule. The language of the following section gives the impression that the boule was taken aback by the extent and vigour of the outcry, which might indicate that prior anti-Spartan acts had not created such a disturbance. The action of Demaenetus was less trivial than it may at first seem; it was also more concrete, less easy to excuse or minimise than what had gone before. One of the twelve ships which Athens was allowed, and which could easily be counted, was gone, and Sparta would know perfectly well where it had gone. She had recently suffered a serious reverse in her struggle with Persia, the loss of Rhodes, whilst the apparently unconcealed object of Timocrates had been the incitement to war of the cities of Greece. In the circumstances Sparta would perhaps be more likely than before to treat the least unfriendly move by Athens as an act of war, especially if it took the form of assistance to Persia, whilst at Athens meditation on the possibility of war, inspired by Timocrates’ appeal, would create an acuter awareness of the likely results of defeat and so promote greater caution and respect for Spartan sensibilities among prudent men.

Those responsible for the outcry were the γνώριμοι καὶ χαρίεστες. They are not so described as to suggest that they formed a party or permanent political group; the phrase perhaps has more in common with such meaningless modern collectives as tous les honnêtes gens or all thinking people. There is no reason to suppose that they were actively friendly to Sparta, nor can any deduction be made concerning their attitude in internal politics. It would therefore be misleading to speak of Thrasybulus, Aesimus and Anytus as the political spokesmen of a group. Rather, three of the larger number of individuals who were temporarily united by their shared reaction to a particular event happened also to be leading figures in public life and so expressed that reaction in the assembly. Their advice prevailed, and by way of commentary on that fact P distinguishes two attitudes of mind in the assembly. The first is that of οἱ ἐπικεῖσθαι καὶ τὰς ὁποίας ἔχοντες, who were content with or prepared to tolerate the present state of things. They would therefore naturally agree with the argu-

I am grateful to Professor A. Andrewes, Mr P. A. Brunt and Mr G. L. Cawkwell for their advice and criticisms: for such defects as remain in this paper I am solely responsible.

1 Hell. Oxy. 6 (1) 1–3.
2 It is here assumed that the events described in Hell. Oxy. 6 (1) belong to winter 396/5 and that 9 (4) 1 marks the beginning of a new year in spring 395. (Cf. E. Meyer, Théopompe Hellenique 58 ff.; K.-J. Beloch, Griechische Geschichte iii² 1, 66, F. Jacoby, FGH iiC, 10 f., V. Bartoletti, Hellenica Oxyrhyncha, xiv f.) It is then very likely that the mission of Timocrates, which must in any case belong after the landing of Agesilaus in Asia (cf. L. Pareti, Studi minori di storia antica ii 92), is to be placed after the revolution at Rhodes in summer 396 (cf. Beloch, GG iii² 2, 216). P certainly does not imply (as is claimed by G. Barbieri, Conone 91 f.) that the sending of Timocrates preceded the embassy to Persia, in which case it would have to be placed in 397; quite the contrary in fact: it is precisely the activities described in 7 (2) 1 which demonstrate, in P’s opinion, that Epicrates and Cephalus were hostile to Sparta before Timocrates’ arrival.
3 The qualification ὁς λέγεται here should not be taken to imply that P is inclined to deny the truth of the statement; προσποιομένου rather suggests that he accepted it.
4 Those detailed in 7 (2) 1.
ment put forward by Thrasybulus, Aesimus and Anytus. The second is that of the πολλοὶ καὶ δημοτικοὶ, that is, the mass of the people, who on this occasion accepted the advice given them, but only out of fear. It is implied that they would have come to a different decision had they followed their inclinations, and in support of that implication P cites specimens of their previous anti-Spartan behaviour: the sending of arms and seamen to Conon and of an embassy to the king, captured by the navarch Pharax and executed by the Spartans. These actions are ascribed to the πολλοὶ καὶ δημοτικοὶ as a fraction of the assembly; that is, they were formal decisions of the assembly, carried by the bellicose majority of the people.

The hostility to Sparta which prompted these measures was encouraged by the associates of Epicrates and Cephalus, who were unfriendly to Sparta and eager that the city go to war, and had been so for some time before their dealings with Timocrates, because they desired to enrich themselves from public funds, which would be possible only if the city were persuaded to give up its acquiescence in the peace in favour of war and πολιτικοδομία. About their views on domestic politics nothing is said or implied. It is often claimed that they were radical democrats, opposed to the moderates Thrasybulus, Aesimus and Anytus, who exercised continuous control from the restoration to the return of Conon after Cnidus. It is hard to know what this distinction might entail, and there is no evidence for it. All that can be extracted from P is that Epicrates and Cephalus were ready to provoke Sparta because they desired war for their own ends, whereas Thrasybulus, Aesimus and Anytus were as yet reluctant to initiate hostilities because Athens would have to fight alone and unprepared. Both the motive ascribed to Epicrates and Cephalus and the terminology employed hint at a desire to contest the hegemony of Sparta with a view to restoring the empire, a valuable indication of the temper of the demos, for Epicrates and Cephalus, says P, merely aggravated and exploited the existing preoccupations of the mass of the people.

II

Athens went to war in summer 395, in response to an appeal from the Thebans. Xenophon presents a speech which purports to give the arguments employed by their ambassadors. Not only its usefulness as evidence, but also its suitability to the occasion have been called into question. In fact, however, no argument appears in it which could not have been used by the Thebans. That the speech can be shown to be uncoloured by later

---

5 They will no doubt have coincided to some extent with the γνώριμοι και χαριτείς (cf. Meyer, o.c. 49, S. Perlman, CQ lx (1964) 66).
6 7 (2) 1. The embassy, for which cf. Isaac xi 8, Androt. 324F18 = Philoch. 328F147, was probably sent out in autumn 397, since Pharax was navarch for 398/7 and took up his command in spring of the latter year, though early 396 is perhaps not impossible, as Pharax's command may have been prolonged well into that year, cf. Paretì, o.c. 88 ff., Jacoby, o.c. 8. It is said that no protest was made against the execution of the envoys (cf. P. Cloché, La politique étrangère d'Athènes de 404 à 338 avant J.-C. 11 f.; S. Accame, Ricerche intorno alla guerra corinzia 48; Barbieri, o.c. 164); for this there is no evidence either way.
7 7 (2) 2. It is, however, worthy of notice that P does not say that Epicrates and Cephalus spoke in favour of acknowledging Demeaenetus, for ταύται refers only to the sending of arms and men and the embassy to Persia.
8 Cf. Beloch, Die attische Politik seit Perikles 111; Meyer, o.c. 50, Barbieri, o.c. 163, Perlman, o.c. 67. To regard Thrasybulus and those associated with him as in settled control is difficult in view of the decisions of the assembly recorded in Hell. Oxy. 7 (2) 1, which directly contradict what is known of their policy.
9 To refer it to championship of the amnesty (cf. Beloch, Die attische Politik 114 f.) is awkward, since Anytus and Cephalus both supported Andocides at his trial (Andoc. i 115, 150). Interpretation of that highly personal affair in terms of political groupings (cf. R. Sealey, Historia v 1956 182) is unnecessary and unwise.
10 The basic difference of opinion was clearly over the proper time to go to war. Cf. Meyer, o.c. 51, Cloché, REA xxxi (1919) 162, Politique étrangère 9, 12, Barbieri, o.c. 165, Perlman, o.c. 67.
12 Cf. Accame, o.c. 43 ff., Perlman, o.c. 72.
events does not of course prove that it gives what the Thebans really said, but as Xenophon’s opinion of what they should have said it is not without its value as a guide to the temper of Athens at the time of the appeal. The envoys begin by disclaiming responsibility for the harsh decrees passed against Athens at the end of the Peloponnesian War, directing attention instead to the unanimous refusal of Thebes to march against the Piraeus, as a result of which she incurred the anger of the Spartans. No mention is made of the much greater benefits which Thebes had conferred on the democratic exiles. The next argument is aimed at the men of the City. The Spartans established oligarchy and set the City at loggerheads with the demos, only to turn traitors in the hour of need, so that if it had been left to them, the party of the City would have perished, whereas it was the demos which brought about its salvation. The implications are interesting. The Thebans seem to expect that the City may be reluctant to act in concert with the demos and to act openly against Sparta. To combat this reluctance they point to three things: the split between City and demos caused by Sparta, the subsequent betrayal of the City by Sparta, and the saving of the City by the demos. The conclusion to be drawn is that the City should feel bound not to Sparta but to the demos. Therefore the Thebans must have been confident that the demos was hostile to Sparta and eager for war, otherwise there would have been no point in this injunction. Such confidence would accord with what has been said above about the attitude of the masses at the time of the Damaenetus debate and its antecedents.

The envoys next cite as common knowledge that Athens is eager to recover her empire. This can best be accomplished by rendering assistance to those who are unjustly treated by the Spartans, nor should Athens be alarmed by the extent of Spartan power, for if Athens and Thebes combine openly against Sparta, many more states will find the courage to declare their hatred. This argument is ostensibly directed at the whole assembly, but what has gone before suggests that it was meant for the demos. Its object was to show that there was no cause for fear, that fear which Thrasybulus and his friends had used to restrain the belligerent demos in 396, and so the speaker underlines the fact that Athens would not have to stand alone. Again the point admirably suits the situation. Nostalgia for imperial power among the masses of the people is hinted at by P. Thus there is no need to suppose that this passage reflects the experience of the years after Cnidus.

There is even less point in the suggestion that the list of potential rebels must be based on the sequence of events after Leuctra, when the Peloponnesian League disintegrated, whereas in the Corinthian War Elis, Arcadia and Achaea remained faithful to Sparta. It cannot be inferred from the fact that when war broke out the Peloponnesian cities did not turn against Sparta, that Thebes and the allies did not hope at first that they would do so, since they certainly had grounds for complaint against their usage by the Spartans. That hope is moreover attested by Diodorus, who remarks that the allies attempted, but failed completely, to detach from Sparta the cities of the Peloponnese. There is then every reason to believe that the possibility of rebellion could have been used as an argument—and of course exaggerated—by the Theban ambassadors. As for the former subjects of

---

13 Cf. Xen. Hell. ii 4.2, Lys. fr. 78, Hell. Oxy. 17 (12) 1, Dein. i 25, Diod. xiv 6.3, 32-1, Plut. Lys. 27, Pelo. 6, Justin v 9.4 f. For the antithesis between the demos, which saved the City, and the Spartans, who betrayed it, to have its full effect, the blame for the fall of the oligarchy has to rest on the Spartans alone; to do justice to the efforts of the exiles, and consequently to the help given them by the Thebans, would have undermined the workings of the contrast, and this is probably why that help is passed over in silence.

14 There is nothing untoward about the similarity of the remark of Thrasybulus in Hell. ii 4.41 (cf. Accame, o.c. 45); the point was a sound one to make in either situation.

15 Cf. supra, n. 13.

16 Cf. Xen. Hell. iii 5.2.

17 As is suggested by Accame, o.c. 43.

18 Cf. Accame, o.c. 44.

19 Diod. xiv 82.4. For the lesson to be drawn cf. Xen. Hell. iv 2.11 f.
Athens whom Sparta had claimed to liberate, they have been cruelly deceived, for instead of enjoying their freedom, they suffer a double servitude. The king too has done himself no good by supporting Sparta. Much less is said about the erstwhile allies of Athens than about the dissolution of the Peloponnesian League. This might be intended to reflect the preoccupations of the Thebans, but it is also justified by the military situation. The war which Thebes had at last succeeded in provoking was a land war in Greece itself, to which the attitude of the Peloponnesian states was of much more immediate relevance—not only for Thebes but for Athens too if she joined in—than that of the maritime cities of the old empire.

In conclusion the ambassadors offer Athens unprecedented power. In the days of her empire she led only the maritime states. Now, in addition to these, she will hold the hegemony over Thebans, Peloponnesians, and even over the king. Thus the advantages which the alliance will bring for Athens are in fact far greater than those which will accrue to Thebes, whose only object is to right her private wrongs. The appeal would be disingenuous, for this extraordinary hegemony, if it could ever be realised at all, would operate only for the duration of the war and have no lasting effects. But given the craving for power of the Athenian demos, this tempting prospect would form a fitting peroration.

On the strength of this speech it may therefore at least be said that Xenophon believed that in 395 the Athenians were eager for the restoration of the empire, whilst there is no cogent reason to suppose that in making this judgment he was influenced unduly by the course of subsequent events.

The vote in favour of the alliance was unanimous. Various factors must have played a part in determining the changed attitude of those who had opposed any act of war in 396. Athens would no longer have to fight alone, nor could she incur any blame for starting the war. Thrasybulus mentions, though in grudging fashion, the debt of gratitude which Athens owed to Thebes; it may have weighed to some extent with him, and perhaps with others. It is harder to assess reactions to the prospect of co-operation with Persia, a point which the ambassadors touched on but did not press. But it seems unlikely that Thrasybulus was affected by Conon’s success in detaching Rhodes from Sparta, since the anti-Spartan coup at Rhodes had already taken place at the time of Demaenetus’ voyage, whilst, except in the financial sphere, Persian aid was not relevant to the immediate military future. On the other hand it is highly likely that the successes of Agesilaus had produced a feeling that Sparta must be checked without further delay—but this could be achieved only by attacking Spartan power in Greece.

The general enthusiasm for the alliance to which Xenophon alludes is remarked on also by Aristophanes, but he adds that there was soon a change of heart. More detailed information on the decline of Athenian morale is provided by Lysias. In the speech for Mantitheus he mentions those who before the campaign of Haliartus illegally insinuated themselves into the cavalry, because of the danger which was thought to await the hoplites. These must have been men of some substance, but another problem faced the enthusiastic poor: lack of funds. The need for private assistance suggests that the treasury was in

---

20 Who were concerned to exploit Athens for their own ends, cf. *Hell. Oxy.* 17 (12) 1, 18 (13) 1.
21 Xen. *Hell.* iii 5.16. His narrative obscures the fact that Athens was declaring war, since the alliance was with the Boeotians, not with Thebes alone (*IG ii* 14 = Tod, *GHI* 101, Lys. xvi 13) and Lysander was already in Boeotian territory. Cf. Accame, o.c. 46.
23 For instance Cephalus, for whose attitude to Thebes cf. Belochi, *Die attische Politik* 117.
24 As suggested by Perlman, *o.c.* 79.
27 Lys. xvi 13; to be dated perhaps in 393 or early 392.
28 Lys. xvi 14, borne out by xiv 14, which must refer to the Haliartus campaign because there was no battle (xiv 5, cf. Xen. *Hell.* iii 5.22, Paus. iii 5.4 f.).
poor shape. One of the illegitimate cavalrymen was the younger Alcibiades, and in a
speech against him Lysias describes the army in a way which suggests that large numbers
of the hoplites were having second thoughts. But at Haliartus at least there was no battle,
and so Thrasybulus, who commanded the Athenian force, had no cause to complain of his
men. Such was not the case at Nemea in the following year. Before the campaign there
were attempts at evasion of service, and after the battle Thrasybulus was free with accusa-
tions of cowardice. Morale was bad and became markedly worse when news arrived of the
approach of Agesilaus. No doubt it had not been improved by the Corinthian refusal to
open the gates of the city to receive the defeated allies after the battle.

Thrasybulus had been the prime architect of the alliance, and when there came a re-
action against it the combination of failure in the field and a critical tongue was bound to
bring about his fall from grace. There are, however, no grounds for speaking of a conscious
change in policy, manifested by the rejection of the moderate Thrasybulus in favour of the
radical Conon. His own errors and lack of success had put Thrasybulus out of favour
some time before Conon's return. To explain his disappearance from the political scene
there is therefore no need to invoke the name of Conon. What can be said is that the advent
of the new popular hero undoubtedly prolonged Thrasybulus' absence from the stage.
Only when Conon in his turn had met with disgrace did Thrasybulus find an opportunity
to recover his position.

III

There is general agreement in the sources as to Conon's aims. Isocrates always main-
tains that Conon's object was to overthrow the Spartan empire. In one passage his
intention is to benefit Asia, but the motivation cannot be trusted, since this alleged fact is
cited to enhance the treachery of the Persian; elsewhere in Isocrates Conon's aim is from
the first to do good to Athens and the Greeks. The Persian contribution is always
minimised, though for varying reasons. Later writers are agreed that Conon's objective
was to win back the hegemony for Athens.

29 Lys. xiv 14. The passage should not, however, be pressed, since the orator may have exaggerated
the temptations to which the hoplites were exposed in order to emphasise the fact of their resistance to
them, which is his main point.
30 Paus. iii 5.4, Plut. Lys. 29.
31 Lys. xvi 15 f.
32 Xen. Hell. iv 2.23, Dem. xx 52 f. This was presumably the cause of annoyance with Corinth
referred to by Arist. Eel. 199 f. (Some take it to be the enmity between the two cities which existed
during much of the fifth century, but Praxagora's speech deals with policy since 395, so an allusion to
the Corinthian War is desirable.)
33 He probably commanded at Corone too. Whether he is the orator of Arist. Eel. 195 f. cannot
be determined; there were many speakers in favour of the alliance. To draw a parallel between these
lines and Lys. xvi 17 is tempting, but probably fanciful.
34 It has been argued that the alliances with the Locrrians and Eretrians (IG ii 15, 16 = Tod 102,
103) were the work of Thrasybulus and reveal his egalitarian attitude towards the allies, which was
superseded by the ruthless imperialism of Conon. (Cf. Accame, a.c. 99 f., 129, 134 f., 139.) But, even
if Thrasybulus was responsible, a point which remains

uncertain, military alliances of this kind, created in
response to the necessities of war, will hardly serve
to demonstrate the attitude of their authors to the
entirely different question of relations with potential
members of a revived Athenian empire.
35 Isoc. iv 154, v 63, ix 54 f.
36 Isoc. iv 154.
37 Isoc. ix 54, 55.
38 Thus at iv 142 it is said that if the king had been left to his own devices the fleet might have had
to be disbanded, but thanks to Conon and the Corinthian allies (!) the soldiers won a difficult
victory. The object here is to show up the king's incompetence and weakness and his dependence on
outside help. The military success is Conon's in
v 63 and ix 56, whilst the king gets no credit for assembling the fleet: note the carefully impersonal
αυτός αυτός αυτός αυτός (v 63) and αυτός αυτός
αυτός (ix 56). The former passage is intended to
demonstrate to Philip that individuals can accomplish
great tasks singlehanded; hence not only the king
but Evagoras too goes unmentioned. The latter
simply glorifies Evagoras and Conon at the king's
expense.
39 Cf. Diod. xiv 39.3, Nep. Con. 2.1, 5.1 f., Justin
vi 3.4 f.
This belief is consistent with official Athenian opinion on the consequences of Cnidus, as inscribed on the pedestal of Conon’s statue and recorded by Demosthenes: Conon freed the allies of Athens.\textsuperscript{40} Alternatively it might be said that the result of Cnidus was to restore the hegemony of Athens.\textsuperscript{41} This view emphasised the humiliation of Sparta, which was regarded as an unmixed blessing.\textsuperscript{42} Conon’s achievement brought great glory to the city as a whole,\textsuperscript{43} and the part played by Persia was either ignored or casually accepted as a piece of useful assistance.\textsuperscript{44} Such was the version which ultimately prevailed. But during and for some time after the Corinthian War a less optimistic judgment was sometimes made. At Athens it found expression, when Conon and his ties with Persia had been discredited, in the \textit{Epitaphios} of Lysias. The orator contrasts the state of affairs produced by the Spartan hegemony after Aegospotami with that which obtained under Athens in the fifth century.\textsuperscript{45} When Athens held sway triremes did not sail from Asia, no tyrant was established among the Greeks, and no Greek city was enslaved by the barbarian. Under Sparta on the other hand the Persians defeated the Greeks in a naval battle and sailed to Europe, Greek cities are in a state of slavery, and tyrants have established themselves, some after Aegospotami, some \textit{μετὰ τήν νίκην τῶν βαρβάρων}. Not all the allusions are clear, especially those to the setting-up of tyrannies,\textsuperscript{46} but the Greek cities which are in a state of slavery must be those which were liberated after Cnidus by Pharnabazus and Conon.\textsuperscript{47} The attitude of Lysias to Cnidus itself is most remarkable. The battle is not named. Conon is passed over in silence. What is more, no comfort is drawn from the defeat of Sparta. Cnidus is the triumph of Persians over Greeks, not Spartans. It is in a very similar context that Isocrates repeats this version of events, just before he contrasts the Peace of Antalcidas with the ‘Peace of Callias.’\textsuperscript{48} The same attitude is attributed by Xenophon to the Spartan Dercylidas at Abydus.\textsuperscript{49} He underlines the fact that there is no Greek fleet on the seas. The prospect engendered by Cnidus is that of an attempt by the Persians to win naval supremacy, against which consolation may be found in the hope that Greece will unite against them. His words to the ejected harmosts at Sestos likewise envisage by implication an attempt to extend Persian rule from Asia into Europe, which may however be faced without despondency, since even in Asia there are cities not subject to the king. A trace of this view can present tense \textit{ἐγγίγνεται} in ii 60 would hardly be adequate after the Peace.) Cf. P. Treves, \textit{Riv. Fil.} lxxv (1937) 280 ff. The supposed difficulties seem to me purely imaginary.

\textsuperscript{40} Dem. xx 69.

\textsuperscript{41} Isoc. v 64, vii 12, 65, ix 56, 68, Dem. xx 68, Dein. i 76. The peculiar claim that Sparta offered the hegemony to Athens (Isoc. vii 65, ix 68) has as its more modest basis in historical fact Sparta’s acceptance in 392/1 of the existence of the Athenian fleet. The exaggeration in vii 65 is due to the orator’s desire to stress the difference in Athenian relations with Sparta under the oligarchy and under the restored democracy; in ix 68 the motive seems to be no more than a general inflation of the consequences of the battle to the greater glory of Evagoras. It is sometimes more broadly stated that Cnidus freed the Greeks (Isoc. v 63, ix 56, 68, Dein. i 14, iii 17).

\textsuperscript{42} Dem. xx 68, cf. 70, 74, Dein. i 75.

\textsuperscript{43} Dem. xx 69, xxii 72–5 = xxiv 180–3.

\textsuperscript{44} Dem. xx 68, x 34 with the comments of Didymus. The treatment of Cnidus in Plut. \textit{Menex.} 244d–245a is too distorted by laboured rhetorical paradoxes to be of any value.

\textsuperscript{45} Lys. ii 56–60. The speech belongs to 392 or 391, when disillusion with Conon and Cnidus was at its height. No mention is made of the Peace of Antalcidas, and it is plain from the tone of the passage that the war is still in progress. (The

\textsuperscript{46} There may well be a reference to the rise of Dionysius, but the sources say nothing of any tyranny which came into being in the period after Cnidus.

\textsuperscript{47} They could of course be described as enslaved in the period between Aegospotami and Cnidus; what matters is the rejection of the view that Cnidus brought them freedom. Cf. Beloch, \textit{GG} iii\textsuperscript{2} 1, 87.

\textsuperscript{48} Isoc. iv 119. Isocrates talks of the two treaties, whereas Lysias contrasts only two \textit{de facto} situations. The natural explanation of this is that the war was still in progress at the time when Lysias was writing. That is, his treatment, determined by the requirements of rhetorical symmetry, depends on the state of affairs \textit{c.} 391, when the Peace of Antalcidas had not yet been made, and not on his views about the existence of the ‘Peace of Callias’. This does not however strengthen the case for the authenticity of the ‘Peace of Callias’; once the Peace of Antalcidas had come into being, the same requirement of symmetry guaranteed the invention of the ‘Peace of Callias’.

\textsuperscript{49} Xen. \textit{Hell.} iv 8.4 f.
be found in curtailed form in Plutarch, where the Persian victory at Cnidus is the cause of the Peace, though blame is placed on Antalcidas and the Spartans, so the sequence of events is not regarded as inevitable.\(^{50}\)

These opposing attitudes to Cnidus and its effects reflect the fundamental contradictions in Conon's position. Whatever his aims and whatever his achievements he was throughout the period from 397 to 392 an admiral in the Persian service, subordinate to Persian officials and bound to further Persian interests, for neglect of which he could be and was called to account.\(^{51}\) One of the most important charges brought against him was that of using the king's resources to win over the islands and the coastal cities of the mainland to the friendship of Athens.\(^{52}\) Xenophon does not say that the accusation was true, whilst Nepos suggests that the attempt was largely a failure. These are the two questions which must be answered: did Conon try to restore the hegemony of Athens regardless of his duty to Persia, and, if so, to what extent did he succeed?

After the battle of Pharandazus and Conon sailed round the islands and the coastal cities, expelling the Spartan harmosts and winning over the cities with the promise to respect their autonomy and leave their citadels unfortified. The cities, pleased by this promise, passed complimentary decrees and sent gifts to Pharandazus. Conon had advised Pharandazus to proceed in this way: if the satrap acted thus, he said, all the cities would be well disposed, whereas if he revealed that he wanted to enslave them, they would cause a great deal of trouble individually and might combine against him.\(^{53}\) So far there can be no question of activity in the interests of Athens. It is to Persia, not to Athens, that the cities are being won over, and Conon's advice is at least ostensibly designed to minimise difficulties for the Persian commander and further his ultimate object of subjecting the cities to Persia.\(^{54}\) It might, however, be urged that whatever Conon told Pharandazus the real motive for the advice he gave was to keep the Persian hold on the liberated cities as weak as could be contrived, in the hope that when the time was ripe they might more easily be brought under the hegemony of Athens. Diodorus gives details of some of the liberated cities. Pharandazus and Conon sailed against the allies of Sparta, detaching first Cos, then Nisyros and Telos.\(^{55}\) Next Chios expelled its garrison and joined \(\text{ο} \ \pi \ \pi \ \varepsilon \ \pi \ \kappa \ \omega \ \nu \ \alpha \ \nu \ \alpha \ \eta \ \nu\), and a similar change was effected at Mytilene, Ephesus and Erythrae.\(^{56}\) Diodorus goes on to make a peculiar distinction. Some of the cities expelled the Spartan garrisons and preserved their freedom; others joined \(\text{ο} \ \pi \ \pi \ \varepsilon \ \pi \ \kappa \ \omega \ \nu \ \alpha \ \eta \ \nu\), that is the Persians.\(^{57}\) Any diminution of liberty involved must be in relation to Persia. There can be no question of any relationship with Athens, and any explanation which supposes such a relationship\(^{58}\) must be rejected. Nor can the difference be that of the cities of the second class required help whilst those of the first did

\(^{50}\) Plut. Artax. 21, cf. Ages. 23.

\(^{51}\) Before Cnidus: Ctes. 688F30, Hell. Oxy. 20 (15) 5, Diod. xiv 39-2, 79-5, 7, 81-4, Nep. Con. 4-3; at and after Cnidus: Xen. Hell. iv. 3-11, 8-2, 6, Dem. xx 68, Diod. xiv 85-2, 4; at the time of his arrest: Xen. Hell. iv 8-16, Nep. Con. 5-3. Cf. Barbieri, \(\text{o.e.} \ 135 \ \text{ff.}\), G. L. Cawkwell, \(\text{NC} \ xvi \ (1956) \ 73.\)


\(^{53}\) Xen. Hell. iv 8.1 f. The enthusiastic cities were of no position to resist. Apart from the overwhelming superiority of the Persians, some at least of the cities had sent troops with Agesilaus (cf. Xen. Hell. iv 3-17) and so were abnormally weak.

\(^{54}\) It is dangerous and misleading to speak of adhesion to Conon and quite wrong to equate that with adhesion to the alliance of Athens, as does Cloché, \(\text{REA}, \ \text{o.e.} \ 169.\) Cf. the remarkable assertion of F. Courby, \(\text{BCH} \ xlv \ (1921) \ 183,\) that 'les Athéniens remportent la victoire de Cnide.' Such inaccuracy has, however, a long history: Paus. vi 7-6, claiming to quote Androtion, says that Conon persuaded the demos of Rhodes (\(\text{sc. in 396}\)) to revolt from the Spartans and enter the alliance of the king and the Athenians. The honours to a Rhodian in 394/3 (\(\text{IG} \ ii^2 \ 19\)) prove nothing about relations between the cities.

\(^{55}\) Cf. L. Robert, \(\text{Rev. Phil.} \ lx \ (1934) \ 43 \ f.\)

\(^{56}\) Diod. xiv 84-3. For Ephesus cf. Paus. vi 3-16, who also mentions Samos; for Erythrae cf. Tod 106. Despite (or perhaps because of) the change at Mytilene, the harvest of Methymna survived until 389, cf. Diod. xiv 94-4, Xen. Hell. iv 8-29.

\(^{57}\) xiv 84-4.

\(^{58}\) As does that of Accame, \(\text{o.e.} \ 97,\) cf. also Barbieri, \(\text{o.e.} \ 155.\)
not, for Chios ejected the Spartans unassisted and nonetheless joined the Persians. The meaning may be only that some of the cities gave contingents to swell the Persian force, while others refrained from so doing, but it is not unlikely that this is an indirect reference to the formation of that alliance which minted the ΣΥΝ coins.

The expedition to Greece in the spring of 393, like the unsuccessful attack on Abydos in the previous autumn and the winning over of the cities of the Hellespont which occupied Conon during the winter, was conceived by Pharnabazus from motives which had nothing to do with the convenience of Athens. There took place during the voyage the seizure of Paros by Pasinus. The island was apparently garrisoned as a result, but this garrison will not have been Athenian, any more than that placed on Cythera, and Pasinus, if indeed he was Athenian at all, will not have been an Athenian general. The fate of Paros therefore does not provide evidence for the nature of Athenian imperialism under Conon.

It cannot then be said that at the time of his arrival in Athens the formal relationship between Athens and her former allies had altered in any way as a result of Conon’s activities. Nor is there any compelling reason to believe that Conon engaged in any naval expeditions during his stay. Conon’s undertaking to maintain the fleet from the islands might suggest that he intended to operate in the Aegean later in the summer or perhaps in the following year, but the results of such an expedition, carried out with the Persian fleet, must again prima facie benefit Persia, not Athens. Nor can it be safely inferred from the activities of Thrasybulus in 390/9 that many alliances had been formally revived after Cnidus through the agency or influence of Conon. The official description at Athens of Conon’s achieve-

---

59. Thus Barbieri, loc. cit.
61. The view that the ΣΥΝ alliance belongs soon after Cnidus was restated by Cawkwell, NC, o.c. 69 ff., and convincingly defended by him, JHS lxxiii (1963) 152 ff., against the objections of J. M. Cook, JHS lxxxii (1961) 67 ff. The capricious distribution of the coins largely deprives of its force the potential objection that no ΣΥΝ coins of Chios have been found.
63. Isoc. xix 18–21. The Siphnian exiles will have joined the expedition before it reached Paros in the hope of restoration to their own city in due course. Events at Paros and the exodus from Siphnos provoked by the approach of the Persians suggest that Pharnabazus’ methods had changed for the worse. On the Cyclades in general cf. Lys. ii 59, Isoc. iv 119. The reference to Paros in Plat. Menex. 245b is totally unhelpful and almost certainly corrupt.
64. Though Nicophonelus was of course an Athenian (Xen. Hell. iv 8.5).
65. There is thus no argument from analogy for the dating of IG xii 1. 977 = Tod 110.
66. As is believed by H. Swoboda, RE xi 1326, Barbieri, o.c. 161. The state of the evidence for the date of the restoration of Athenian control over the Delian amphictyony (cf. IG ii² 1634, J. Coupry, BCH lxxii [1958] 237 ff.) does not permit any confident conclusion, but in any case armed intervention would hardly have been needed. The recovery of Lemnos, Imbros and Scyros (cf. Xen. Hell. iv 8, 15, Andoc. iii 12, 14) must belong between Cnidus and spring 392, when Antalcidas set off for Sardis, but again there is nothing to suggest that this required active intervention. The inhabitants had not been expelled at the end of the Peloponnesian War (cf. Beloch, GG iii² 1, 79 n. 1), and Spartan control had presumably been broken when Pharnabazus and Conon sailed northwards after the battle. For the inhabitants to renew relations with Athens was possible at any time after this without further military action. The recovery of Carpathos is ascribed to Conon on the strength of IG xii 1. 977 = Tod 110, generally dated c. 393, but no arguments have been adduced since those of P. Foucart (BCH xii [1888] 159 F.) and the remarks of Cook (o.c. 68) are just. Internal evidence shows only that the decree belongs after the battle of Cnidus and perhaps before the final success of the oligarchical coup at Rhodes in 389. The Athenian interference on Carpathos may therefore belong to the last campaign of Thrasybulus: orders might be given to Cnidus (if the restoration is correct) for the sake of Athenian morale, even after Cnidus had relapsed into Spartan hands, and so it would be rash to take the autumn of 391 as terminus ante, whilst on the other hand a reference to Lindus is not impossible if the decree dates from a time of division and upheaval on Rhodes. From the scraps of IG ii² 17 nothing can be gained.
68. Conon justifies his plan to Pharnabazus by demonstrating that it serves Persian interests: Sparta will be gravely hurt and Athens deeply grateful. But again it could be argued that this was only a pretext to persuade Pharnabazus to further the interests of Athens, with which Conon was really concerned.
ment was the liberation of the allies. That is, the unfortunate break in Athenian domination was now at an end and could henceforth be disregarded. The liberation was a military, not a diplomatic event, brought about by or rather identical with the destruction of Spartan naval power, and not dependent on any subsequent diplomatic procedure; any city which had been a subject of Athens in the days of the fifth-century empire could be described forthwith as a liberated ally, and although some alliances were no doubt solemnly renewed, any city which had been under Athenian control before 404 was ipso facto still an ally in the eyes of Athens, even if it hopefully abstained from official revival of its lapsed connection.

Throughout his stay in the city, Conon’s sailors must have been largely occupied with work on the walls. This had been begun before his arrival and continued until 392/1. The money and labour he provided were of vital importance, and so it is hardly surprising that later writers give him sole credit for the work. But it is significant that the initiative preceded his return. Here again Conon did no more than foster and exploit a manifestation of popular imperialism which in no way depended on his personal policy. He had, however, a larger hand in Athenian relations with Dionysius of Syracuse. The honours paid to Dionysius early in 393, before Conon reached Athens, need not have been instigated by him, though the renewal of honours to Evagoras later in the year must almost certainly have been his work. But the plan to create a connection between Dionysius and Evagoras is specifically attributed to Conon by Lysias. However, the object cited is only to bring Dionysius over to the Athenian side in the war against Sparta, and it is rash to credit Conon with an attempt to build a coalition which would be capable of standing up to the combined forces of Sparta and the king.

Conon’s influence on the domestic politics of Athens is hard to determine. He organised or at least financed the mercenary force which was stationed at Corinth and commanded by Iphicrates. It has been argued that Iphicrates had family ties with Conon, but there is no evidence for this, nor is it by any means certain that Conon was responsible for Iphicrates’ appointment. Agyrrhius undoubtedly flourished after Conon’s return, but he had been important before Conon and was still prominent at a time when Thrasybulus had recently recovered a leading position. His connection with Conon, if it existed at all, had clearly not been intimate enough for Conon’s fall to damage his standing. His province

---

69 Cf. the brief but brilliant analysis of Cawkwell, NC, o.c. 72 ff.
71 IG ii² 1656 = Tod 107A; σεναναστησου in Xen. Hell. iv 8.9 suggests that Conon knew it.
72 IG ii² 1657–64.
74 Cf. Barbieri, o.c. 162, 167 f. The importance of the walls as an imperial symbol should not be underestimated, as it is by Cloché, Politique étrangère 17 f.; in 392/1 Sparta merely accepted what she was powerless to prevent, as Cloché himself recognises, o.c. 24.
76 Lys. xix 20.
77 Cf. Beloch, Die attische Politik 121, Swoboda, o.c. 1331, Barbieri, o.c. 173, 188. No such plan appears among the Spartan accusations against Conon in 392. Diodorus is perhaps wrong in saying that an alliance with the Corinthian allies was concluded by Pharnabazus (xiv 84-5, accepted by Beloch, Die attische Politik 118; cf. Justin vi 5.11): the exhortations of Pharnabazus to the allies in Xen. Hell. iv 8.8 do not presuppose an alliance between them and the king, for the acceptance of Persian money would be quite enough to create, at least in Persian eyes, a duty of loyalty. But it seems that after Conon’s return, and probably with his blessing, Epicrates and Phormius went on an embassy to Susa (Plato frt. 119 ff., Plut. Pelop. 30, Athen. 251a, Arist. i p. 283D, cf. Schol. iii p. 277D, who misdates the reference to 386).
79 Cf. Sealey, o.c. 184: Iphicrates’ grandfather named his son after Conon’s father. A less pregnant statement of the facts would be that the fathers of Conon and Iphicrates were both called Timotheus. The supposed service of Iphicrates with Conon in 394/3 is pure conjecture. The co-operation between Iphicrates and Callias in the Corinthiad in 390 (Xen. Hell. iv 5.13) shows merely that neither commander was given to treason.
80 Arist. Ecd. 104.
was finance, and the influx of Persian gold provided him with opportunities. But it is going beyond the evidence to infer that, because Agyrrhius made proposals concerning the use of the money supplied by Conon, those proposals must have had Conon’s approval, or that Agyrrhius and Conon were politically closely connected. All that can be said with certainty is that the object for which Agyrrhius employed the money secured, not surprisingly, more publicity than the acts of financial administrators usually acquire. Eunomus is another who is sometimes linked with Conon with more confidence than is warranted by the evidence. He went on the embassy to Dionysius which Conon promoted, as a colleague of an undoubted friend of Conon, Aristophanes, but he seems to have been chosen not as an associate of Conon but because he was already on friendly terms with Dionysius himself. Hieronymus, Nicopheimus, Aristophanes and perhaps Damaenetus: these are the only men whom the evidence makes it worth while to call friends of Conon.

IV

The achievement of Conon had created at Athens the hope that the maritime power of the city might be restored. Such aspirations must, if pursued to any large degree, bring about an eventual clash between Athens and Persia, and so the aims of Athens and the gulf between Conon’s supposed intentions and his duty as a servant of the king provided Sparta with a chance of diplomatic advantage which she was not slow to exploit. In spring or summer of 392 Antalcidas was sent to Sardis to negotiate on Sparta’s behalf with the satrap Tiribazus. The Spartans, Xenophon says, hearing that Conon was rebuilding the walls of Athens with the king’s money and winning the islands and the coastal cities of the mainland to friendship with Athens whilst maintaining his fleet at the king’s expense, thought that if Tiribazus were informed of this, he would come over to their side or at least cut off Conon’s finances.

It is plain that Antalcidas’ mission was to conclude a purely bilateral peace between Sparta and the king, and it is such a bilateral peace that in Xenophon’s account he recommends to Tiribazus. There was, properly speaking, no peace conference of Sardis. The Athenian embassy was not summoned to engage in discussions with a view to a general peace; it was an independent counter to that of Antalcidas, with the negative aim of preventing an agreement such as Sparta was eager to obtain. The envoys of the other allies, who were persuaded to support the Athenian initiative, had, whatever their various motives for so doing, the same negative object. It is therefore odd that Xenophon moves without comment from the terms which Antalcidas proposed for a bilateral peace to the reasons for which Athens, Thebes and Argos were unwilling to make peace on those terms. It has, however, been pointed out that Sparta could by no means guarantee the realisation of the terms put forward. It seems necessary to assume that Tiribazus understood, or had it chronology of the later years of the Corinthian War. The system adopted here is in essence that of Beloch, OG iii 2, 217 ff.; cf. also Accame, o.c. 103 ff., P. Meloni, Athen. n.s. xxviii (1950) 300 ff., T. T. B. Ryder, Keine Eirene 166 ff. Accame’s dating of the discussions at Sardis to 393 (o.c. 113 f.) overlooks the fact that at the time of the congress of Sparta Corinth could still be said to be in some sense independent of Argos; cf. G. T. Griffith, Historia i (1950) 243.

82 For the increase in ecclesiastic pay cf. Arist. Ecle. 183-8, 289-310, 380, Plat. 329 f., Ath. 41-3.
83 Cf. Beloch, Die attische Politik 119, Accame, o.c. 139, Sealey, o.c. 183. Evidence is again lacking. Even if Conon was an official member of the embassy to Sardis in 392 and it was certain that Callimachus was related to Agyrrhius, there is no reason to assume without further grounds that members of the same embassy must be political friends.
84 Cf. Cloché, REA, o.c. 187, Accame, o.c. 139.
85 Lys. xix 19.
87 It is not my intention to discuss in detail the
pointed out to him by the representatives of the allies, that the Spartan offer was worthless unless underwritten by the other major cities of Greece, and so invited the allied envoys to agree to a general peace on the terms proposed. This extension of the peace to include Sparta’s enemies was essential if negotiations were to have any point, and paved the way for the formal congress at Sparta in the winter of 392/1, when discussions were renewed and concessions made in the light of the experience of Sardis.  

Sparta’s motive in seeking peace was partly fear of resurgent Athenian imperialism, in which Persia had appeared for the moment to be acquiescent. The terms which she suggested are precisely those which if enforced would not only have restored her hegemony in Greece but also put an end to the new Athenian empire, whilst in surrendering Asia Minor to Persia she was only graciously presenting to the king what in fact she had already lost. Since she must give up Asia Minor in any case, its abandonment to the king was to be preferred, because under this arrangement Athenian ambitions would be stunted. This of course would be even more true if the autonomy of the islands could also be realised. The only real loser would then be Athens, and with Athenian aspirations thus rudely checked, Sparta could be satisfied.

If fear of the resurgent imperialism of Athens was a major motive at Sparta, unbridled imperial ambition is an obvious ground for the Athenian rejection of peace. The only reason directly attested apropos the talks at Sardis is the fear that the city would be deprived of Lemnos, Imbros and Scyros, possessions to which she was particularly attached, whilst the official ground for the refusal of peace at Sparta even when these islands had been conceded to Athens was unwillingness to sacrifice the Greeks of Asia Minor. Beneath this high-sounding phrase the yearning for empire is not difficult to detect. From a practical viewpoint little had as yet been achieved, but even so any further advance, as Andocides was to point out, would not be tolerated by Persia; the terms of Sparta represented the final concessions. The moment of decision had come. Acceptance of the peace meant acceptance of a lasting check on the vision of a restored empire. This was the prospect that Athens was rejecting when she refused to abandon the Greeks of Asia Minor.

The imperialistic mood of Athens is plainly revealed by the arguments which Andocides employed in his effort to persuade the assembly to agree to the peace. The opening words of his speech attribute to the partisans of war a thesis drawn not from the military situation nor, at first sight, from the claims of imperialist expansion. They warn that the conclusion of peace will be liable to bring about the fall of the democracy. But the equation of democracy with empire was familiar, and any speaker who claimed that peace and demo-

---

92 For the precedence of Sardis over Sparta cf. Martin, o.c. 20, *MH* vi (1949) 131 ff., Accame, o.c. 111 ff., Barbieri, o.c. 175 ff.; the opposite view is argued by W. Judeich, Philol. xxxi (1926) 142 ff., A. Monigliano, *Ann. Pisa* 1936, 98 ff. By the terms proposed at Sparta Athens was to keep her islands and Thebes was to retain the hegemony of the Boeotian League. These points are intelligible only as attempts to iron out the differences revealed at Sardis. Cf. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *SB Berlin* 1921, 735, Beloch, *GG* iii 1, 81 ff., Foucart, *Mem. Acad. Insc. xxxviii* (1909) 169, Barbieri, o.c. 179.

93 *Simpson*, o.c. 129.

94 Sardis: *Xen. Hell.* iv 8.15; Sparta: Philoch. 328F149. The refusal to abandon the Asiatic Greeks is also cited as a motive for rejecting peace by Plat. *Menex. 245b-c.* It has been disputed whether the reference is to Sardis or to Sparta; Philochorus has even been forced into agreement with modern interpretations of Plato’s words. (Cf. Accame, o.c. 121 ff., Ryder, o.c. 30 ff.; contra, Barbieri, o.c. 178.) The problem seems to be an illusion. The congress of Sparta grew out of the wrangle at Sardis, and Plato, not surprisingly, gives an account, perverse and distorted by rhetorical paradoxes, of the results of both sets of negotiations taken together. There is no call to deny (as do Accame, o.c. 117 ff., Ryder, o.c. 32 f.) that Persia had an interest in the conference at Sparta, though it is uncertain whether she sent a representative; presumably Tiribazus sanctioned the amendments to the terms proposed at Sardis and gave a proleptic blessing to such further discussions as Sparta might initiate, whilst undertaking to seek the king’s approval of the amended conditions.

95 Thus concern for their fate was ample reason for Athens to refuse the peace, *pace* Accame o.c. 124; cf. Barbieri, o.c. 170, 181, 188.

96 Andoc. iii 1.
cracy were incompatible was claiming also by implication that peace was equally incompatible with empire. For the moment Andocides appears to take the point at face value and undertakes to show how often the democracy has survived treaties of peace, peace, that is, specifically with Sparta. But his preoccupation with empire comes to light when he catalogues the benefits which accrued to Athens from each of the treaties he discusses, benefits so chosen as to reveal beyond any doubt the imperialistic leanings of his audience.

He describes first of all the ‘Peace of Miltiades’, which apparently concluded the First Peloponnesian War. While it was observed, the demos was not overthrown. Instead the city reaped great advantages. The Piraeus was fortified, the northern Long Wall was built, a hundred new ships were fitted out, cavalrymen were enrolled and archers acquired. A secure base, a powerful fleet, and men: the prerequisites of international power. With the dissolution of the democracy is contrasted not its mere survival but its capacity to rule and exert its sway over others. The analysis of the Thirty Years’ Peace follows a similar pattern. The demos was not overthrown, it reigned lofty and secure, depositing a thousand talents on the Acropolis against its time of need, building a further fleet of a hundred ships, building docks, enrolling men and erecting the south Long Wall. Reserves of money, reserves of ships: the bases and safeguards of enduring empire. The Peace of Nicias brought seven thousand talents in cash to the Acropolis, a fleet of over three hundred ships, and an annual tribute of more than twelve hundred talents. Athens controlled the Chersonese, Naxos and most of Euboea. Thanks to Argos these advantages—the enjoyment of the profits of empire—were wantonly thrown away when war was renewed.

Thus Andocides claims to have proved that peace has never caused the fall of the demos. His real point is that peace with Sparta has never been a hindrance to the acquisition and maintenance of imperial power. The present peace, which is treated as a peace with Sparta, has the same virtues. It allows Athens to rebuild her walls, to keep as large a fleet as she likes, to retain Lemnos, Imbros and Scyros, and does not compel her to restore her exiles, who caused the fall of the demos in 404. So once again peace will mean security and power for the democracy, whilst war will bring about its overthrow. There are those who would reach out for more, for the Chersonese, for the colonies, for Athenian property and financial interests abroad. But these must be given up, for without the support of the king and the allies they cannot be won, and that support will be denied. Let us, says the orator, be content, προσλαμβάνω τα αυτά δι’ θησαυρού δεόμεθα.

The obsession with empire is evidenced again in the series of examples adduced to show the folly of abandoning powerful friends. The rejection of the ‘Peace of Epilycus’ in favour of the rebel Amorges was the cause of Persian aid to Sparta in the Ionian War, which continued till the king had overthrown the power of Athens. This, the assembly might infer, might well happen again. The refusal of alliance with Syracuse in favour of Segesta led to the Sicilian expedition, with its huge losses in ships, money and power. The recurrence of the key word δύναμις points the obvious relevance of the disaster to the fall of the empire; the Syracuse of Dionysius might do comparable harm. The alliance with Argos, ἄρχη πολλών κακών, resulted in the destruction of the walls, the surrender of the fleet and the return of the exiles, which last has already been closely connected with the triumph of oligarchy in 404. Thus democracy and empire are linked yet again in their collapse. Not only is peace with empire possible, but the rejection of peace now will create a situation

97 Andoc. iii 2.
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99 7.
100 9.
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analogous with that which was the ruin of the old Athenian empire. Imperialism is not merely compatible with peace, it is essentially dependent on it.

In the peroration this point is made openly, without further equations or implications. Walls and fleet are the ἄρχη τῶν ἀγαθῶν, through them was won the greatest δόμαμος the world has ever known, when Athens acquired empire over the Greeks. Then came defeat in war. Walls, fleet and empire crumbled. Today the keys to power are offered again, but only by the acceptance of peace can they be grasped and put to use. To fight to a finish against Sparta and after her Persia is a practical impossibility. For the moment Athens must rest content with the seeds of empire, for which she went to war, and wait in patience, as she did before, for the harvest to ripen.

Andocides' arguments, distortions and omissions all serve a common end, the placation of a yearning for empire that was strong in the spirits of his hearers. But on the Greeks of Asia Minor his case was bound to break. It need occasion no puzzlement that he passes them over in silence. From one quarter in particular he seems to have expected opposition: the friends of Boeotia. No individual is named, but some space is devoted to the thesis that a belligerent policy is inconsistent with adherence to the Boeotian alliance, as if the orator expected those who had favoured the Theban cause to be at the same time those who were now most eager to fight on. For Athens to fight when the Boeotians make peace would be pointless and dangerous, for it was on the power of Boeotia she had thought to depend. The alternatives open to her are presented so as to bring the point into relief. She may choose war, with Argos, or peace, with the Boeotians, an idea repeated later with still greater emphasis as a choice between alliance with Argos and with Boeotia, so that to carry on the war is as it were to betray the Boeotians, a grave inconsistency with 395.

The orator's misgivings were not without foundation. Thrasybulus had been prominent in moving the Boeotian alliance, but the military failures of 394 and the triumphant return of Conon had thrust him into the background. Now that the arrest of Conon had displayed the limitations of his policy and position, the warlike mood of the assembly supplied Thrasybulus with the chance to recover the ascendancy, and he intervened decisively in favour of continuing the war. The evidence is murky and has often been misinterpreted. In her review of Athenian policy since 395 Praxagora remarks that there had been a glimpse of safety, but that Thrasybulus had in some way opposed it or brought it to nothing. The text is corrupt, but the presence of ἀλλά is sufficient to indicate that Thrasybulus was displeased by the advent of σοτηρία. His active opposition to the peace is made certain by a reference later in the play to the wild pear, ἣν Θράσυβουλος ἔστε τοῖς Λακωνίκοις. It is reference to Epiprates' flight need be expected, whilst his notorious beard might well be remembered long after he had gone into exile. It is therefore possible to put the play in 390 (as formerly Beloch, Die attische Politik 357), a date to which 197 f. are perhaps more applicable, since Athens' first serious naval efforts after Persian subsidies had been cut off were made in spring and summer 390 with ships presumably built or fitted out in the winter of 391/0. But decision between 391 and 390 can only be arbitrary.

Arist. Eccl. 193-203. On the date of the Ecclesia eus it is unlikely that agreement will ever be reached. The scholiast dates the play to 392, and is followed by Cloché, REA, o.c. 170, Beloch, GG iii 2, 226, Jacoby, FGH iiib Supp. 1, 514, but at 201-3 and 355 f. there are unmistakable allusions to the failure of peace negotiations in winter 392/1. Some therefore date the play to 391 (thus Wilamowitz, o.c. 737, Accame, o.c. 112, 125) on the assumption that the reference to Epiprates' beard in 71 must precede his exile and that the play was therefore produced after the rejection of peace by the assembly but before the condemnation of the envoys. (Cf. Wilamowitz, loc. cit., Accame, o.c. 126, Treves, o.c. 134.) This assumption is quite unjustified; in the passage concerned only beards are in point, so no
distressing to find that the scholiast’s explanation\textsuperscript{113} has found favour with some scholars.\textsuperscript{114} He says that Thrasybulus was to speak against the Spartan envoys, but pretended, on receipt of a bribe, that he had eaten wild pears and was unable to appear. The objections are obvious. Text and scholiast agree that wild pears produce constipation, an unimpressive excuse for non-appearance in the assembly. More important, on this view the text could have only one meaning, that Thrasybulus sent a message to the Spartan ambassadors, regretting that he would be unable to attack their proposals, a somewhat implausible step, quite apart from the problem of how such a message became public. Nor is this a natural way in which to take ἕως ἐλέμε. The correct interpretation is surely that Thrasybulus spoke a metaphorical wild pear to the Spartans, that is, that he made a speech in the assembly which had the same effect on the efforts of the Spartan envoys as the real wild pear had on those of Blepyrus, in whose reply the parallel is preserved: just as the ἀμπελώνος Ἀραβότης (the pear) has bolted the door on his digestion, so Thrasybulus will have bolted the door on negotiations.\textsuperscript{115}

The Epitaphios of Lysias mirrors the mood of Athens at this time, when disillusionment with Conon and Cnidus must have been rife. What may perhaps be a sneer at Conon’s performance at Aegospotami\textsuperscript{116} precedes the violently hostile treatment of Cnidus.\textsuperscript{117} It is interesting that shortly afterwards Conon is again ignored, and the rebuilding of the Long Walls, elsewhere universally attributed to him, is ascribed to the men of Phyle.\textsuperscript{118} Perhaps it is not too fanciful to see in this a reflection of, and perhaps a compliment to, the renewed ascendency of their leader Thrasybulus.

V

Late in the summer of 391 the prospect that Rhodes, Sparta’s great naval base earlier in the decade, might fall completely under Athenian influence brought about a renewal of Spartan naval operations. On the request of oligarchic exiles from the island, a fleet of eight ships was manned and sent out under the command of the navarch Ecdicus, together with Diphridas, whose task was to protect the friendly cities of the mainland and organise the remnants of Thibron’s army.\textsuperscript{119} The Spartan expedition sailed first to Samos and detached that island from Athens,\textsuperscript{120} then proceeded to Cnidus, where Ecdicus heard that at Rhodes the demos was in complete control both by land and sea, with a fleet twice as large as his own, and so remained inactive.\textsuperscript{121} When the Spartans learnt that his force was too small to be of use, they ordered Teleutias to relieve him, taking the twelve ships already under his command in the Gulf of Lechaum. Teleutias sailed by way of Samos and

\textsuperscript{113} Cf. the just comment of J. van Leeuwen ad loc.: ‘delirantis et vere vesani hominis sunt quae sequuntur.’ His own view is that Thrasybulus uttered the threat that the Athenian fleet would blockade the Peloponnese and cut off supplies: ὁσπερ ἀχραῖο τὰ στία ἐγκόψατας ἀφεῖν ἔλειν. But the wild pear seems to be Thrasybulus’ speech itself.

\textsuperscript{114} Cf. Accame, o.c. 128, 134, Barbieri, o.c. 190 f.

\textsuperscript{115} 361 f. There is thus no justification for the view that the rejection of peace was the work only of the so-called radical democrats. (Cf. Beloch, \textit{GG} iii\textsuperscript{2} 1, 82, Jacoby, \textit{FGH} iiib Supp. 1, 519, Accame, o.c. 127, 131 ff., 139, Sealey, o.c. 185. The only friend of Conon whose attitude is known is Hieronymus, and he was in favour, \textit{cf.} Arist. \textit{Ecll.} 201.) The same is true of the condemnation of the envoys; it is unnecessary to look for party political motives to explain Callistatus’ action.

\textsuperscript{116} Lys. ii 58.

\textsuperscript{117} ii 59 f.

\textsuperscript{118} ii 63. \textit{Cf.} Treves, o.c. 282.

\textsuperscript{119} Xen. \textit{Hell.} iv 8.19–21, Diod. xiv 97.2 f. \textit{Cf.} Momigliano, \textit{Riv. Fil.} lxiv (1956) 54. It is most probable that Ecdicus sailed shortly after taking office, that is in late summer 391, cf. Paretì, o.c. 100, Accame, o.c. 132, and that Teleutias replaced him \textit{extra ordinem} as early as was practicable in the following year. The arrival of Teleutias need be postponed till later in the year only if it is assumed that he was navarch for 390/89, against which \textit{cf.} Paretì, loc. cit.

\textsuperscript{120} Diod. xiv 97.3. Thus Samos is friendly to Sparta when Teleutias puts in there.

\textsuperscript{121} Xen. \textit{Hell.} iv 8.22. The inactivity of Ecdicus at Cnidus presumably accounts for the winter of 391/0.
Cnidus, collecting ships as he went; by the time he reached Rhodes his fleet numbered twenty-seven vessels.\footnote{122}{Xen. Hell. iv 8.23 f., Diod. xiv 97.4.} On his way from Cnidus to Rhodes Teleutias fell in with and captured an Athenian fleet of ten ships, commanded by Philocrates, which was sailing to Cyprus to help Evagoras. Xenophon remarks on the paradox that Athens, although the king was her friend, should be sending a force to fight for Evagoras, the enemy of Persia, whilst Sparta, at war with Persia, was destroying a force intended for use against the king.\footnote{123}{The expedition illustrates the new readiness of Athens to provoke the king, but whether Thrasybulus was responsible\footnote{124}{is not certain. His prominence at this time is uncontested, but Agyrrhius also occupied a leading position.\footnote{125}{Lysias supplies the information that when envoys came from Cyprus Aristophanes, the friend of Conon, was active on their behalf.\footnote{126}{This is hardly surprising in the light of his earlier career and throws no light on possible political conflicts in 390.}}} Later in the summer Thrasybulus himself was sent out with forty ships, for Athens was alarmed at the resurgence of Spartan naval power. Xenophon expressly states that his expedition was intended as a counter to that of Teleutias, and from the fact that he sees fit to explain why Thrasybulus neglected Rhodes, it may be safely inferred that Thrasybulus had formal instructions to assist the Athenian sympathisers on the island.\footnote{127}{Diodorus makes no direct mention of such a mission, but there are hints in his account that Thrasybulus was allowing time to pass too freely, which may suggest neglect of some specific objective.\footnote{128}{The narrative of Xenophon leaves a major question unanswered. How close did Thrasybulus get to Rhodes before deciding not to intervene there? All that is certain from Xenophon’s account is that Thrasybulus made his decision after leaving Athens, at some point on his outward voyage. It is tempting to believe that he sailed as far as Carpathos, and that the garrison installed on the island and withdrawn by the terms of a decree of uncertain date\footnote{129}{was left there by him when he sailed for Ionia after ascertaining the state of affairs at Rhodes. At all events he must have set a course for Rhodes in the first instance, so Diodorus is clearly correct in making him sail up the Ionian coast towards the Hellespont.\footnote{130}{The Ionian allies from whom he collected money are not recorded, but it may be that some of them at least were allies only in the tenuous technical sense that they had once been members of the fifth-century empire, the continuity of which had in Athenian eyes been merely interrupted by the Spartan hegemony and automatically restored by Conon’s victory at Cnidus. They may thus have had no dealings with Athens since Aegospotami and may have found Thrasybulus’ visit an unwelcome surprise.\footnote{131}{Dionysius was still alive. The form of the comparison also makes unlikely the view (cf. Beloch, Die attische Politik 126) that Thrasybulus’ arrogant behaviour had led to foolish accusations of tyrannical ambition against him, since the natural way to express this point would be to say, not that Dionysius was like Thrasybulus, but vice versa. The reference may of course be to Thrasybulus Collyteus and Dionysius the Athenian general, in which case the passage has no relevance to this context.}}.\footnote{132}{Cf. xiv 94.2: διατηρεῖν; 3: μετὰ τινὰ  χρόνον.}}\footnote{133}{IG xii 1. 977 = Tod 110.}}}}\footnote{134}{Diod. xiv 94.2. During which campaign he visited Clazomenae (cf. IG xii 28 = Tod 114) is uncertain.\footnote{135}{Xenophon explains (Hell. iv 8.27) why the people of Byzantium were glad to see numerous Athenians (i.e. Thrasybulus’ forces) in their city; where the particular political motive did not apply, the reaction may have been different.}}
In the north Thrasybulus did considerable service to the city, reconciling Amedocus and Seuthes and concluding alliances with them, with a view to bringing the Thraceward cities under the influence of Athens. His success at Thasos is recorded by Demosthenes. Sailing to Byzantium, he farmed the Pontus δεκάτη and also democratized the city, thus making the presence of his force welcome to the δήμος. He also won over Chalcedon. From the Hellespont he moved on to Lesbos, probably in spring 389. There Mytilene was favourable to Athens, but the other cities were on the Spartan side, whilst in Methymna at least the Spartan harmost and garrison had remained undislodged despite the general reaction after Cnidus. Weakened by the loss of twenty-three ships in a storm, Thrasybulus used diplomacy wherever he could, and after defeating Therimachus, the harmost of Methymna, received the surrender of Eresus and Antissa. From Lesbos he made at last for Rhodes, taking ships from Mytilene and Chios and collecting money from the coastal cities as he went. Xenophon remarks that he was in a hurry to reach Rhodes. News had probably reached him of the success of the pro-Spartan faction there, which certainly preceded his death. But his urgency was not so great as to prevent him from sailing so far out of his way as Aspendus in his quest for money, and there the conduct of his troops provoked a night attack by the inhabitants of the city, in which Thrasybulus and others lost their lives. It is uncertain whether the decree mentioned by Lysias recalled Thrasybulus or only the other generals. In describing the withdrawal of the fleet from Aspendus to Rhodes, Diodorus speaks only of the trierarchs, not the generals. From this it might be deduced that there were no other generals present, that is, that they had already been recalled, so that unless Thrasybulus was defying orders, he cannot have been included in the decree. If this is correct, the activities of Ergocles at Halicarnassus would have to belong to the outward voyage, which would make it certain that Thrasybulus sailed south-east when he put out from Athens.

It has been argued that the imperial policy of Thrasybulus was based on a system of alliances which respected the rights of the individual cities and treated them with moderation, in sharp contrast with the policy pursued by Conon and by Conon’s friends after the death of Thrasybulus. The evidence, such as it is, tells a different story. It is obscure with what cities Thrasybulus made alliances: Thasos, Byzantium, and Chalcedon are probably certain, Samothrace, Carpathos and Clazomenae not unlikely. The terms of these alliances are almost entirely unknown, but Clazomenae and Thasos had to pay the ἐκοστή, Thasos may have been subject to judicial interference and an archon, and Carpathos may have had to agree to a garrison. Of the supposed egalitarian provisions no trace

---

132 Xen. Hell. iv 8.26, Diod. xiv 94.2. A fragment of the alliance with Seuthes is preserved (IG ii² 21). For the cities of the Hellespont in general cf. Xen. Hell. iv 8.27, 33 f.; to claim from these passages that Thrasybulus kept on good terms with the satraps (cf. Beloch, Die attische Politik 129, GG ii² 1, 93) is to go beyond the evidence.


135 Xen. Hell. iv 8.28, Diod. xiv 94.3.

136 There is no reason to suppose that there had been a recent movement towards Sparta in the cities of Lesbos. The pluperfects καταπερβάγεται (Xen. Hell. iv 8.28) and ἀδέσμυκεται (Diod. xiv 94.3) should be allowed their full value. The latter is a further interesting example of the continuity of conception which existed at Athens concerning the empire; fifth-century rebels were still rebels in 389, despite the intervention of the Spartan hegemony.

137 Diod. xiv 94.3.


139 Diod. xiv 99.4 f. cf. Accame, o.c. 10.


141 28.5.

142 94.4.

143 Thus Accame, o.c. 8, 129, 135, 137, 139. There is no support in the sources for the supposition (cf. Beloch, GG ii² 1, 91, Accame, o.c. 136, Sealey, o.c. 184) that Thrasybulus and Agyrrius were personal or party rivals at this time. For more reasonable judgments cf. Treves, o.c. 134, Barbieri, o.c. 193, 299.

144 Cf. IG ii² 24a. 3-6, 13 f., 5.5 f., 13; 28 (= Tod 114), 7 f., 13-17, 22-5, xii 1. 977 (= Tod 110), 19-21.
remains. Now that Persian subsidies had been cut off, imperial expansion was a financial necessity if the war was to be continued. Thrasybulus had taken the lead in rejecting peace, and he seems to have accepted the implications of his action. His campaigns bear witness to the desperate need of money, money to fill the treasury at home, to which the δεκάτη and εἰκοστή would contribute, and money to strengthen and enlarge his own forces. Money too provides the key to the recall and prosecution of his colleagues. It has been suggested that opinion at Athens was concerned at excesses committed against the allies. In fact the arguments which Lysias thought would impress his hearers indicate that the expedition of Thrasybulus had been a product of the imperialism of the assembly, from which his death brought no revulsion, and that Ergocles was brought to book not for oppressing the allies but for impairing the Athenian war-effort.

The opening formulation of the crimes of Ergocles says nothing about the allies or their grievances. Ergocles is guilty on three counts. He has betrayed cities; he has injured the προξενοί and citizens of Athens; from a poor man he has become rich ἐκ τῶν ὑμετέρων. These are all crimes against the city and people of Athens. When the charges are repeated later in the speech, the betrayal of cities and the theft of the money recur, with the addition of bribery to secure an acquittal. The accusation of betraying cities might at first sight seem to bear witness to some sympathy for the cities as the victims of treason, but it is clear from the law which treated of this matter that such betrayal was seen solely as an offence against the Athenian people, which was being deprived of its possessions. It is not implausible to see in this charge an allusion to the proper object of the expedition, the relief of Rhodes. The peculations of Ergocles too are immediately related to the military objectives of Athens. He and his friends grew rich, while the fleet which they commanded was disabled and diminished through scarcity of funds. So private greed undermined successful prosecution of the war. The second presentation of the charges and their possible consequences likewise takes place against the background of the precarious position of the city’s financial affairs. The acquisition of a fortune by Ergocles was a crime against the city, because it damaged the city’s prospects in the struggle for empire. Therefore he was condemned to death, κακῶς διαβελὶς τὰ τῆς πόλεως.

What Lysias tells us of the hopes and intentions of the people confirms the impression produced by his treatment of the charges. Had the people known that Thrasybulus would destroy the efficiency of the fleet and expose his fellow-citizens to danger and expense while lining the pockets of his friends, he would never have received his command. Again only the ships and the money seem to be in point, whilst the decree of winter 390/89 and

145 On the shortage of money at this time cf. Arist. Eul. 823–9. 1006 f. The decree of Euripides was a recent measure intended to raise money; it is therefore generally held that the decrees dealing with salt and coinage (814–22) had the same purpose and were also recent. This is plausible but not quite certain. The point that all these decrees have in common is that the people later changed its mind and rescinded them; it is not necessary to suppose the additional link of a common object.
146 Cf. Lys. xxvii 5, xxix 2.
147 Cf. Beloch, Die attische Politik 127, GG iii 1, 91, Schwahn, o.c. 574. Cloché, REA, o.c. 189 ff., M. Bizos, Lysias Discours (ed. Gernet-Bizos) ii 143 f., Accame, o.c. 137.
148 Lysias’ attitude to Thrasybulus is ambivalent, cf. xxvii 8.
149 xxviii 1. Cf. Dem. xix 180. It is of course possible that the chief prosecutor devoted the whole of a much longer speech to this theme, but such a speech would be gravely inconsistent with that of Lysias, and it might be supposed that prosecutors usually worked in greater harmony than is suggested by Ps.-Lys. vi 42.
149 xxvii 11.
150 Hyp. iv 1, 7 f.
151 xxvii 2, cf. 4.
152 xxvii 11.
153 xix 2. τὰ τῆς πόλεως probably here means the affairs of the city, though elsewhere in the speech (8, 11) it refers to the money. Cf. xxix 14: Ergocles went χρηματομονομον ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ πρὸς ἐμᾶς φιλοτιμομονομον.
155 xxvii 4. It is surely implied that the people would have approved the actions of Thrasybulus if only they had been honestly and efficiently carried out.
the reaction of Ergocles to it do nothing to suggest that Athens was indignant at the treatment of the allies. The people wanted to know how much money there was and what the generals had done with it, but there is no evidence that they cared how it had been acquired. It is true that Lysias claims that the people must see to it that the generals are just, but with justice is contrasted not extortion of money from the allies but misappropriation of τὰ ύμετέρα. For the benefit of the poor, the theft of the money is connected with the decline of the fleet, for the upkeep of which it should have served, but at the same time Lysias skillfully appeals to the payers of eisphora, who had no love of the war and had viewed its continuation with dismay. To excite their envy and rancour Lysias emphasises how their contributions have been misapplied and contrasts their increasing poverty with the newly acquired wealth of the friends of Thrasybulus.

The orator's choice of catch-phrases also illustrates his confidence in the imperial inclinations of a majority among his audience. The generals, he says, were elected by the people to make the city great and free. The contrast with the appointment of the Thirty at once brings to mind the fall of the fifth-century empire, whilst allusions elsewhere to the greatness and freedom of Athens make it clear that this polite rhetorical formula implied the establishment and preservation of democracy at home and imperial power abroad. The same is true of the hope of Athens that σωτηρία had at last been achieved.

The memory of 404 is exploited much more directly in the treatment of the reasonable advice which Ergocles is said to have given to Thrasybulus. Thrasybulus, he suggested, should seize Byzantium and retain possession of the fleet. The effect these actions would have on the imperial aspirations of Athens is plain enough. Control of the Hellespont was vital to the corn supply, apart from the δεκάτης. Not only would the loss of the fleet put an abrupt end to the dream of restoring the empire; the fleet, together with the walls, was the great symbol of empire, and its loss in 404 was synonymous with the loss of the empire. So, when the charges are repeated, the conduct of Ergocles is openly equated with the surrender to the enemy not only of the fleet but of the walls. The analogy then serves the same end as the manner in which Ergocles' offences are formulated. Both in their immediate effects and in their deeper implications the actions of Ergocles are regarded as crimes against the imperial design which Athens was striving to accomplish.

Ergocles is also accused of the desire to establish an oligarchy. The experience of 404 had impressed on men's minds the equation between the survival of the democracy and that of the empire, and the insistence upon Ergocles' oligarchical intentions completes the denials at Isoc. xii 68 and Aesch. ii 74-7. Cf. Dem. xv 4.

154 xxviii 5.
155 xxviii 10.
157 xxviii 3 f. Philocrates was not tried by the full assembly, and so the speech against him makes no direct appeal to trierarchs or eisphora-payers. Their sufferings are, however, exploited and contrasted with the profits made by Ergocles and company in a manner reminiscent of that adopted here (xxix 4, 9).
158 xxviii 14.
159 Cf. Lys. ii 55, 63 f., xii 70, xiii 46, xvii 24 f., xxv 20, 32 f., xxx 18, Isoc. xv 316, Dem. x 45, xviii 99, 208, xxiv 5, 216, Ps.-Andoc. iv 1. If Thrasybulus was known for moderation in his dealings with the allies, he was an odd choice to lead such an expedition.
160 xxviii 15. Cf. Lys. xii 68, xviii 5, xxv 23, 33, xxvi 23, xxvii 3, xxiv 3, 9, Andoc. iii 12, Dem. v 17, x 45, xviii 99, 208, xx 18, xiii 16, Ps.-Dem. xiii 16, Ps.-Andoc. iv 11 f., 19. The same view is implied by

The significance of Ergocles' third piece of advice, that Thrasybulus should marry the daughter of Scuthes, is less apparent, as it does not seem to allude to any sinister precedent; there is probably a reminiscence of Alcibiades' Thracian strongholds. Perhaps the fact that she was a king's daughter made her suitable for a would-be tyrant, whilst the fact that she was a barbarian might underline Lysias' fundamental point, that Ergocles and his friends had made themselves ἀλλοτροETA τῆς πόλεως.
163 xxviii 11.
164 xxviii 7, 11.
165 Cf. Lys. xii 68-70, xiii 5 f., 14-16, xiv 38 f., xviii 5, Andoc. ii 27, Isoc. xii 114-18.
supposed parallel with 404. Nothing in the remarks attributed to Ergocles gives proof of such intentions, for the threat to make the people περί αὐτῶν δεδέναι need only imply the interruption of the corn supply and the loss of the fleet; it is precisely his analogy with 404 which permits Lysias at once to draw the consequences and announce the desire of Ergocles and his friends to secure power for themselves.\textsuperscript{170} The way is neatly prepared by Ergocles' complaint against resurgent sycophancy.\textsuperscript{171}

Only at the very end of the speech do the unfortunate citizens of Halicarnassus and others wronged by Ergocles make a brief appearance, but nothing is said even here about extortion of money.\textsuperscript{172} The offence of Ergocles and his friends is again betrayal, which inevitably leads the mind back to their crimes against Athenian imperialism.\textsuperscript{173}

VI

After the death of Thrasylulus, the command of his fleet was taken over by Agyrrius.\textsuperscript{173} There is no evidence that Agyrrius and his party had intrigued against Thrasylulus during the winter or that Agyrrius defeated Thrasylulus at the elections of 389.\textsuperscript{174} Xenophon says only that Agyrrius was selected to take Thrasylulus' place at the head of the fleet, a decision which must have been made some time after the elections. The successes of Thrasylulus provoked Sparta to action in the Hellespontine region, whilst Athens in her turn sent out Iphicrates, either in autumn 389 or spring 388, for she was eager to protect the gains made.\textsuperscript{175} Iphicrates, like Thrasylulus before him, was largely concerned with the collection of money.\textsuperscript{176} Indeed, there seems to have been no change of policy.\textsuperscript{177} The other generals who are known from this period are unhelpful to the student of politics or policy. The affiliations of Pamphilus, who failed at Aegina, are unknown.\textsuperscript{178} Eunomus, who succeeded him in 388, should not be hastily described as a friend of Conon.\textsuperscript{179} The inglorious performance of Damaenetus, Dionysius, Leontichus, Phainias and Thrasylulus Collyteus in the Hellespont in 387 brought upon them the censure of Cephalus.\textsuperscript{180} But only Damaenetus has any known connections, and his link with Conon need have no significance in context—the criticism levelled at the generals was perhaps not unjust, and Cephalus may have been known for a critical tongue.\textsuperscript{181}

Little can be gleaned from the speech which Lysias wrote for the brother-in-law of Conon's friend Aristophanes.\textsuperscript{182} Nicophemus and Aristophanes were executed ἄκρατοι and their bodies were not handed over for burial.\textsuperscript{183} The strong degree of hostility indicated here is borne out by the speaker's remark that in 393 at least Nicophemus and Aristophanes had been looked on with favour by the city, and his insistence that his father and Aristo-

\textsuperscript{170} xxviii 7, cf. 6.
\textsuperscript{171} For the link between sycophancy, democracy and its fall, cf. Lys. xxv 3, 19, 24, 27, 29, Isoc. viii 122 f., 133, xv 21, 23, 164, 300, 316.
\textsuperscript{172} xxviii 17.
\textsuperscript{173} Xen. Hell. iv 8.31.
\textsuperscript{174} Cf. Beloch, Die attische Politik 127 f., GG iii 9, 1, 91, Accame, o.c. 196, Sealev, o.c. 184; contra, Cloché, REA, o.c. 187. Agyrrius may have been general in preceding years and there is of course no question of direct competition between him and Thrasylulus.
\textsuperscript{175} Xen. Hell. iv 8.31–4. We know nothing of the attitude of Thrasylulus to the indiscretions of Iphicrates at Corinth, pace Accame, o.c. 133. There may well have been a general reaction against Iphicrates' behaviour, and his reappearance at this time is more likely to be due to the shortage of
\textsuperscript{176} Xen. Hell. iv 8.31–4.
\textsuperscript{177} Cf. Cloché, REA, o.c. 187.
\textsuperscript{179} Xen. Hell. v 1.5–9.
\textsuperscript{180} Xen. Hell. v 1.26, IG iii 29 (= Tod 116) 6, 11–15.
\textsuperscript{181} Cf. Arist. Ecl. 248.
\textsuperscript{182} The speech belongs before the expedition of Chabrias in spring 387, probably early in 388, since Eunomus is called as a witness and was clearly still in favour at the time (Lys. xix 23, cf. 43); thus the trial is more likely to have been before he left for Aegina than after his unsuccessful return to Athens later in the year.
\textsuperscript{183} Lys. xix 7.
phanes had very little in common.\textsuperscript{184} Nothing suggests that this hostility included Conon; the hatred felt by the people for Nicophemus and Aristophanes is simply that which was reserved for all, regardless of their party, who seemed to have made too much money in times when the city was poor.\textsuperscript{185} But attention is focussed on Conon’s ties with Cyprus, which were still acceptable; his association with Persia is passed over in silence.

More light is shed by another speech of Lysias, the Olympic oration, delivered in 388.\textsuperscript{186} He complains that much of Greece is under Persian control and that many cities have been uprooted by tyrants.\textsuperscript{187} The theme recalls the Epitaphios, and here as in the earlier speech the Greeks who are subject to Persia must be the Greeks of Asia.\textsuperscript{188} The reference to tyrants must be aimed at Dionysius, and the following sections develop an attack on Sparta for her dealings with the tyrant and the king. Empire belongs to those who control the sea: the Spartans are the leaders of the Greeks. Yet the king and the tyrant of Sicily have many ships, for the king holds the purse-strings and the Greeks are all for sale.\textsuperscript{189} The message is clear: by seeking aid from the king and Dionysius in order to subdue Greece itself, at the price of abandoning the Asiatic Greeks to the king, Sparta has betrayed her position and her own propaganda.

The implications for Athens are equally obvious: rejection of the unreliable friendship of Persia and wholehearted commitment to the Greeks of Asia. Such commitment had however been in 392/1 a polite cover for imperialist aspirations, and an inscription recording honours paid to Clazomenae shortly before the Peace of Antalcidas indicates that the temper of Athens had not changed.\textsuperscript{190} Clazomenae is to be exempt from taxation, except for the εἰκοσάρχη imposed by Thrasybulus, her dealings with some exiles are to be left to her own discretion, and no Athenian garrison or archon is to be sent out. These concessions are the product of necessity.\textsuperscript{191} They depend entirely on the will of the Athenian people, and the degree of interference to which Athens considered herself entitled is more significant of her attitude to the allies in these years than the fact that she waived her rights in this particular instance. Her readiness to lay down the law in Clazomenae is unlikely to have pleased the king, but an increasing disregard for good relations with Persia marks Athenian policy after the arrest of Conon. Thrasybulus had interfered for the first time since Cnidus with the Greek cities of the mainland, although his activities seem not to have angered Pharnabazus. After his death Athens became more reckless. An alliance was concluded with Acoris of Egypt probably before February 388\textsuperscript{192} and the expedition of Philocrates to Cyprus in 390, which might, given its failure to arrive, have been forgiven, was followed by that of Chabrias in 387.\textsuperscript{193} Thrasybulus might not, however, have disapproved. The presence of Demaenetus in the expedition of 387 does not show that it was planned by former friends of Conon and enemies of Thrasybulus, whilst the only appearance of Chabrias before he took over command of the mercenaries at Corinth is apparently as a member of Thrasybulus’ staff on his last expedition.\textsuperscript{194}

\textsuperscript{184} xix 13, 18.
\textsuperscript{185} Cf. xix 11, 21 f., 29, 50.
\textsuperscript{186} Diod. xiv 109.3, rejected by G. Grote, History of Greece viii 72 n. 2, ix 34 n. 1, who argues for 384. But the language of Lys. xxxiii 7 suggests that the war is still in progress. For the Asiatic Greeks to be under Persian domination presupposes only Cnidus, not the Peace, whilst a reference to Sparta as hegemon in 388, to which Grote takes exception, is acceptable when the object is to point out that she is disgracing her station. The prospect for Athens of a naval war against Sparta, Persia and Dionysius, which Andocides thought relevant as early as 391, fits perfectly the circumstances of 388.
\textsuperscript{187} Lys. xxxiii 3.
\textsuperscript{188} Cf. Lys. ii 57–9.
\textsuperscript{189} xxxiii 4–9.
\textsuperscript{190} IG ii 28 = Tod 114.
\textsuperscript{191} Cf. Clocé, REA, o.c. 185, Accame, o.c. 145.
\textsuperscript{192} Arist. Plut. 178.
\textsuperscript{193} Xen. Hell. v 1.10 ff.
\textsuperscript{194} IG ii 21.2, 21 f.
Thus it appears that the constant determining factor of Athenian policy between the restoration of the democracy and the Peace of Antalcidas is the refusal of the mass of Athenians to accept the fact that the empire had been lost and their desire to attempt to recreate it in fact as soon as or even before the time was ripe. When Thrasybulus first intervened it was to check that desire, but only because he thought the city was too weak to face a war with Sparta alone. When Athens accepted the Boeotian alliance the popular yearning for empire was still the same, and circumstances had altered sufficiently for Thrasybulus to acquiesce in the people's judgment. The failures on land which followed damped the ardour of the masses and Thrasybulus fell from favour, but the triumph of Conon at Cnidus brought new hope to Athens. With the end of Spartan control of the sea the renaissance of the empire could be hailed as a fact. Conon recognised the mood of the people and exploited it to his own greater glory, but his ambiguous position meant that his hands were tied. During his stay at Athens little practical advance was made and Athens did not interfere on the mainland of Asia. The ambitions sharpened by Cnidus had not been fulfilled, and Conon's arrest and the reasons which prompted it made clear to all what had been true from the first, that maintenance of friendship with Persia and restoration of the empire were ultimately incompatible. Athens opted for empire, and the fall of Conon brought Thrasybulus back to power as the instrument of the assembly's imperial design. From this point until the end of the war the nature of Athenian policy does not change, regardless of the individuals who execute it: increasing presumption and harshness towards the allies and increasing unconcern for good relations with the king, manifested by intervention on the Asiatic mainland and especially by Athens' dealings with Cyprus and Egypt. It was this longing for empire on the part of the people which determined the actions of Athens throughout the period, not the divergent views of individual statesmen or political groups, who attempted no more than to restrain or encourage the people in accordance with the dictates of patriotism or personal advantage.

University of Liverpool.

Robin Seager.
THE TASTE OF A BOEOTIAN PIG

Already by Pindar’s day the term ‘Boeotian pig’ was an old reproach, and indeed Boeotia was ‘a slow canton, as the nimble Attics would say, a glorious climate for cels, but a bad air for brains.’ My choice of title does not, however, stop there. Anyone brought up in Scotland or in the north of England will know the word ‘pig’ in another meaning than the usual, will know it as a pot, a jar, a crock, and the use of this meaning in the phrase ‘Pig and Whistle’ is perhaps more widely known. Porcelain also establishes a connexion between pigs and pottery.

Boeotian pottery is the Cinderella of the local schools, offering few of the usual attractive groups and classes of work which distinguish most other centres, and much of the potting and painting done in Boeotia is indeed poor or mediocre. It has, however, an interest of its own which makes it worth looking at—the interest one can take in seeing first-rate work copied and adapted for local use and in noting the influence of more brilliant craftsmen on their less well-endowed neighbours. Part of the trouble with looking at Boeotia is that we see Greek pottery through the eyes of Athens; we have come to judge Greek work by the standard of Athens and to consider that a different approach means necessarily an incompetent attempt at mimicking Athenian work. In many cases this is so, for the influence of Attic work on the less original centres was widespread and rarely good. Occasionally a Boeotian artist produced work which rivals Attic, but this is uncommon, and it is more likely that such an artist was an immigrant Athenian. We may also run into the danger of regarding ‘Boeotian’ as having the same range in meaning as ‘Athenian’, whereas we are really dealing with different local centres, e.g. Thebes, Tanagra, Coroneia, Thespiae. Thus we must not expect a continuous tradition of development along a single line, and this makes dating hazardous. Boeotian artists did produce local work which is distinctive, and they used the basic techniques of black-figure and red-figure in ways and combinations different from their neighbours; they also had their own variations with added white and purple. For shapes too they preferred a slightly different range and their own local variations.

Boeotia did not export much of her pottery, indeed it is doubtful if she exported any, except to neighbouring Euboea; most that has been found beyond her boundaries is likely to have been taken away casually by individuals. This means that the soil of Boeotia has to

This article was first given as a lecture to the Triennial Meeting at Cambridge in August 1965. The British Academy provided a generous grant which enabled me to visit European museums and collect photographs of Boeotian material, and the University of Southampton very kindly contributed to the cost of the plates. I take great pleasure in thanking Miss Alison Frantz for her photographs of vases in the National Museum, Athens, and a special debt is owed to the photographers in Heidelberg and Berlin, as vases in those collections make up the bulk of the pictures. I would also like to thank the authorities of the following museums for permission to publish and many other kindnesses: Athens (National Museum); Berlin (Staatliche Museen); Copenhagen (National Museum); Heidelberg (University); London (British Museum); Paris (Louvre); Toronto (Royal Ontario Museum). Individuals to whom I owe debts of gratitude are: Mrs Semni Karouzou, Dr Norbert Kunisch and Professor C. M. Robertson, and most important Mrs A. D. Ure to whom the lecture was given as a tribute.

I have added an appendix on the Rhitsona Graves as these still constitute our most accurate and continuous series of graves for chronological purposes.

---

1 Pindar Ol. vi 89–90; cf. fr. iv 9.
2 Gildersleeve, B. L., Pindar: the Olympian and Pythian Odes viii.
4 Some reached the west, e.g. the rf. skyphos and krater from Spina: Arch. Class. xiv (1962) pl. 16, 17, r–2, 18, 1 and 19, 1; and the geometricising skyphos from Gela: JHS xlix (1929) 171. For a more extended reference, see Arch. Class. xiv (1962) 30 (Pelagatti).
provide the history of its pottery, and the number of sites excavated is not many. Added to this there is the fact that the quality of the excavations or the size of the yield has been for the most part poor, the two exceptions being the Rhitosena excavations and the German researches at the Cabeirion. There has also been much illicit digging in the area, and, what may be worse, a great deal of pottery both Boeotian and non-Boeotian that appears on the market, especially in Athens, is given a Boeotian provenience, no matter what its true finding place. Many Boeotian vases in museums outside Greece have come there as the fruit of illicit excavations and consequently have no associative dates, no precise provenience and much false embroidery. This means that one has to be careful in checking the credentials of particular pieces. Non-Boeotian pieces, falsely given a Boeotian provenience, confuse the picture of imports in the area and thus the social and aesthetic culture of the Boeotians. For the Boeotian material, the usual criteria can be applied: the nature and content of the painting, the colour of the clay, and the quality of the glaze.

Attention will be concentrated mainly on the sixth and fifth centuries, but something must be said of the centuries before. Scratch is notoriously a position from which one can never start, and for the Boeotian material this is undoubtedly true, as evidence is scanty for the Geometric period. On plate XIIa we have a late-Geometric neck-amphora of modest size and decoration. Most of the decorative elements belong to the Geometric koinē—circles, meander, zigzag—but two are elements favoured in Boeotia: the thin-thick wave round the middle and the central panel on the neck. The influence of Attic work is strong, but the copying is well within the grasp of the Boeotian artist. Sometimes more ambitious borrowing is tried, as on the hydria, fig. 1. After a moment or two of amazement, one can recognize on this vase the familiar prothesis scene: the dead laid out on the bier, mourners around, at the side and above, most likely thought of as behind. Scale is immaterial, and the figures are only a little more than pattern. The effect is less disciplined than on the amphora, the copying less accurate and less precise. It is not too early to suggest that the Boeotians saw their decoration—whether linear, floral or figured—as a pattern, reduced to a flat or slightly curved surface. Thus the Geometric linear manner of drawing suits the Boeotians very well, for it is a matter of replacing one surface by another. Rarely in the history of their painting do they go beyond this and as rarely does one find them capable of suggesting depth. The stamnos, plate XIIIb, shows the pleasing use of these Geometric linear elements. The lidded bowl, judging by its shape, originated from a woven basket, and the linear groupings happily convey the effect. There is a slight borrowing here from Corinth which exerted an influence on Boeotian artists at this time only a little less strong than that of Athens. Not that Boeotia failed to appreciate the quality of foreign work for its own sake. Two bowls, one made in Athens, the other in Corinth, were both found in Thebes. Both figure ships, and it has been suggested that the ship was particularly dear to those from whose shores the armies sailed to Troy. One need not be reminded that rowing is the most Geometric form of exercise, and best adapted to pattern work.

---

5 For Rhitosena, see the Appendix 128–130; for the Cabeirion, see Wolters, P., and Bruns, G., Das Kabirenheiligtum bei Theben i (1940) and more recently AA 1964, 231–265 (Bruns).
6 Berlin inv. 3124. The same pattern is to be seen on Berlin inv. 3310 (Hampe Fgs pl. 20, V 34) and Boston 287 (Hampe Fgs pl. 20, V 33).
7 For Boeotian Geometric, see now 'Bootsische Vasen aus dem 8 und 7 Jahrhundert', JDAI lxxx (1965) 18–75 (Canciani) and CVI Heidelberg 3 (27).
8 Paris, Louvre inv. CA 693, from Thebes: Pottier Vases du Louvre pl. 21, above and to right; Pfluhr figs. 16 and 17; AM liii (1928) Beil. 9, 17; Hampe Fgs 28, V 48; JDAI lxxx (1965) 31, no. 4.
9 Athens NM 11795: Hampe Fgs pl. 21, V 11; JDAI lxxx (1965) 40, no. 5.
10 Attic bowl, London BM 1899.2–19.1: JHS lxxviii (1958) pl. 139; Matz GGK pl. 14; BSA xlv (1949) 114–16, no. 40. Corinthian bowl, Toronto 919.5.18: Robinson, Harcum and Iliffe no. 113; Lane GP pl. 10b; JHS lxxviii (1958) pl. 144; Matz GGK pl. 18; BSA xlv (1949) 113–14, no. 38; Demargne AA 294, fig. 383.
11 JHS lxxviii (1958) 124 (R. T. Williams) where other ship scenes from Boeotia are quoted.
12 Payne Protokorinthische Vasenmalerei 10.
Fig. 1. Paris, Louvre inv. CA 639

discipline of such foreign vases could not be commanded, and in many Boeotian works of similar date a common ground line means nothing, and scale once more is of little concern. There is also a certain disregard for the basic shape and contour of the vase, a disregard emphasised by the very nature of the figure drawing itself. Dating is difficult. A time lag has to be allowed for the transference of foreign ideas to take hold, but we shall not be far wrong if we think of the workshops which produced such vases as on Plate XIIa–b as in existence in or near Thebes around 700 B.C.

In the seventh century there is one vase which, though very well known, can hardly be omitted from the account, Plate XIIc. The shape is developed from the Geometric krater on a stem but is tall, narrower and altogether more imposing. In the seventh century it is common in a number of centres—the Cyclades in particular, hence its usual designation as 'Cycladic-type amphora'. The thick vertical lines of zigzag are typical of Boeotian work of the period, though this amphora stands apart from the main series in quality. The figured scene is concentrated between the handles and is bordered by a line of water birds above, and at either side by a dotted wavy line. One of the most striking borrowings from the East at this time was the figure of the Mistress of the Animals. The ways by which this fearsome and awe-inspiring deity came to Greece were many, and ideas of her appearance and nature reached the more remote centres through more than one intermediary. In Boeotia the group has been reduced to a combination of Geometric elements symmetrically disposed, even to a heart-shaped face. The beasts on either side partake of the patterning at their shoulders. There is, however, no terror in the central figure, indeed she is hardly seen as a living being at all but rather as a submissive puppet created to serve as part of an ornamental tapestry, and the effect is more than a little like woven fabric. It is curious to compare this drawing and the amphora it decorates with a

13 Athens NM 5893, from near Thebes: JHS lxxx (1961) pl. 5, 1–2; Arias, Hirmer, Shefton pl. 11; JDAI lxxx (1965) 22, no. 23 (with full bibliography).

14 On the shape, see BSA xlvii (1952) 13–39 (Boardman), Cook, GPP 100 and 107–8, JDAI lxxx (1965) 19–25.
vase only slightly later from Corinth which was imported into Thebes: the Macmillan aryballos. The Corinthian artist has created figures which are instinct with life and yet serve as decorative elements as well. Movement, harmony and control of line are qualities which the Corinthians of the time had mastered but which the Boeotians with their slower wits never really regulated.

The Geometric traditions die hard in Boeotia, and long after the conventions have been abandoned elsewhere, Boeotia still clings to the older manner. Even in the sixth century when other schools were producing work in the full black-figure technique and had in the main gone over to that technique, Boeotia was producing work like Plate XIIIa. This low bowl with four handles is typical of a group of vases which belong mainly to the sixth and early fifth centuries. The fabric is soft, there is no incision, and the patterns are a latter-day version of the old Geometric linear decoration, the birds in the panels having more connexion with the Mistress of the Animals on the Cycladic-type amphora of a century before than with anything produced contemporaneously elsewhere. Until the excavations of Burrows and Ure at Rhitsona and the researches of the latter into these vases, bowls such as these were thought to be much earlier than the sixth century. However, the floruit of this type of bowl from datable contexts at Rhitsona cannot be set much earlier than 560 B.C. So here we have a case of stylistic criteria bowing to the discipline of excavations and the latter revealing an example of artistic tradition to which the Boeotians seem to have been temperamentally prone. Some of the bowls have a high stem and only two handles, and there are other variations. The example shown belongs a little before the middle of the sixth century. Much work has still to be done on these bowls when the local variations may appear more clearly; certainly it is likely that they were produced in more than one centre.

We have mentioned the influence of Corinth on Boeotian work. This influence was strongest in the seventh century. The Rhitsona excavations unearthed many objects imported from Corinth—mainly small, either round aryballoi or pear-shaped alabastra. It was natural that the artists of Boeotia should not be content to import material which they thought they could produce themselves, and around 600 B.C. there was produced what we now see to be a well-defined group of alabastra which are Boeotian but lean heavily on Corinthian models. Let one stand for all, Plate XIIIb–c. This alabastron, about 7 inches high, is a characteristic example of the work of this painter. The motif, like the shape, is ultimately derived from Corinthian which often has a snake between cocks; here the painter has put a snake between eagles. The black glaze in such work is never very dense, and the background colour of the clay is usually slightly muddied, the brown of untanned leather. Incision on and around the black is much in evidence, and here care is taken in incising the details of birds and reptile, less attention is paid to the filling ornament of rosettes. Other subjects are known: processions of women, Mistress of the Animals and also a complicated floral pattern as the central motif. One painter is responsible for the whole group—known as the Horse–Bird Group—and what is of great interest is that the

15 London BM 89.4–18.1, from Thebes: Payne NC pl. 1, 7; Payne Protok. pl. 22, 1–2, 5; Lane GP pl. 23c; Hafner GgK 89, fig. 89; Richter HGA 290, fig. 409; Boardman Greek Art 49, fig. 37; Demargne AD 341, figs. 439–40.
16 Heidelberg G 27: CVA 1 (10) pl. 23 (457) 6.
17 For studies of this ware, see JDAI iii (1888) 325–64 (Böhlau), Mon. Prot. i (1894) 29 (Holleaux), BCH 1895, 179–81 (de Ridder), BSA xiv (1907–8) 308–18 and 227, n. 1 (P.N. Ure), JHS xxx (1910) 336–41 (P.N. Ure), Arch. Eph. 1912, 110–13 (P.N. Ure), Class. Chr. Ant. xii 6–10 (P.N. Ure), Sixth and Fifth 12–20, AA 1933, 2–6 (P.N. Ure), Studies Robinson 48 (P.N. Ure), CVA Reading i text to pl. 15, Cook GPP 101.
18 Ure in Studies Robinson 48 says that the style 'must go back some way before its first appearance in our Rhitsona graves'.
19 On the alabastra of this group, see Payne NC 202–3 and 341, AA 1933, 8–13 (Ure), Hesperia xiii (1944) 45 (Beazley), CVA California i (5) text to pl. 11, 2 ff., ABV 22–23 and 680.
20 Heidelberg inv. 161, from Boeotia: Payne NC 202, 10; CVA 1 (10) pl. 22 (456) 2–3; ABV 680.
painter has been shown to be identical with a known Attic painter.\textsuperscript{21} So here we have an
emigré Athenian in Boeotia producing work which is influenced directly from Corinth and
indirectly through the medium of Attica. Such an involved route of influence is not unique at
this time. In the early sixth century there are other groups and painters in Athens whose
work is heavily in debt to Corinthian models, and some of this Attic work, if not the painters
themselves, reached Boeotia and helped in the formation of a flourishing school to copy such
work.\textsuperscript{22} The process produced one masterpiece, found at Tanagra—in Beazley’s laconic
phrase ‘a good vase’, PLATE XIV.\textsuperscript{23} The shape is known as a tripod-pyxis and was
presumably based on a metal original; its purpose is not known for sure.\textsuperscript{24} The decoration
covers top, sides and legs and also part of the belly. The top is devoted to animal parades,
and the general similarity to Attic work is obvious, though for the lid the inspiration most
likely comes directly from a Protocorinthian hare hunt which it copies fairly faithfully.\textsuperscript{25}
Man finds himself outnumbered here and writ small. There is much incision to add life
to the figures and most of it is carefully done. The legs, PLATE XIVb–d, give us individual
scenes and a connected story: athletes below, a smiling Perseus and the Gorgons above.
Beneath, on the belly, there are sphinxes, sirens and a lion bringing down a bull. Around
the sides, scenes of everyday life: on one, an animated symposium, the scene full of noise,
music and the sound of wine streaming into cups; on another, a dance of komasts to the
pipes. On the third side, PLATE XIVa, we have the sacrifice of a pig. An attendant
follows the pig with a sacrificial tray, the pipe-player comes after, then two bring up the
rear with twig and flower. The pig restores us to our title, and a magnificent animal it is
too, worthy of the description that G. K. Chesterton gave of a pig in Fancies versus Facts.\textsuperscript{26}

‘The actual lines of a pig (I mean a really fat pig) are among the loveliest and most
luxurious in nature, the pig has the same great curves, swift and yet heavy, which we
see in rushing water or in rolling cloud. . . . There is no point of view from which a
really corpulent pig is not full of sumptuous and satisfying curves . . . he has that fuller,
subler and more universal kind of shapeliness which the unthinking (gazing at pigs and
distinguished journalists) mistake for mere absence of shape.’

Added red picks out the underbelly of the pig and is also used for details on the other figures.
The same group of painters has bequeathed us another pig, PLATE XVa–b,\textsuperscript{27} not quite
so fine in proportion but a splendid creature none the less. He is representative of a small
group of vases\textsuperscript{28} in the shape of animals which were made in Boeotia—goat, bull, pig, e.g.
PLATE XVc,\textsuperscript{29} usually undecorated but on PLATE XVa–b bearing on its sides five tipsy
revellers. Also related to this group is the unusual tripod-kotthon from Thebes, PLATE
XVd,\textsuperscript{30} which carries on it a lively satyr, Σάτυρος by name. The figure is not in black-figure
technique but incised on a completely glazed surface and filled with added red. There are
one or two other examples of it in Boeotian in later times.

We have seen that one Attic painter at least crossed over the border into Boeotia and
worked there, and the instance is unlikely to have been unique,\textsuperscript{30a} though Hesiod doubtless

\textsuperscript{21} ABV 21–22, the painter of the Dresden lekanis.
\textsuperscript{22} E.g. the lekanis from Thebes, London BM 1905.7.11 (plate 2 (2) pl. 9 (65) 3; ABV 24, 3, the Komast Group.
\textsuperscript{23} Berlin F 1727: ABV 29, 1, the group of the
Bocotian Dancers; Brommer Vasenlisten 213, C 1; RIA n.s. A. ix (1960) 177, fig. 65.
\textsuperscript{24} See most recently on this and allied shapes,
\textsuperscript{25} I owe this observation to Professor Martin
Robertson.
\textsuperscript{26} Quoted in Sillar and Meyer (see note 3) 1.
\textsuperscript{27} Berlin inv. 3391: Maximova pl. 24, 173, ABV
31, top, Tuchelt Tieregifase pl. 23, 1–2.
\textsuperscript{28} For the group, see Payne NC 199 and CVA
Oxford 2, 57; Maximova 194–7; Tuchelt Tieregifase
94–97; Boardman Cretan Collection 105, note 5.
\textsuperscript{29} Paris, Louvre CA 1898–1900 (bull, pig, ram): TEL
iii pl. 59C, A and B.
\textsuperscript{30} Berlin 3364; JDAI xiv (1909) 64, fig. 4; and see AA 1933, 98 (Ure) and JDAI lxxix (1964) 96
(Scheibler). Also Fränkel Satyr- etc. 19–20.
\textsuperscript{30a} See BICS v (1958) 8 (Boardman).
THE TASTE OF A BOEOTIAN PIG

would fail to understand the reason and we can only guess. Sometimes, as Plate XVIa,\(^{31}\) the
drawing is very close to Attic, but in this case the shape spells Boeotia. Of all the shapes
which the Boeotians cultivated, the kantharos with its many different forms was the
favourite.\(^{32}\) Here we have a deep body, with inset lip and two high-rising handles
strengthened with struts and thumb-_rests. This particular shape is a little unusual in the
form of the strut and the curve of the lower wall but cannot be separated from the more
common shapes which are most popular about the middle of the sixth century, and the
drawing well suits such a date. Besides the panel composition adopted for this quadriga
scene, the whole of the lip is sometimes decorated, as on the more canonical shape with
the hunt for the Calydonian boar,\(^{33}\) a myth popular in the middle of the sixth century.\(^{34}\)
Another type of contemporary kantharos alters the proportions of bowl to lip—reducing
the bowl and increasing the lip, Plate XVIb.\(^{35}\) This gives a deeper field for the figured
scene and enables the artist to be bolder in conception and more erratic in execution. The
legend here is that of the Trojan prince Troilos, youngest and dearest of the sons of Priam,
and of how he escorted his sister Polyxena to the fountain outside the walls of Troy, only
to be butchered by Achilles who waited in ambush for him.\(^{36}\) On the left, Troilos advancing
on his mount; on the right, hidden by a tree, Achilles lying in wait for him. The bird
between them—whether of ill omen or in its natural habitat by the water-hole—is a frequent
member of the cast in this drama. So too is Polyxena, and she is present here too, but
rather harder to find. Though the damage the vase has sustained has reduced her appear-
ance even more than was envisaged by the painter, the latter must take most of the blame
for her Lilliputian appearance. The story is robbed of some of its point by this lack of
consistent scale, but the artist has had in his mind the figures of Troilos and Achilles, the
story to his way of thinking, if he thought at all, is theirs only. As the figures engrossed his
mind, so they overspread his canvas. Polyxena was only a means to an end and is now of
little accord. A mentality which thinks in this way has no need for preliminary sketch, no
place for balance of composition, no consideration for relative scale, no real feeling for the
narrative content, though it must be admitted that there is a certain grandeur in Troilos
and his horse. The carelessness of the glazing is apparent here on the horse’s legs especially
but elsewhere also; and the incision is erratically engraved.

Incision is for the Boeotians the salvation of much of their figure drawing. Line can
give form to a carelessly painted shape very quickly and redeem the mistakes a painter has
made with his brush. Recourse is too often taken in enlivening a dull scene in this way,
but the effect of a canvas devoid of incision is very drab indeed, as can be seen on a group
of vases of the mid-sixth century, most likely made at or near Coronea.\(^{37}\) They present a
very flat, lifeless appearance with parades of animals and humans predominating. The
shape most commonly found is the lekanis as on Plate XVIIa\(^{38}\) in a scene more elaborate
than was usual: a procession to Athena Itonia at Coronea in which boneless and wraith-like
figures gesticulate limply. Only out of sheer necessity, as for the figure on this side of the
bull, is the painter stirred from his lethargy to incise a line or two. A slightly later group

\(^{31}\) Copenhagen NM inv. 4984: CVA 3 (3) pl. 98
(100) 4, and see Caskey and Beazley Boston Vases iii
52–3.

\(^{32}\) On the different kantharos shapes, see especially
Ure BGP 4–19.

\(^{33}\) Athens NM 432 (CC 626): de la Coste-
Messelière Au Musée de Delphes pl. 7; Wolters and
Bruns Kab. pl. 35, 4–5; BMFA xlvi (1948) 47, figs. 5–
6; Brommer Vasenlisten 237, C 1.

\(^{34}\) On the myth, see BMFA xlvi (1948) 42–48
(Bothmer) and the lists in Brommer Vasenlisten 235–
239.

\(^{35}\) Berlin 3178: RPAA xix (1942–3) 379, fig. 4;
Brommer Vasenlisten 266, C 13.

\(^{36}\) On the myth, see Brommer’s lists in Vasenlisten
264–9 and most recently AA 1965, 394–401 (Kunisch).

\(^{37}\) On the group, see Pfuhl Muζ 207, Ure, Sixth
and Fifth 21 ff., 32 and 57, JHS xlix (1929) 160–171
(A. D. Ure), lv (1935) 225–8 (A. D. Ure) and
lxxiii (1962) 126 (Sparkes).

\(^{38}\) London BM B 80: JHS i (1880) pl. 7; Pfuhl Muζ
fig. 169; CVA 2 (2) pl. 7 (65) 4a–b.
of lekanides\textsuperscript{39} which present a more lively appearance were made in southern Boeotia in the Thebes–Tanagra region and may be typified by Plate XVII\textit{b–c},\textsuperscript{40} again a parade of animals—bull, lion, boar, felines—but given substance by the use of incision and the addition of red and white colouring. The style of drawing is an amalgam of foreign elements with the Athenian predominating. The filling ornament is discreet, once more an attractive pattern which only seems to lack quality when one recalls that it was painted about the same time that Exekias was working in Athens, c. 540 B.C. Inside we have a sturdy satyr picked out in red, a more than competent attempt to fill the difficult circular field. The animal parade seen on the outside of the lekanis has a long life in Boeotia. Such a piece as Plate XVIII\textit{a}, from Tanagra,\textsuperscript{41} shows the scratchy work that the theme could evoke, even in the sixth century: ill drawn, careless use of incision, all carried out on a shape that is as disastrous as it was popular. Many examples of the shape are known,\textsuperscript{42} one signed by Gamedes, a circumstance which has given the shape a certain fame, but no more justly deserved than the amphorae which Nikosthenes signed. The head below the spout of the jug reminds us that there is a lively industry in terracotta figurines in the region, and the incidence of this head here indicates that the vase and figurine shops were one and the same; other evidence points the same way.\textsuperscript{43}

In view of this sad scene it is a relief to turn from figured ware to black. Here the shape claims our undivided attention and the distressing figures are absent. Not all potters were as bad as Gamedes, and a famous name at the end of the sixth century is that of Teisias, Plate XVIII\textit{c},\textsuperscript{44} his scratched signature is clearly and neatly written above the cul of the kantharos. The shape is distinctive and well planned, with details recognisably his, such as the square tops to the handles and the moulded ring on the stem. The kantharos, Plate XVIII\textit{d},\textsuperscript{45} though a worthy piece, is not so well ordered and brings out the quality of the Teisian model. Besides the kantharos, Teisias signed two other shapes: a skyphos of so-called Corinthian shape\textsuperscript{46} and a skyphos with sloping handles, Plate XVIII\textit{b}.\textsuperscript{47} The latter is not all black but has alternately empty and full rays encircling the foot in a reserved band, and round the rim a laurel wreath incised through the glaze and coloured with added red. The effect once more is distinctive and striking. The signature is informative. Written retrograde, it says ‘Teisias the Athenian made me’.\textsuperscript{48} What are we to make of this? It looks very much as though the master of the good shape is an intruder and once more the Boeotians have gained only reflected glory. But our potter works within the Boeotian tradition, for the kantharos, Plate XVIII\textit{c}, has nothing Attic about it, and we already know from the incised satyr earlier in the century, Plate XV\textit{d}, that the incised and reddened

\textsuperscript{39} On the group, see MMStud. iv (1932–33) 18–28 (A. D. Ure).

\textsuperscript{40} Heidelberg inv. 179: MMStud. iv (1932–3) 26, no 7, figs. 10–11; CVA i (10) pl. 27 (461) 4–5.

\textsuperscript{41} Berlin F 1651: BCH 1897, 448, fig. 3; Festschrift Eugen v. Merklin (1964) pl. 17, 12 and pl. 20, 1–2.

\textsuperscript{42} On this workshop, see now Rosmarie Elgnowski, ‘Eine Gattung boottischer Kannen’ in Festschrift Eugen v. Merklin (1964) 32–40 and further Hesperia xxxv (1966) 155 (I. K. Raubitschef). To Elgnowski’s list of 12, add at least two more whole examples, Athens NM 12576: Hesperia xxxi (1962) pl. 113, and one in Jacques Schultman List of Egyptian, Greek and Roman Antiquities, exhibited at the 13th Antique Dealers Fair, Delft, August 18–September 9, 1961, no. 38.

\textsuperscript{43} See for instance Grace Archaic Sculpture in Boeotia 23 and 26, and for the earlier period, Ure Arysteai 53–54.

\textsuperscript{44} Athens NM 2239. For Teisias, see BSA xiv (1907–8) 305, n. 2 (P. N. Ure), JHS xxix (1909) 348, Ure BGP 9–10, Arch. Eph. 1912, 104 ff., Hoppin HGBV 347–9, Ure Sixth and Fifth 34, Robinson, Harcum and Iliffe Toronto Vases 150–1, AA 1938, 68–77 (Crome), Hesperia xxxi (1962) 371 (A. D. Ure). Much work has still to be done on Boeotian black vases, of which there is a good deal in Nauplia museum (from private collections), soon to be published by Madame Ghali-Kahil.

\textsuperscript{45} Athens NM 2238.

\textsuperscript{46} Toronto C 319: Robinson, Harcum and Iliffe Toronto Vases pl. 52. 347.

\textsuperscript{47} Toronto 919.5.134: Robinson, Harcum and Iliffe Toronto Vases pl. 52. 346; Graham Black-figure and Red-figure Greek Pottery (1950) pl. 1 A.

\textsuperscript{48} There is an Attic Teisias, see ABV 177, but the relationship is uncertain.
laurel wreath here has local antecedents. Examples of this technique are only intermittent, and there is too little evidence to say definitely that they constitute a continuous tradition in Boeotia, but it seems likely. Examples of 'Teisias' work have been found at Tanagra and Rhitsona, and he may be presumed to have worked in that area.

A popular import from Athens about 500 B.C. is a stouter version of the Teisian skyphos, with sloping handles and heavy foot. Many Attic skyphoi produced in the Athenian 'Krokotos workshop' made their way to Boeotia and naturally were imitated by local artists. The man who painted the skyphos, Berlin 3283, followed his model quite closely; the dotted rim, the tongues on the lower wall and a white heron under the handles, all these are characteristics of the Attic version. The drawing has enthusiasm on its side but little else. It is a happy pastiche, and many elements can be matched on the model. In the Cyclops story the artist seems to have felt his legend more deeply than the generally tame subjects the Athenian artists chose for decoration, even though the local artist has given Polyphemos two eyes, instead of the more usual one. Minutiae of legend rarely disturb Boeotian painters. What one must remember, however, is that in Athens at this time the black-figure technique was only a second string, red-figure had already passed through its initial experimental stage and had gained a primary position; in Boeotia red-figure had not yet been attempted and their better painters had not yet been diverted to the new technique. It is a sad commentary on the quality of their output that we are seeing here some of their best work.

The same sort of sketchy black-figure technique is found on a lidded lekanis of much the same date in Adolphseck. The subject is the preparation for a religious festival with men slicing the meat, skewering it and laying it to one side. The uneven edge of the figures and the slappish character of the incision here help in the impression of hurry and concern. Such an elaborate treatment of this type of subject is rare, and one can only surmise that the everyday theme struck a chord in the heart of the Boeotian artist. A homely scene such as this will also introduce us to the early red-figure vases which the Boeotians began to produce soon after 480 B.C., two generations later than its appearance in Athens. An early example in Munich presents us with a representation of everyday life very much of the same order as the lekanis scene. The drawing on the Munich pelike has been shown to depend on Attic work of about 480 B.C. We need not doubt that we have here one of the earliest attempts by Boeotian artists to draw in this technique. The inner lines, especially of the seated woman, are stiff and straight, indicating an artist more used to scraping away glaze with a sharp point as in black-figure than of handling the fluid medium of the glaze line in red-figure. The subjects are not usual; comparisons have been adduced for the butcher, but the picture of the butcher's wife (for that is who she must be), asleep at her task of selling the meat, which is in some danger from a marauding cat, is unique, and again one might suppose the Boeotian artist to have looked around for a congenial subject from his own experience. The adoption of the new technique was not always, or indeed usually, for the better. The potting of the vase is competent, and the impetus to attempt red-figure may have come with the arrival of Athenian craftsmen.

49 JHS lxxv (1955) 90-103 (A. D. Ure).
50 Berlin 3283; AA 1895, 34, no. 22, fig. 9; Neugebauer Führer 75; Brommer Vasenlisten 314, C 1.
51 That the Cyclopes may originally have had two eyes (see Masouri Συμβολή εἰς τὸ γένος καὶ τὴν μονοφθαλμίαν τῶν Κυκλών) has no bearing here.
52 Adolphseck, Schloss Fasanerie 120; Neugebauer Antiken in deutschem Privatbesitz (1938) pl. 68, no. 161; Brommer Antike Kleinkunst in Schloss Fasanerie, Adolphseck (1955) 6, fig. 111; CVJ 2 (16) pl. 63 (752) and pl. 64 (753) 1-2; Zschietzschmann Hellas and Rome (1959) 192, above.
53 Munich 2347; AM lxxv (1940) pls. 1 and 2, 1; Rumpf MuZZ pl. 23, 7.
54 E.g. the Erlangen pelike, inv. 486: AM lxxv (1940) pl. 2, 2; Rumpf MuZZ pl. 23, 6; ARV3 259, 21 and addendum 1639, the Syleus sequence.
55 On Boeotian red-figure, see AM lxxv (1940) 1-27 (Lullies), Cook GPP 189-90. Mrs Ure has done most of the spade work in this field and has succeeded in sorting out a good number of painters.
56 In preparing this material, I accepted the usual attribution of London BM 93-10-27.2 (Jacobsthal Göttinger Vasen pl. 22, figs. 81-83; AM lxxv [1940] pl. 3.
The import of Athenian red-figured vases in the early fifth century was not very heavy. Rhitsona in controlled excavations revealed a multitude of slight black-figured vases imported from Athens (mainly lekythoi, as is natural in a cemetery) and one or two pieces of red-figure, amongst them a skyphos by the Brygos painter. Rhitsona was small and backward; Thebes was large and powerful, and we need not be amazed if there were some people there who admired fine work, but again the yield from controlled excavations is not great. The kantharos in Boston with Zeus pursuing Ganymede is said to come from Thebes, a work also of the Brygos painter and syntactically one of the most perfect shapes ever produced in Athens. It is interesting that the kantharos shape so popular amongst the Boeotians in the home-made version was also imported from Athens. But it is black-figure that the Boeotians prefer and the importation of black-figure cups in preference to red-figure cannot be wholly laid at the door of Boeotian financial poverty. Experiments in the white-ground technique in Athens, e.g. on alabastra, appealed to the Boeotians, and many alabastra of this type where the provenience is known have come from Boeotia. The simple pattern formed by the figures of negroes on the white ground may have helped in the formation of the distinctive school of grotesque black-figure work, the Cabeiric, which flourished in the second half of the fifth century and beyond. Also to be taken into account in tracing the ancestry of this important school is the group of kantharoi of the mid-fifth century with white figures on a black ground. The shape of the kantharoi in this group is a development of the earlier kantharos series, thinner and taller with more attenuated stem, the decoration relying on heavy caricature for its effect. Three Attic red-figured lekythoi in Boston also found their way to Boeotia, presumably at one time, and the Boeotians once more fell to copying both shape and decoration. Lekythoi were naturally in great demand as grave offerings, and in the Polyanondron of the Thespians, a multiple grave for the Thespians who died at Delium in 424 B.C., three red-figured lekythoi were found which are local versions of imported Attic. The work is good, but the stiff drapery, the artless and clumsy figures, the patchy glaze and the colour of the clay all point to Boeotia.

A constant shuffling to and fro between black-figure and red-figure is representative of the state of affairs in the fifth-century Boeotian workshops. It is clear that the same workshops produced both black- and red-figure, and in certain cases the same painter within one workshop put his hand to both. Let us take an example of the two techniques within one workshop. One of the finest specimens of Boeotian red-figure is the lidded calyx-krater showing Selene driving her horses over the sea preceded by Hermes, PLATE XIX. The influence comes from Attic work of about 430 B.C. and only a certain over-emphasis of line, beyond the usual criteria mentioned before, sets the piece apart from Attic. Not the least charming aspect of the work is the lid which is decorated in unincised black-

1–2) as Boeotian, but I have since been persuaded by Professor Martin Robertson to accept it as Attic. The drawing is bad, but the shape, glaze and details of potting point to Attica.

67 Thebes, from Rhitsona: BSA xiv (1907-8) pl. 14 (Grave 22.8); ARV² 381, 177, the Brygos painter.

68 Boston MFA 95-36: ARV² 381-2, 182, the Brygos painter.

69 Negro alabastra found in Boeotia: ARV² 267, 1 and 268, 9, 10, 30. Compare also the head-kantharos, Boston 98.928: ARV² 265, 78, the Syriskos painter, which was found at Tanagra.

60 JHS lxxi (1951) 194–7 (A. D. Ure). There are other classes of overpainted vases in Boeotian which merit study.

61 Boston 95-45, 95-43, 95-44, from Thebes: ARV² 640, 74–6, the Providence painter.

62 Thebes, from Thespias: AM lxv (1940) pl. 4-6; ARV² 1010, 7-3. Only a small part of the material from the Thespian polyanondron at Delium has been published. Apart from the three lekythoi already mentioned, there is a rf. Boeotian bell-krater: AM lxv (1940) pl. 7; two black stemless kantharoi with ring handles: Wolters and Bruns Kab. pl. 50, 3-4; and three Cabeiric kantharoi, with black figures or pattern: ibid. pls. 51, 1-2, 56 and 59, 9.

63 Athens NM 4213 (CC 1934): JHS xix (1899) 270, fig. 3 and pl. 10; AM lxv (1940) pls. 8 and 10, 1; Arch. Class. xi (1959) pl. 31, 1 (lid only).
figure. The pattern has freshness and is well controlled, and the Boeotian artist has lavished care on the lotus in particular. The same pattern is repeated on a shape of vase known as the stamnos-pyxis, no red-figure this time, both body and lid devoted to black. It is possible that the same artist used both techniques, but it is more likely that we have two painters here, the red-figure painter for the body of the krater, the black-figure painter for the lid of the krater and for the stamnos-pyxis.

Of the workshops producing black- and red-figure in the second half of the fifth century, pride of place must be given to the Cabeiric potters and painters who worked mainly for the Cabeirion near Thebes. The Cabeiroi were mystery gods, worshipped mainly in Asia Minor, Samothrace and Boeotia, and the religion followed under their guidance is perplexing; its secrets, like those of all ancient mystery religions, were well kept. There was an older and a younger god among the pantheon (Fig. 2); the older god is usually shown reclining, holding a kantharos, and he is sometimes accompanied by his younger companion, Pais. With the vases produced at and for the Theban Cabeirion, Boeotian painting abandons its slavish imitation of Attic and pours out examples of a style of painting both individual and unmistakable. There are not many drawings as serious as the fragment in Fig. 2; indeed, the ideal features of Cabeiroi and Pais give way on the left to a shrivelled Pratolaos and a simian Mitos, and they have many followers. The shape from which this fragment comes is also characteristic. On plate XXa we have it whole: a deep cup on an elaborately profiled foot and with two vertical handles with thumb-rests and finger-grips. The antecedents of this shape are not known; it appears full grown, as if from the head of Zeus. It was already in production before 424 B.C., as it appears in the Thespian polyandron, and the Cabeiric style of drawing was also in full swing by then. Turning to the drawing, we see the features we have noted before as characteristic of Boeotian: a loose flat outline for the figures with slipshod incision for added life and a thin glaze with little sparkle and bare patches. But all this has been transformed by one or two painters endowed with an engagingly comic draftsmanship which renders errors of little moment. Here we have a pygmy with rustic spear and a pig with severely upturned snout, the pygmy no less rotund than the pig.

64 Brussels A 78: BSA xli (1940-45) pl. 7, 4; CVA 3 (3) pl. 5 (114) 6.
65 For the Cabeirion, see primarily Wolters and Bruns Kab, passim and for the more recent excavations, AA 1964, 231-265, where one sees (248 and 262) that production of the distinctive Cabeiric painting continued at least to the middle of the fourth century.
66 Athens NM inv. 10426: AM xiii (1888) pl. 9; Wolters and Bruns Kab, pl. 5 and pl. 44, 1.
67 Heidelberg inv. 190: Wolters and Bruns Kab, pls. 26, 11 and 53, 6 (M 15); CVA 1 (10) pl. 30 (464) 1-2 and 7.
The artist of the vase has two modern names: the Mystenmaler and the Thetis painter. If I keep mainly to this one man, it is because, of the few Cabeiric painters who have a distinct personality, he is the liveliest and the most idiosyncratic. Our artist likes mythological subjects, and they are usually seen with a fresh eye, as the judgement of Paris where Paris' task is made difficult not by the beauty but by the ugliness of the contestants. All is gross caricature, from the camera-conscious Hera to an elderly and bearded Paris. Odysseus and Circe are popular figures in the Cabeiric workshops and may have had special significance; the players are travestied and burlesqued, and it would be difficult without the name to separate Odysseus from the pig-hunting pygmy. One shape which carries the two scenes of Odysseus is the common skyphos borrowed from Athens. More unusual is the almond amphoriskos, plate XXb–c, never a common shape and rarely figured. The three men in a boat have defied analysis, and they still sail by, their identities unknown, on a stormy sea, lit by the twin constellation perhaps of Castor and Pollux who had significance in the Cabeiric observances. The figure on the other side, riding on a dragon, is also difficult to place. One thinks of a Nereid, most likely Achilles' mother, Thetis, not, it is true, carrying the armour but complete instead with box and quite naturally a Boeotian kantharos; but she may simply be a character out of the mysteries. This is not the vase which gives the Thetis painter his name; the subject-matter there is less equivocal, plate XXIa and fig. 3. Here Thetis and her sister Nereids ride along the curling sea on dolphins, sea-horses and a sea-dragon, each carrying an item of Armour for Achilles: sword, helmet, shield, breast-plate and spear. This troupe of aquatic sisters is a little stocky, but they take evident delight in their diaphanous veils, as did Hera, their triangular eyes unblinking as they circle round the vase in continuous travel, bordered above and below by water birds. The vase on which the scene is painted is not well preserved, but we have met it before: the stamnos-pyxis. A contemporary example is plate XXIb, with the legends about people who conveyed the secrets of the Mysteries (Cabeiric, in this case) being helped miraculously on their way by sea-creatures; he adds characteristically that she might have been Jonah-ed out of the boat on the other side of the vase.

---

68 Boston 99.533: Fairbanks Cat. pl. 69, 562; Wolters and Bruns Kab. pl. 37, 2–3 (M 18).
69 See Brommer's list in Vasalisten 310, D 1–6.
70 Berlin 3263: Wolters and Bruns Kab. pl. 36, 3–4 (M 20). The vase is not mentioned in Beazley's discussion of non-Attic almond amphoriskoi, BSA xlii (1940–45) 14.
71 I am grateful once more to Professor Robertson for this suggestion. He recalls Pausanias x 28.3 in which it is said that in Polygnotus' Underworld Kleoboa was shown in Charon's barque with Demeter's cista mystica on her knees, because she was the first to bring the Mysteries of Demeter from Paros to Thasos. He asks if there may not have been Paris, Louvre CA 4502: Wolters and Bruns Kab. pl. 36, 1–2 (M 19); Rumpf MuZ 119; Brommer Vasalisten 272, Da 1 (but not in Athens NM).
72 The bringing of the new armour was a common subject in late fifth-century art, see Brommer Vasalisten 271–2 and AR13 39.44; fig. 44; Wolters and Bruns Kab. pl. 55, 1 (M 23); CVA i (10) pl. 28 (462) 3–4.
THE TASTE OF A BOEOTIAN PIG

water birds which were subsidiary to the Thetis scene promoted to the centre of the stage where they spread their wings in a pleasing pattern amongst the tree, palmettes and tongues around. At this point we may return three centuries and compare the earlier version of this shape, PLATE XIIb, where the composition of the decoration is so strangely echoed in the later vase. The Thetis painter besides painting in black-figure used the red-figure technique but did not abandon his individual approach, and the elements which mark off his style can be seen very clearly.\textsuperscript{75}

The close connexion in the workshops between red- and black-figure at this time can be further shown in other groups of vases where a mixed technique is common.\textsuperscript{76} Such pieces seem to be linked to a larger group of vases—kraters, plates, bowls—which have as almost standard decoration a woman’s head; the workshop seems to have been situated in Thebes.\textsuperscript{77} Close to this group but finer is the Thetis krater in Cambridge:\textsuperscript{78} at the back a woman’s head, in front, Thetis once more, riding a hippocamp. Despite the clumsy hand this is an enchanting piece of work. It is closely modelled on contemporary Attic work, a comparable piece being the cup with Sparte on a horse, found at Tanagra.\textsuperscript{79} It was such a drawing as this that the Boeotian artist had before him, but the Boeotian Thetis has more charm and attraction than the swooning Attic jade.

In the late fifth century the shape of vase that proved popular in Boeotia was the calyx-krater. These were imported from Athens and are in the main loose, sloppy pieces of work, but eye-catching with much added white. The Boeotians copied these imports in both red- and black-figure, work as bad as the Attic.\textsuperscript{80} One can hardly expect the copyist to outstrip the model when the model gives such poor guidance. A further decrease in quality in the Attic imports during the fourth century does not seem to have lessened the enthusiasm of the Boeotians for these monstrosities, for of the fourth century Attic red-figured calyx-kraters with known proveniences, many went to Boeotia.\textsuperscript{81} The only plea one can make in the defence of the Boeotians is that there was little that was any better that they could import instead.

It would be impertinent to finish with references to vulgar Attic work. The fourth century is a dark period in Boeotian art where little is known for certain. That Alexander destroyed the Cabeirion in 335 B.C. provides a terminus ante quem for material produced and found in that place, but evidence for elsewhere and for the middle of the fourth century is meagre.\textsuperscript{82} Let us rather turn back a little and look at a Boeotian lebes with stand, PLATE XXIIa-\textsuperscript{b}.\textsuperscript{83} It is a very attractive piece well within the scope of Boeotian potters, painters and coroplasts. There is black-figure pattern dear to the Boeotians and also another old favourite: the animal parade, though this time the figures are applied onto the sides of the pot in the contemporary manner. Amongst these animals is a white pig and he can act as the tailpiece.

\textsuperscript{75} See Athens NM inv. 1393 (CC 1926): Eph. Arch. x (1890) pl. 7; AM lxv (1940) pl. 26; attributed by A. D. Ure in AA 1933, 31.
\textsuperscript{76} See AA 1933, 36-7 (Ure); Arch. Class. xiv (1962) 36-41 (Pelagatti).
\textsuperscript{77} Add to the references in the previous note, AJA lvii (1953) 245-9 (A. D. Ure) and Arch. Class. xiv (1962) 33-4.
\textsuperscript{78} Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, on loan from Trinity: JHS lxvii (1957) pl. 4; Brommer Vasenlisten 272, Da 2.

\textsuperscript{79} Boston 00.354; Matz Naturpersonifikationen pl. 1; CB iii pl. 106, 175; ARF\textsuperscript{2} 1516, near bottom.
\textsuperscript{80} E.g. New York 57.11.4 and 57.11.3: BMMA xxi (1962-3) 10, figs. 11 and 12.
\textsuperscript{81} BSA xi (1904-5) 224 ff. (Richter); Schefeld Untersuchungen zu den Kertscher Vasen 25.
\textsuperscript{82} A. D. Ure’s study of fourth-century floral cups has indicated the standard of the work; see especially JHS lxvi (1946) 54-62 and Hesperia xv (1946) 27-37.
\textsuperscript{83} Athens NM 12539; mentioned AA 1933, 31 where other examples of the same shape are quoted.
APPENDIX

The following list catalogues the published graves dug at Rhiatona by R. Burrows, Professor P. N. Ure and Mrs A. D. Ure. Photographs of the material from the graves are scattered throughout the writings of the excavators, and there has been no previous list of the published references. As the Rhiatona cemetery still constitutes the only closely dateable Boeotian contexts which cover an extended period (from Geometric to Hellenistic), it seemed opportune to gather together the published material from each grave. The list contains the primary publication of the grave contents, subsequent photographs and the attributions of painted vases to be found in Haspels ABL and Beazley ABV or ARV'. The numbers given for the contents in each grave are in some cases approximate, and the dates also may need slight adjustment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Number of Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>JHS xxx (1910) 341-2, figs. 5-6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>mid-8th c.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Aby 88, plate 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>mid-8th c.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JHS xxx (1910) 344-6, figs. 6 and 8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>late 8th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>JHS xxx (1910) 342-4, figs. 6-7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>late 8th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Aby 83, pls. 1 and 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>late 8th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Aby 84, pls. 1 and 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>late 8th or early 7th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Aby 88 and 13, fig. 4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>650-40 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>JHS xxx (1910) 346-9, figs. 9-12; Aby 4 pl. 4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>650-25 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Aby 85, pls. 1, 4-6, 10 and 12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>650-600 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>JHS xxx (1910) 350-53, figs. 13-16; Aby 5 pl. 9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>late 7th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Aby 83-4, pls. 1, 4 and 6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>late 7th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Aby 84, pls. 3, 6, 8, 9 and 21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>late 7th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Aby 88, pls. 5-6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>late 7th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>JHS xxx (1910) 353-6, figs. 17-20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>c. 600 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Aby 83, pls. 4, 5, 8 and 21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>c. 600 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Aby 83, pls. 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>c. 600 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Aby 85, pls. 1, 8, 9 and 21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>c. 600 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125a</td>
<td>Aby 86-7, figs. 2 and 3, pls. 5 and 12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>c. 600 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125b</td>
<td>Aby 87, figs. 2 and 3, pls. 8 and 9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>c. 600 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Aby 85-6, pls. 3, 4, 6, 10 and 17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>early 6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125c</td>
<td>Aby 87, figs. 2 and 3, pls. 3, 10 and 13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>590-70 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125d</td>
<td>Aby 87, figs. 2 and 3, pls. 13 and 16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>590-80 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125e</td>
<td>Aby 87, figs. 2 and 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>early 6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101a</td>
<td>Aby 86, fig. 1, pls. 2, 10 and 12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>570 B.C.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101b</td>
<td>Aby 86, fig. 1, pls. 2, 7, 12, 15 and 17; see also 89</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>590-80 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>6th and 5th 92, pls. 7, 8 and 10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>c. 570 B.C.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Aby 85, pl. 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>c. 570 B.C.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Aby 83, pls. 2, 4-13, 15-16 and 21; Payne NC 60; ABL 5, note 2; 4, 4</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>580-70 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Aby 83, pls. 2, 5, 7, 13 and 15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>c. 580 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>JHS xxix (1909) 310-16, figs. 1-5 and 8; BGP 13</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>mid. 6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>BSA xiv (1907-8) 250-56, figs. 6 and 12, pls. 9 and 15; BGP 13-14, pls. 1 and 7; AE 1912, 114, figs. 12-13; AE 1915, 116-17, figs. 1-3, 118-19, figs. 4-5; 6th and 5th pls. 13 and 17; Aby 58, fig. 8, pls. 13-14 and 16; ABL 3; 4, 2, 12, 17-18; 5, 10, note 32; 25, note 2; 29, note 3; 26, Studies Robinson pl. 11, a-c; ABY 50, 5 and 8; 655, 12</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>560-50 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>BSA xiv (1907-8) 257-64, figs. 7 and 9-12, pl. 10; JHS xxix (1909) 332-4, fig. 15 and pl. 25; BGP 14, pls. 1 and 7; AE 1915, 113, figs. 10 and 11; AE 1915, 123, no. 1; 5th and 6th pls. 13 and 17; Origin of Tyranny 115; JHS xlix (1929) pls. 13, 12 and 16; Aby 36, fig. 5, 38, fig. 6, pls. 7, 9, 15 and 16; JHS lii (1932) 56, 1 A 1; ABL 4, 13-14; 51, 15, note 4; 16; 28, note 2; 36; Studies Robinson pl. 11, a-c; ABY 30, 5 and 8; 655, 12</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>560-50 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Aby 84 (maybe not a grave); 22, note 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>mid. 6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Aby 86 (with possible intrusions)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>550-25 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>6th and 5th 86-7; Aby 5 pl. 17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>mid-6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Aby 2, note 1 (burnt grave), pl. 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mid-6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Aby 2, note 1, pls. 13, 16 and 17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>mid-6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Number of Contents</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 51</td>
<td>6th and 5th 88; 103, fig. 6, pls. 6, 8 and 13; Abyr pls. 14–16</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>mid-6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 3 85</td>
<td>6th and 5th 94–6; 103, fig. 6, pls. 2, 4–8, 10–13; Abyr pls. 14 and 17</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>540–90 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 31</td>
<td>6th and 5th 85–6; 102, fig. 6, pls. 1, 7–9, 11–12, 14, 17–20; ABL 205, 6,</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>515 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 5</td>
<td>6th and 5th 96–7; 103, fig. 6, pls. 3, 9 and 14; Abyr 471, 2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>late 6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 133</td>
<td>6th and 5th 99; 103, fig. 6, pls. 3, 7, 11, 15 and 18; Abyr 500, 45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>late 6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122 112</td>
<td>6th and 5th 97–8; pls. 3, 7–8, 10, 14–16, 20–21; Abyr pl. 17; ABL 68,</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>late 6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 25</td>
<td>6th and 5th 82–4; 103, fig. 6, pls. 1, 8–12, 14–16, 19 and 21; Abyr pls.</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>510–500 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 18</td>
<td>6th and 5th 90–90; pls. 2, 5–8, 12, 16, 19 and 20; Abyr pls. 14, 17 and 19</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>500 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 102</td>
<td>6th and 5th 92–3; pls. 2 and 22; Abyr 628, 5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>late 6th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 15</td>
<td>6th and 5th 98–9, pls. 2 and 15; Abyr pls. 14 and 19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>early 5th c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Number of Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>BSA xiv (1907–8) 299–304, fig. 23, pls. 13–14 (grave not complete); ARV² 140, 29; 381, 177.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500–480 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22(a)</td>
<td>BSA xiv (1907–8) 299–300, 304–5 (part of Grave 22?)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>BSA xiv (1907–8) 298, fig. 22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>early 5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>6th and 5th 90–91; 103, fig. 6, pls. 2, 11 and 15; ABV 585, 6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>early 5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>JHS xxix (1909) 321–9, figs. 8–13, pls. 23 and 24; BGP 18; AE 1912, 102–111, figs. 1, 4 and 5; 115, fig. 15, pls. 2 and 6; 6th and 5th pls. 15–16 and 22; ABL 112, 6; 141; 150, note 2; 259, 115; ABV 530, 70; 546, 213 and 218; 547, 246; 560, 513; 571, 701 and 707; ARV² 302, 10; 306, 7.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>early 5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>JHS xxix (1909) 329–31, fig. 14 (disturbed); BGP pl. 9; 6th and 5th pl. 10; Ayrh pl. 17.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>early 5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>BGP 41–2, pl. 10 (disturbed)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>first half of 5th c. and c. 400 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Ayrh 2, note 1 ('cluster of objects'), pl. 19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>first half of 5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>6th and 5th 87–8; Ayrh pl. 20; ABL 136; ABV 566, 622</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>mid-5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>6th and 5th 100–101, pl. 3; Ayrh 58, fig. 8, pl. 20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>mid-5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>BGP 40–41, pl. 9; ABL 136; 184; 189; ABV 576, 6; 577, 24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3rd qu. 5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>6th and 5th 101–2, pls. 10, 16, 22, 23 and 25; Ayrh pl. 20; ABV 566, 623</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>440–30 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114(a)</td>
<td>6th and 5th 91; 103, fig. 6, pls. 1, 10 and 24; Ayrh pl. 20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>430–20 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>6th and 5th 94; 105, fig. 6, pls. 2, 10–11 and 24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>430–20 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>6th and 5th 102, pl. 24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>420–10 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>BGP 49–50, pl. 15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2nd half of 5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>6th and 5th 89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2nd half of 5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114(b)</td>
<td>6th and 5th 91–2, pl. 25 (maybe not a grave)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>c. 400 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>BGP 42–5, pl. 11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>end of 5th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>BGP 46–7, pls. 12–13 (see also 45–6)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>early 4th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>BGP 47–8, pls. 12–13 (see also 45–6)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1st half of 4th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>6th and 5th 87, pl. 25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1st half of 4th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>BGP 50–52, pl. 15; 6th and 5th pl. 10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>mid-4th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>BGP 52–3, pl. 16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>early 2nd half of 4th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>BGP 53–5, pl. 17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2nd half of 4th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>BGP 48–9, pl. 14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>BGP 55–6, pl. 18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>mid-3rd c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>BGP 56, pls. 18–19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>mid-3rd c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>BGP 56–7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>mid-3rd c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>BGP 45 (rifled)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>BGP 41 (a group of fragments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>JHS xxx (1910) 342–3, note 44 (disturbed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Southampton.

B. A. SPARKEs.
NOTES

Further thoughts on the 'Cycle' of Agathias

We should like to make the following additions and modifications to our article 'The Cycle of Agathias' in JHS lxxxvi (1966) 6–25:

p. 7: We might have added that AP xiii, xiv, xv and probably iv as well are non-Cephalian.

p. 7, n. 11: We would now retract the view that Planudes used the Palatinus direct. Cf. Gow, Sources and ascriptions 51, and F. Lenzenziger, Zur griechischen Anthologie (Diss. Zürich, 1965) 31–55. But our argument at, e.g., p. 12, para. 4, is unaffected, since it is clear that Planudes used a MS closely allied to the Palatinus (more closely, indeed, than Lenzenziger, op. cit. 55, supposed).

p. 8, n. 18: We should now place Eutolmius in the Cycle rather than in Palladas' Sylloge, and probably admit Diogenes as well. Possibly also, on the strength of their titles, Thomas Scholasticus (xvi 315) who may be the Thomas mentioned by Agathias in xvi 80. This latter Thomas is probably not, as Beckby (index nom. s.) supposed, a painter, but the man who commissioned the painting in question or wrote the epigram for it (cf. G. Mathew, Byzantine Aesthetics [1963] 74). Mathew assumes that he is the Thomas Curator of xvi 41: this is certainly possible, but no more.

p. 10: i 34 was written before Agathias' fourth year of legal studies. It was in 551 or 552 that he began them (see ch. i of Averil Cameron's forthcoming monograph on Agathias), and so the poem can be dated to 554 or 555. For the question of the inclusion of this poem in the Cycle see below on p. 22.

p. 11: Concerning line 1 of SEG xvi no. 474, J. and L. Robert report (Bulletin Epigraphique 1960, no. 347), 'nous avons lu sur la pierre Kıpatövâ sans aucune trace d'un rho.'

p. 12: If we are correct in distinguishing the John grammaticus of ix 628 from John Barbcuallus, then it would be attractive to identify him with John grammaticus, the author of an 'Ekphrasis toĩ koumikou πίνακος (preserved only in the Palatinus, between AP xiv and xv). The lemma to an epigram (xv 4) alluding to this Ekphrasis styles its author 'John grammaticus' just like the lemma to ix 628. P. Friedlaender (Joh. von Gaza [1912] 110–112) has shown that the author of the Ekphrasis belongs in the middle of the sixth century, and thus it would be natural enough for him to have been selected as a contributor to the Cycle. The poem, written by Paul, appears to imitate a phrase from Agathias' poem on the bridge over the Sangarius, written (cf. p. 9) c. 560: for Agathias' priority, cf. Mattson, op. cit. (p. 26, n. 89) 86.

On Theaetetus, see Koster's note, below.

Theaetetus pseudogrammaticus

NOTES


W. J. W. KOSTER

Groningen

A Note on IG II 114

The battered stone which bears the bouleuthic oath and a decree of the demos about the boule has the same width as and is universally agreed to be a companion piece to IG II 115. That text begins with a decree of 409–8 ordering the anagrapheis to obtain Draco’s law on homicide (from the basileus, as R. S. Stroud will show) and write it on the stone. On the face of it, they are merely to make a copy, and, though the stray voice has been raised to suggest that they altered the text, most discussion has been about the age of the text before them and the changes that it might have undergone before 409.

The bouleuthic stone is unprotected by a decree, as it stands, and encouragement for those who might wish to suppose that it represents a revised text comes from Philochorus F 140, which suggests a change in legislation about the boule in 410–9. There has not, to my knowledge, been any very great enthusiasm for massive revision or new formulation. To put it at a minimum, τάδε ἐδοξασε ἐλλ’ Ἀθηναῖοι (l. 34) and μὲ ἐνα πόλις ἐπιβαλεῖ (l. 41) do not sound like constitutional procedure or even formal language of 410, and there has been at least one attempt to carry the whole document back beyond the Persian War. The archaism seems even Hignett3 ‘that it was to some extent a copy of another earlier text’, but he found it ‘incredible that in 410, when the full democracy had just been restored after an oligarchic interval, a law on this subject should have been in the hands of the demos, and at least as far back as a faithful copy of a previous law; some additional safeguards suggested by previous experience must have been inserted.’

Wade-Gery’s text of line 43 runs ἡπόσος ἄν δοκεῖ [τὸ] δέμοι [τὸ] Ἀθηναίον πλήθος περί [τιτο].1 and readers have probably assumed, as I did myself, that the spaces represented by the first τὸ were so worn or damaged as to be illegible.2 This is however not the case, as may be seen quite clearly on BSA xxxiiii (1932–33) pl. 15. The three spaces are in excellent condition. They were never inscribed with letters. Instead each space does have, rather left of centre, a vertical pair of points, similar to those used, in single pairs, at least in ll. 34, 44 and 50. The line runs ἡπόσος ἄν δοκεῖ : : : δέμοι τὸ τὸ [τὸ] Ἀθηναίον πλήθος περί [τιτο].

Even if one were to assume that a major break in the structure of the text at this point for no very obvious reason occasioned a triple punctuation instead of a single one, the thought of a clause ending ἄν δοκεῖ and another beginning δέμοι τὸ [τὸ] Ἀθηναίον πλήθος περί [τιτο] is not attractive. The traditional restoration must be correct, and the [τὸ] once appeared somewhere. Where the somewhere was, I do not know, but it was not on this stone, which was carved by a careful man transcribing a damaged original with such fidelity that he preferred to mark three blank spaces which he could not read rather than make what appears to us the easiest of conjectures. This stone was put up on the Acropolis and I imagine the original had been there too, just as the Draco code came from the basileus and went back on stone to the Stoa Basileia.

D. M. LEWIS

Christ Church, Oxford.

1 I quote by Wade-Gery’s line numbers (BSA xxxiiii [1932–33] 120–i).

2 Cloché, REG xxxiiii (1920) 28–35.

3 History of the Athenian Constitution 153 f.

4 Velsen and Koehler seem to have reported part of a crossbar, whence τ[α] in both editions of IG.

Three new enquiries from Dodona

It is due to the efficient scholarship and generous kindness of Professor Henri Seyrig that I am able to publish the texts of three new enquiries from Dodona. In 1929 he bought three lead tablets in Athens, which were sold to him as coming from that site. They were at that time still rolled up in the form in which most of them have been found. This fact itself can be regarded as a strong confirmation that they were genuinely derived from Dodona. Professor Seyrig proceeded to unroll the strips and fortunately copied carefully the texts which he found within. He then put them aside, and when some years later he looked at them again, the lead had completely disintegrated. Thus the original tablets are gone, but Professor Seyrig’s copies survive, and he has kindly put them at my disposal for publication.

These enquiries are generally quite typical of those already found, but also have some individual features of interest. They are all from private enquirers asking Zeus for guidance on personal subjects. The lead tablets showed no signs of previous use. They were not palimpsests, as are some other extant examples. Also as preserved at the time of copying, they showed no marks on the reverse of the tablets, such as were used to distinguish one enquiry from another after it had been rolled up. But such marks may have been on the back of the first line or two, which in each of the three instances appear to be missing. The lettering, as can be seen by Professor Seyrig’s facsimiles, is of an indefinite post-5th century B.C. type (fig. 1 a–c).
was not common in Athens. Kirchner (P.A. 7710 and 7711) lists only two examples.

(b) 4.9 cm × 2.5 cm

καὶ ἐ ἄμενον

μου μετά Διω-

[τί]μοι ἐργαζόμεν

νοι Μεγάροι[σ].

The verb of enquiry has again been lost together with the first lines of the question. Possibly the enquirer’s name may also have occurred in this part of the sentence, but some extant enquiries are anonymous. Enquiries, such as this, on business prospects are very usual at Dodona. One may compare Carapanos, Dodone et ses ruines, ii, plate XXXV.2, where the simple use of the verb ἐργάζομαι recurs. It is interesting that the proposed place of business, Megara, is named, but it is not certain that the enquirer meant the city in mainland Greece and not one of those of the same name in Sicily.

(c) 8 cm × 1.8 cm (to left) and 3 cm (to right)

η ἀφέσσεις οἰκαδε πός

τὸν ἀδικάραθνον.

Again the lines with the verb of enquiry are lost. Also the use of the second person seems colloquial. It appears to be an enquiry about a suitable place of residence—whether the enquirer is to retire and join his brother. The forms used are not Attic, but are scarcely distinguishable enough to suggest the precise dialect of the writer.

Trinity College, Dublin.

H. W. Parke.

Greek Mosaics: A Postscript
(Plates XXIII-XXIV)

These notes supplement and correct my article ‘Greek Mosaics’ in JHS lxxv (1965) 72–89 (hereafter GM).

I. Additions

Miss Elizabeth Ramsden, who is making a corpus of Roman mosaics in Greece, has drawn my attention to three important pebble-mosaics omitted from my survey. I am most grateful to her for this, and for permission to use her descriptions and photographs, reproduced in plates XXIII and XXIV. I am also very grateful to Professor Orlando for permission to publish the photographs of the mosaic in Sicyon, no. 1; and to the late Dr. N. Verdelis for permission to publish those of the fragment in Athens, no 3. I know these two floors only from photographs and descriptions; nos. 2 and 4 only from the publications.

1. Sicyon Museum, from Sicyon (Kiaton). Found by Professor Orlando in 1940 and published by him in Praktika 1941, fig. 6 (see also BCH 1940/1 241,
fig. 7). Here, plate XXIV. 2.80 × 2.80 m (without entry-panel); blue-black and white pebbles, with a few red.

I said in GM 83 that no ‘Pausian’ flower-mosaics had been found at Sicyon, but this, which I had carelessly missed, is such a floor. It has not the ‘three-dimensional’ spiralling tendrils of the Apulian vases and the floors at Pella, Dyrrhachium and Vergina-Palatitsa; but the stalks supporting the trumpet-flowers show the same idea in a simpler form; and are exactly paralleled in those of the inner ring of flowers on the Vergina-Palatitsa floor, whose central feature too is particularly close to that of this mosaic (both elements best seen in the detail-photograph, AJA lxii [1957] pl. 86, fig. 14). The flowers, too, are foreshortened; and the whole conception and treatment is of the same character.

The idea that in the floral style common to South Italian vases and mosaic floors in Macedonia and Thessaly we see a reflection of the famous style of flower-painting developed by Pausias of Sicyon, receives some support from the presence of this and the next floor at that city. The very elegant Oriental griffin on the entry-panel, with its feline head and bull’s horns, finds a close parallel on a pebble-floor from Assos which I suggested (GM 86 with n. 75) might be of Hellenistic date. The floral style of the Sicyon mosaic and its technical character make an earlier date likely (see on nos. 2 and 3 below), and it probably takes the Assos floor with it. The horned feline griffin is rare in Greek art, regular in Achaemenid; and in these floors, especially this from Sicyon, there seems foreign influence in the style of drawing as well as the nature of the beast—perhaps through textiles; see III, 6, below.

2. Sicyon Museum, from Sicyon (Kiaton). Fragments found in illicit excavations, and collected by Professor Orlandoos in 1940; published by him in a restored drawing, Praktika 1941, 60, fig. 7. Black and white pebbles. Circular design (originally in square?): central rosette surrounded by bead-and-reel and simple scroll supporting eight palmettes of two alternating types, and between them foreshortened trumpet-flowers; wave-pattern border.

Only the flowers here recall the ‘Pausian’ style. The palmettes belong to an older but enduring tradition, represented at Olynthus and, for instance, in the centaur-mosaic at Sicyon (GM 83 with n. 57), in the floor of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia (GM 85 with n. 69), and in the border of the Amazonomachy at Pella (GM 78 with n. 32). The bead-and-reel is found in the border of the Pella lion-hunt (GM 80 with n. 44, and 82).

Professor Orlandoos dated 1 to c. 400 B.C. and 2 to the first half of the fourth century. In technique at least, like the other Sicyon mosaics, between the crude simplicity of Olynthus and the extreme refinement of Pella. What this means in terms of relative and absolute dating must in our present state of knowledge remain vague (see GM 83-7, 69); but I should suppose these to belong most probably to the second half of the fourth century. See also on 3 below.

3. Athens, Fetiye Djami, from Athens (found ‘near the Arch of Hadrian’ in the late nineteen-fifties). Unpublished. Plate XXIII, 1-4. I know this piece from Miss Ramsden’s excellent photographs and description. Fragment, c. 1.50 × 0.80 m. (no original edge preserved). Circle-in-square composition; original d. of circle c. 1.30 m.; original extent of surround unknown. The pebbles of the ground are black, those of the main designs grey, with yellow (eyes, hair, beard), pink and red for details; white is used for the tondo-border (a double row) and the letters.

In the tondo: hero (Herakles rather than Theseus) and centaur. Herakles (beardless?—the face has suffered), attacking from behind, pulls back the centaur by the hair with his left hand and swings the club in his right behind his head. The centaur’s head (pink details) and human torso are preserved, with the left arm flung up and back, the open hand almost touching the end of the club. His right arm is stretched back towards Herakles’ breast, but is lost below the elbow, with the lower part of the hero’s left arm and the front of his body. The beginning of the centaur’s equine back is preserved, and part of one foreleg raised in front. Behind Herakles, under his raised right arm, is preserved part of his quiver, ‘hanging’ on the background, red, with grey outlines and a yellow interior showing.

Round the inner edge of the tondo-border, to be read from outside, runs part of a signature:... or... ετω...; ΩΝ between the centaur’s foreleg and his left elbow; ΕΠ between his left hand and Herakles’ right; Ω between Herakles’ right elbow and the corner of the quiver.

Outside the border, as though in the two upper corners of a square in which the circle is thought of as inscribed, are two birds (doves? pink details), displayed as though in flight, their heads breaking the outer pebble-circle of the tondo-frame. There must have been two more, at the lower imagined corners; and the rough square formed by the circular picture and the four birds, was itself enclosed by big scroll-work with foreshortened trumpet-flowers. One such flower, supported on broad scrolls, is set horizontally, at the level of the heads in the tondo-picture, by the lower wing of the left-hand bird. Traces of a precisely similar arrangement, with the flower set vertically, are visible by the upper wing of the right-hand bird, suggesting, what is in any case probable, a symmetrical design; but the whole cannot be reconstructed.

The light-on-dark tondo with encircling inscription suggests a red-figure cup, though in those the inscriptions are normally read as viewed from the centre—a difference due to the different scale and nature of the objects. The basic formula of the design is very old, and is found in much this form on the two Boston cups by Aristophanes, of around 400 B.C., though there the centaur carries Deianira, his face is in
three-quarter view, and the hero does not grasp his
hair. The centaur here may likewise be Nessos, but
he is not identified.

The form of signature could have been ἔποιοι(εί)
or ἔποιοι(εί)ησαν (see GM 81 and 88). The sequence
of letters is interrupted by pictorial elements; when
not so (DN and EIT) they are rather widely spaced.
The background at the bottom of the picture may
have been rather freer than at the top, but if the
longer form were used the artist’s name must have
been short, and cannot in any case have been very
long.

The birds shown in flight at the corners of the
composition, as it were supporting the circular picture,
are a most unusual as well as attractive feature. It
seems a slightly odd invention for a floor; and remem-
bering Pliny’s statement that Pausias was the first to
paint coffered and vaulted ceilings, I wonder if this
is not a reflection of a ceiling-design.

The character of the scroll-and-flower-work is, so
far as preserved, very like that of the floor from
Sicyon, no. 1 above, though a little simpler. In tec-
chnical quality it seems less refined, though that
may be in part due to poorer condition. Its pictorial
polychromy seems more advanced, colour being used
to suggest modelling on flowers and birds, while the
foreshortening of the flowers on the Sicyon floor is
purely linear. Technique and style alike of the
Athens pavement are less advanced than those of the
stag-hunt at Pella signed by Gnosis; and the second
upright of Gnosis’s I’ is slightly shorter than that at
Athens.6 The Athens floor then is probably the
earlier, and the first signed mosaic of which we know.
The difference in stylistic development, however,
does not seem great, the earlier impression made by
the Athens piece being partly due to its less refined
technical quality; and Mr Peter Fraser, with whom
I have had the benefit of discussing these inscriptions,
considers that both belong to essentially the same
stage of development, and suggests a date for both in
the late fourth or early third century.4 The floor
at Athens, then, may very well date from the time of
Demetrios of Phalerum’s rule (GM 84 f.), and that
at Pella to the early third century, as the excavators
suggest.

4. Pella. In BCH xc (1966) ii, 871 and 875 fig. 5,
is published a drawing of an important new mosaic,
the circular floor of a tholos: floral complex, sur-
rrounded by a frame of animal-scenes in panels (one
preserved: stag attacked by griffin and feline). It is
noted that the beautiful floral resembles that at
Verghina-Palatitis but seems earlier. It is also very
like our no. 1 from Sicyon.

II. Correction

GM 75 ff. and 82: use of lead and terracotta in
the mosaics of Building I at Pella. Correcting an
erratic reference to bronze in my Greek Painting I said
in GM that only leaden strips were used to contour
limbs in these mosaics, terracotta only for locks in
the hair of Dionysus. In fact leaden contour-strips
are used in the Dionysus and centaur-mosaics, terra-
cotta strips in short sections not only in Dionysus’
hair but for limb contours in the lion-hunt, where
leaden strips are not found.5

III. Bibliography

1. The proceedings of the Paris Congress (GM
75 n. 17, etc.) are now published as La Mosaique
Griech-Romaine (Colloques internationaux du centre
national de la recherche scientifique, Paris, 1965;
here MGR). Mr Petas’ contribution, Mosaics at
Pella, is pp. 41–56, with ten black-and-white plates
and one coloured. It is particularly valuable for its
full discussion and illustration of technical processes.
The references in GM should read: GM 76 n. 22
(patterned floors of anterooms): MGR 40 f.; GM
77 n. 25 (beads in Dionysus’ hair): MGR 46; GM
82 n. 55 (scroll-work on vases and Dyrachium
mosaic): MGR 55 (Supplément).

Some other pebble-mosaics are also illustrated and
discussed in this volume. A detail from Motya (GM
76 and 84) is given by Becatti (fig. 1 and p. 16) in
his most important paper on black-and-white mosaic
in Italy. A. Vostchinina (pp. 315–19 and figs. 1–2
and a) republishes the floor from Cherson with bath-
ing women (GM 86 with n. 75). It comes from the
bathroom of a house dated third to second century
b.c., and is said to belong to the last reconstruction,
but Mme. Vostchinina notes its dependence on fourth-century models. She also illustrates (fig. 5)
a detail of the floor from Olbia with palmettes and
heraldic animals; and points out that new investiga-
tions at Olbia have allowed the dating of the Hellen-
istic houses to the third century, not as previously
thought, the late Hellenistic period.

An important review-article on this volume is in
REG lxix (1966) 704–26, by Ph. Bruneau, who also
publishes in BCH xc (1966) 371–427, a mosaic from
Delos of c. 100 b.c. with Lycurgus and Ambrosia,
most important for iconographic continuity.

2. In Hesperia xxiv (1965) 77–88, pls. 23–4, M. K.
Donaldson publishes with good photographs an
interesting pebble-mosaic in a cave-sanctuary in
Piraeus, with a chariot, previously available only in
an unsatisfactory drawing in Eph. Arch. 1925–6, 1–8
(Dragatis).

3. In Essays in Memory of Karl Lehmann (1964)
190 ff., Phyllis W. Lehmann writes on ‘The Tech-
nique of the Mosaic from Lykosoura’, with a valuable
discussion of pebble-mosaic and the transition to
tesserae.

4. In Scientific American December 1966, 94–105,
Makaronas publishes an article on Pella with illustra-
tions of mosaics including (cover) a large detail of
the animal’s head from the lion-hunt, showing very
clearly the use of terracotta strips (II, above).

5. Mosaic at Sparta (GM 86 with n. 74). The cen-
tral panel is now illustrated in BCH xc (1966) ii,
796 fig. 5, where the floor is said to be from a Hellenistic building.

6. I should have mentioned F. v. Lorentz's important article Βαρθαλόντων ἑραίστατα in RM ii (1937) 165–222, in which he elaborated the thesis that pebble-mosaics derive from Oriental textiles. He perhaps exaggerates the importance of textile-influence; but for the early patterned floors the thesis must be essentially sound, and I did not sufficiently emphasize the connection (GM 74). See also Rumpf in Fraser and Rumpf, Two Ptolemaic Dedications (JEA xxxviii [1952] 73 ff.; Webster, Bull. John Rylands Lib. xiv (1962) 261 ff. and Hellenistic Art (1967) 23 ff.).

7. Centaureasses (GM 77 f.). A full and delightful discussion of these creatures is now provided by D. E. Strong, BMQ xxx (1965) 36–40 with pl. 6.

8. Plate XXIII, 5 illustrates the fragment from Corinth, GM 84 with n. 62.

MARTIN ROBERTSON.

Oxford.

1 ARV² 1319 nos. 2 and 3; CB iii pls. 83–7, pp. 103–5 with refs. and discussion. Deianira's outstretched right hand corresponds almost exactly in position to the left hand of the centaur in the mosaic. Pithiros, in the groups on the exteriors of the cups, pulls back the centaur's head by the hair, and the figure is much like that of Herakles here, except that he thrusts down with a spit instead of swinging a club; but the centaur there resists, clutching with both hands at the hero's left arm.

2 idem et lacunaria primus pingere instituit, nec camaras ante eum taliter adornari mos fuit. NH xxxv 124; Overbeck 1750; GM 83 and 85.

3 Both are in fact made of three pebbles; but Gnosius uses five for the first upright, the craftsman of the Athenian pavement only four.

4 Mr. Fraser also tells me that he thinks the lettering of Sophilos' Alexandria mosaic dates it in the second century B.C. (GM 88).

5 See Petras in MGR (below III, 1), 48; also III, 4.

Kimon's Capture of Eion

Diodoros makes a notorious mistake in his dates for the Eurypontids at Sparta during the fifth century. Under the archonship of Phaidon, 476/5, he records (xi 48.2) the death of Leotychidas, after a reign of 22 years, and the accession of Archidamos, who went on to rule for 42 years. Accordingly, after these 42 years have passed, we find the death of Archidamos and the accession of Agis recorded in 434/3 (xii 35.4). In three subsequent passages, however (xii 42.6; 47.1; 52.1), Diodoros mentions activity of Archidamos during the early years of the Peloponnesian War. Three passages in Thucydides (iii 1.1; 26.2; 89.1) lead us to suppose that Archidamos died sometime in 427, probably in 427/6 (cf. Gomme, Commentary i 405). Thus, given that Diodoros is correct in the length of the reign, 42 years, then his accession date is seven years too high—476/5 instead of the correct 469/8. In consequence, his dates for Leotychidas and Agis are also seven years too high.

The most satisfactory solution of this muddle is that Diodoros used an archon list (A) which recorded Phaidon as archon for 476/5 and Phaidon/Phaeon for 469/8. Finding the death of Leotychidas and the accession of Archidamos dated to the archonship of Phaidon/Phaion (469/8), he unfortunately took this to be the earlier Phaidon (476/5) with the results outlined above. This explanation involves an authority (viz. Diodoros' source for the accession of Archidamos) in addition to Diodoros himself for Phaidon/Phaion as archon for 469/8. A different archon list (B), first evident in Marmor Parium 56, recorded Aephephon as archon for 469/8 in place of the Phaidon/Phaion of list A. In this it is followed, with slight variations in the spelling, by Apollodoros (FG 244 fr. 34) and Plutarch, Kimon 8.8. It is usually assumed that list B is the 'correct' list and that whenever the archonship of Phaidon is elsewhere mentioned it must necessarily refer to 476/5 (Phaidon) and not to 469/8 (Phaidon/Phaion). Whether list B is or is not the historically correct list is unimportant and will not be considered (but see the suggestion in n. 2): it is the second assumption which is here challenged.

The scholiast on Aischines ii 31, in listing the nine disasters which the Athenians suffered around Ennea Hodoi, begins as follows:

το τρότον μὲν Ἀναπαράτος καὶ Λυκόρρον καὶ Κρατίνου στρατευόντων ἐπ’ Ἡπείρου τὴν ἐπὶ Στρυμόν διεφθάραν ἕνα τρωκόν, εἰληφότες Ἡπείρου, ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀθηναίος Φαίδονος.

This cannot be identified with Kimon's expedition, but is probably closely connected with it in some way. The accounts of Kimon's expedition (Hdt. vii 107; Thuc. i 98.1) imply that it was the first capture of Eion, and so εἰληφότες Ἡπείρου in the scholiast must refer to a second capture. Plutarch, Kimon 7.3 ends his description of Kimon's Eion campaign as follows:

οὐχὶ δὲ λαβών τὸν πόλιν ἄλλο μὲν οὖν ἄλλο ἄξιον ὁπλίτης, τῶν πελάτων τῶν βαρβάρων συναπαύσατον, τὴν δὲ χώραν ἐφυγεστέραν ὡδήνος καὶ καλλίστην ὀλίγής παρέδωκε τῷ Ἀθηναίοις.

It seems possible, then, that the details found in the scholiast on Aischines ii 31 are those of the first colonising expedition, after Kimon's capture of Eion, perhaps in the following year. We must assume that in the meantime a native rally had necessitated a second capture by Lysistratos and his colleagues before the colonial activity could proceed. This second expedition is dated to the archonship of Phaidon, which gives us a choice between two years, 476/5 (Phaidon) and 469/8 (Phaidon/Phaeon). Which is preferable can be decided only after establishing a probable date for the initial capture of Eion by Kimon.

Kimon's capture of Eion, along with the reduction
of Skyros and the battle of Eurymedon, is related by Diodorus (xi 60.2) under the archonship of Demotion, 470/69. It would be natural to suppose that he found at least one of these events dated in his chronological source to this archonship. Skyros can be satisfactorily eliminated. Plutarch, Theseus 36.1, dates the Delphic oracle concerning the recovery of the bones of Theseus to the archonship of Phaidon. The expedition cannot have been long afterwards and so, whether Phaidon’s archonship here be 476/5 (Phaidon) or 469/8 (Phaidon/Phaion), it must have taken place either a few years before, or a few years after, 470/69. The choice, then, lies between Eion and Eurymedon for 470/69. Some years ago, confirmation that Eurymedon was fought in 469 was found in Plutarch’s story (Kimon 8.8) of the time when, contrary to custom, Kimon and the board of generals sat as judges in the theatre when Sophokles first competed with Aischyllos in the archonship of Apsephon (list B, 469/8). The prelude of Kimon which occasioned this departure from custom was presumed to have been recently won at Eurymedon. It is significant, however, that Plutarch’s account follows immediately after his description of the Skyros campaign and the popularity won by Kimon when he brought home to Athens the bones of Theseus. Elsewhere with reference to Skyros Plutarch mentioned the archonship of Phaidon, here that of Apsephon. It is my guess that Plutarch is unaware of both passages to one and the same archon year, 469/8. To this year different archons had been attributed by his different sources: his source for the oracle followed list A, that for Sophokles’ first competition with Aischyllos, list B. Thus the oracle, the campaign, the triumphant return and the honour at the tragic contest all belong to 469/8. Eurymedon in all accounts follows Skyros and so, if the above guess is right, happened after 469/8; it cannot have been fought in 470/69. Thus, if both Skyros and Eurymedon be eliminated from the archonship of Demotion, 470/69, the only event which Diodorus can have found so dated in his sources will be Kimon’s capture of Eion. This means that the expedition of Lysistratos, etc., dated by the scholiast on Aischines ii 31 to the archonship of Phaidon, must be placed in 469/8 (Phaidon/Phaion) and not 476/5 (Phaidon). The order of events will be:

| 470/69 | Capture of Eion by Kimon. |
| 469/8 | Kimon’s expedition, following the oracle, to Skyros. |
|       | Success at Skyros, triumphant return. |
|       | Kimon and the board of generals made judges at the dramatic contest. |
|       | Colonising expedition of Lysistratos, etc., to Eion. |

This low date for Kimon’s capture of Eion, if correct, would have important consequences for the interpretation of the early history of the Delian League. I hope to deal with this elsewhere at length.

Charles Fornara has recently (Historia xv [1966] 257 f.) re-argued the case for accepting Justin ix 1.3: haec namque urbs (sc. Byzantium) condita primo a Pausania, rege Spartanorum, et per septem annos possessa fuit; dein variante victoria nunc Lacedaemoniorum, nunc Atheniensium turis habitas est. Fornara suggests 478/7–479/1 for Pausanias’ possession of Byzantium. I agree with him in principle and would add my support to Meyer (Forschungen ii 60) against Wilmowitz (Aristoteles i 145 n. 40; ii 291). But it must be emphasised that there is difficulty on the orthodox chronology with Kimon’s capture of Eion in 476/5. Ephoros clearly makes Kimon sail out of Byzantium on his way to Eion. There can be no prevarication: on the orthodox chronology one must reject Ephoros if one accepts Justin. It may (or may not) be a virtue of the proposed chronology that one can accept both sources. That Thuc. i 98.1 starts his account of how the Athenian archon was established with the capture of Eion does not necessarily exclude his having believed that Pausanias was expelled from Byzantium before the Eion campaign (contra Fornara, art. cit. 270); ATL iii 159 may well be right. The τριστεστή μύθος του Thuc. i 98.1 should not be pressed too hard; it means ‘the first event to be mentioned is their capture of Eion’ and not ‘the very first thing they did after the foundation of the League was to capture Eion’.

Finally, a small point. In the Aristotelian Atheneion Politeia xxvi 1 (κατά γάρ τὸς καυροὺς τοῦτος ἵππος τοῦτος τοῦτος ἄρα τῆς ἱππευστῆς, ἀλλ’ ιδίως προστάτη Κιμόν τοῦ Μικτίδιος, νεότερον ὡς καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ὡς προσπολίσαντα νεότερον) is commonly regarded as corrupt. But on the proposed chronology Kimon, if one supposes that he was at least 30 at the time of his first generalship in 471/0, need not have been born before spring, 501. Thus he need not have been older than 40 in 462/1 and νεότερον could just fit. Plutarch Kim. 4.4 describes him as μειστήν κακοῦρνσαμον at the time of his father’s death in 489. This, for what Plutarch is worth here, might well mean an age nearer (?) under 15 than the 18 or 19 required by the orthodox chronology.

J. D. Smart.

University of Leeds;
Trinity College, Toronto.


Busolt and his followers must suppose that for some reason or other Leotychidas’ years of exile were included in his reign and yet so far no convincing
reason has been suggested (Pleistoanax's 18 years in exile [cf. Thuc. v 16.3] were included by Diodorus xii 75.1 in a total reign of 50 years, but Pleistoanax returned from exile, whereas Leotychidas did not); Meyer failed to notice that Diodorus' statement of Archidamos III's death in 346/5 occurs in a digression (xvi 61.1); and Beloch could give no good reason why Leotychidas' Thessalian expedition should fall in 476/5 other than that this was the year needing explanation. The solution accepted in the text is that of Prof. Andrews and appears in M. E. White, JHS lxxxiv (1964) 145 n. 21.

2 Diod. xi 63.1 ἐν ἄρχιστος δ' Ἀθηναίοι Φαίδωνος (PAHL)/Φαίδωνος (FIKM). Φαίδωνος, the reading of the better MSS and difficult lectio, is generally preferred (cf. Diod. xii 65, Ἰσαίρης (PAHL), right, Ἰππαρχος (FIKM, wrong)). All that can be said against it is that Phaiaon seems to occur nowhere else as an Attic name. Phaidon does, but otherwise there is little to be said for Φαίδωνος. One can only remark that to read Φαίδωνος would make Diodorus' mistake more straightforward and would avoid the necessity—involving in reading Φαίδωνος—of believing that the scholiast on Aischines ii 31 and Plutarch Theseue 36.1 (or their sources) joined Diodorus in misreading Phaiaon in list A as Phaidon.

Dr H. B. Mattingly has suggested to me the possibility that Φαίδωνος (later corrupted to Φαίδωνος) occurred as a misreading (or mishearing) of (Ἀπό) φίλους during the early transmission of Diodorus' MSS. If this were so, it would nullify the whole of the above argument. It would be a pity to have to abandon Andrew's neat solution of Diodorus' mistake in the dating of Archidamos' reign. But Mattingly's suggestion remains attractive and one way of making use of it for our own purposes would be to suppose that early (? 3rd cent. B.C.) in one branch of the transmission of a source for the Athenian archon list (say a MS of Hellanikos) Apsephon was corrupted to Phaiaon/Phaidon in the way suggested. This would account for the fact that Phaion/Phaidon has on the present hypothesis replaced Apsephon in Diodorus' chronographical source for the archon of 469/8 while it and Apsephon (from the uncorrupted tradition) stand together in Plutarch.


That Plutarch's juxtaposition of the recovery of the bones and the honour at the Dionysia does not necessarily imply chronological connexion was demonstrated by Wilamowitz (Aristoteles i 146 n. 41; cf. Meyer, Forschungen ii 62 n. 2) but this naturally does not show that there was in fact such a connexion.

4 In 471/0 to Fornara's 472/1 and hope to present detailed arguments elsewhere. For a sceptical attitude towards possible earlier generalships (e.g. Plut. Aristeid. 10.10; 23.1; Kim. 6.1) see Jacoby, CQ xli (1947) 2, n. 4.

5 Cf. Jacoby CQ xlii (1947) 1: Ion was 'about fifteen years of age' when Plutarch Kim. 9.1 described him as παντνάπασα μεγάλικον. For a different interpretation of Kim. 4.4 see ATL iii 160 quoting Plut. Brutus 27.2.

I am grateful to Dr. J. P. Barron and those who attended the seminar Athenian Imperialism at the London Institute of Classical Studies in 1965/6 for much useful discussion of the above arguments.
NOTICES OF BOOKS


‘La critique du XIXe siècle a trop souvent mutilé ou tué la confiance indispensable pour goûter pleinement un auteur comme Homère.’

It is a rare privilege in these hypercritical times to read a book by an author who knows enough about Homer to choose to confine himself to what the poet says about the gods without being side-tracked into speculation about their origins or discussion about religion in general. Almost twenty years have gone by since the writer had the pleasure of reviewing Homère. Le cadre historique and Homère. Le poète et son œuvre, and the present work, like its predecessors, is characterised by learning, good sense and an enviable ability to express multa in parvo.

J’ai donc relu Homère is a salutary reminder that no one can hope to carry the entire Iliad and Odyssey in his head, or recall every event or reference in poems of such length. In this case S. has performed the task for us, reminding us of incidents that we had probably forgotten, and sometimes inspiring us to think again.

The book is divided into two sections, of which the first treats in seven short chapters with ‘Les Dieux chez Eux’. The gods all belong to one family, based on paternal rule and the right of seniority, and though they love their children are more vicious than virtuous and, in general, reflect contemporary society. That they were also coeval with the Trojan War is proved by Linear B, but Homer’s treatment of myth is veiled in mystery. Behind the frivolous lives of the gods lie older and darker stories, like the punishment of Hera or attempts to dethrone Zeus. Homeric contradictions have given much offence to critics. But critics are readers, not listeners, most of whom the inconsistencies would probably escape. The gods differ from men in certain obvious characteristics. They can see further, shout louder and move with a curious lightness, despite their size and weight. There is a gods’ vocabulary and a men’s vocabulary, but is there any reason to suppose that their scales of measurement were also different, just because Ares, doubtless to impress the audience and enhance Diomedes’ prowess, is said to stretch so far? Hephaistos’ marvels are the precursors of science fiction, but the gods’ disguises are in general ‘d’ordre physique’.

Part II deals with the gods es-d’es men. They converse by signs and omens and their intermediaries are professional seers. Homer’s own views on omens sometimes obtrude, e.g. at II. 859 and V. 148 f.

The introduction of Teiresias and Theoclymenos from other epics marks a deliberate attempt by the poet to build a bridge between his work and that of his predecessors. Homer does not sleep. ‘Même un dieu sous forme humaine est quelquefois distrait.’

The gods sometimes display unreasoning jealousy and Calypso gives vent to a cri de cœur in a society where women were not permitted to choose a mate. Nevertheless the gods’ loves and hates are frequently so arbitrary that one is forced to conclude that the incidents figured in previous epics, or when Zeus sends storms against Odysseus, it is merely to justify the hero’s wanderings. Homer is always discreet. ‘Mais comment distinguer entre silence voulu et réelle ignorance?’

The penultimate chapter on Zeus’ protégés curiously ignores the Islands of the Blest. Behind Zeus chained to destiny is an older and free Zeus, the guardian of morality, guests and outcasts.

The ritual of sacrifice ascends to an era when gods and men lived side by side. In Homer the gods, significantly, go abroad to feast. Homer served an apprenticeship in epic, borrowed from other poets and invented for himself. As far as the gods are concerned ‘On pêchait lourd en construisant sous son nom un ensemble rationnel dont serait éliminée toute disparité’. In fact epic has its own logic, and the unity of Homer belongs to the beginning and not the end. This is a delightful and scholarly little work. If it sometimes betrays naïveté is this due to the author’s modesty and occasional irony rather than to any lack of acquaintance with the deeper problems involved. The occasional footnotes are brief and to the point. The references are full and accurate.

John Pollard.

University College of North Wales.


This work is valuable for its statistical data, but rather fanciful in its methodological criteria and conclusions. The author is an enthusiastic follower of the ‘formulaic style’ and ‘oral composition’ approach: the dangers inherent in an exclusive adherence to this creed are evident in his pamphlet.

‘Formalists’ such as O’Neill have often applied a considerable amount of labour to the demonstration of features which are ultimately truisms. To quote Tsopanakis (p. 338), O’Neill Jr. has irrefutably demonstrated that each word tends to occupy a particular place in the verse according to its individual metrical form, not only in the Homeric poems, but in the later epic poets as well: this demonstration will hardly strike as an unexpected revelation those who are conversant with posthomerish epic poetry and consequently know that, owing to the metrical limitations which the poets in the development of
the genre progressively inflicted upon themselves in addition to the restrictions they had inherited from Homer, Homeric formulae could hardly be accommodated, in Alexandrian and post-Alexandrian hexameters, elsewhere than in their respective Homeric sedes (Ludwich, Wiistrand and Keydell have shown this instructively).

Tsopanakis analyses the prosodic and metrical problems connected with the Homeric usage of Ὑ: his statistical data are useful in their exhaustiveness, but his explanation of metrical anomalies as being somehow due to 'oral composition' seems to me far-fetched. The trouble with 'oral compositionists'—I am of course not speaking of Tsopanakis alone!—is that they often do not trouble to acquaint themselves with the relevant research-work already extant. The problems discussed by Tsopanakis have been best elucidated, as far as I know, by Danielsson, Zur metrischen Dehnung im älteren griechischen Epos (Uppsala 1837), La Roche, Homerische Untersuchungen, i (Leipzig 1869) and Hartel, Homerische Studien, i (Berlin 1873). In these works, which every 'oral compositionist' should be compelled to read, satisfactory explanations are offered: for instance, in the case of the εὐφώνεις at Od. xii. 336, rather than hastily postulate with Parry a metrically incorrect juncture of two formulaic hemistichs (cf. Ameis-Hentze ad loc.),—a hypothesis rightly rejected by Tsopanakis himself, cf. p. 372—or attempt the contorted justification submitted by Tsopanakis (p. 372 f.), it is far simpler to explain the metrical phenomenon in the light of Hartel's coherent and balanced conclusions.

To sum up: a useful piece of research, with interesting statistical data.

Giuseppe Gianrande.

Birkbeck College, University of London


The contention of this doctoral dissertation is that the term 'tragic guilt' is an absurdity, since guilt is never the theme of tragedy and when it enters in at all it is κατὰ συμβεβηκός (p. 155),—as a minor element utterly irrelevant to the meaning of a tragic action. 'Guilt' is to be understood in the strict juridical sense of a deliberate breach of law and not with the wider and vaguer connotation which Funke decries in much writing about Greek tragedy.

Funke covers familiar ground in sketching the emergence of the concept, utterly alien to the Homeric poems (even, he argues, to the Ἀρδαί passage of I. 496 ff.), until with the code of Draco the presence or absence of σφοδρα becomes the determining principle in the evaluation of a delict. In his attempt to show that this juridical concept of guilt plays no part in Greek tragedy he concentrates on the Oedipus Tyrannus; his treatment of the plays of Aeschylus and the other plays of Sophocles (Euripides is left out of account) is much more cursory, and he is too easily content to assume that where ὕπατι or ἀνάψυξις is alluded to an act must be regarded as involuntary and guilt therefore ruled out. It is the Oedipus which bears the weight of his argument, on the assumption that it may be taken as the paradigm of tragedy (p. 11). Oedipus, he shows, would not be pronounced guilty by any Greek court, but nevertheless by the frightful punishment which he inflicts on himself accepts responsibility for acts which he did not will; so too do Deianira in the Trachiniae and Adrastus in Herodotus' tale of Croesus and Adrastus. The deeds of all three are instances of acts which lie outside ordinary legal and moral categories and which constitute a breach of the Divine Order for which the doer must suffer, regardless of his intention (p. 119); but whereas the affirmation of a divine law transcending human standards of justice is implicit in the Trachiniae and in Herodotus' story, in the Oedipus it is explicit, above all in the second stasimon, which Funke regards as the heart of the work and programmatic for it. Like many others he sees in it Sophocles' affirmation of faith in a divine order, evoked by his opposition to the moral relativism of the sophists, of which he gives a good account in Chapter VI.

Funke's work shows a wide range of reading and is written persuasively, sometimes eloquently. He has many good ideas, though occasionally, as when he deduces to illuminate the fate of Oedipus and 'not only this, but the essence of tragedy in general' (p. 123) Heraclitus' dark saying ὑπάτων θυτός, θυτων ὑπάτων . . . (B. 62), one is tempted to echo Socrates 'α μνήμη γεννατον, ομα δε και α μνήμη, πλεὶ Ἰλιον γε ταύς δεῖ τινες κόλαθτιοι. Occasionally, too, he offers strained interpretations, as when in OT 965-70 he will allow Oedipus no glimmer of relief and no shadow of doubt in the infallibility of Apollo's oracles. There are other defects of detail, such as the improbable interpretation of Heraclitus fr. B. 79 on p. 126 and of S. Ant. 601-3 on p. 149. But the main defect of the work is its method: in his elaborate treatment of the Oedipus Tyrannus Funke often seems to be flogging a dead horse, and his concentration on this play, which so obviously fits his theory best, has the result that, while he has justified it as a formula for tragedy, he fails to carry conviction that it is the formula,—that, as he claims on p. 155, 'guilt and the tragic are mutually exclusive'.

C. Barratt.

Westfield College, University of London.


This is an original, highly sensible, and beautifully written book, which may well become the standard
theory of the origin of Greek Tragedy. Professor Else is well aware that it is a theory (and it may be vulnerable in certain places). He states his pre-suppositions: (1) only Athens matters, (2) there were two creative leaps, by Thespis and by Aeschylus, (3) the second leap followed in direct line from the first, (4) tragedy was never Dionysiac except that it was presented at the City Dionysia, (5) tragedy did not grow out of any kind of possession or ecstasy, Dionysiac or otherwise.

The first, second, and fifth seem undeniable; argument will centre on the third and fourth. But first Else's positive position must be briefly stated. What we know about Athens in the early sixth century is Solon. 'His religious view of the structure of life... won through personal experience and hard personal meditation, without benefit of revelation or cult' is the prototype for the religiosity of the fifth-century tragedians. Secondly, in the famous Salamis episode Solon himself acted, and in his late poems he used the iambic trimeter or the trochaic tetrameter. Another milestone was the inauguration of the recital of the Iliad and Odyssey at the Panathenaia, which may have been the act of Solon himself. This is all excellent.

The next step is more doubtful: Peisistratos imported the cult of Dionysos of Eleutherai and from the beginning tragedy was its central, special feature; the Dionysia was created for tragedy. But we have no evidence either that Dionysos of Eleutherai was imported by Peisistratos or that tragedy was from the beginning an element in his festival; the parallel with Archilochos' Parian experiences suggests that neither was true (cf. my Greek Art and Literature, 700–530 B.C., 58 ff.).

But to proceed to the first creative leap, that of Thespis. His name may suggest that he or his father was a reciter of epic (this is an excellent idea). He was the first tragoidos or poet-actor. His prologues may have been frankly introductory; his theseis were either an exhortation or a description of a state of affairs and in either case elicited a response from the chorus; he took his metres from the late poems of Solon. (It should perhaps be noted that essentially the assumed relationship of Thespis to his chorus is that of Aristotel's exarchon, and that the introduction of the tetrameter (as distinct from the iambic trimeter) is ascribed by the Suda to Phrynichos, which may be true: the polymety of the Persae may be a comparatively recent development, which Aeschylus then rejected.) The subject-matter was epic and more particularly the hero's pathos, made immediate by impersonation and realised before the sounding-board of the chorus, who particularly sang hymns and laments. 'It took Thespis' act of genius to bring the heroic vision into focus for a new age.'

What is excellent here is the new emphasis on Athens in the sixth century, on Solon, and on the Panathenaic recitations of Homer as the essential influences on tragedy. They are much more important than Arion, satyrs, Kleisthenes of Sikyon, Charch of Lampsakos, and all the rest, who are thrown out of the window in the first chapter. Spiritually Solon and Homer are sufficient ancestors, but are they also sufficient formally? 'From this quasi-impersonation of Homeric characters' (by the rhapsode) 'it was only a step to full impersonation' (by the actor). If this was the source, why was not Homeric debate also introduced either between two actors or by one actor taking both parts as the rhapsode did? The mask is an essential ingredient of tragedy, and the mask, like the costume, surely came from the cult of Dionysos. We still have to ask what disguised performers were known in Athens in Thespis' time, however we interpret them; the creator of a new art form commonly uses kindred art forms: cinema found it hard to get away from the theatre; television finds it hard to abandon the film. And the Dionysiac story of Pentheus may well have been the prototype for the pathos of the tragic hero; it may not be chance that, as Attic vases show, maenads' costume changes in his lifetime or that the first surviving representation of the Pentheus story can be dated some fifteen years after 534 B.C. Dionysos cannot be entirely discarded.

The second creative leap was made by Aeschylus, and Aeschylean tragedy is seen as the result of the new spirit which inspired Athens to fight and win the Persian Wars. 'The long ordeal of Greece and her salvation through the spirit of Athens and the will of the gods are the prototype of the Oresteia.' The chapter on Aeschylus is excellent: Aeschylus accepted the pathos of the hero but insisted on making sense of it as flowing from certain events or conditions and issuing in others. The urge to do this determines Aeschylus' whole development in so far as we can see it, i.e. from the Persae through the Septem and Supplices to the Oresteia. With the Prometheus Else promises to deal later and this treatment will be awaited with great interest.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University College London.


Dr Aylen attempts to disarm criticism in his preface by admitting that he is making a synthesis of work in very different fields—literary criticism, social history, religion and philosophy—and that he feels it incumbent on him to brave the dangers of superficiality to expound his personal convictions. In the final count, this book is in fact special, sometimes self-contradictory, pleading for his central theme that tragedy is rightly a tool for moral leadership. His argument is supported by aperçus of Greek Tragedy and of modern drama which are often stimulating and provocative to the informed; but for the general reader they are both too partial and too incomplete to be safe guides to the study of these two periods,
NOTICES OF BOOKS

despite his very real interest in stagecraft and dramatic form. Aylen's thesis is that the main function of tragedy is to help mankind to come to terms with death, and to make relevant comments on man's relation to the universe. It is a sort of lively meditation on some issue of permanent significance. It flourished in the Greek world before the development of formal philosophy, in the context of a generally accepted pattern of religious belief, and may now be again revived to fulfill its role in a modern post-war world where, in his view, philosophy has nothing relevant to say about life and men are once again aware of the limitations of human power—circumstances which are very similar to those which produced Greek Tragedy. For this reason he omits consideration of French tragedy and even of Shakespeare, whose work he seems to regard as a highly individual codas to the—to him—truly tragic didacticism of the miracle and mystery plays; and he is highly critical of what he considers misguided analyses of tragedy by writers and scholars (especially those of Henn and Steiner) because they are based on Idealist philosophy, which, together with logical positivism, he regards as entirely obsolete and disproved. He is, of course, correct in arguing that the word tragedy is nothing more than a convenient label whose meaning and application changes with the years by general consent. It is also true that critical literature, from Aristotle onwards, has tended to set canons which have arbitrarily affected the development of tragedy, often with nullifying effect. But he allows too little for the combination of artistic and intellectual perception which has shaped the development of tragedy as a literary form in some way distinct from melodrama, comedy and the rest; and too little for the poet's interest in dramatic expression in its own right. There is too the possibility that this kind of aesthetic development helps the dramatist to express and us to intuit some dimly discerned truths about life, though we may at the same time remind ourselves that we may be imposing a pattern on events which is merely the product of our own mental and emotional processes.

Aylen sets himself first of all to analyse the religious and social background of Greek tragedy and rightly draws attention to the two levels, human and divine, on which Greek drama operates, calling it not 'over determination' with Dodds, but rather 'double determination'. For him, the tragic dramatists are first and foremost not men of the theatre but teachers, using historical myth (he overstresses Greek acceptance of myth as history) to pose the problems of life in their own world against a common background of belief. The change of outlook induced by Ionian natural philosophy, intensified in the fifth century, led to a greater search for purposiveness and order, but also, he argues, weakened the practical and mythological formulae which were the current expressions of belief. Tragedy declined pari passu and died before Euripides was written out (but may it not be that its existence is in part an outcome of the conflict?). Aylen draws his analogy here with the gradual dilution of 'affirmative' pre-Reformation Christianity after the Reformation and remarks that Plato, like the Puritans, found imagery dangerous and that he condemned the poets for being depressing about the after life and for having too much sense of humour; Shakespeare's age is not without its similarities to the fifth century in Greece and Aylen might have been wiser to compare Greek drama in the fifth century more carefully with Shakespeare in his search for effective tragedy. Though the Greek dramatists did not mix humour and serious thought in the same play, as Shakespeare did, they did after all combine both in the same cycle of plays in the Dionysiaic festival; and there is evidence for allowing Shakespeare a more central claim to his place in the tradition of tragedy than is acceptable in Aylen's argument. His parallel with the mystery cycles and miracle plays is less close, despite their ritual origins and their communal setting (cf. Allardyce Nicoll, Development of the Theatre, p. 80 f.), and Aylen is nearer the mark when, in discussing the possibility of modern tragedy, he remarks that rational poetry is the sensible medium for the imaginative, speculative, eclectic, provisional approach which alone makes it possible—words which describe excellently one side of Shakespeare's intensely sensitive understanding, suit Euripides to a T and are not entirely inappropriate even for Sophocles and Aeschylus.

What Aylen has to say in detail about the Greek tragedians, despite interesting comments on imagery and stagecraft and the function of the chorus, is severely limited in range by his special interest and uneven emphasis. His insistence on the communal focus of Greek tragedy leads him to exaggerate the importance of the chorus in the later plays, to underestimate the importance of plot in Sophocles and to discount altogether much of Euripides' later work.

When he turns to the modern world, Aylen sees, though not very hopefully, the possibility of a rebirth of tragedy based on historical myth in a Christian context, though it must not be the Idealist one to which in his view most Christians are bound. There must be a shared point of view between audience and dramatist. Neither Marxists nor existentialists see enough meaning in history to give an adequate scale of reference or value. To be effective for tragedy, religion must create a mythology (did Greek religion create the myths?) and tragedy itself cannot be naturalistic, for naturalism in the theatre encourages the author to avoid showing his own views about the nature of the decision which is his subject. For this reason Ibsen is ruled out of court as a tragedian for, though he has a moral purpose and nostalgia for an heroic past, he avoids the moment of decision—a harsh judgment which does too little justice to Ghosts and to other plays, and is unfair to naturalist drama. Anouilh's plays are indeed shrouds of defiance, as Aylen says, but there is surely something of tragedy in Antigone, even if its cathartic effect falls short by reason of its utter hopelessness. Eliot comes nearest to Aylen's ideal, but falls short by reason of his
idealism. There is, he feels, no double determination, simply God in action, crushing Thomas into martyrdom, first spiritually and then physically, and the chorus loses in effectiveness because it lacks the metrical, antiphonal rhythm of song and dance found in Greek tragedy; but all the same here is a model which shows us how Greek tragedy could be imitated in the modern context.

Aylen is partly right—yet Thomas, from a strictly Christian viewpoint, is not and cannot be a tragic figure at all. The tragedy lies in the conflict and uncertainty which causes a man like Becket (or a woman like Antigone) to die for something he believes to be more important than life itself, the sense of waste and destructive force in human affairs combined with a certain grandeur that ennobles those who follow their bent without fear or compromise against inscrutable and uncertain forces. Eliot is at his most tragic where he is least Christian. The end of tragedy, Aylen concludes, is that every person and every point of view should capitulate to a peace beyond understanding—but that would be the death of tragedy and the end—in another sense—of man. This book cannot, alas! be commended either as a scholarly account of Greek tragedy for the student of classical literature (as the bibliography alone demonstrates) or as a safe guide to the general student of drama. There is some robust argument, at times oddly expressed, and some enlightening comment, particularly on modern plays, but his theme is more the subject for a paper of normal compass than a full-scale book.

P. G. Mason.

The Manchester Grammar School.


In this book the author seeks to establish the approximate date of the Trachiniae by comparing it in respect of particular scenes or aspects of dramatic technique with plays of known date by Euripides and Sophocles. In relation to Euripides his most detailed comparison is between Tr. 900–46 and Alc. 158–98. Both passages are in effect 'messenger speeches', in both we have a description of the words and actions of a wife about to die and in both the centre-piece as it were is the picture of the woman in tears bidding farewell to her marriage bed. Schwing discusses these scenes against the background of each play as a whole. In the Trachiniae he regards this scene as an integral part of the play; the love of Deianira for Heracles, essential for the plot, is here once more emphasised, and it is essential for the audience to know with what thoughts of Heracles she is about to die. In Alcestis he considers the scene much less appropriate, since he does not believe that Alcestis is represented as acting out of love for Admetus, and much less functional. From this he infers that Euripides must have had the Trachiniae in mind when he composed this speech, so that 438 is established as a terminus ante quem for the Trachiniae. This brief outline does not do justice to the thoroughness of the discussion and many interesting points that are made, but the whole argument depends on an interpretation of the Alcestis that is open to dispute. Even if this is accepted the argument is still based on the assumption that where a similar scene or dramatic device appears in two plays, the play in which it is more appropriate and effective must come first; yet this is surely not self-evident.

Schwing then surveys certain aspects of dramatic technique in the plays of Sophocles, including plot structure, developments in the use of dialogue and the dramatic use of oracles. In all these respects he finds the Trachiniae to be similar to Aias and Antigone and contrasted with Oedipus Tyrannus and later plays. I am not sure that he makes sufficient allowance here for the possibility that differences in dramatic technique may be due to differences in the theme of a play rather than to its date, and it may be that there is not enough material to establish a wholly convincing picture of developments in technique. The cumulative effect of the arguments in this part of the book is certainly to suggest an early date for Trachiniae, though they are not conclusive, and less objective than the linguistic evidence for a similar date put forward in 1944 by F. R. Earp. The late date for the Supplices of Aeschylus, based on the external evidence now generally accepted, is a warning against relying on internal evidence. There is however much to be learned from this scholarly and perceptive study of the Trachiniae and other plays apart from the author's main thesis.

P. T. Stevens.

Bedford College, London.


Une enquête policière dure parfois longtemps, l'affaire se révèle plus complexe qu'on ne le pensait d'abord et les résultats auxquels on parvient sont souvent fort éloignés de ceux que l'on entrevoyait en commençant. L'inquiry de M. G. Zuntz est à la fois philologique et historique, mais elle reste conforme aux lois du genre. Un problème: les manuscrits L et P d'Euripide sont-ils copiés sur un modèle commun? ou bien P est-il transcrit de L? Plusieurs enquêteurs successifs se sont prononcés en faveur de l'une ou de l'autre solution, sans que l'affaire fût jamais jugée. Le dernier venu, Alexander Turyn, avait apporté des faits nouveaux, d'un intérêt capital, qui ont décidé M. G. Zuntz à poursuivre ses recherches pour aboutir à un résultat définitif, indiscutable, tel qu'après lui on ne put plus soulever le
problème. Il livre aujourd’hui son dossier au public, qui est le juge en pareille matière; la conclusion qu’il lui propose, c’est que, contre son attente, P est la copie de L. On se défie toujours, plus ou moins, d’une démonstration qui aboutit à la solution entrevue dès le départ. En revanche, un retournement, comme celui de M. Zuntz, témoigne d’une bonne foi respectueuse des faits; notre auteur n’est pas, comme tels de ses contemporains, de ceux qui donnent tort aux faits quand ils contredisent leur théorie. Comment donc lui refuser notre assentiment?

Ou avons donc le dossier. Il se divise en six parties, dont les quatre premières présentent les pièces de l’Inquiry; les deux dernières en constituent l’élargissement. En quelques pages (pp. 1–15), M. Zuntz démontre d’abord, par des preuves externes, que le manuscrit P a été copié sur L; l’élément décisif est un minuscule fragment de paille, adhérant à la surface du papier de L, que le copiste de P a reproduit comme deux points superposés (dicolon). Le livre aurait pu s’arrêter là, et nous aurions eu un excellent article. Mais, en philologie, les choses ne sont jamais toutes simples; et si de bons savants, A. Turyn en dernier lieu, ont soutenu que L et P descendaient indépendamment du même modèle, c’est que des arguments solides étaient leur thèse. M. Zuntz devait donc les réfuter, ou du moins nuancer son affirmation initiale; il s’y emploie dans les deux parties suivantes, qui occupent à elles seules plus de la moitié du volume (pp. 16–192). Avec une extrême minutie et une grande honnêteté, M. Zuntz étudie le travail de Démétrius Triclinius (dont A. Turyn a eu le grand mérite d’identifier la main) sur le manuscrit L et ses effets sur le manuscrit P, puis il dégage les caractères distinctifs des deux témoins et cherche à en déterminer l’origine. Dans la quatrième partie (pp. 193–216), M. Zuntz montre que le travail de Triclinius correspond précisément à celui qu’il a fait sur d’autres poètes grecs.

Les deux qualités fondamentales de M. Zuntz, la minutie de son examen et sa grande honnêteté intellectuelle, ont leur contrepartie. La lecture de certaines pages, remplies de petits faits, n’est pas spécialement attrayante, et l’on se trouve contraint soit de faire pleine confiance à l’auteur, soit de reprendre de bout en bout son travail pour le vérifier; parmi les motifs qui poussent le lecteur à adopter la première solution, il suffit d’indiquer la prudence et la réserve de M. Zuntz, qui présente ses arguments en se gardant de toute extrapolation. D’autre part, dans la masse de petits faits qu’il rassemble et analyse, il nous montre, avec une grande probité, des éléments résiduels qui n’entrent pas dans sa reconstruction; par là même, il invite le lecteur attentif à remettre en place, à son tour, les pièces restantes du puzzle, ou même à le recomposer à sa manière.

Avant de répondre à cette invitation, il convient de préciser que, même aux yeux de M. Zuntz, les relations de L et P sont plus complexes que je ne l’ai laissé entendre jusqu’à présent. Pour les neuf pièces dites alphabétiques, dont l’initiale du titre commence par E, H, I ou K, P est copié sur L, et il en va de même pour le Rhéssos. Pour la triade et les autres tragédies dites du choix, y compris les Bacchantes, P est copié sur un descendant révisé du modèle de L; il est toutefois possible que quatre tragédies: Andromaque, Médiée, Hippolyte et Aïste, remontent directement à L. Ainsi se trouvent résolues plusieurs difficultés, notamment l’absence des Troyens dans L et, dans le même manuscrit, la mutilation volontaire des Bacchantes (interrompues au v. 755, au bas du recto d’un folio dont le verso, comme les pages restantes du cahier, est resté blanc).

Le cadre d’un compte-rendu ne permet pas d’exposer en détail les points sur lesquels le travail de M. Zuntz ne paraît pas pleinement convaincant; pour répondre à son argumentation si précise et si honnête, il faudrait un gros article, sinon un autre livre. Je me contenterai donc de poser quelques questions, qui touchent au fond du problème étudié.

Le manuscrit perdu, utilisé par le copiste de L (et par celui de P, pour ceux qui ne croient pas que P a été copié sur L) pour les pièces alphabétiques, ne comportait-il pas déjà de brèves notes métriques—indigines de Triclinius?—qui ont été transrites dans L par le réviseur (celui que M. Zuntz appelle, et ce serait alors à tort, Tr); qui a aussi corrigé la colométrie, et dans P par le rubricateur?—L’argument du brin de paille, en Hélène 95, paraît décisif; mais le dicolon est-il de première main dans P (sur la photo que donne M. Zuntz, pl. V (e), il semble tracé avec une encre pâle)? et pourquoi le copiste du Laurentius 32, 1, qui travaillait un siècle plus tard, n’a-t-il rien noté à cet endroit? ne pourrait-on pas attribuer la ponctuation à la double difficulté que présente la fin du vers, avec πιον (alors qu’on attendrait le génitif) et le futur actif στρεψει (au lieu du participe aoriste passif στρεπτος)?—Pour reconstituer l’ordre primitif des quatre parties de L, ne faudrait-il pas tenir compte des filigranes du papier (B et D offrent un filigrane unique—un bulbe—absent des deux autres parties, A et C), de la couleur de l’encre (identique à la fin de C et dans D) et des signatures de cahiers utilisées par Nicolas Triclinius, le copiste de la partie B? ne constaterait-on pas, alors, que la tragédie d’Hippolyte se trouvait à l’origine en tête de L comme de P? et si, de nos manuscrits, nous remontons à leurs sources, ne découvririons-nous pas que les deux tragédies mutilées ou incomplètes, les Bacchantes et Iphigénie à Aulis, occupaient la dernière place respectivement dans un manuscrit du choix et dans un manuscrit de la collection alphabétique?—Pourquoi, dans P, le texte doit-il se lire verticalement, une colonne après l’autre, alors que dans L la disposition des vers est du type usuel à cette époque (on change de colonne à chaque vers)?—Comment se fait-il, si P est bien une copie de L, que la fin d’Iphigénie à Aulis ait été, à partir du v. 1570, transcrite par une main différente dans l’un et l’autre manuscrits, mais que son addition
NOTICES OF BOOKS


Earlier publications by both scholars had indicated their common interest in this strangely under-edited play. In his dissertation of 1955 Biehl discussed a number of textual points, often to good purpose; more recently di Benedetto put out two good articles, the more accessible of which appeared in Hermes 89 (1961) 298 f. The two editions are however so different that a comparative review is hardly practicable.

I am at a loss to divine the kind of reader for whom Biehl's well-produced edition is intended. For continuous text it substitutes (in the interests of economy?) a list of passages (pp. 216 ff.) where Murray's readings are rejected, though the lyric portions are set out in the metrical analysis (pp. 187 ff.). Critical apparatus, lists of MSS and papyri are lacking, and there is not so much as a vestigial literary introduction. What is offered is 183 pages of commentary, divided into 26 sections, κατακεκοριματισμένα, each headed by a paraphrase of the ensuing action. The notes are couched in a staccato style, relying heavily on inverted commas and exploiting parentheses much as Mr Alfred Jingle might have done, had that Dickensian worthy ever had to expound Euripides: a good random-chosen specimen is the note on 296. Points of dramatic technique pass Biehl by, and he is tantalisingly mute on other major problems, as at 502, 755, 813, 1253 f. and elsewhere. All too often paraphrase or jargon-labels such as Ersatzhandlung (268, 1293) Motiv der 'Geringfügigkeit' beim Opfer (382) Tektonik der Wortsprache (1172) and the like do duty for critical discussion. However, some interesting parallels such as those to Timotheus' Persae in the notes on the Phrygian's monody (e.g. 1397, 1420, 1487 al.) caught my eye, and no doubt there is useful interpretative material here for the inquisitive to disinter, but the overburden takes a deal of shifting as quite elementary points bulk large and new material (see below) sometimes goes unnoticed.

Di Benedetto's edition materially advances the study of the play. He confines himself in his Introduction to textual matters, giving (pp. ix-xvii) a concise résumé of the conclusions of his book on the Euripidean textual tradition of 1955 (not yet accessible to me). I infer that in it he makes substantial allowance for contamination within and between the main branches of the tradition as Turyn, in his magisterial but over-schematic work of 1957 did not (on this see Lloyd-Jones, Gnomon 30 [1958] p. 509); this is surely gain. Di Benedetto has himself collated most of the key-MSS, it seems alertly. He lists 11 papyri, one previously unpublished (pap. Flor. 1475, containing 867-881, second century A.D.). To lighten the apparatus, the numerous citations of the indirect tradition are recorded separately (pp. xx-xvvi); Ar. Rhet. 1405 b 22 f. is omitted, presumably because it only quotes 1587-8. In view of the editor's thoroughness, I find some surprising gaps in

1 He points to two disconcerting instances of 'endemic' error in reporting of readings at 1101 and 1148 on p. xv. This kind of thing is coming to be seen as more frequent than was once thought.
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It is as a linguistic and textual critic that di Benedetto comes into his own. His expertise in assessing stylistic levels and detecting verbal nuances stems from intimate acquaintance with standard works, ancient and modern (he generously acknowledges his debt to Eduard Fraenkel: unfortunately Barrett’s Hippolytus must have appeared just too late to be of help). Thus within the first 50 lines there are at least a dozen places where an acute observation illuminates a point that is easily missed, and this is no unfair sample. Now and then a tendency to overconscientiousness entraps him: surely, to take a random example, there was no need at 844 to waste space on Hermann’s ὃσ ποιο... for ἵπτον... of the MSS, as if there were really no more than ‘una differenza di sfumatura’ between the two phrases: compare the instances on p. 286 of Denniston’s Particles with those on p. 492. Happily this kind of thing is not typical and is more than offset by some excellent extended notes, such as those on πονηδαι (318), ἁλίττονος, (373), δοκεῖν (579) or δοκεῖν (782), to mention only a few. Verbal ancestries are skilfully traced and Steichorus duly comes in for attention, as at 268 where P. Oxy. xxix 2605 is cited; here Biehl only refers to the scholiast and Vürthme’s book of 1919, but of the papyrus ὀδη γε rather. On 1305, the two ἀπολογο-compounds might have prompted a reference in the note to Stes. fr. 46/223 line 5 in PMG. Myth is in general well handled, as e.g. in the notes on 389 f., 985 f.; on a detail, Euripides may well have created Lyssa as a figure in tragedy (270), but she appears in a representation of the death of Actaeon on a r.f. bell-crater in Boston by the Lycean Painter of c. 440 (illustrated in Pfuhl, Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen, vol. III, fig. 515).

Dramatic technique is perceptively handled: witness the notes on 71 (dialogue before parodos and unannounced entry of Helen); 140 (form of lyric interchange which serves here for parodos); 217 (2-line stichomythia: cf. on 257, 1047): 375; 470 (Tyndareus’ hasty entry does not preclude an explanation of how he came to be in Argos); 492 f. and 544 f. (structure of speeches in the δυσ-scene: here Krieg, p. 30, neatly points out the fundamental issue, in that ‘Tyndareus bases his argument on communal νόμος while for Orestes the vengeance is a personal matter’; 852; 1238 (division of chorus); 1324–5 and 1334 (timing of sounds ‘off stage’); 1567 (roof-scene). Where so much is ad rem, one misses discussion of the curious way in which Euripides in his later plays handles ‘triangular’ scenes: thus from 1018 to 1152 Electra, Pylades and Orestes are together on stage but the scene is no true triloquium, for in 1018–65 Orestes talks only to Electra and in

1 I had taken the passage so, before I found that Krieg (p. 27) had anticipated me. First prize for reading into Euripides’ words at this point what simply is not there must go to Pohlenz (Gr. Trag. I p. 419), with others who shall be nameless but far behind.

2 An interesting observation on Orestes’ πιετας lurks in di Benedetto’s note on 418–20 (p. 91).

3 Any future treatment of the moral issues of the Orestes-saga should take account of the observations of Professor D. Daube in his Oxford Inaugural Lecture of 1956, The Defence of Superior Orders in Roman Law.
Much interpolators’ dead wood is cut away, but judiciously; thus 111 goes, but not 110 as well, 677 but not 678–9, 716 but not 714–5. 1366–8 survive; perhaps 602–4 might be repleved if they can be deemed a pendant to Tyndareus’ wy remarks at the corresponding point of his speech, 540–1. Space precludes discussion of metrical matters, but luckily I have few bones to pick with di Benedetto here. The mere mention of Prato’s lunatic oðði pedávou at 35 with its fourth-foot anapaest (split, too, for bad measure) made me raise my eyebrows: this spectre flits across the page too at 700, where mercifully it is disposed of by reference to Miss Dale’s note in Lustrum II 1957 39

Clearly this work deserves to go one day into a second edition, when I hope it will be rather better served by its proof-reader: I noted some 30 misprints and I fear there may be others. In places I thought I detected signs of over-intense editorial pondering; if so, di Benedetto might be well advised to lay this play aside for a time and in the light of further reflection produce what should be the definitive edition for years to come. Even as it is, he has done more than enough for honour in the service of the Orestes.

John G. Griffith.

Jesus College, Oxford.


The most interesting part of this book for the general reader is the all too short introduction. No wonder Xenophon was enthusiastic about the military value of cavalry, having dragged his abandoned infantry over the back end of Asia Minor. Other good features of the book are likely to be missed altogether; fancy packing an essay on bits into seven closely packed pages of small print (notes 90, 91 pp. 94–100).

It is a pity that he has missed J. K. Anderson Ancient Greek Horsemanship. We should have liked to have our author’s reactions to Anderson’s archaeological evidence, particularly on halters; some of it might have modified his note 70. The absence of stirrups affected Greek riders in other ways than by making mounting difficult. Our author should have consulted another fundamental treatise on this, namely Lefèvre de Noëttes, L’attelage du cheval de selle à travers les âges.

Mr Widdra has given us a careful and accurate translation—Mr Anderson is sometimes more specific than our author, as when he tells us that the μυάμα, the sabre, or hunting knife, has a rounded blade. There is a good example of the weapon on a red figure cup by the Penthesilea Painter in Munich: no doubt Apollo is using this weapon because he is the

1 Incidentally, while strophe and antistrope are often quite widely separated in Comedy, only Hipp. 362 f.~668 f. provide a parallel to this in Tragedy: see Barrett, p. 224.
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God of hunting: Xenophon tells hunters to take a μάγαγμα with them to cut wood. It is also being used by mounted Arimaspians against griffins on a red figure bell-krater in the Louvre: see Anderson pl. 31.

S. Benton.

Oxford.


Professor Braun, who is already responsible for a number of papers on issues arising out of the third book of the Politics, notably his studies in the Jahreshefte des Österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in 1959, and in the Vienna Academy Sitzungsberichte of 1961, has now followed these up with a full-length book devoted to the same work of Aristotle. He describes his aim as being to arrive at a satisfactory overall understanding of the treatise and of its place in the Politics as a whole, and he sets about this by undertaking a detailed critical exegesis of the text. Although he declines the comparison, his treatment is hardly less full or less thorough than that of the classic work of Newman. He takes each chapter in turn, giving a close analysis of the contents and considering their relation both to the argument in the neighbouring chapters, and to the opinions that Aristotle expresses elsewhere in the Politics or in the ethical works. His last chapter gathers together the threads of his discussion and sets out some general comments on the results of his step-by-step analysis, and he ends with ten pages of notes on points of textual criticism.

Braun makes full use of the extensive studies on the origin and growth of the Politics that have been carried out, since Jaeger’s Aristotle, by such scholars as von Arnim, Kahlenberg, Siegfried, Gohlke, Theiler and Weil. At several points he summarises and criticises the opinions of most of the principal commentators on particular passages, so that this book serves as a useful introduction for anyone interested in learning the current state of scholarly discussion on these questions as they relate to book III. One work of a rather different kind which he does not discuss is Robinson’s translation and commentary in the Clarendon Aristotle series (Oxford 1962), and this provides a striking contrast with Braun’s book. Where Robinson frequently passes judgement on Aristotle’s political thought and expresses outspoken views on where his theories are right or wrong, Braun hardly ever ventures any opinion on such matters. The principle he adopts is to interpret the text, as far as possible, from the evidence within the text itself. But this means that he concentrates most of his attention on the question of the internal consistency (or lack of it) of Aristotle’s ideas, and he makes little attempt to evaluate those ideas as contributions to political theory.

Besides the numerous insights Braun provides into the meaning of obscure passages in the text, the chief merit of his work lies in his sensitive handling of the question of the relation between Aristotle’s several treatments of the nature and varieties of political constitutions. As with the psychological treatises, so too with the books of the Politics, scholars have sometimes been too ready to see an actual contradiction between two contrasting theses on a particular topic and have not made sufficient allowance for the different points of view from which the same topic may be discussed. As far as this book of the Politics is concerned, Braun does a great deal to redress the balance. He points out where different discussions of such topics as the citizen or the state may be quite independent of one another, and in particular he makes some penetrating and original comments in his criticisms of Jaeger’s conclusions concerning the interconnections between book III and the description of the ideal state in books VII–VIII.

The scholar will find this book a valuable addition to the tools of research already available for a study of the Politics. The philosopher or historian of ideas may perhaps be rather disappointed to find so little on such issues as how Aristotle’s theories relate to the political realities of his time, or the relevance his ideas may have for us in the twentieth century.

G. E. R. Lloyd.

King’s College, Cambridge.


Professor Eichholz is to be congratulated on his excellent edition of ‘Theophrastus On Stones’. For this he originally collated the three manuscripts (ABC) which were used by Caley and Richards for their 1956 edition.¹ Later ten new manuscripts were found and these were discussed by the writer² after he and Eichholz had examined the photographs. It was clear at that time that they all belonged to the same tradition as the first three, and as Eichholz now points out, ‘the results have been disappointing’. However, one lacuna has been filled with a reading adapted from B²H, το λεκνον χλωροεδεπτερον (ὁτι χλωροεδεπτερος; Schneider § 33).

Eichholz supplies a stemma, in which FKLM form one group, AGN with CE another, and DJBH (in that order) form a third. The change that has been made since the photographs were first examined is that N is now rightly grouped with AG. N was put with DJ because they all share the omission of μίατα ... μίατα (§ 64). But Eichholz shows that this may be a coincidence and that a lacuna could easily have arisen in N because the phrase πρὸς τὰ μίατα occurs in two successive sentences. He also explains why BH end at παρά [τε] in § 43. In J παρά occurs at the end of a verso page, so that B's scribe, while copying J, failed to keep his place.

Eichholz has transferred τὸ ἄλοι ... τοῦτος from § 49 to § 50 and ἐν δὲ τῷ ... αὐτής from § 53 to § 52. Of §§ 43 and 57 he says that 'the expedients adopted are the most drastic and the least satisfactory'.

Caley and Richards were expected to provide a conservative text and could not go far from the editions of Schneider and Wimmer, but fortunately Eichholz has felt free to emend the text where he found it unsatisfactory. There are at least fifty-five places in the apparatus where the word ego indicates an emendation of his own. Many of these are of great interest. Thus he has ἔξιμοιοισθαί δύναται (ἔξιμοιοϊσθαί δυνάμεις codd. § 5) and χειρίδιο (§ 14), since the archetypal may have had κεφαλή, leading to κεφαλή, etc. codd., κεφαλή Schneider. There is a brilliant emendation in § 47, which he had already adopted when it was found in the margin of the British Museum's copy of Turnebus; ὃς ἰδίος τοῦ ἔδων (as though the statue were sweating) now replaces ἰδὼν τι τοῦ ἔδων (ὡς ἰδὼν τοῦ τοῦ ἔδων codd.).

He accepts a few readings suggested by Caley and Richards, such as συνήθειατος ὅς (§ 9), ἐκακότε, ἐκακότε (§ 17), ἡμας τοὺς γυναῖκας (§ 48), ἄλοισ (§ 60), and several suggested by Schneider, such as ἐν τοῖς ἐκακοκταῖς (§ 20) and άμα τῷ γαραμφ (§ 62). In § 25 he substitutes Ἀλκασιών for ταυρῶν (ἀνών codd.) and follows Turnebus (and E) in reading ἰδωτέρος ('in a more remarkable way'). In § 69 he restores nine words (τηρομένᾳ ... τῆς γῆς), which were omitted by Schneider and Wimmer but included by Caley and Richards in the apparatus.

His introduction contains a thorough treatment of the formation of earths and stones according to Theophrastus, a continuation of a theme already discussed in connexion with Aristotle and Pliny. This is better than the treatment in the edition of Caley and Richards, but their commentary is still useful, since Stanley Smith, who died in 1955, was unable to write his mineralogical chapters for Eichholz. Sometimes Eichholz has different views on the identification of stones, but here certainty is impossible. The two editions supplement each other and can both be used together.

J. F. C. Richards.

University of Connecticut.


The Dyskolas again, now provided for the first time with introduction, parallel translation and notes in Spanish. The work began from a seminar in Buenos Aires in 1960, and was completed early in 1963, although it was possible to take some account of J.-M. Jacques' Budé edition while the printing was in process. The text was set up initially from a collation of the photographs published with the editio princeps, and the apparatus gives detailed reports of the Bodmer papyrus; alternatives to the editorial choice of readings and restorations appear in a limited selection in the notes, which also find room in their nineteen pages of small type for some brief exegetical comments; a numbered list of publications at the end helps to make references in the introduction and notes economical and precise. It would be gratifying if such a work helped people to study the play who might otherwise have felt discouraged; but there are many places where the treatment of the text and the selection of material for the notes could beyond doubt be improved. There is, for instance, great uncertainty over metre: 893 is too short as printed, and 958 too long; 122, ἀνωτέρος; printed (and translated) as the end of an iambic trimeter; 713, ἤμαρταν ἐν ὑπονοίᾳ τινι in troch. tetr. is one of a number of instances of anomalously distributed short syllables (ἡμάρταν ἐν ὑπονοία τι would do, if it were clear that the imperfect is right); 715, ἀνέλεξεν does not scan as a cretic, no matter how much wish it did; 953, an iamb. tetr. beginning ἄλλη δή. Except at 715, nothing is said on these passages to show that others view the matter differently; and much though one sympathises with the problems of making a compact selection from the mass of criticism available, there are many other passages where the reader is given a text which may puzzle him, and is left without adequate information and guidance. I cannot comment on the literary quality of the translation, but note that as an aid to understanding the text it is sometimes defective, as at 39 (ἡμάρταν 'me') and 639 (out of step: no comment). There are a few textual innovations and departures from the vulgate which, it may be, will attract attention from critics (e.g. 266, καθ μοι δοκο; 510, the spelling νη retained); but extensive revision is needed before the book can be said to have served its purpose as a critical edition satisfactorily.

E. W. Handley.

University College London.


Publication of this penetrative study (the shortened version of a 1965 Berlin dissertation supervised by
R. Kassel) has been tragically accompanied by the premature death of its author. Schäfer’s main aim is to provide the means for a more objective assessment of the merits of the Dyskolos by analysis of its dramatic structure and technique in general and of the relationship between Sostratos and Knemon—that is, between ‘love intrigue’ and ‘character drama’—in particular.

The book’s central thesis, so far as it can be summarised, however inadequately, in the short space of a review, is as follows. In the Dyskolos Menander attempts to combine two different sorts of play, that of character (in which Knemon’s misanthropy is the focus) and that of love intrigue (where the interest lies in the method by which Sostratos gets his girl). Though many of the dramatic ingredients (such as the motif of the sacrifice) are cleverly organised, and though the climax of the play in the fourth act is surprisingly masterful (Sch. subjects Knemon’s great monologue to an incisive analysis), Menander’s attempt to create a structural unity must be judged to fail, with a progressive disintegration from the third act on. This unity is forfeited—here Sch. is strongly influenced by Kayser’s dramatic theories—because Menander has not made up his mind whether the love intrigue or the characterisation of a humgriffin should be the keystone on which his play rests.

This attempt at a general interpretation is abundantly justified for two main reasons. First, by carefully delimiting the play’s dramatic problems, it should stimulate more valuable (because productive) debate. How far is Sch. right to make the interrelation between plot structure and character study the basic criterion for judgments about the Dyskolos? Is the Kayserian critique really relevant to the Dyskolos? Secondly, in the course of his argument Sch. frequently sheds new light on individual passages or aspects of the play. To illustrate this one may single out three of the discussions: that on the early scene (vv. 81–152) in which Chaireas and Sostratos allow differing prejudices to colour their mistaken judgments about Knemon; the analysis of Knemon’s fourth-act monologue, already noticed, in which Menander cleverly distinguishes between the hero’s central misanthropy and its peripheral accessories; and the new interpretation of the final giravage, in which Sch. suggests that Menander may possibly be parodying the Theophrastean idea that education civilises the soul by removing from it τὸ θηριῶδες καὶ διγυμον, though here admittedly the evidence is insufficient to substantiate the author’s case.

Naturally, in a study where so much seems controversial, Sch.’s arguments appear to be sometimes wrong-headed, sometimes only half-true. Thus (p. 52, n. 13) in the discussion about Pan’s alleged influence on the action Sch. may be right in steering his middle course between Photiades’ theocracy and its complete rejection, but he misses what seems to me an essential point here: that Menander is aiming at a deliberate ambiguity. Again (p. 54, n. 8), in arguing that Menander is playing on the audience’s ignorance about the origins of Knemon’s misanthropy in the first three acts, Sch. ought not to have glossed over the precise τὸ τρόπον of v. 13. Yet points such as these are details merely in relation to the book as a whole.

The work is enriched further by two bonuses: an analysis of the Aulularia on lines similar to his Dyskolos one, and a detailed review of those passages in the Dyskolos where Sch. rejects Lloyd-Jones’ text. The problem of the relationship between Aulularia and Dyskolos is already a cause célèbre. Sch.’s ideas (which take as their spring-board Ludwig’s important paper) and especially Sch.’s views on the lost ending of the Aulularia, cannot fairly be neglected by future scholars, although they may at times be a trifle irritated by the assertive dogmatism that here (and occasionally elsewhere in this book) rears its head. Thus the possibility that the lost Plautean ending may have differed significantly from the Menandrian original is never allowed for, and the theory that Euclio’s sacrifice of his treasure has been promoted by a third party such as Megadorus is too easily discounted. In this connection John Jackson’s remarks about Herwerden’s textual conjectures (Marginalia Scannica, 14) may perhaps, mutatis mutandis, be of some relevance.

In his critique of the Lloyd-Jones edition Sch. combines sensitivity to Menandrian Greek with a nice appreciation of the origins of scribal error. There are important long discussions of several passages (especially vv. 89–95, 280–3, 756–61) and several new suggestions among which the attribution of vv. 145–146a alone to Chaireas (but cf. Kraus) and Kassel’s supplement ζήσε τῷ at v. 924 seem the most interesting.

There are a considerable number of petty misprints, but these are perhaps less likely to disturb readers than the unattractive type face used for Greek.

W. GEOFFREY ARNOTT.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne.


While the parts of the Samia in M. Bodmer’s library are still ἐν ἀπορρήτως, it is bold to publish an edition of what is contained in the Cairo codex. But it is to be hoped that Dr Dedoussis has not diminished the number of her readers by writing in demotic Greek, for she offers a palatable half-loaf. She has wisely cut down speculation about the unknown, and her valuable interpretative and illus-
trative commentary will need little revision when the new evidence is available.

Dr Dedoussi publishes for the first time a photograph of the mosaic from Mitilini which by its title Σαμίας μ(ηρος) γ confirms that the play is the Samia and that the Cairo MS begins near the opening of the third act. The scene represented is 153 ff.: the cook has an attractive black face and wears his hair in plaits, Demas raises his arm to dismiss Chrysie. Having this evidence, Dr Dedoussi is able to prove that Sam. did not come first, nor directly succeed Perik., in the Cairo MS, which must therefore have contained at least six plays. She would date Sam. a few years later than Dysoi, arguing that the characters are more individualized and more subtly related one to another; she rightly remarks that the scenes in trochaeics and the numerous monologues are no evidence of an early date.

The commentary deals not only with individual passages but also with the dramatic aspects of whole scenes. For the most part the interpretations are sensible and convincing. By way of exception it is not believed that Demas' alarm in Parmenon at 81 and that the latter's ἀγαθή τρίπτη is a prayer, not a formula of assent; rather the slave is jauntily down to 91, when with fine dramatic effect a chasm yawns at his feet. At τί δέναιων cannot be a 'magnifying plural'. At 139-40 an interesting piece of lexicography leads to a revival of Allison's untenable view that Chrysie did not pretend to Demas that the baby was his and hers, but that it was a foundling. Her action is three times described by the word αὐθενθεῖσα, which D. maintains is always used in the Greek world of taking an exposed child. Only with reference to Romans does it mean 'acknowledge and decide to keep', being then a translation of súcipe or tollere. But her attempts to reconcile this with 111 and 99 ff. are quite unconvincing. In fact Plutarch, Mor. 486F, uses the word with reference to Attalus, and Epicetus i 23 against Epicurus, both in the sense needed in the Samia. The word must already have been capable of bearing it in the fourth century. Some passages do not get the attention they need. Thus there is nothing on the reading at 10, 55, 267, 310, 327, and no explanation of 52 γνωρίζων, 174 καὶ δικαιοῦν, 208 τοῦτ' ἐν, 277 ἐπ' ὈλNSS; and the difficulties of 177-8 are not faced. Among good notes may be mentioned those on 97 ἄρα, 112 Demas' cries, 150 λόγων as an utensil associated with fish, 235 ἄσπρους, and on the whole scene 89-110.

D.'s text not infrequently departs from that of Koerte, which, however, rather awkwardly provides the lemmata for her notes. When she prefers readings or supplements that Koerte rejected, it is usually with good cause. But she has put in the text too many conjectures of her own. The most likely is to write μέλλεις as a statement, not a question, at 331, understanding 'you'll soon be fetching your bride'. At τί παράνω is inferior to παράλων or τί γε. No trace of the word is visible on an infra-red photograph in my possession, but LeFebvre recorded ι [or εκ], which might suggest σκότος. 105: τί παρε' ἐστίν; the initial τ is all but certain (Koerte's οὗν impossible), but πατε is out of place and D.'s continuation εἶναι τὸν ἐπιμέρος improbable. 210: ὄργοι [ἐπική] τέρητρε supposes an unusual scritoio πληνα' ὀφροπαίεισι' and the third letter after η was almost certainly η. 289: παράφορας is too short. 306: ὑπερδιπλή τις τιγνὸν is no better for sense than Koerte's τῆς τιγνος, but τις is probable; the foot of the letter does not suit δν. Perhaps τι αὐρνον:

At times D. relies too much on Koerte. She perpetuates mere printers' errors by omitting paragraph at 100, 108, 109 and inserting one at 244, and by giving δώρων for δωρως at 233. She fails to look beyond his apparatus for conjectures. 33: ἔθη (Sudhaus, Guéraud) fits the space and context better than ἀξιόλη. 183: Koerte gives Λεον τάλας' ἐγώ'περ-τῆς ἐμῆς τῆς χυρής, but τάλας ἐγώ is unusual and γε uncalled for here. Headlam was on the right line with τάλας τῆς ἐμῆς τῆς χυρῆς ἐγώ. Now Μίσουνετος Β-37 gives the correct order of words, τάλας τῆς ἐμῆς τῆς χυρῆς, cf. Dysoi. 189, τάλας τῶν ἐμῶν ἐγώ κακῶν. The Cairins certainly transposes words at 52, 209, 244, 245, 208, and probably elsewhere. 197: Allison's assignment of speeches should be followed. 253: the punctuation of the Cairins should be recorded and followed with Jensen, etc.; then Headlam's ἀκραβλας ζωῶν (cf. Dysoi. 615, St. 532) is better than ὁδός. 335: van Leeuwen saw that a heavy step is needed after βαβίζων. Then read νῦ Α' ἡεβίρα γε [μέγα] κακῶν (ironic, Denniston GP 128, 149); here Wilamowitz ἡεβίρα δὲ for ἡεβίρακε has become the textus receptus.

Although this edition is least satisfactory on the textual side, even here it may serve to stimulate criticism of Koerte. For the rest Dr Dedoussi has provided a welcome contribution to the understanding of this play and one for which a wide circulation must be wished.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

WEBSTER (T. B. L.) Hellenistic poetry and art.

With this book Webster completes his comparative history of Greek literature and art. The twenty-five years which separate the first book from the latest have naturally produced changes in approach. Prose is not included here, as W. says that he could not write satisfactorily about it or fit it into the same framework. Where earlier one felt that everything was being made to fit into the scheme, W. admits that this cannot be done here. The major difference, however, lies in the nature of the material and the stage at which the study of it stands. W. has had to be his own scout, crossing sweeper and guide.
The ground was not cleared beforehand as with the earlier periods, and much of the present book is prosopographical. Renewed interest in the Hellenistic period will make this a valuable synthesis of evidence.

The prologue begins on the mainland at the end of the fourth century, the epilogue treats of Italy and the influence that the Hellenistic writers and artists had there. In between are chapters on the great names of Hellenistic poetry: Apollonius Rhodios, Theokritos and Herodas, Kallimachos; these are followed by a wider picture of culture in the Eastern Mediterranean. Through these chapters there run references to and discussions of contemporary works of art, and W. is able to show the parallel developments in the two spheres he is describing. The common features on which W. lays stress are the evident interest in scholarship with its emphasis on aetiology and recendite allusions, the increasing attention paid to science and medicine, to nature and landscape, and the delight that both writers and artists took in close portraiture, especially of children and old people. W. shows the importance in this period of such items as Dionysos' grotto, Erotes, the stars and physical pain. W.'s marshalling of the evidence is enviable, and there are few who will not find some previously dark corner illuminated.

His choice of illustrative material is judicious, ranging from the Pergamon frieze to such less well-known pieces as the Hunting Erotes mosaic in Alexandria (pl. 7) and the faience oinochoe in Amsterdam (pl. 11).

In a developed period like the Hellenistic one can never be really sure whether a poem or a work of art is completely original, how much the one owes to the other and to what extent both are consciously or unconsciously influenced by earlier treatments. W. has been able to establish pristocracy in some cases, but a question mark must inevitably stand beside some works and their creators. It is to W.'s credit that he has shown us on what bases the picture of Hellenistic culture rests and has guided us through a period which is tortuous, recendite and academic, yet at the same time proved so seminal for the civilisation which developed from it.

Since the book was published works have appeared which indicate the growing interest in the period; of these, Richter's The Portraits of the Greeks, Gow and Page's *The Greek Anthology of Hellenistic Epigrams* and Harrison's *Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture* are some of the most important. A few points remain.1 P. 22: see now JHS lxxv (1965), Robertson on mosaics, for the big Apulian volute-kraters and much else. P. 162: on Hadra hydriae, see Guerrini, *Vasi di Hadra* (1964). P. 180: Cook's inaugural lecture on 'Niobe and her children' has more than a passing interest here, as C. holds contrary views to W. on the interaction of art and literature. One provoking eccentricity is the *almost* total absence of quoted Greek. The chronological table at the back of the book is both a salvation and a curse. With so many names and dates to handle, the reader is in need of a time chart, but why had it to be set sideways, and be partly covered by the pages? It is mercifully easy to remove.

The University of Southampton.

B. A. SPARKES.


This book, now appearing in its second edition, was for the first time published in 1934:1 the author has succeeded in proving his point, according to which the Callimachean *manifesto* (i.e. validity of the 'kleinepos' as opposed to the 'Grossepis' of Homeric proportions) was very much an isolated exception, which did not exert any appreciable and durable influence upon Callimachus' contemporaries, let alone literary successors. Ziegler's results are now accepted by the majority of scholars, and have indeed penetrated the standard handbooks on Hellenistic poetry (cf. e.g. Körte-Handel, *Die hellenistische Dichtung*, Stuttgart 1960, pp. 270 and 358). The backbone of Ziegler's contention is represented by an impressive list of bulky epic poems (pp. 18 ff.), from which list it is evident that during the Hellenistic period there were produced 'Hunderttausende von Versen epischer Dichtung nichtkallimachischen Stiles'.

The second edition of Ziegler's work contains a new chapter on Ennius as a hellenistic epic poet (pp. 53 ff.). Ziegler's thesis seems to me fully convincing when he stresses and analyses the presence in Ennius of many 'homerifrome Stilelemente' (e.g. the 'Hervortreten der eigenen Person': on this Hellenistic feature, cf. e.g., for Callimachus, Lapp, *De Callimachi Cyrenaei tropis et figuris*, Diss. Bonn 1965, pp. 145 ff.: 'poëta de se ipso loquitur'). This new interpretation of Ennius is not entirely original, because such a possibility was already hinted at—if tentatively and hazily—by one of the greatest Latin literary critics of our century, Friedrich Leo (as Ziegler does not fail to state, cf. pp. 56 ff.), followed by Reitzenstein (*Festschrift Reitzenstein*, p. 69): however, Ziegler has the merit of having now offered a full demonstration, with new material persuasively used.

Callimachus' *manifesto* has been accurately studied by Eichgrün (*Callimachos und Apollonios Rhodos*, Diss. Berlin 1961, pp. 69 ff.); its effect has now been

1 Reviews: *REA* 1935, p. 512 (Delage); *RFIC* 1935, 104 (Rostagni); *REG* 1935, 457 (Puech); *Museum* (Leiden) 1937, p. 201 (Kuiper); *Phil. Woch. *1934, 1368 (Sonnenburg).
focused by Ziegler. It is now to be hoped that Apollonius’ position within the framework of Hellenistic epic poetry will be clarified by the critics. The difficulties are of course great, because Apollonius did not publish literary manifestos, and his Argonautica, as Fränkel has appropriately emphasized, are ‘ein Werk von sehr komplexer Natur’ (Mus. Helv. 1937, p. 2). There are, for the moment, no less than four Apollonii: the faithful follower of Callimachus’ theories (Erbe; cf. Eichgrün, op. cit., p. 82), the author of an epos ‘sui generis’, very much in the tradition of Hellenistic epic literature (Eichgrün, op. cit., p. 108 f.), the traditional epic poet swimming against the Callimachean stream (Fränkel, art. cit., p. 2), and the poet who tried to mix ‘Mass und ... Weise des alten Epos’ with an interest, new in the genre, for ‘innerseelische Vorgänge’ (Körte-Händel, op. cit., p. 192 ff.; cf. also Fränkel, art. cit., pp. 11 and 18, on the poet’s interest for the ‘intimes Einzeldasein der Person’, which appeals so much to ‘uns Moderne’).

GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE.

University of London,
Birkbeck College.


The main object of this book, as the author expresses it in his introduction, is to trace the picture of Homer that is to be obtained from the Greek epigrams, the traditions about his life and the statements and judgments on his poetry. For this purpose Dr Skiadas is principally concerned with the relevant epigrams in the Greek Anthology (those with primary reference to Homer, AP 7.1–7 and 16.292–304, and also many others that do not primarily or directly refer to him), but also, necessarily for a full and scholarly treatment of his theme, he adduces the witness of numerous epigrams from the collections of inscriptions as well as of the relevant statements in the Homeric Vitas and the Hesiodic Certamen, the latter being a necessary starting-point at least as regards the biographical tradition.

The first chapter is a short one and is concerned with the background and transmission of certain epigrams crucial for the biographical tradition: AP 7.3, the famous distichon supposed to have been taken from Homer’s gravestone, AP 7.53, the contest between Homer and Hesiod, AP 9.438, the riddle of the lice, and AP 14.65, 66, 102, concerning the death and burial of Homer. Chapter II, the first of the main chapters, entitled Das Leben Homers, deals in full detail with the statements concerning Homer’s home and parentage, his contest with Hesiod and his death. Chapter III, Der Dichter Homer, considers the traditional image of Homer qua poet in its various aspects, the divine poet, Homer and the Muses, the epic poet, the poet κατ’ ἐξοχήν, and then goes on to the comparative views of Homer, Homer in relation to divine and mythical figures and to historical figures, mostly poets and poetesses, Archilochus, Sappho, etc. Finally Chapter IV, a rather miscellaneous chapter entitled Die homerische Dichtung, is concerned successively with judgments on Homeric poetry, use of Homeric quotations, especially by Pindar, Homeric centos, the attitude of Parthenius of Nicaea (the Callimachean) to the Homeric epics, and lastly the alleged recension of Peisistratus (Apol. 11.442) and the claims of Cometas to have improved the manuscripts of Homer (AP 15.36–6).

Dr Skiadas’ treatment of most of these topics is very full and thorough. At times, indeed, I feel that he goes to unnecessary lengths to fill in the background, although this is perhaps an ungenerous criticism. However, there are points at which I would appeal to the criterion of relevance, no matter how interesting the material assembled, as for instance in the section on AP 9.24 and the expression Μοσαίον ἔγγος as applied to Homer (pp. 78 ff.). Here he simply uses the original question, the characterisation of Homer by the epigrammatist (Leonidas of Tarentum), as the starting-point for the fairly exhaustive treatment of a figure of comparison in Greek poetry generally. Also, several of his sections on Homer in relation to other poets, etc. (notably that on Antimachus and Homer, pp. 118 ff.), are mainly concerned with themes quite independent of Homer, albeit very interesting themes in themselves. A criticism in the opposite direction is that Dr Skiadas gives us disappointingly little on the very interesting subject of the linguistic imitation of Homer in the Anthology and the use of Homeric quotations, on which he has some good remarks on p. 151 (cf. his careful analysis of the use of Homeric expressions in AP 7.1 on p. 58). It is only for Pindar that he begins to give an adequate treatment of this subject.

Having made these criticisms and before going on to express my disagreement on some matters of detail, I should like to say that Dr Skiadas deserves high praise for his painstaking assemblage and thorough digestion of a mass of material, the fruit of his mastery of the widely scattered literature of the field. He himself says (p. 1, n.1) that he has regarded it as part of the service of his work to gather together all relevant publications. This he does primarily in his bibliography (pp. 193–9), which, however, fairly full though it is, hardly indicates the extent of his researches, for that is only apparent from a careful perusal of his very rich footnotes. Not unexpectedly this book does not tell us much that surprises or that was not already available to the specialist. Indeed, one could apply to most aspects of the main theme Dr Skiadas’ own words as regards the concept of Homer as the poet κατ’ ἐξοχήν (p. 95): ‘Diese in den Epigrammen festzustellende Auffassung von
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Homer ist an sich nichts anderes als die Wieder-
spiegelung bzw. die ununterbrochene Kontinuität
der antiken Urteile.’ But at least the book greatly
facilitates orientation in this field and will un-
doubtedly remain a useful work of reference
(enhanced by the full indices of references, pp. 177 ff.)
for any further research.

On p. 9 in discussing AP 7.3 Dr Skiadas concludes
from the fact that κατὰ γάια καλύπτει is already in
Homer that Homer was therefore ‘der Erfinder
dieser Form der Grabauschrift, die für ihn selbst
verwendet worden ist’. This is, to say the least, a
very curious way of expressing what a little later
emerges as his considered opinion, namely that in
view of the commonness of this motif it is not surpris-
ing that having first appeared in Homer it was later
used in an epigram applied to him. His explanation
(pp. 21–2) of AP 16.294.4, τῶς Μωσάως ἐλπίζειν
πατρίδα καὶ γενεά, ‘Seine Gesellschaft waren die
Musen. . . . Also, nur die Musen wissen darüber
Bescheid (sc. wo die Herkunft des Dichters zu suchen
ist)’, seems to me most improbable. Surely it is
simplest to translate ‘For the sake of his poetry
(Μωσάως = Dichkunst, as noted by Skiadas) he
abandoned his home and family’, which supports
the explanation rejected by Skiadas (ibid.). Even if we
agree with Skiadas that the more striking sense ‘For
the company of the Muses . . . ’ is preferable, there
is no need to follow his interpretation of the line as a
whole. On p. 103 Skiadas explains Ἑλλάδας πατρίδα
(“Homer, AP 7.7.1) with ‘er hat als griechischer
Dichter in und durch seine Epen ganz Hellas
gerühmt’. This seems to me a very strained
interpretation of the Greek and I would endorse
Beckby’s explanation (expressly rejected by Skiadas)
that Homer sang of the heroes from all Greece. At
p. 146, 1.10 Skiadas is surely wrong to reject as false
the lemma to AP 9.522, εἰς Ὀμηρον. The poem is
addressed to Homer’s works, and such a metonymous
use of Ὀμηρος has already been correctly
understood by Skiadas at p. 137, 11.23–4, ‘wo natürlicher
Ὁμηρος = homerische Dichtung’ (cf. also p. 149,
11.4–5 and p. 172, 11.1–2). Skiadas’ attempt
(p. 155) to explain what he considers to be a contrac-
tion involved in 11.5 and 6 of AP 9.166 (sc. that
this couplet is really an answer to the point of the two
preceding couplets and has been wrongly attached
to them to make a single epigram) is merely mis-
guided. He has simply missed the double entendre
in the words Ἰλιας and Ὀδυσσα, the former being
meant to remind us of the proverbial expression
Πανακακόν and the latter of the popular etymology
Ὀδυσσεας (and so also -εια): Ὀδυσσαμαι (Od.
19.407–9).

Having checked a portion, albeit a comparatively
small portion, of the countless references in this book
I have only found one mistake; p. 9, 1.5 for Σιων
read Σιων. I have noted 25 misprints in the whole
book.

PÉDECH (P.) La méthode historique de Polybe.
Fr. 50.

Polybius has a good deal to say about his own
method of writing history and still more about the
faults of his contemporaries’ methods; but his practice
does not always conform to the recommendations he
makes and his theories themselves, heavedly
advocated, are not always very clearly developed. The
subject which Professor Pédech has chosen for this
long study is therefore a serious and fascinating one;
he has treated it with great thoroughness and some
originality; the book he has produced is nevertheless
rather disappointing.

The first chapter discusses the question of Polybius’
own description of his technique; Pédech, following
Schweighaeuser and Walbank, argues that the phrase
πραγματική ἱστορία, so far from being any
specific kind of history is only to be contrasted with
mythology or legendary history (as Polybius implies
at IX.1.2) so that it means no more than history in
our sense of the word. Pédech, however, goes on
to look for the phrase by which Polybius does identify
his own kind of history and finds it in ἀποδεικτική
ἱστορία, which he understands quite reasonably as
history including evidence and argument rather than,
as Walbank (Commentary on Polybius, 8 n. 6), ‘history
which investigates causes’. No doubt, Polybius
regarded his history as ἀποδεικτική rather than
otherwise and uses the term to distinguish his full
narrative from the preliminary sketch of Books I and
II (at II.37.3, where Pédech (46 n. 108) accepts the
reading of the corrector of Vaticanus 124—τῆς
ἥδας καὶ ἀποδεικτικῆς ἱστορίας). But this is the
only time Polybius used the term in the surviving
parts of his work and there is nothing to suggest that
he regarded it as of special importance. This search
for a phrase is surely a dead end; Polybius told us
how he thought history should be written but not
what correctly written history should be called, nor
does it matter.

The next six chapters (pp. 54–354), amounting to
about half the whole book, are devoted to the study
of historical causation in Polybius. Chapter II
analyses the theory set out at III.6–7.3 and XXII.
18.2–11 that all wars have their aitia, προφασίας,
and ἀρχηγί; he then (Chapter III) examines the
origins of all the wars covered by Polybius’ history
on the assumption that the theory of causation was
applied in every, or almost every, case. Chapters
IV–VII discuss the role of individuals in the causal
process, the historian’s use of speeches, his analysis
of constitutions as the causes of historical events
and finally—the critical question—the relationship
between these theories of causation and Polybius’
concept of τῆς. A great deal of this is of value;
in particular, Pédech brings out well how much
emphasis is placed on the thoughts, plans and
characters of individual statesmen and how complex
is the vocabulary of psychological states which
Polybius has at his command to express this emphasis;

Selwyn College, Cambridge.

A. W. JAMES.
it may, however, be doubted whether he is right in insisting (pp. 80-88) that causes are themselves intellectual processes, for they seem in fact to be either events which influence decisions or else the emotional condition of the men who take the decisions (e.g. the rapaciousness of the Aetolians) and Walbank is probably right to take III. 6.7 as defining causes as 'events which influence in advance our purposes and decisions' (Commentary p. 306). More seriously, the whole study of the causes of wars seems based on a false assumption; we do not know whether Polybius did or did not apply his rigid theory of the causes of wars in all cases. He explains it with reference to the Second Punic war and offers the war with Antiochus and Alexander's invasion of Asia as parallels (III. 6-7); he returns to it in his account of the third Macedonian War (XXII. 18); in both passages, he is making the polemical point that earlier writers have mistaken pretexts for causes. But have we any reason to assume that Polybius always applied his theory? The only test case available is the Social War, the only other war for which we have a full discussion of origins (IV. 3-13). Here the aitía is simply Aetolian greed; the apókyphē is the Achaeans' declaration of war, not, as in the theory, the opening of hostilities: the rest of these ten chapters gives a long narrative described as ἡ ἀπόκρυφη which includes various negotiations, conferences, raids and the battle at Caphyae. It is far from clear how all this relates to the theory of III. 6-7, but certain that if Polybius is applying his theory at all he is doing so very loosely. Thus, even if Polybius regularly used this kind of analysis—and it is in itself a restrictive and schematic analysis—it would be useless to try to guess how; Pédech's Chapter III is largely devoted to just this.

The second half of the book offers a series of studies of varying value on more or less independent topics. The least satisfactory is perhaps Chapter VIII which discusses Polybius' use of oral evidence, of documents and of arguments from probability. Pédech touches lightly on the many problems of this subject without offering solid argument on any of them. Thus, the apparent contradiction between the treaty of 212 between Rome and the Aetolians, which we now know from an inscription, and the version of it assumed in negotiations at Pol. XVIII. 38 is resolved with the thought that 'ce n'est pas la première fois que des négociateurs antiques ignorent superbement la teneur des traités' (pp. 383 ff.).

Again, the Carthaginian treaties are glanced at rather than studied and the views of Nenci (Historia 7 [1958] 275 ff.) adopted without argument (pp. 385 ff.). All too often, in fact, Pédech rejects out of hand criticisms of his author's reliability or consistency; he is astonished to find Phylarchus' view on the fall of Mantinea taken seriously 'en dépit de la critique de Polybe' (p. 598 and n. 5); while even that little 'difficulté irritante' over the position of Saguntum is abolished without discussion on the authority of one of Carcopino's least persuasive suggestions (REA 55 [1953] 258 ff.) (p. 184 and n. 421). Yet these few occasions where we have a document or a rival account offer our only hope of testing the reality of Polybius' professed passion for truth.

On the other hand, Chapters X and XII, on Polybius' contributions to chronology and geography respectively, contain the most forceful and original argument in the whole book and represent very substantial progress in the study of the Historiae. Pédech had already suggested in CRAI 1955, 367 ff., that the chronology of II. 14 ff., the narrative of the Gallic Wars, was founded on a system of Olympiads years; where an ordinal number is used to show the time passed since the last reported event, the reckoning is inclusive, but where a cardinal number is used to indicate the interval (e.g. ten years passed), the event which follows is placed in the following year (i.e. the eleventh). Pédech now argues that a framework of this kind lay behind the whole of the Historiae and that events are carefully grouped according to their Olympiad dating, even though the indications given are generally in terms of the seasons and the arrangement of the narrative is very flexible to allow for the unified description of the individual campaigns. All this is very persuasive and will require the most careful consideration. The final chapter again develops earlier published work, particularly on book XXXIV (cf. Les études classiques 27 [1956] 3 ff.); Pédech seeks to trace the development of Polybius' interest and expertise in the field of geography and to associate this with the travels of the author after 151. He argues accordingly that those excursuses which show this developed geography, including Books XII and XXXIV, must belong to a revision of the work later than 146.

It is an unexpected Polybius who emerges from this book. Where others have seen the retired statesman obsessed with knowing the truth, but rancorous in criticism and superficial when he turns to generalisation, Pédech has found a professional savant, studying profoundly in philosophy, geography and chronology, above all consistent in his views on history and his application of these to his work. I, for one, still find Polybius' views on τῆς ἡγήσεως thoroughly muddled (despite Chapter VII), his analysis of the Roman constitution inconsistent (despite Chapter VI) and his theory of causation superficial (despite Chapter II). It is pleasant that Polybius has found so sympathetic a commentator and there is no doubt that Professor Pédech has considerably widened our appreciation of Polybius' enormous achievement; but it is a pity that the Polybius with whom he sympathises should be so largely of his own making.

University College London.

J. A. North.


Trouillard's new translation of the Elements of Theology, the first in French, is largely based on the
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Edition of Dodds. It contains, in addition to the text, a short account of Proclus’ life and works and a fairly brief introduction to the Elements themselves. The translation is accompanied by footnotes, which, however, are comparatively limited in scope, being mainly concerned with cross-references and references to other works of Proclus and his predecessors. They are insufficiently detailed to provide much help to the philosophical reader who is not already well versed in Neoplatonism. Such readers will be obliged to refer to the edition of Dodds.

As far as Proclus can be made easy to read, Trouillard’s version has made him so. It will be useful to those readers (more numerous in France than elsewhere) who can support their reading of the text by listening to experts discourse on the individual propositions.

In Proposition 180 Trouillard rejects the reading of Dodds for the unintelligible text of Creuzer.

John M. Rist.

University College, Toronto.


These are chapters from the history of Greek literature intended for students and lovers of literature who are assumed to be not entirely uninformed but probably unfamiliar with the language. Passages are quoted in English, a few in the versions of old favourites like Rogers or Murray but mostly in the author’s renderings into equivalent metres—not that his admirable account of Greek metre and language gives much justification for the practice. Whatever literature-lovers may feel, students are likely to think them old-fashioned.

In a book of this size covering the whole subject from the beginnings to the Hellenistic poets, with the exception of a few of the more indigestible topics such as dramatic fragments and scientific prose along with Aristotle, it would be unreasonable to expect much novelty. But Sir Maurice writes with remarkable zest and freshness both on subjects which he has already treated at greater length and on others, like Thucydides and Plato, on which he has had little occasion to comment. However, the scheme of the book, which in the interest of continuous exposition avoids reference to controversy and even to alternative possibilities, has certain disadvantages for students, who may miss the hints of doubt and uncertainty which would be appropriate to a fuller treatment. For instance, the latter part of the Iliad is bathed in a warm ethical glow by the comment on 24. 27-30, though this unique allusion to the Judgement of Paris has been suspect since the days of Aristarchus. Again, Euripides’ acquaintance with philosophy may have been ‘at a low and popularized level’, but since this is the only level at which the subject could well be introduced into drama no certainty is possible.

Sometimes those who do not know the facts already will be misled by too concise statements: Socrates is known to have written verses’ suggests something more than his prison experiments; ‘only fragments of Hypereides survive’ implies less of continuity than is in fact present in his remains: the number of occasions when four actors appeared in tragedy is so small that it would be truer to say there were not more than three. That the Danaid trilogy is about ‘the right of a woman to marry the man she loves’ may apply to Hypermenestra, hardly to the other forty-nine Danaiads. The climax of the Septem is not so much that Eteocles decides to fight, but that having decided to fight he discovers that, unless he changes his mind, he will fight his own brother. It is true that the group of plays with which Euripides competed in 431 B.C. was placed third, but considering that Sophocles was second that year and Euriphon, perhaps with a tetralogy of his father’s, first, it is taking a good deal for granted to say that one particular play, the Medea, ‘made a bad impression’. At times it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that memories assembled from past readings have not been checked against the text. In the Agammemnon, whether or not Cassandra had a chariot to herself, for which the Argument is hardly evidence, her vision came to her after, not before, she was summoned into the palace by Clytemnestra. There is nothing in the text of the P.V. to imply that Io’s ‘monstrous gadfly’ was represented on the stage, nor in that of the O.T. to support the notion that Oedipus left Thebes at the end of the play; he wanted to leave, but if O.C. 435 is evidence he stayed at Thebes for a substantial time. According to the Frogs Euripides did not ‘displace’ Aeschylus in Hades; he laid claim to the throne of tragedy and found some support, but Aeschylus had not given way when Dionysus arrived. But these are details and do not affect the value of the sound and sober critical judgments which characterise the book.

The 40 pages of photographs are well reproduced but mostly familiar. A word of warning might have been given that the pegs on which stands the Rieti statuette of a tragic actor are not gigantic buskins.

D. W. Lucas.

King’s College, Cambridge.


This is a republication in the Everyman Library of part of Greek Poetry for Everyman, issued in 1951 and reviewed in JHS 1952 (p. 126). A few small changes have been made, including the addition of a short appendix on the Palatine Anthology; but the main difference from the previous work is the omission of
the lengthy selections from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, both of which are already available in other *Everyman* volumes. The dramatists are also absent, as they were reserved for *Greek Drama for Everyman*, published in 1954. It seems questionable whether *Greek Poetry* is a reasonable title for a book in which neither Homer nor tragedy nor comedy is represented: *Minor Greek Poetry* would have been more appropriate to most of its contents. But some of Lucas's versions are felicitous and his introductions and notes contain much that is entertaining, if not always profitable. A wide public will be grateful for the inclusion of this volume in the *Everyman Library*.

H. C. BALDRY.

University of Southampton.


'In languages with a stress accent, like English, an unaccented short vowel is often suppressed.' Such syncope of short vowels is unknown in ancient Greek with its pitch accent, but is very common in Latin.' So Buck, *Comp. Gram.* 98, 99, stating the consensus. It was not always so: both de Saussure and Kretschmer advocated Greek syncope in their day, although they did not make the important distinction between Hellenistic examples (when the emergence of the stress accent complicates matters) and classical or preclassical cases. S. at once proceeds to annul the law of no Greek syncope by adding examples of it which he considers certain: 14 of loss of i or υ, 24 of ε or ο. Each word is treated in exhaustive detail as the author spreads himself in an ample, lucid, and digressive style. Much space is spent in refutation, for these words do not come up here for the first time, and since philological explanation entails placing a word in a general scheme of derivation, the refutation ranges far and wide to abolish all support for any solutions but syncope. Persuasiveness naturally varies. I should sort the arguments and examples into five groups:

1. Affirmation of some certain cases: e.g. 'Α(μ)ιστο- in Thessalian prosopography, ἢλ(υ)θων, οἰ(υ)ματι, πτειτε(ο)ν, τάπιτα(ε)-. Whatever the concealing verbig- age, syncope has here always had its supporters.

2. Denial of residual atematic conjugation: e.g. εσά(σι)ται, σεφε(ε)τε, Cyrenian τεστατι and Alamanic κέντο (τετέλε(τι)ται, κέλε(το)στα, with 'Doric' λ > β before dental).

3. Denial of fluctuations in gradation: e.g. ὀρ(υ)νος; Ἀλ(λο)ος, πεθ(ε)θων, μεσημβρια < ημερία (an IE *emria* is impossible under the Siervers-Edgerton Law, which would require *emria*), ὰρ(ο)γη.

4. Denial of variations in suffix: e.g. θαύμ(υ)νος; ἰπ(ε)κ(ο)ς, ἰπ(ε)ρ(υ)ς, Ionic χλαν(δι)δον, which, being derived from χλανί, requires an exceptional dissimi- lation, at-ι-ς > α-ι-ς.

(5) Revision of etymology: e.g. παλαύ(υ)τορ, relying on the attested chronological relation of παλαύ(υ)τορ and παλαύ(υ)τος; hence also γεραι(ο)τοτος and κραται(ο)γύλας (and other κραται- composita).

The author's discussion of these words can hardly itself be discussed at briefer length, but in general terms it must be a minimum concession that vowel syncope is a possible explanation of a considerable number of Greek forms. How many of these are certain and to how many should be given a confirmatory role? In the latter class S. puts σδ(υ)τα, Ἀθα(ι)μιδος, τετ(α)ρακάτος (accepting Risch's τέταρτο*κάτα* as the basis), and the monosyllabic forms of dissyllabic bases before nasals (type τόλκ(ο)μα). The conservative philologist might well argue that my group (5), or even groups (2)-(4), can be given no higher status, with the object of making the base too small to carry the philological conclusion. Yet those who have accepted Brugmann's IE *fratices* (or their later day replacements) on very scanty evidence will be hard pressed to condense S.'s list to such a length.

Since there is some relation theoretically between frequency and syncope, it is striking that the more frequent the word the more attractive philologically is S.'s syncope, as in group (1) above. Of the rarer words one wonders if κενθ(υ)ρόνων and the loanwords σμύρ(ι)νη and χί(υ)ρονος are to be given much weight. Were *κανθ(υ)ρόν* attested it would be called a Volksetymologie for sure, cf. the usual reaction to π(ε)λείδες. S. demolishes the current explanation of the initial sibilant of σμύρη (contamination with the ghost word *σμύρων*) but does not replace it. Perhaps the *-ν* is not adjectival, but both it and the sibilant derive from a phrase, such as Ugaritic *ṣm m r* 'oil of myrrh', which contained the distinctive features of *σμύρη* in the same way as *Επαυρος* reproduces those of Egypt. *μυρος* is a syncope of the sort needed only if Greek certainly borrowed the term as *μυρος*'. I cannot see that we are obliged to assume this even if it is allowed that the Semitic vocalism of the first syllable had not yet been reduced to schwa at the time of borrowing, for phonetic shifts at the moment of entry are not to be described in as rigorous terms as internal developments and may be violent. Also there may be counter-examples: Astour has connected Δρόμος with *dērō* (< *dērāru*) where a parallel phonetic process to that envisaged for *μυρος* would involve a syncope of *α*, which is impossible.

The words of group (2) are particularly interesting, for it is here that etymology is linked with regularities at a deep linguistic level. S. makes a masterly use of the advances in structural IE philology over the last thirty years which does not exclude personal views. Thus the derivation of ὄργανον from a perf. part. *οργονια* depends on the Attic reduplication (the only type attested in this verb) being secondary:
it has on the contrary been advanced as very basic IE. Here we have part of the author's vague hostility to parts of the laryngeal theory, and we are promised a disquisition.

The theoretical status of syncope, along with dissimulation, metathesis, and other 'spontaneous', 'sporadic', or 'isolated' changes has long been unsatisfactory. Some have begun to operate with the concept of 'weak phonetic change', a sound-change of low predictability because of paradigmatic resistance, consciousness of etymological connection, low frequency of words involved, etc. With such an approach syncope can be integrated into the linguistic history of Greek in a fairly normal way. It is defined as affecting short unaccented (or sometimes unaccented) vowels, the physically shortest vowels (never a), chiefly between single consonants, and before those consonants known to have a physically shortening effect, in words of at least three syllables. The chief trouble is that the temporal dimension is very long, from the earliest discernible period to the end of classical times. However, S. is willing to think of syncope as inherent in language generally if the volume of a syllable falls below some critical level, and may thus be hypothesised even for IE itself. A few possibilities are advanced.

The pages on the nature of accentuation are few and cautious in view of current disputes over the contrast of stress and pitch, and S. modestly concludes with the hope that his work may remove some of the obstacles to progress in that direction. It will certainly impose some rethinking on students of Greek linguistic history.

J. B. HAINSWORTH.

King's College, London.


The title of this book must be taken in a narrow sense: the Author is here concerned mainly, and almost exclusively, with those Greek compounds which have as their second element -οργός or -οργή or similar dialect forms. It may be as well to stress at the beginning that the philological problems created by these compounds are important enough to justify an independent work—and indeed it is the great merit of Mlle. Bader to have put them clearly, perhaps for the first time, and to have offered for most of them what I believe is probably the best solution obtainable in the terms of the evidence available.

A first chapter discusses some formal and semantic problems connected with the base *ωρ-ς. The Mycenaean evidence points to a verbal present *ωρζα from *ωργ-ς, for which an alternative form *ωρζα is theoretically possible, though not attested.

According to the Author, the forms of the First Millennium (F)έρος and (F)ρέκα should be taken as analogical formations from *ωργ-ς*ωργ-ς and *ωρζα*ωρζα respectively. The causes of this development should be found in the one case in the presence of (F)έρος and its group and in the other case in that of the ancient aorist (F)ρέκα. Mycenaean ωο-ς (ωρζα) on the other hand is a direct continuation of the original zero grade present; its meaning—the Author maintains—would have a definite religious connotation and would be almost identical with that of τε-ρε-ύα. I cannot help feeling that all this discussion is rather nebulous. The inferences about early and late forms and the prehistoric or protohistoric analogical processes can hardly be proved and do not rise above the status of attractive guesses. As for the Mycenaean documents taken into consideration the Author occasionally tries to extract from them more than they can offer, at the risk of stretching the evidence too far. For instance, I do not see how one can accept that the basic argument for the religious meaning of ωο-ς in Pylos is its synonymity with τε-ρε-ύα and then proceed to assume that there may be some nuance in meaning which distinguishes τε-ρε-ύα from ωο-ς. With Chapter 2 begins the central nucleus of the book which almost assumes the overtones of a fascinating 'who done it'. The data of the problem are relatively simple. Myc. τε-ρε-ύα offers the expected form of the compound nomen agentis from this root: ο- vocalism and (presumably) accent on the final syllable are present in the second element. Thus this type is differentiated from, e.g. a βαθυρή (like μοθοδύκτειος), which would have an e ablaut and a regressive accent. The Attic compounds in -οργός and the dialect forms in -οργος or -οργή may be taken back to -ο-ωργος. However, not all the evidence is so straightforward. Homer has forms in -ο-ωργος with e vocalism and final accent, even where we would expect a nomen agentis in -ο-(F)οργος, and -ο-ωργος compounds continue to appear in dactylic poetry, where they correspond to the terms in -οργος frequent in iambics. Further, the -ο-ωργος nomina agentis appear in Herodotus, but not in the Ionic inscriptions (where -οργος is the rule). Mlle. Bader's thesis—which I believe must be accepted—is that in Homer and elsewhere -ο-ωργος is an artificial form. In the epic poems it represents a more ancient -ο-ωργος, and is due to an attempt to preserve the disyllabic scansion after the contraction had taken place in the spoken language. In later authors it becomes a poetic formation coexisting with the usual -οργος, and as such appears in dactylic poetry down to the Byzantine period. In Herodotus it is one of the many Homerisms. However, a different grade of authenticy pertains to forms like υργος; here the Attic ήργος points indeed to a nomen agentis (cf. the accent) with an early e vocalism (α is a contraction of αυ- and not of *αω-); this is obviously secondary but 'authentic', that is to say is due to a regular

This handsomely produced book, which is largely a restatement of the author's previously published work, 'aims at providing qualified scholars with all the evidence they need for understanding the North-west Semitic character of Minoan'. Etecyrirote, Etecretan, Linear A, and the Phaistos Disk are claimed to represent dialects of the same language 'mutually intelligible' with Phoenician. The historical picture put with this is that of a Crete-centred thalassocracy dominating the cultural and economic life of the coastland of the whole eastern Mediterranean—Africa, Asia, Europe, and the islands. The 'palace-building Minoans' themselves were 'North-west Semites mainly from the Delta'. However, they were essentially the same people as the other North-west Semites in Libya, Palestine, Phoenicia, Syria, etc., so that it would be a mistake to insist that all of the early Minoans came exclusively from the Delta.'

The last part of this final sentence is perhaps the only one in the book that the present reviewer finds he can agree with wholeheartedly. G.'s case rests on the decipherments proposed, and none of them is conclusive. Etecyrirote receives 24 pages: four of the twelve words in the Amathus inscription are given 'probable' Semitic interpretations, the remainder 'tentative' ones. This is judged enough to show that Etecyrirote is N.W. Semitic 'in vocabulary, morphology, and syntax'. The seven Etecretan inscriptions get fuller treatment, and are made to yield 25 Semitic words for which 'contextual evidence is strong and in five key cases corroborated bilingually'. A single example will suffice to show the strength of this corroboration. The letters KOMN, which occur on three of the inscriptions (nowhere certainly as a complete word), are equated with 'the Semitic gbn — cheese', on the unverified assumption that they answer to τῶν τεσσάρων in one of the Dhreros inscriptions.

Coming to the Minoans proper, the Phaistos Disk ('related to Linear A as Egyptian Hieroglyphs are to Hieratic!') is deciphered in three pages. This is, I think, a record for brevity, though we are told that 'more work' remains to be done. Linear A itself is made to yield some two dozen Semitic words. Most, if not all, of them have been previously suggested by the author. A few are, in my view at least, plausible enough to warrant a full and dispassionate examination of the case they present. But unfortunately G., though his expert knowledge would qualify him to give us one, does not do so. His method remains one of making suggestions. As an example of it one may take his treatment of the group L32—L57 found on a pithos fragment (Brice II 3) from Knossos. G.'s argument is simply that since other pithoí carry the wine ideogram, the word on this pithos may be ja-ne = Hebrew yam-n = wine. There is no mention of the grave uncertainty of the phonetic value given to L57 (which he elsewhere makes even more unlikely by giving the same value to L61); no mention that the word is the middle one of at least three; no mention that pithoí could contain other commodities.

Such interpretations could only be accepted if they supported each other and resulted in a coherent picture. G. is aware of this and includes chapters on orthography, phonetics, and morphology. But these turn out to be a series of ad hoc justifications and serve rather to reveal the contradictions than to explain them. For instance on the identification KOMN = gbn = cheese, we are told that 'K stands for etymological g' and that 'it looks very much as if the voiced stops shifted to surds in Etecretan'. This might be tenable if y was not used. But even in the meagre handful of inscriptions that we have it is used ('though rarely!'), and has to be explained. This is done by calling it a positional variant (!) without etymological significance: thus εύνω (ಕ yakun) with original k becoming voiced g inter-vocally'. These are the cadences, not the arguments, of scholarship—what those who write about the degenerate phase of Homeric epic call 'traditional formulae used non-traditionally'.

The book, therefore, will only persuade the converted. But it does perform the service of giving us G.'s views within a single cover. It also reveals very clearly the basic fallacy on which this sort of 'decipherment' proceeds. One may call it the philosophy of the shot-gun. The more pellets you put into the air the greater your chance of success. Some birds at least are bound to be shot clean, and if others are only winged or even missed altogether what does it matter? There is always the second barrel. On these rules everything in G.'s book makes sense—the triumphantly-produced lists of identified words, the ignoring of contrary evidence (for if victory goes simply to the best bag everything else will just fall away as irrelevant), the invitations to others to come forward with supporting contributions, and sentences such as 'The decipherment is validated by the established results; it is in no way shaken by inconclusive or
even mistaken details beyond those established results. But the true rules of the game are quite different. What G. establishes are possibilities not results; and of course the multiplication of possibilities, however protracted, does not of itself increase probability.

Maurice Pope.

University of Cape Town.


The formula followed in this book is that already adopted successfully in such standard works as Ventris and Chadwick’s Documents and Palmer’s Interpretation. A long Introduction (pp. 15–99) deals first with the linguistic and cultural ambition in which Linear B developed, and then, after a chapter on the decipherment, it offers a detailed description of the script and its spelling conventions. A few pages are dedicated to the non-syllabic signs (“ideograms”, etc., but I would prefer “logograms”) and to the system of measures. The reader will perhaps regret that a manual which is meant for university students, i.e. for non-specialists, should dedicate only nine lines to the units of measurement (p. 53). No doubt it is useful to issue the warning that Mycenaean does not use a decimal system, but it might be even more interesting to go into the details of the system used, so that it could be compared, e.g., with those of the Near East. Moreover, most of the texts lose much of their significance, and indeed become almost incomprehensible—especially to the student—if the ratios between the various quantities of land or of goods are not made clear. Chapter 5, which follows, deals in detail with a number of linguistic problems—the position of Mycenaean among the Greek dialects, its similarity to classical Greek, its archaisms, etc.; at the end a brief picture of the grammar is given. The last chapter offers a short description of all the series of tablets in Cnossos, Pylos, etc. There follows (pp. 100 ff.) an anthology of tablets divided by class and by localities. The text is given in transliteration and is accompanied by a number of textual notes. A translation is provided whenever possible while the commentary concentrates on the doubtful points. A short glossary (divided in sections listing respectively lexical items, gods’ names, proper names and place names) and a long bibliography complete the book.

No doubt Italian students will welcome such an introduction to Mycenaean; Doria’s knowledge of the texts and of their bibliography is complete and up-to-date and his choice of tablets for discussion appears on the whole acute and reliable. One may wonder, however, if it is correct from a purely pedagogical point of view to offer for each phenomenon a long series of examples, some of which are certain and recognized as such by general consensus, while others would probably be doubted by a large number of scholars. For instance, it does not seem opportune to use (p. 55) the infinitive *we-ze-e* (from *we-e-se-n?*) to illustrate the dropping of the intervocalic *s* in Mycenaean, when the origin of the infinitive is not completely established. Similarly, why quote mara-ku (p. 58) as a sure example of preservation of the cluster *mr* in Mycenaean, when the reading of the word is doubtful (mara-ku or mara-pi) and its interpretation even more so? Of this the reader is warned later (p. 120), but not at the relevant passage. The student should also be careful to read the commentary to the texts quoted and not to content himself with the translation: a few inconsistencies between the latter and the commentary and/or the glossary are to be observed and no doubt will be corrected in a second edition. Thus da-mo-ko-ro (Ta 711) is taken as “*dumokolon, titolo di un notabile*” in the glossary at p. 222, but the translation of Ta 711 (p. 163) reads “Ciò che vide P. quando il Re investi Damoclo [proper name] del titolo di . . .”, while the commentary seems to hesitate between the two possible interpretations. In this particular case the crux can probably be resolved; in fact, a new join seems to prove that da-mo-ko-ro is a title and not a proper name.

Needless to say, the specialist will be more interested in seeing Doria’s own views and interpretations; from this angle a complete reading of the book will prove rewarding, though most of his findings have already appeared in print in several articles. For my part, I find particularly interesting the suggestion (p. 77) that the supposed dissimilation of labiovelars in the doublets *o-po-qa*/*o-qe-qa* and *pe-re-qo-la*/*qe-re-qo-la* is really an assimilation of the type *p>kw>kw>kw* found in Latin and Celtic. However, it is unfortunate that the two words in question are proper names for which various etymologies are possible so that real certainty cannot be reached. The only other example *i-po-po-qo* (cf. *i-qo: τετάρτος*) is taken by Doria as an instance of dissimilation: Myc. *q>q>p=>q*. In this he may well be right, but if so, it would seem more economical to classify the two doublets under the same heading of dissimilation. Or should we think of an assimilation of labials even in the case of *i-po-po-qo*, i.e. of Myc. *q>p>o>p*? In any case, the whole problem should probably be reconsidered, in view of the fact that its solution might have some importance for the classification of Mycenaean among the Greek dialects.

Notwithstanding the many typographical difficulties the book is well printed and presented; I have noticed very few misprints and omissions, all of which may be easily corrected. In spite of the vertiginous rate of bibliographical growth in Mycenaean studies it is likely that this introduction will be of useful service to a number of students for many years to come.

A. Morpurgo Davies.

St Hilda’s College, Oxford.

Mycenology as a name for the study of the Linear B tablets and the world that produced them is now accepted in many languages, and English had better follow suit. Mycenological publications appear thick and fast, and 1967 will see the first International Mycenaeanological Congress. Introductions to the subject have now begun to appear in languages other than English: L. Deroy's *Initiation à l'épigraphie mycénienne* (1962; *JHS* lxxxiv, 185 ff.) and M. Doria's *Avvicinamento allo studio del miceneo* (1965; *JHS* lxxxvi, 160) are now joined by this admirable summary by the leading German Mycenologist, Professor A. Heubeck. Within the limits of space it would be hard to improve upon this succinct and clearly written account of what we know and the problems we still face.

H. starts with an account of the tablets, the script and the dialect; he believes that Mycenaean is not the direct ancestor of any one later dialect. The contents of the tablets are discussed under the headings: geography, history, political and social organisation, agriculture, arms, craftsmanship, and religion. Where interpretation is difficult H. does not hesitate to present alternatives; but for the most part his sound judgment has enabled him to choose the most plausible of the interpretations so far offered. To quote only a few examples: the territory controlled by Pylos should be confined to Messenia. The importance of chariots as a means of transport is emphasised, and recent work on the Mycenaean road system is quoted. Killen’s account of the Knossos sheep tablets is accepted. The Pylos Ta tablets are the records of an inspection on the appointment by the king of a *da-mo-ko-ro*; H.’s judgment here has now been confirmed by new evidence that this is the title of an official. The *o-ka* tablets record the establishment of a coast-watching service as an emergency measure; the destruction of Pylos, together with all prominent Mycenaean sites, cannot be attributed to the Doriasts, though it is perhaps a little bold to identify the raiders securely as the 'Peoples of the Sea' and to ascribe the fall of Troy VII to the same cause.

More questionable are the following points. For *o-ka* H. proposes *holkal*, a modification of Mühlestein’s *holkas*, = 'ship'; this seems to me unlikely, but it makes little difference to the interpretation of this key series. On the Pylos E tablets, H. apparently rejects the theory that the quantities of wheat represent land; this is not only evidenced from Babylonia, but has been reported from several parts of the Mediterranean today (Sardinia, Yugoslavia and the Greek islands, where a man in Naxos was described as owning *dēo piōa oumēlnkia* 'two bushes (so to speak) of vines', for the *piōa* is a measure of capacity). The aim of this system is to equate parcels of land of equal productiveness, though their superficial area may differ considerably; it is like the Persian measurement of distance in parasangs, or the modern Greek use of time to express distance in rough country. H.’s suggestion that the quantities represent rent payable by the *onaters* raises more difficulties than it solves.

On the Pylos Aa, Ab tablets H. accepts F. J. Tristach’s hypothesis that the women and children are refugees; I have a complete discussion of this question in course of preparation, but here it should be enough to point out that the parallel tablets at Knossos (Ak) are so close that the same explanation must hold good there too; and H. himself has seen that these record the labour force for the textile industry.

H. fails to make the point that ideograms are used exclusively with numerals as counting symbols, at least apart from the use of one ideogram to qualify another. On the other hand he takes the view that the ideograms are largely stereotypes, and may thus be used indiscriminately and even inappropriately where the verbal description describes the object more accurately. This enables him (p. 82) to accept D. J. N. Lee’s suggestion that *a-ra-ro-mo-te-me-na* means ‘fitted with wheels’ (*a-mo-ta*) despite the absence of wheels from the ideogram; equally the second tripod cauldron on *PTa* 641A has only one leg (*e-me po-de*) despite the representation of three in the ideogram. This is an idea which needs to be seriously considered, though examples are still too scarce for an easy solution.

H. takes the view that the pairs of wheels listed on the Pylos Sa tablets refer ‘not to two single wheels, but to the complete undercarriage... composed of axle and two wheels’. This view seems to me untenable, since the whole tractive effort of the two horses has to be transferred via the pole and axle to the wheels, and it is hard to imagine any temporary method of joining the axle to the framework which would withstand the strains involved. The axle must surely have been an integral part of the chassis, and the wheels would be separately mounted by passing the hub over the ends of the axle and securing with lynch-pins. The need for the wheels to balance, and to match in decoration, is sufficient to account for their being recorded as pairs. It is therefore inadvisable to regard *we-e-ke-re* as a compound of *ezigos*; despite the linguistic difficulties there can be little doubt that the word means ‘in good condition’ as contrasted with *no-per-e-re* ‘unserviceable’.

In his presentation H. has adopted the useful convention of distinguishing reconstructed Mycenaean forms from transliterations by the use of italic type between oblique strokes, thus: *pe-rusinuv o-te-ro* (*perisinon opelos*). This seems to me an excellent solution, and one which I shall imitate. On the other hand, I must deplore the abandonment of the *Wingspread Convention* on the transcription of ideographic and metric signs. H. uses Latin words, but to substitute *axres* and *ovrs* for *ovrs* and *ovrs* is no gain and leaves one with no equivalent for the simple...
ideogram with no mark of sex-distinction (ovs). For the metric signs H. adopts the clumsy (if rational) system proposed by Deroy; since the use of z, v, s, τ, etc. is now standard in all texts, it is a pity that an introduction fails even to mention this system. The question of the real values of the volumetric signs cannot be discussed here, but the value of 0.2 l. for z is in my opinion too low.

The assumption of intervocalic -h- from -s- leads to numerous breaches of Grassmann's law (e.g. te-o-jo [thehojo], not to mention doubtful etymologies like 'Poseidonion'; in fact H. is inconsistent in his use of h: Trisēros p. 72, Tris-hēros p. 101; entē (instr. of el; p. 62) is perhaps a misprint for hemē. Other misprints: p. 31 for se-to-i-jo read se-to-i-ja; p. 61 for te-re ja read te-re-ja; p. 66 (Jo 438. 9) read [ro]. -s-; p. 85 read [thōrakes]. Safran (p. 80) is a slip for Safflor (English safflower, Carthamus tinctorius) as a translation of [knākos].

JOHN CHADWICK.

Downing College, Cambridge.


Concerning the linguistic aspects of the argument presented in this book I am not competent to judge, but it soon becomes obvious even to the rankest amateur that etymology is too often a first resort, that even where an etymology is brought in apparently to clinch an interpretation introduced on other grounds it was often actually the first cause, and that identification with Greek words of one-syllable stems or of two and even three-syllable words can not convince by their uniqueness where the spelling rules allow a multitude of other possibilities. The authors frequently quote Homeric uses of words to lend verisimilitude to identifications of syllabary words with Greek, but often it is not so much the possible meaning that needs confirmation as the identification.

The first and longer part builds up, in fourteen chapters (I-XIV), a picture of a Pylian land-register by means of almost all the E tablets (I). The first necessity, proof that the grain-amounts define parcels of land, is found (II) in the impossibility of other explanations (cf. Ea 801, Er 312). The usual understanding of private and public lands is supported (III) by more refined (cf. Ktimene as Antikleia's 'own' daughter in ο̑ 369) or new etymologies (resulting from a search for a reduplicated 'ke' stem which might give the 'public' meaning). The acquisition of both kinds of land is etymologically defined (IV) as sale rather than lease, with the acquired land (onato) not sharing the inalienability of the owned land (kotona).

After explaining the differences of the two kinds of records (Ea vs. Eb, En, Eo, Ep) as reflecting two districts (V), the authors study in some detail the proprietors (kotomoko) and acquirers (onatere) of both (pakijamia in VI; meteto in VII). (I do not understand why the authors seem to have consulted Bennett's basic 'Landholders of Pylos' only on the subject of hands.) An impressive case is made for the damo as the assembly of the kotomoko, who subsequently own both individually and collectively land which can be acquired by onatere without, however, their gaining thereby any voice in the damo. The social and professional associations of both types of landholder are shown to be preponderantly religious, whether they are slave (only onatere) or free. The situation at meteto is less clear because only the single-entry tablets are preserved. The genitive trade-names (qopotao, amoteaco, mariteco) which accompany various parcels of public land (kekemenon kotona) are explained as nominal rather than possessive so as not to upset the private-public distinction. That there are none such in pakijamia is perhaps not too strange considering the other differences (onatere here are all free, and religious associations are few).

Assuming that kama (VIII) is relevant only to abandoned (public) land (although its being so designated only twice raises the question if these are not special situations), so that its etymological 'toil' (cf. also woze and terreja) can reclaim it, the authors contemplate an allotment of land for services rendered to it; both the land and the labour could be shared by onatere, but the responsibility remained with the kamaen. Other special kinds of landholding are taken up in the next three chapters: etonija (IX) as an enclave of parcels excepted from regular onato-proceedings in the interests of the holder (with ensarirjo etymologized through a glass darkly to give both a god and time of troubles!); temena (X) as the term for six special grants of public land to important persons (king, duke, three magistrates) or for a public facility (granary) with a probable seventh on Er 880 (whether [a]pu is rightly identified or not); sarapedo (XI) as a provisional land-grant (by an etymology exemplifying the obscuren per obscureus principle).

Consideration of the tereta (XII) as magistrates shows the general tendency of this treatment to replace religious interpretations of words with secular and economic terms (meaningful titles are also often suggested to replace personal names). A survey of all landholders and parcels of land (XIII) serves as a basis for various statistics from which some conclusions can be drawn about social and economic development. A summary synopsis (XIV) points up the consistency of the system, e.g., scarcity of anono (unsold) public land requires the opening up of new lands provided for in the kama-type contract. Generally speaking, the effort to impose a general order on the many various aspects of the E tablets has produced impressive results; the system which has been induced is not the final answer, as the authors are quick to say, nor is it the only possibility, but it provides valuable pointers which no follower in the field can afford to ignore.

The second part of the book takes up, in nine
chapters, subsidiary matters which contribute to a proper appreciation of the cadastre itself. Ordinary servitude and the extent to which it incapacitated a man are studied in all the Pylos tests (XV); but apparently only sacred slaves (of the god or of clergy) could acquire land (XVI); another special group of slaves (An 607) is improbably presented as prison guards (XVII). Also treated are: an apparent partnership (XVIII); a new etymology for vawos (XIX); identification of amouet as wheelwright (XX); assignment of magisterial role to egeta (XXI); a free gift of grain to a diviner (XXII)—this involves etymologies of Varronian scope; and the attempt (XXIII) to define and locate pakijanija, concluding with one etymology indicative of a geographical situation and another making it the land of the Dove Goddess. It is in connexion with this last that a sentence typical of the book's tendentious argument should be quoted: 'Tout serait clair si l'on découvrait, sur le terrain, ce lieu sacré dont l'importance dans le royaume pylien explique peut-être que le vieux roi Nestor buvait, selon Homère, dans une coupe à quatre anses ornées de colombe.'

M. L. Lang.

Bryn Mawr College.


In a work of synthesis on this scale, which will provide for our time what Zeller did for his, we look for judgment and balance rather than novelty and adventure. Professor Guthrie's command of the modern literature is complete, his discussion dispassionate and judicious; avoiding tedious polemics, he unravels and presents the evidence with objectivity and acute comment. Nothing of importance is overlooked, and there is reason to be grateful for the pages on the history of the Zenonian controversy, on some obscure points in Anaxagorbas, and on the Atomists' concepts of indivisibility and causality. At the same time due proportion is preserved, and full consideration is given to the biological and meteorological ideas which are sometimes treated as a rather unimportant appendix to cosmology, as well as to Democritus' moral notions. In particular one must admire the mastery of the use and disposition of footnotes, which though plentiful are models of concise statement; and applaud his publishers' consideration and skill in maintaining the civilized custom of printing them where they belong.

The history of the rationalist assault on natural philosophy and its reconstruction follows in general the lines of the modern vulgate, in the development of which Cambridge has played a large and distinguished part. If G. has not initiated motion, he has taken account of all things and set them in order. Clarification of Parmenides is achieved by providing a translation with commentary. Despite this it is not altogether easy to grasp how he understands P.'s (non-material but extended) Being, which it is surely anachronistic to describe as 'the Parmenidean One'. On the Doxa he appears to dismiss too lightly Owen's suggestion that it was dialectical. Zeno and Melissus are dealt with at roughly equal length, and rightly: for Melissus, however little respect his arguments may command, is of central importance as evidence, as well as changing the basis of Eleatic doctrine, whereas there is little to show (pass Kirk and Raven, p. 370, and less positively Guthrie, pp. 281, 289) that any pluralist took much account of Zeno. The supposition that he was contoversing a particular Pythagorean doctrine dies hard and regains G.'s not very enthusiastic adherence.

Empedocles occupies more space than either the Eleatics or Atomists, and twice as much as Anaxagoras, which accords not only with G.'s avowed interest (p. xiii) but also with the length of his remains, and probably his importance. The account is fairly plain sailing. G. upholds a cosmological cycle of three periods, considers (rightly) that (B35) Love withdraws to the centre of the Sphere, and interprets B100 to imply that we breathe through the inner surface of our nostrils, which despite Aristotle (p. 223)—who is anyhow uncertain what process E is referring to—is not easy to accept. Like Bignone, G. finds no incompatibility between the two poems, but differs in his identification of qjpiy iepi. This last is an interesting but not wholly convincing section.

Controversial questions in Anaxagoras are well and clearly treated, though I can find nothing objectionable in Aristotle's statement (p. 293) that for A. 'the homeoomers are simple', and doubt whether his use of 'seeds' indicates any stress on biology. Mind is described as virtually immaterial though extended: the connexion with vjepi is emphasised; the significance of krjte might well have been. A's originality, though acknowledged, is somewhat diminished by the emphasis on his Milesian affiliations (Gigon's article in Philologus 1936-7 is commended). If A's (and not Leucippus) was indeed the first to postulate an infra-sensible reality, this may have been his most important advance. Leucippus is squeezed chronologically between the younger Eleatics and Diogenes, about 430. The terminus post quem hardly seems warranted, especially if 'he looked rather to Parmenides for his concept of Being', and the crudity of his astronomy suggests an earlier date. Atomism is described as 'a reformed and corrected version of Pythagoreanism'. It might be less paradoxical to stress L.'s uncompromising break with Eleatic ideas more than the resemblance between his atoms and the Or; particularly if the latter was not only motionless and single, but immaterial as well. The remainder of the account (in which G. abjures the
impossible task of distinguishing L. from his successor) is very clear, and brings out the ad hoc character of some Atomist explanations. Diogenes received the full consideration that he deserves.

Details apart, there are aspects of this history on which fuller comment from Professor Guthrie would have been welcome and enlightening. On chronological relations, though he admits uncertainties and the possibility of other views, the impression persists that the current vulgate has been too much taken for granted regarding the younger Eleatics, Anaxagoras, and Leucippus. Again, G. appears a little impatient of raising questions which, he says, cannot have occurred to Parmenides or others. Even if P. had no clear concept of the incorporeal, it seems pertinent, indeed unavoidable, to ask whether his Being is corporeal or not; just as we may inquire (but seldom do) whether his argument is in fact logical, even if he had no concept of logic. And the assertion that a question ‘could not have occurred’ to someone is always rather question-begging, particularly if it did in fact occur to someone else shortly afterwards. Though G. is the least dogmatic of writers, historicism seems to cast its shadow here, in the tacit assumption that things could not have happened otherwise than as they did.

Finally, a few questions. Did Empedocles and Anaxagoras simply accept the traditional ἄμορφος-ἀμφότερος as a law of matter independent of the operation of Νεῦστος or Νεῖν;? Did Anaxagoras really suppose that the vortex both carries heavier bodies to the centre and flings them outward? (The answer here seems really to hinge on a word in Aetius (pp. 302–3).) If the concavity of the earth (p. 342) explains why the sun rises at different times in different places, does it explain why it lights the east first? Should Aetius be quoted without comment when he apparently describes the shift of the pole from the zenith to its present position as a tilt of the κόσμος to the south (p. 305; cf. pp. 191, 423)? If the Atomists held that the earth is still rotating (even slowly), did they fail to observe that the sun does not in fact rise at all points on the horizon? Did they hold both that atoms are subject to a strict law of mechanical necessity (p. 418) and that their motion when unimpeded was confused and irregular in all directions (p. 404) without inquiring whether it might not at least be rectilinear?

Since our sources offer no answers, such questions might be called pointless. But they are not of a kind that pre-Socratic thinkers ‘cannot have asked’: they should have asked them, and surely must have asked them; unless we are to suppose that they were too much concerned with exorcising answers to Parmenides to consider the world they lived in. Clearly G. does not mean to give this impression, which seems to do them less than justice, and one could therefore wish that the emphasis in his book were slightly different; and suspect, or venture to hope, that his exemplary regard for evidence has sometimes led him to show greater tenderness to the doxographers, when uncontradicted, than they deserve.

These are marginal points in a big book. In its liberal display of the evidence, patient discussion of problems, and lucid exposition, Professor Guthrie has written an account which is comprehensive, coherent, and readable.

R. Mathewson.

University of Exeter.


This is in the main a work of piety. The editor, Franziska Mayer-Hillebrand, in Innsbruck herself heard Kastil, a firm devotee of Franz Brentano. He virtually reproduced Brentano’s lectures on Greek philosophy and recited to his students Brentano’s Ode to Anaxagoras, which will be found as note 101 at pages 362 and 363 of this book. Is this more than hagiology—hagiology of a saint who gave up a chair in Würzburg and was jockeyed out of one in Vienna because he reluctantly and without bitterness ceased to assent to church doctrine? Provided that one allows for the difference of generations and does not use this book as a concise ‘Kirk and Raven’, it is in fact very worth while to reproduce the words of the departed master. The reprinting at Darmstadt in 1960 of the Freiburg publication of 1862 Von der mannigfachen Bedeutung des Seienden nach Aristoteles is a sign of the relevance of Brentano today. He is probably the greatest philosopher to devote himself almost entirely to the history and interpretation of Greek philosophy on the Continent in the nineteenth century. Schleiermacher was more ideosyncratic and Zeller was not in the same sense a philosopher: indeed Brentano and Zeller crossed swords over the interpretation of Aristotle. Brentano’s ‘creationism’ taught the direct creative act of the divine at the point where the human embryo was ready to be delivered: not a creation of the spiritual soul as a distinct entity but a Mitwirkung which produced man as a unified total creature endowed with reason not to be found elsewhere in the sublunary realm.

This is all compressed into note 177 at pp. 379–80 of this book but can be read more fully in Aristoteles Lehre vom Ursprung des menschlichen Geistes (Leipzig 1911). In the present work we have a brief introduction setting forth the doctrine of four phases—the climbing, ascending phase, represented in antiquity by Greek thought up to Aristotle; and three phases of decline: practical and popular philosophising, scepticism, mysticism (man meint alles zu wissen und weiss nichts). Then begins the long and carefully detailed account of philosophy from Thales to Aristotle. It is remarkable how well and with what understanding this great Aristotelian treats Plato. It
is impossible in a short notice to indicate in detail where the mid-twentieth century judgment differs from that of the later nineteenth; but it is always fascinating to see what Brentano said. One is left wishing that all historians of philosophy were real philosophers and congratulating Franziska Mayer-Hillebrand on her good fortune at hearing Brentano at second hand and on her undertaking so great a labour of piety.

J. B. Skemp.

University of Durham.


Müller has developed his Bonn dissertation into a book about the like-to-like principle, mainly in the Presocratics and in its physical and more special aspects only. It is well known that the principle was an important one, explicitly so from Empedocles onwards, and was much used as an analytical tool in Peripatetic histories of philosophy. It is a fault of the present study that its author does so little to identify and discount the excessive schematisation of the doxographical tradition, and especially of Theophrastus himself. Moreover, the consideration of individual thinkers is often sketchy, in spite of some very long footnotes, and the Milesians and Heraclitus deserve far more attention, in relation to possible early appearances of the concept, than they receive here. The question of ultimate origins is dismissed with some cursory references to sympathetic magic, on which the author’s reading does not seem at all up-to-date. In the fuller discussions of Parmenides, Empedocles, Anaxagoras and the Atomists I found little that was revealing, and a good deal that appeared irrelevant. The study of the development of a particular theme or idea often turns out to illuminate its wider context, but there is not much gain in the present case. Perhaps too much has already been written on like-to-like in the Presocratics; but certainly clarity and expression could have been improved on, and, more important, different forms and applications of the concept—some of which may imply a complex origin—could have been more clearly distinguished. On some early Hippocratic uses of the idea, which are less familiar, Müller is correspondingly more valuable; but the book tails off again in its treatment of sophistic, popular and post-Platonic developments. Perhaps I have been too critical; for a more favourable assessment see G. B. Kerferd, CR NS 16, 1966, 211 f.

G. S. Kirk.

Tale University.


The writer is a Protestant theologian as well as a student of ancient philosophy who in the main follows Martin Heidegger. He is concerned with the meaning of 'analogy' and seeks by a new study of it to justify Barth's use of an *analogia fidei* as distinct from the traditional and scholastic *analogia entis*. Purely as a first exercise to this end he makes a kind of 'phenomenological' study of what happens in the thought of Parmenides and of Heraclitus and concludes that each of them proceeds by a method (or basic assumption) of analogy; the former by analogy as *Entsprechung*, the latter by analogy as *Gegensatz*. Much of this is *φωνής συνετοίας*; the reviewer can make little of

Die aus dem Raum der Sprache verstandene Analogie weist auf das Sein hin in der dem Widerspruch zwischen der Wahrheit des Seins und der Ordnung des Scheins eigenen Entsprechung zwischen der Wahrheit des Seins und der Ordnung des Scheins. (p. 29.)

The general sense seems to be that Parmenides shows close and conscious linkage between *οὐ* and *τά πρός δόξαν* and that within both (fragments B3 and B16 having verbal echoes and similarities of sense) there is at once an antithesis and an intimate linkage between thought and what there is to be thought. The most interesting discussion is that of Fragment 16. Jüngel is very dogmatic about the text, and is quite sure that in *τὸ γὰρ πλέον ἐστὶ νόημα, πλέον* means 'full' not 'more'. He is also sure that *μελέων φῶς* in 16, 3 refers to the 'limbs' of the Universe. Neither of these things is certain. Theophrastus did not so understand the passage. One can only contrast with Jüngel's treatment the more patient and careful treatment by J. Mansfeld in *Die Offenbarung des Parmenides und die Menschliche Welt* (Assen, 1964), pp. 175-93, of this fragment. He too takes *πλέον* to mean 'full', but his whole careful treatment of each line shows how risky it is to come to a text like this à parti pris.

With Heraclitus Jüngel can 'go to town'. The system by which opposites coexist constantly appears and disappears in nature. Instead of correspondence between worlds you have inbuilt correspondence of mutually necessary opposites. This is indeed *Gegensatz*, as Jüngel says, but in what real sense is it *Analogie*? I spite of pretty chastic diagrams (especially on page 33!), I find little enlightenment of the dark one here. I think Parmenides really (if one takes *τά πρός δόξαν* as in any sense correlated to *ἀλήθεια*, and that is a big prior question!) provides Jüngel with his best case of a contradiction in parallel which cannot transcend itself and so points beyond itself—a *theo-onto-logische Analogie* in his orthography.

J. B. Skemp.

University of Durham.

The word ‘new’ in the title of this book is presumably meant to indicate what is claimed in the editorial preface—that the essays are the work of modern philosophers with an awareness of the continuity of philosophical problems, writing on the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. The implication is that the contributors write predominantly as philosophers, if also as scholars. The eight essays fulfill the claim, when they do at all, in a surprising variety of ways and in varying degrees. They range from the essay of the editor, Renford Bambrough, which claims, dubiously, that Aristotle's analysis of the two senses of ‘justice’ in Book V of the Nicomachean Ethics somehow reveals the essence of philosophy, to Ryle's treatment of the much more local question concerning what eristic and dialectic meant to the Greeks (with its intriguing claim that eristic was a refereed game with definite rules and that dialectic was essentially another species of the same genus). If Bambrough's essay is more about philosophy than about Aristotle, Ryle's is certainly more about ancient Greek methods and procedures of argument than about philosophy itself.

Of the other articles on Plato, Gregory Vlastos provides a careful and interesting account of what the doctrine of degrees of reality meant for Plato. The ontological issues are, he claims, prejudiced by epistemological doctrines which put a premium on infallibility and hence on the objects of such knowledge. He provides incidentally a useful counter to the view that the ἐκπομπή τὰ πολλὰ which are F and not-F are not individuals but kinds of individual. R. M. Hare discusses Plato's objections to mathematics in Republic 510 ff., and its implications for his view of dialectic and its relation to mathematics. Hare's remarks on this are fairly schematic and the tentativeness of the interpretation of Plato contrasts with a certain dogmatism on individual philosophical issues, e.g. the nature of metaphysics, the possibility of the synthetic a priori, and the logic of the word 'good'. He claims, incidentally, that the hypotheses of the Republic are things not propositions.

There are two papers on ontology in Aristotle, by G. E. L. Owen and D. M. Mackinnon. That by Owen is, expectedly by far the more intricate and fascinating, and it will no doubt be much discussed and repeatedly returned to by scholars in this field. By contrast, Mackinnon's paper on Aristotle's conception of substance, solid as it is, has a certain flatness. Owen starts from a putative analysis of existence in Aristotle (to the effect that 'to be' means 'to be so-and-so')—an analysis which is relevant to the view that πολλά μὲν λέγεται τὸ δὲ. He proceeds to work out the implications of this and of Aristotle's failure to note the distinction between the existential 'is' which is predicative and the existential 'is' which is not. Any summary of this in a short space would be misleading. Owen's paper has a characteristic rich-

ness which demands frequent re-examination. One question which arises at first glance is whether Aristotle's so-called analysis of the existential 'is' is this at all—whether it is not something much more reductionist, a refusal to attach a distinct sense to 'exists' at all. To what extent, indeed, is it justifiable to assume that the formula about the different senses of being is about existence at all?

Of the remaining two papers, Ackrill's pays careful attention to Aristotle's distinction between energia and kinesis at Metaphysics Θ.6, and raises objections to Ryle's interpretation of energia in terms of 'got-it verbs'. A possible interpretation of this passage is followed by a discussion of difficulties which arise both from Aristotle's examples and from versions of the distinction elsewhere in his works. The examples might be dealt with, perhaps, by the recognition (to which Ackrill pays no clear attention) that the distinction is essentially relative. But I am inclined to think in many cases that Ackrill devotes too great a consideration to the criteria offered at Metaphysics Θ.6, and too little to the connexion of the distinction with such concepts as that of a τέλος. Miss Anscombe's paper on 'Thought and Action in Aristotle' leads up to a conception of 'practical truth' which she finds in Aristotle—the good working of practical judgment. Her treatment is sometimes obscure and I am not sure that everything that she attributes to Aristotle is really there. But it is nevertheless a paper which is bound to provoke thought and comment.

In the sum, we are presented here with an uneven but generally interesting set of papers, some of which are bound to find a more or less permanent place in the study of Greek Philosophy. Whether there is anything there of a kind which could not be found in collections with a different preconception is another matter.

D. W. HAMLYN.

Birkbeck College, London.


This is a valiant exercise in the art of compression. In 81 pages of text and 19 of notes Eggers Lan tries to provide a social, cultural and economic history of Greece from the very earliest times to the fourth century, the better to understand Plato's life and thought. The drawbacks are soon apparent: dogmatic statement instead of reasoned discussion; major topics skated over in a sentence or two; quotation of ancient sources without adequate allowance for their peculiar character (e.g. the 'Old Oligarch', pp. 57-8); heavy reliance on opinions taken ready-made from modern authorities. The degree of generality is in fact such that Plato tends to be lost from view.
and the book could serve as an introduction to practically anything. But these faults seem inevitable, given the nature of the enterprise. On the credit side the very brevity of the work gives it a good sharp outline, and there are abundant references to stimulate further reading (though coverage of modern literature is sometimes patchy). Provided the book is taken as no more than an introduction, it will be useful enough.

T. J. S.

Romano does not, I think, commit the petitio principii mentioned in (1) above. But the other difficulties bedevil the book. Romano cannot show, he can only assert, that the myths must mean something as specific as the point conveyed by the logos; but this does not stop him constantly finding interpretations of the myths that fit his view of Plato’s real ‘point’. Take, for instance, the problem of the tripartition of the soul and the question of whether the irrational parts survive the death of the body (deftly handled by Guthrie in Fondation Hardy, Entretiens, vol. III, which Romano ought at least to have cited). Romano believes that the soul is a unity in its essence but a plurality in its potentialities and relations (pp. 145–6, cf. 169); the ‘principle of corruption’ of the soul is inherent in the soul itself, and does not spring from its attachment to the body (p. 175). Now this may or may not be a correct view of the tripartition of the soul, but it does mean that Romano has to dismiss the other-worldly myth of the Phaedo, with its stress on the corrupting effects of the body, as ‘solo un momento provvisorio della speculazione platonica’ (p. 174). According to the Phaedrus, all the ‘parts’ of the soul survive death; but the reincarnation which figures so prominently in the myth becomes in Romano’s view ‘la figurazione mitica dell’ eternità della vita e dell’ immortalità del suo principio, che è l’anima’ (p. 176); soul always cares for the inanimate (Phaedrus 246b6—a key text for Romano), and when a soul enters a body, the body ‘lives’, and when the soul departs, the body ‘dies’. Reincarnation is therefore treated as a mere picturesque expression of the intimate alternating relationship of soul and body, i.e. life and death. In effect, Romano can make reincarnation ‘mean’ something only by virtually eliminating it from his interpretation. My complaint is not that Romano’s approach is necessarily wrong (to ask what a myth is getting at is a natural and justifiable question), but that to concentrate so grimly on the dialectical ‘point’, without reference to what other less precise purposes the myths may serve, inevitably distorts them.

Romano has written an interesting and provocative book, and his reconstruction of Plato’s logos on the soul deserves consideration. But in his handling of the mythoi he has been both one-sided and methodologically incautious.

TREVOR J. SAUNDERS.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne.


In this account of the Hermaphroditea the androgynous cult in the classical world from the end of the
fifth century B.C. to the conclusion of the period of Antiquity is examined in some detail with adequate documentation and illustration. The oldest trace of it in this region is in a bearded male Aphrodite statue at Amathus in Cyprus supported by a few references to it in Theophrastus, Alciphon and Macrobius, together with the portrayal of Hermaphroditus as a beautiful youth with developed breasts, and subsequently Aphrodite with male genitals. The legend of the fusion of the son of Hermes and Aphrodite with the nymph of Salmacis in Caria as male and female is related by Ovid in his Metamorphoses to explain the regenerative qualities of the water of the fountain. But after the fourth century the androgynous theme and its iconography ceased to be a special cult, surviving rather in customs like the exchange of clothing in nuptial ceremonies, and in other rites symbolizing bisexuality.

In the essay devoted to typology the androgynous statues and reliefs are discussed. Many of these were of excellent design and workmanship; the Eros of Praxiteles at Parian on the Hellespont, for instance, displaying male and female beauty rather than Hermaphroditus freaks of nature. The widely dispersed domestic cult that has been attested in Greece in the first half of the fourth century (c. 393 B.C.) is reviewed; some of the grosser bisexual figures having Demetrian features; as, for example, that at Stockholm carrying the calathos full of fruits. Others are associated with Demeter, Persophone, Hades and the gods of Samothrace. On the Stockholm statue appears Baubo, the obscene female daemon in the Orphic version of the Rape of Kore, and mother of the Anatolian Mise. These works reveal a virile force in combination with maternity, sacrificing elegance to the bisexual motif. The Hermaphroditus Chablaïs in the Capitol museum is in all probability a marble Roman copy of an ancient original in which a virile member was attached to the female pubis of Aphrodite in the portrayal of a woman carrying a child like Isis and Horus. In this Chablaïs tradition is the red figure of Aphrodite suckling and playing with Eros, and a Hermaphroditus head sometimes has that of Isis, while Hermes or Silene carries Dionysos.

The Aphrodite type resembles the Demeter figures except that the hips and thighs are larger and the male and female androgynous members are placed as in the Chablaïs Hermaphroditus. With the ithyphallic symbolism shells occur as the emblem of Aphrodite. The Dionysian type is intentionally androgynous, a clad figure in the Naples museum having a thyrse with double sexual organs, like the Bacchic figures. In the Priapus type the double god is often associated with Pan, but devoid of ithyphallic designs. Symbols of water or rivers recur to promote fertility with nymphs and fountains, the abdomen often turned towards the earth for this purpose. The calathos on the Stockholm statue is indicative of a parentage with Demeter; mirrors and necklaces with that of Aphrodite; and the thyrsus with Dionysos.

In classical art the earlier cults are obscured and become nearer to the primitive at the end of the period. At all levels in Greece a great variety of androgynous forms recur, generally without successors, rarely ithyphallic and never priapic. The two natures are frequently hardly discernible, and in the case of twins duality at birth retains primitive androgynous traits. To stimulate all the vital forces, and everything that provokes love, virility and fecundity, Hermaphroditus is connected with Aphrodite, Dionysos and Eros. Being associated with birth and fertility, the primeval egg or shells become images of Eros as in folklore, while in Orphic cosmogony this symbolism is applied to the origin of the world. The Jungian archetype of the child is reviewed in its androgynous aspects, together with angels, the role of funerary figures and that of Eros as Ganymede carried off by Zeus to Olympus. Eros with Ganymede, in fact often is virtually Attis or Adonis in Graeco-oriental guise. In this exhaustive collection of the heterogeneous androgynous traditions and techniques in the classical iconography and typology the oriental versions of the archetype have persisted as an integral element, largely derived from its cradleland in the Fertile Crescent and the Ancient Near East.

E. O. James.

All Souls College, Oxford.


This is, in the main, a useful illustrated compendium of the chief legends connected with Heracles, based on the original Greek authorities, vase paintings (not all of them familiar) and reliefs. ‘Il n’est pas de personnage qui dans la légende grecque ait été plus populaire qu’Héraclès’, and the book needs, perhaps, no further justification for its existence. Certainly no monograph on Heracles has appeared in recent years where the literary and archaeological evidence is so neatly collected. The book is not intended for scholars as Greek is eschewed and cult and controversial matter only touched on in M. Flagellière’s masterly introduction to the literary sources, of which he provides lively and accurate prose translations drawn from various sources, including some of his own. The extracts are supplemented by summaries where necessary, and also furnished with brief explanatory notes at just the points where they are needed, without confusing the reader with unnecessary detail which those who are interested can obtain for themselves. The source and content of each extract is revealed in a short introduction, in the first of which F. wonders whether the curious contradiction between the presumptive derivation of the hero’s name (‘glorie d’Héraclès’) and Hera’s unrelenting hostility might not be
explained on the grounds that the numerous trials undergone by the hero ultimately redounded to the goddess’ fame, rather than that he was her glorious gift to his parents.

The Twelve Tasks of Herakles were not canonical, and vary from authority to authority. F includes them all, as well as the hero’s secondary exploits, expeditons, death and apotheosis. The French is sometimes delightful. What, for example, could be more delicately expressed than that when the Argonauts landed at Lemnos ‘ils y trouvent une situation très particulière’?

Turning to the archaeological material so painstakingly assembled by the Conservateur en chef au Musée du Louvre it is amply illustrative of his distinguished collaborator’s opening caveat that ‘Dans toute la mythologie grecque il n’est pas de légende plus complexe que celles d’Héraclès! There can be little doubt that ‘les nourrices contaminaient certaines de ses aventures aux enfants dont elles avaient la garde’, just as, a British scholar might have recalled, Spanish mothers were reputed to have alarmed their children with horrific accounts of the exploits of El Draco. But the hero is not invariably represented as a figure of terror ‘et chacun si l’on peut dire, s’est fait selon sa nature et selon l’époque et le lieu où il vivait un Héraclès à sa mesure’. He can even appear sentimental on occasion, or fatherly as in the delightful scene en famille by the Siren painter. Indeed one of the most useful features of the book is undoubtedly M. Devambez’s sensitive interpretations of the 24 vase paintings chosen for illustration. These are excellent for the most part, although archaic and classical examples are sometimes bewilderingly, if effectively, juxtaposed. The un-classical features of the curious Asteas vase (which D thinks may well derive from a larger work) are carefully examined, while the episode of the slaying of Geras is explained as an allegory of the hero’s stand against old age in his capacity of Alexikakos. Extreme violence is requisite because old age is a far more redoubtable adversary than the lion of Nemea or the Cretan bull. The artists’ humour is not confined to scenes of burlesque, such as the cowardly discomfiture of Eurystheus when faced with the Erymanthian boar or Cerberus, but is more subtly depicted in the stroking of the hound on a vase from Vulci where, as D. aptly remarks, ‘notre curiosité est plus usée qu’iniquète’.

Who is the mysterious goddess seated beside Hestia in the scene representing the hero’s apotheosis attributed to the Sosias painter? Why again is the Apollo-like figure between Hermes and Herakles inscribed ‘Artemis’? D.’s explanation that they represent ‘une confusion du peintre’ seems inevitable in view of the false identification of the goddess as Amphiitrite, who appears on the obverse beside her husband Poseidon. Could she not, perhaps, be Aphrodite naked to the waist and bearing a myrtle wand? It is a pity that Evelyn A. Harrison’s article Athena and Athens in the East Pediment of the Parthenon (AJA 71.7 Jan. 1967) appeared too late for D. to favour us with his considered opinion of the suggested identification of ‘Theseus’ with Herakles.

This is more than a mere picture book. It is a work of scholarship besides. It does not pretend to be comprehensive, e.g. there is no discussion of Apollodorus’ account of the hero’s amorous adventure with Thespius’ daughters, of Herodotus’ attempt to identify him with Egyptian deities, of the war against Erginos or his place in Latin legend. But then the authors are concerned with the essential Herakles of classical Greek times, and of him they have provided a vivid portrait that should prove adequate for all.

The book is admirably printed and produced and I noticed only one misprint on p. 94. It is a pity that there is no index, but in a work of such a general nature it may not strictly speaking be necessary.

JOHN POLLARD.

University College of N. Wales,
Bangor.

1965. Pp. vii + 223. £1 17s. 6d.

Professor Baldry’s scholarly little book is marked above all by conscientiousness. However much he would like to draw striking conclusions from the evidence, he is too good a scholar to twist it or overemphasise, or to omit what tells against the conclusions that might be drawn from the more striking conclusions of sages, taken in isolation. This, it must be admitted, does not make for exciting reading; but for reference, after one has read the book through (and not without this essential step) it will be most valuable, presenting as it does a thorough collation of the evidence, parts of which have often been isolated and over-stressed, especially perhaps by scholars of the first half of our century.

After a brief Introduction there follow five chapters: II, ‘From Homer to Hippocrates’ (including the Sophists); III, ‘Socrates and the Fourth Century’ (not surprisingly, much the longest chapter, having to deal with Isocrates, Plato and Aristotle among others); IV, ‘Alexander and his influence’; V, ‘The Hellenistic philosophers’; VI, ‘The impact of Rome’, with Polybius, the Middle Stoa and Cicero, who is rightly included, as being our chief source on much Hellenistic moral philosophy.

A number of quotations will perhaps best illustrate the character and severely limited conclusions of the book.

‘My subject ... is the emergence of an idea—or rather, perhaps, of an attitude of mind.... The unity of mankind has been treated as a doctrine ‘discovered’ by a single individual... Antiphon,
Alexander, Zeno . . . But the history of thought is not so simple’ (p. 2).
‘Hellenic civilisation in its early days provided far from fertile soil for the growth of the concept’ (p. 3). From Linear B ‘nothing’ relevant ‘has come to light’ (p. 8). (This is hardly surprising). In Homer ‘There is no explicit statement of this unity in either poem; but as an unconscious assumption it is present throughout.’

Now this is not very surprising either. Surely the fact is simply that as soon as language possesses a word for ‘men’, the concept of mankind, however naive and undiscussed, is already present. Discussion of it and more conscious formulation only arises when social conditions produce uneasiness about the divisions within the species: ‘Best people’ and masses, women, slaves (already a subject of pitting comment in Homer; a slave is only half a man); and later, especially, Hellenes and barbarians. Consciousness of the antithesis then produces attempts at a synthesis. This, indeed, is what the whole book is about; but one may feel that B.’s treatment would have gained in clearness and interest if he had made the point explicit.

As it is, through chapters II and III, amid the excellent collection of source-material (the translation and discussion of the long papyrus fragment 44 of Antiphon the Sophist is particularly to be commended), one reader at least was left continually wondering whether we are getting anywhere. A notable bromide on Plato, for example (‘His awareness of humanism as a single entity is beyond question’, p. 76), rather suggests the contrary. The argument warms up, however, with the chapter on Alexander, where B. finds himself in the presence of a tangible antagonist, and addresses himself ably to the contemporary enterprise of dismantling Tarn.

‘The direct evidence cited by Tarn and his supporters is slight’ (p. 115; taken up after eleven pages of analysis on p. 126). So also on the Cynics (p. 113): ‘In our evidence . . . there is no trace of any vision of a united humanity.’ The ‘widening of the world’ (p. 128) produced by Alexander’s military career is not buried; but even in Menander (pp. 134–40), in the last analysis ‘the old distinctions and prejudices are still taken for granted’ (p. 139).

This indeed is the salutary if unexciting conclusion of the book. What passes for new in the thought of the Hellenistic age can be traced earlier; and its effect on society remains weak. B. concludes:

‘The development and spread of the concept of human unity which we have traced from Homer to Cicero ends with the traditional divisions and prejudices still unbroken. It has roused no call for revolutionary change in the structure of society . . . But at any rate a stage has been reached at which acceptance of the idea of human brotherhood is regarded as an essential characteristic of every human being worthy of the name.’

A. R. Burn.


The purpose of this book, which is intended to be the first of two volumes carrying the subject down to the present day, is to give ‘a connected and reasonably substantial account of man’s quest for political knowledge in the West’. However, the criterion of man’s advancement appears to be his appreciation of the necessity of establishing political study-centres and teaching institutions; and the writer (whose English style reminds one most of a BBC Junior Schools Programme) seems both surprised and disappointed when he discovers (with the aid of a team of research assistants) that neither the Cities of Sumer nor the Palaces of Hammurabi and Pharaoh, nor the rulers of Israel, nor the Delphic Oracle, nor, indeed, any responsible authority anywhere, down to the fourth century B.C., appears to have recognised the need for such Foundations. Socrates, however, despite certain shortcomings (for instance, his failure to support the emancipation of women, and a faulty ‘survey technique’) undertook as his lifetime mission the study of ‘the problems of men living in communities’, although the writer can find no evidence that he ever lectured. So it is with manifest relief that he introduces us to Plato (whose school, situated in the grove ‘called after the military hero Academus’, taught ‘anti-politics’, gave no degrees, and was, by implication, less effectual than the Fabian Society or the N.Y. New School for Social Research), Isocrates (‘who most nearly corresponded to a typical American college-teacher of political science’—and whose work represented, therefore, less of a waste of useful talent than did Plato’s), and Aristotle, who at last founded a genuine ‘research institution’. But when Rome (‘not truly a republic in the modern sense’) appears on the scene, we note a sad falling-off. Between Polybius, deported to Rome after the defeat of ‘the Achaeans’ at Pydna, and Cicero, there was no ‘major publication’ on politics; and we are invited to sympathise with the latter in that, during his ‘fourteen or fifteen years of semi-retirement’ after 59, there was no ‘strong and free university’ to invite this ‘out-of-office’ politician to join its faculty as lecturer or professor!

Although a quite disproportionate amount of the text is devoted to thinkers (and, indeed, to peoples) who have admittedly left no trace of their political opinions, the Greek tyrants of the seventh to the fifth centuries (who must surely have had some worthwhile contribution to make to a survey of this sort), Cleisthenes and Themistocles of Athens (whose policies are surely evidence of political experience gained and applied), and the architects and statesmen of the great Federal ‘Leagues’, receive between them some one-and-a-half lines. Nor, indeed, do 400 years of republican constitutional development, the Gracchi, Drusus, the Federal experiment of the
Italian Allies in 90 B.C., Augustus, Claudius, the Flavians, the Five Good Emperors, the Severi, Dio- cletian, Constantine, the Praetorian Edict, the Stoic Republicans of the Early Empire, Livy and Pliny rate more than half a dozen or so words in all. Xenophon, Polybius and Cicero are considered to be less advanced thinkers politically than Solon (whose thought, despite his dependence at this point on W. Jaeger, the writer has failed to understand), on the grounds that they did not exclude the gods from participation in human affairs. Not that he is any happier with Homer (‘aware of some of the political facts of life’), Hesiod (who insisted on obedience to ‘the law’), Aeschylus, Sophocles (who ‘rose in his military career to become a general’), or Euripides (who was not an Athenian citizen, because born in Salamis).

It will, I think, already have been appreciated that this work is not to be relied upon for matters of fact. There really were more—not less—than 150 City-states in Greece; Apollo (‘a very pleasing god—like a department store’) was not called Pythian after the Pythia; the Persian Wars were not fought about the middle of the fifth century, nor did Aristophanes start to write towards the end of the period 450–400: and it has now been known for many years that Xenophon did not write Old Oligarch—and, a fortiori, not after the Constitution of the Lacedae monians. In short, this attempt by one who is not a student of antiquity to summarise the political ideas of the ancient world betrays a complete lack of understanding of that world, its history, and its thought, from the myths of Mesopotamia to the Parable of the Tribute. The positive matter in this book of 381 pages could have been condensed into less than half that number; the useful into about ten.

B. McM. Caven.

Birkbeck College, University of London.


This masterful survey by the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford is a reprise of the Hewett Lectures on early Alexandrian Christianity in the U.S.A. in 1962. The bulk of the book contains a revision of the lectures as delivered, and some 45 pages of smaller print adduce the necessary references to primary sources and modern discussions with lively and indeed caustic comment.

The first chapter sets the scene; one of C.’s great strengths is his capacity to see things in context and perspective. He regards the encounter between Christianity and Greek thought as beginning with Paul’s speech at Athens. This is not wholly happy. Paul’s speech was unsuccessful, and he later seems to have repudiated it as worldly wisdom. Fortunately the encounter was already there, not merely in the Dispersion, but in the Decapolis. The Jews had already ‘greatly modified the traditions of their fathers’. C.’s account of contemporary philosophy underestimates the Epicureans, but is otherwise very judicious. The whole question of the confrontation of Christianity and the pagan world has been well analysed by Richard Niebuhr in Christ and Culture, a book as relevant to twentieth-century Nigeria as to second-century Alexandria, and one which might usefully have been mentioned. From the general background C. selects two figures: Justin, whose relation to his philosophical context is brilliantly and concisely summarised on p. 21, and Celsus, on whom C. speaks with authority.

Chapter 2, ‘The Liberal Puritan’, deals with Clement of Alexandria and is an exceptionally perceptive appraisal. Perhaps the most notable aspect of Clement’s thought is his attitude to the body. It has been well said that to the Greek tradition (‘Platonic’ would be better) man is an imbedded soul, to the Hebrew an ensouled body. C. is right in saying that Clement is not wholly clear and consistent, but this is to do less than justice to a sane and balanced approach. Clement declares that the body is an obstacle to the soul’s clarity of vision, and that death frees soul from body, but he also states ‘The soul is not good by nature, neither is the body evil’, attacks the notion that sinfulness is transmitted through sexual reproduction, and argues from the fact of the Incarnation that man’s physical condition cannot be of itself evil. Many today who follow Christ and love Plato find sanity here. Clement’s social ethic is interesting and sometimes amusing: it is good to know that a Christian woman was allowed cosmetics only if married to a pagan husband, as a means of holding him. C.’s final evaluation of Clement is ‘His entire character and personal achievement constitute in themselves an answer to Celsus’ thesis that between Christianity and the Hellenic tradition there can be no reconciliation’. Not only to Celsus, but to others, Christian and non-Christian.

The remaining chapters deal with Origen; the title of the first, ‘The Illebrial Humanist’, is a shade too slick. C. is sane and sensible on Origen’s biography, and brings out well his modernity by the suggestion that De Principiis is closer to Sounding than to Summa Theologica or by characterising Origen’s God as ‘the immaterial ground of being’. Epiphanius said that Origen was blinded by Greek paideia, and Porphyry saw him as a dishonest thinker who used the tools of Greek rationalism in defence of a barbarian superstition. When Celsus claimed that the Christian had nothing new to say in ethics, Origen answered, ‘Of course’. He was a child of his philosophical age, who held a Platonic-Stoic ethic within a Platonic metaphysic, and C. draws a useful parallel with the Platonist Atticus. I suspect that more should be made of him as a child of gnosticism; he absorbed even while rejecting; in this connection reference
might have been made to Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion*. Hanson rightly says that Origen’s thought remained outside the Bible for all his Biblical scholarship. On the other hand, he has a deep sense of the Church, and a deeper understanding of the God of the New Testament; his celebrated universalism, as C. shows, is based upon this, without any particle of sentimentality, and, we may add, has never been answered in the terms in which it was propounded. Anatole France once said that no great man was without a blend of opposites, and Origen remains a paradoxical compaction of the liberal and illiberal, the humane and the world-denying. If we attempt to categorize his greatness he eludes us; he remains *sui generis*. Yet to those who still believe that Athens, Rome and Jerusalem are the three mountains from which most that is best in our culture has flowed, and to those who do not wish to hold culture in one compartment and faith in another, he is one of the greatest pioneers, and we may be grateful to C. for a treatment which combines sound scholarship with stimulating presentation.

Letters have dropped out on pp. 120, 126. Otherwise the book is beautifully produced.

**John Ferguson.**

*University of Minnesota.*

---

Atallah (W.) *Adonis dans la littérature et l’art grecs.* (Études et commentaires, 62.)
text figures. Fr. 60

This is the first comprehensive survey of Adonis since Baudissin’s *Adonis und Esmon* appeared in 1911, and will be welcomed by scholars not only as a valuable compendium of all the evidence, both literary and archaeological, but for its reasoned discussion of modern views. Little new or startling is revealed about Adonis, but the treatment is refreshing and sometimes novel.

After acknowledging his debt to Baudissin, the inevitable ‘point de départ’, A. briefly surveys the weakness of the comparative method as exemplified by Frazer. The chief problem is to decide when Adonis became Greek. Hesiod made him the son of Phoinix, and he is not associated with Cyprus before the classical period. This, in A.’s view, suggests that the myth of Adonis represented a later conflation of two traditions which developed independently in Phoenicia and Cyprus. The story of Myrrha did not apparently achieve popularity until Hellenistic times, though Homer refers to the tomb of Myrinx in a phrase which baffled Plato. Attempts to trace any ritual or cultural link between Adonis and the boar have foundered, though the legend is as old as Dionysius the Tyrant. Indeed it is difficult to see anything more in the boar than a traditional heroic theme.

The ritual lament for Adonis is as old as Sappho, while Xenophanes referred to the accompanying flutes. During the fifth century Praxilla wrote a hymn to Adonis, and although Plutarch’s descriptions may have been influenced by contemporary practices, Aristophanes bears witness to the celebration of the Adonia in his own day. Theocritus’ account is basically literary, but *skias* recalls Dioscurides’ reference to a *kalybe*, and perhaps significantly, as both the poet and his characters were of Dorian extraction, the Karneia. Though Adonis was an Oriental, his popularity was largely due to the many analogies which the Greeks discovered between him and their own local cults. That he was always regarded as alien and different is apparent in the manner Theocritus distinguishes him from the other heroes, a passage which has not been accorded proper weight. Here A.’s discussion of the significance of the terms hero and demigod might have been deepened by a study of Nock’s article (*HTR*, 1944). On the question as to whether Theocritus is describing an Oriental or a Hellenic festival, A. agrees with Gow that the poet was writing for a community which was essentially, and even self-consciously, Greek.

A.’s detailed examination of the archaeological material is a model of caution. Whatever the true identity of the emerging female on the Ludovisi Throne, the winged figure on the Boston relief could be Adonis if, as Ashmole supposed, its provenience were Lokroi like the enigmatic child plaquettes. Nossis too, who wrote about Adonis, was a Locrian poetess. Adonis is a favourite subject on Etruscan mirrors from the fourth century B.C., but the evidence for supposed ritual from lebetes gamikoi or loutrophori is rarely convincing. Nevertheless the presence of ladders in other scenes recall the roof-top celebrations referred to in the Lysistrata. The possibility of confusion between Eros and Adonis cannot always be ruled out.

In Plato, the *locus classicus*, the mysterious Gardens of Adonis are proverbial for sterility. There is no evidence that Adonis was connected with fertility or phallic ritual, and the symbolism of the gardens, if any, escapes us. The season of the celebration of the Adonia has been much disputed, but on the whole a date in high summer best accords with the known facts, including the time of sailing of the Sicilian expedition.

There is no firm evidence that the Greeks ever believed in an actual resurrection of Adonis. There are merely references in general to his annual return, whatever the true interpretation of Lucian’s mention of an aerial flight. Similarly evidence for any mysteries of Adonis, at any rate prior to the influence of syncretism, is notoriously thin, though the rites naturally reflected the mood of a particular epoch.

In the two final chapters the question of Adonis’ origins are examined in detail. Philology has thrown little light on the matter, and, even if it had, a deity’s name is no proof of his origin. Developing the thesis which he had already propounded A. suggests that a possible course of events was that Kinyras, already
associated with Cyprus in Homer, was regarded as prince consort to the local mother-goddess by the Eteocypriots. Later Adonis was brought to Cyprus by Phoenician colonists in the eighth century B.C. and his legend gradually ousted that of Kinyras. His cult, which does not appear to have reached the Greek mainland before the fifth century B.C., always retained traces of his former history enshrined in the curious legend that he had been born of the tree into which his mother had been metamorphosed. This for A. is the central feature, and in the final resort, though the Greeks were unaware of it, Adonis was the myrrh-tree itself. For this view he claims support not only from the legend, but from a reference to a Syrian tree-deity in a pyramid text, as well as Theophrastus' account of bark notchng during the summer solstice.

This is a fascinating book, learned yet interestingly written. It is attractively illustrated and furnished with full indices and bibliography. There are some misprints in the bibliography and 'abenteuer' is misspelt.

JOHN POLLARD.

University College of North Wales.


This handsome addition to the series Destins du Monde has many features besides Professor Lévéque's well-written text to attract the reading public. The numerous illustrations include few hackneyed items. Wherever possible the reader is helped by maps, diagrams and lists, and these or subheadings constantly break the monotony of the printed page. There are nearly a hundred pages of bibliography, chronological tables, and indices. The jaded reader of lavished publications about Greek civilisation will find here something different.

Lévéque's approach to his subject is also unusual. Most books for the general reader concentrate on the highlights of the Greek achievement; above all, on Athens and the classical period. Not so Lévéque. His theme is the restless dynamism of a people which must expand in order to live: 'l'aventure grecque est fille de la faim'. Expansion becomes for the Greeks 'une nécessité absolue et la loi fondamentale qui désormais régit leur destin'; and their history is 'une succession de pulsations où se rêvèle un impérialisme tantôt politique et tantôt marchand'. In this picture the early migrations and colonisation stand out; the classical period is seen as a pause in the expansionist process, which is resumed with Alexander and the Hellenistic Age. While the first half of Lévéque's volume brings us only to the end of the archaic period, and a quarter is given to the Hellenistic age, there are only seventy pages on all aspects of the fifth century B.C., and only four on the Peloponnesian War. The book ranges widely in space as well as time. With the help of archaeological evidence, in which he is evidently at home, Lévéque brings within his scope the more obscure states of Greece and the most far-flung settlements and influences of the Hellenistic world. The resultant picture—a remarkable feat for a single author—is Greek history presented in a perspective rare in a publication of this type; whether the general reader will find such width of range and variety of detail acceptable may be open to doubt.

Along with the adventure of material expansion Lévéque promises to deal with 'l'aventure spirituelle'; but it is here that his book is weakest. Literature seems to interest him only as a reflection of social and political conditions: it is significant that Homer is given little more space than Hesiod, a mere page and a half. Philosophy perhaps comes off worst of all. In the few pages devoted to the Pre-Socratics, Parmenides is dealt with after Anaxagoras, the Atomists, and Empedocles. Plato's Republic is described in eleven lines, and the keynote of fourth-century thought is said to be the trend towards mysticism: 'partout c'est le triomphe de l'irrationnel'.

All in all this is far from being the ideal popular book on Greece, and many may find it more valuable as a reference book or encyclopaedia than for continuous enjoyment; but one reader at any rate is grateful for its freshness and vitality of approach.

H. C. BALDROW.

University of Southampton.


The many friends and admirers of Dr Ehrenberg will always greet with satisfaction republication of his work for itself and to do him honour. The present is a splendidly produced volume not lightly undertaken by publishers. As Dr Ehrenberg points out in a brief Introduction: while it is true to say of the present day Graeca (and indeed Latina) non leguntur, it is also true that Graeca videntur et Graeca quaeruntur; in other words, as every classical and especially Greek historian and archaeologist notices with satisfaction, an ever-increasing modern public, its interest often aroused in the first instance by tourism, seeks knowledge of the Ancient World: that is people often experts in other disciplines, not necessarily dilettanti, but not interested in the approach either of the Classical Quarterly or of Didaskalos.

Dr Ehrenberg might have added, and the promoters of this collection might have reflected, that for these as well as undergraduates the paper-back has come into its own, and if not the paper-back something less lavish than this volume would have
served the purpose just as well, if this was the purpose of it.

Title and purpose merit discussion. It would appear that the writer of the articles in this book might have preferred to name it *Graeco et Romana* rather than *Polis und Imperium*. The latter title is not ill-balanced, even though the strictly Roman is represented only by 44 pages contrasted with roughly 547 on matters Greek (one article on Carthage gets nearly as much): the genesis of the problems of Imperial Rome are not to be separated from those of Alexander and the Hellenistic World, and these are accorded 232 pages. The 'arch', as the Editors call it, from Greek to Imperial Roman is there all right.

The selection will also certainly portray Dr Ehrenberg as 'Mensch' as well as 'der grosse Gelehrte', to quote his own words on Mommsen in a review (613) included in the book. It is this general purpose of drawing the portrait of a scholar through the republication of portions of his work which is often the main justification of such an expensive venture. On the other hand the title does less than credit to the many-sided genius and tireless industry of a great historian forced at the peak of his career to re-establish himself in another country and another language. It is clear from these and his other longer writings how much Dr Ehrenberg is concerned with the evolution, functioning and replacement of the Greek *polis* (note the stress in the title of Schaefer's appreciation (*Historia* 10 (1961)) on 'Griechentum'), and not only in professional detail, but also with concern for what the Editors call 'das Wesentliche und das Ganze', yet without an urge to write 'universal history' or bits of it (his observations on *Toynbee* 's 'Hellenism' is appropriately reprinted in the book). It is also true, as the collection abundantly demonstrates, that he is no narrow 'historian' (witness his first book, and the studies here reprinted: 'Anfänge des griechischen Naturrechts', 'Tragic Hercules', 'Athenischer Hymnus auf Demetrios Poliorcketes', 'Bemerkungen zu Pindar'). A strong sense of humour characterises him (see the end of his article on 'Das Harmodioslied') and a great capacity to pursue an idea in all its ramifications—admirably demonstrated by his *Polypragmasyne: A Study in Greek Politics*.

This is not a volume in honour of Dr Ehrenberg in the strict sense of the term. If it were it should be regretted that the Bibliography in *Historia* 10 (1961) 399-408 was not brought up to date and reprinted together with Schaefer's appreciation (this has now been done, to some extent, in *Ancient Society and Institutions: Studies presented to Victor Ehrenberg*, Blackwell, 1966, as a supplement to *A List of the Writings of Victor Ehrenberg*, London, 1962). It is a reprinting in almost every case (there is an unpublished lecture (32-41) on 'The Fourth Century B.C. as Part of Greek History', and (337-45) 'Bemerkungen zu Pindar'), suggested by the Artemis-Verlag. Leaving aside the considerations mentioned above, of more personal import, there must be considered in such an expensive reprint the question of avail-

ability of the articles in question. It is always useful to have reprints of articles which are old but still valuable, of those which have appeared in obscure journals or Festschriften, and of those which were published during periods of war when the supply of periodicals was restricted. It appears to the reviewer that the bulk of this collection is drawn from easily accessible books or periodicals: *JHS*, *CQ*, *CPH*, *Graecia and Rome*, *HZ*, *Hermes*, *Historia*, *Klio*, *RFC*, *AJP*, *Die Antike*, nor are the wartime dates likely to cause difficulty in any country, except perhaps in the case of *CQ* 1943 and *Durham University Journal* 1943. Two things are published for the third time ('Eumonia', augmented from *Aspects of the Ancient World* (1946), 70-93, and 'Zu älteren attischen Kolonisation', reprinted from the German original, though it appears in English in *Aspects* 116-43. One must be grateful for the inclusion of the more inaccessible: so 105-30, *Sitzb. Heidelb. Akad.*, 1961, 'Grundformen griechischer Staatsordnung'; 253-64, *Wiener Studien* 69 (1956), Festschrift Albin Lesky, 57-69, 'Das Harmodioslied'; 359-79, *Archiv für Gesch. der Philosophie* 35 (1923), 119-43: 'Anfänge des griechischen Naturrechts'; 380-98, *Durham Univ. Journal* 39 (1943), 51-62, 'Tragic Hercules'; 399-448, *Beilage zum alten Orient* 7 (1926), 'Alexander und Agypten'; 449-57, *Festschrift Winternitz* (Leipzig, 1933) 287-97, 'Die Opfer Alexanders an der Indusmündung'; 549-86, *Morgenland* 14 (1927), 'Karthago'; 613-50, *Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 4 (1960), 94-107, 'Theodor Mommsens Kolleg über römische Kaisergeschichte'. It is certainly right to rescue 'Legatus Augusti et Tiberii' (607-13) from *Robinson Studies* (II 938-44), and perhaps the articles from *Die Antike* 3 (1927), 'Griechisches Land und griechischer Staat'; 503-19, *Die Antike* 7 (1931), 'Athenischer Hymnus auf Demetrios Poliorcketes'. The trouble is that such a book is apt to be criticised because it is not all of three things: a portrait in scholarship of the writer, complete *Kleine Schriften*, and a selection to illustrate a theme. The editors and the publishers have done very well indeed, if this is taken into account.

R. J. HOPPER.

University of Sheffield.


Le nouveau livre de R. F. W. sur la Crète ancienne témoigne des mêmes qualités qui avaient déjà fait apprécier les précédents ouvrages ou les articles de l'auteur: une connaissance approfondie de la Crète, tant minoïenne qu'hellénique; une information bien à jour, dont la bibliographie et le tableau chronologique final donnent une vision commode; des
idées personnelles, évidemment toujours contestables; un exposé net et clair surtout, et qui se lit facilement. Mais tandis que les livres précédents relevaient du travail scientifique et visaient à discuter et à argumenter, celui-ci se borne à renvoyer à ces études antérieures pour tout l'apparat de la critique historique. On ne sait donc plus très bien à quel public il est destiné: le savant et l'étudiant se satisferont-ils d'être toujours reportés ailleurs? quant au grand public, est-il vraiment susceptible de s'intéresser à ce qui reste tout de même très technique et spécialisé? On fournit généralement à cette sorte d'ouvrage comme alibi une illustration géographique ou archéologique impressionnante. R. F. W. L'a réduite au minimum. Le livre pourra donc décevoir comme décevront évidemment tels ou tels raccourcis, sans doute imposés à l'auteur par le genre de son travail, ainsi certaines des pages sur la religion au chapitre X, ou le paragraphe plus que schématique sur l'âge hellénistique, p. 143.

Pourtant qui voudrait s'informer sur la société crétoise des temps classiques aurait profit à lire le tableau qu'en brosse R. F. W. Les principaux chapitres sont consacrés à l'invasion doriane, à la vie économique, aux institutions des cités crétoises, à la description des diverses classes sociales. Mais des aspects moins essentiels, comme l'éducation, le culte, la piraterie ou le mercenariat, ne sont pas négligés pour autant. L'auteur reprend souvent des vues déjà défendues dans ses premiers travaux, ce qui dispense d'en refaire la critique. On ne peut pas dire qu'il renouvelle le sujet, il en donne seulement une présentation plus modérée et plus allégée.

Elle risque pourtant d'induire en erreur, dans la mesure même où des idées plus ramassées peuvent prendre une plus grande force. On sait les opinions de R. F. W., qui est un élève de G. Thomson. Lorsqu'il peut les exprimer à l'aide, il y apporte volontiers nuances et précisions. Dans le raccourci du présent exposé, cela rend parfois un son de primarisme doctrinal qui est un peu gênant (p. ex., p. 18 sq., sur la situation dialectale de la Crète; p. 40 sq. et passim, sur le tribalisme; p. 95, sur les fondements de la Cité; p. 7, 44 et 149 sq. sur la société esclavagiste). Cela surprend quand on connaît la personnalité originale de l'auteur et sa curiosité d'esprit. Tout comme surprennent, pour la même raison, ses fidélités ou ses inductions pour des thèses quelque peu dépassées (p. 37, le basculement longitudinal de la Crète; p. 42, la roue qui révolutionne les transports; p. 54, l'invention de la monnaie pour développer l'économie; etc.).

Tout compte fait, nous préférons l'attitude de R. F. W. quand il fait œuvre scientifique, quand il cherche, quand il critique, et même quand il nous critique, comme dans son premier livre. . . . Ici, le savant nous paraît avoir été desservi par le genre même auquel il s'essayait.

HENRI VAN EFFENTERRE.

Sorbonne, Paris.


If anything could undermine the love for Greece of one who has walked her mountains, slept in her villages receiving the hospitality of the people, and been present in 1940, it is the spectacle of a Greek nationalist professor or journalist (there is no sharp division between the two) in full patriotic cry after lost territories of the Byzantine Empire. Professor Dascalakis, whose sincere patriotism has never been called in question, has followed his Hellenism of the Ancient Macedonians, translated for the same publishers in 1965, with the present work; another patriotic tract, which is not to deny that both works show evidence of detailed study of the ancient literary sources. The trouble, which will go far to prevent any single reader, except another Greek nationalist, from reading right to the end, is the constant aroma of ethnikismos, which must ever equate Hellenism with all that is good, and Macedonianism with Hellenism. The suspicion is engendered, that this handsomely produced book must have been subsidised; for it is not likely to recover its costs by sales in the English-speaking world.

Unhappily, the translation itself is also just not good enough. The Greek original (some of which I have read) is in a high patriotic style. The translation, by a Greek who has been in America, is into English which would do well enough in conversation; but its colloquialism (e.g. the constant use of 'don’t' for 'do not') and sheer inaccuracies (e.g. 'caught prisoner' for 'taken prisoner', passim) produce a ludicrous effect. When will our Greek friends realise that writing good English is beyond the skill of most of their compatriots who attempt it—and that, if the Institute for Balkan Studies receives subsidies from public funds, these might be applied to better purpose?

A. R. BURN.


This is a third in the useful series of photographic reprints of groups of papers, in which we have already had Finley’s selection on slavery and Kirk’s on Homer. Sixteen papers by twelve scholars, Badian (2), Berve, T. S. Brown, Ehrenberg, J. R. Hamilton, F. Hampi, L. Pearson, C. A. Robinson, Schachermeyr (2), Tarn (3) and G. Walser, derived from ten periodicals (two rare in Britain), and two Festschriften, together with Ehrenberg’s famous chapter on ‘Pothos’ and Tarn’s appendices on A.’s Foundations and his Deification, make up a volume which many scholars
and advanced students will be glad to have available. Tarn's *Alexander*, it might be thought, would certainly be in the hands of all likely readers, but presumably it was judged that T. had to be represented by more than his famous Raleigh lecture, 'A. and the Unity of Mankind'. The process of photographic reduction, especially from the generous expanse of the *American Historical Review*, does indeed bring the original small print of footnotes down almost to the limit of legibility; but the reproduction is admirably clear, though in one place (p. 101) footnotes have inadvertently blocked out along with the beginning of Tarn's next article. One could also wish that it had been thought practicable to add an index. Nevertheless, to take Alexander as a Special Subject for Honours, with Mr Griffith for supervisor and this book available, would clearly be an inspiring experience for a young scholar.

The 'Main Problems' of the title are, as might be expected, those of the sources, the unfulfilled Plans, the delification (Tarn and Balsdon, *et al*.), 'Unity of Mankind' (Tarn, Badian, Bervey's *die Verschmelzungspolitik*, and allusions *passim*) and, as final objective, the 'question how far if at all Alexander was a man of reflection and a planner, and not predominantly a man of action in war and of improvisation in the arts of peace' (introduction, p. ix). The answer to this would be, says the editor, a valuable step to 'what I hope this book will lead towards'; namely 'our final view of the essential Alexander'.

It is at this point that some scholars, no doubt, will raise sceptical eyebrows. Mr Griffith calls it 'a paradox' that this King, one of the better documented figures of antiquity, should still be an enigma. But is it a paradox? The main facts about what A. did are not in doubt; and looking at G.'s next page, we see that most of the questions that fascinate him begin with 'Why?' Why did he burn the palace at Persepolis? Why the 'deification'? 'How far did his plans at his death include plans for further conquests?' To this one can only say that one of the last important things that he did do was to organize a large New Model army. The hotly contested questions about A. are nearly all questions about what he thought, felt, intended; and on these, surely, the idea that historical research is going to arrive ultimately at a 'final view' is doomed to disappointment. The Middle Ages were wiser here, with the familiar gnömë, 'The Devil himself knoweth not the heart of man.' We may make up our own pictures of what it was like to be Alexander, and many have done so; this young, historical Achilles, with his dazzling conquests and his early death, fascinates. People care about him (or 'identify'), and this is why controversies about him grow hot; but essentially, such pictures belong to historical fiction. This is why, as C. B. Welles (represented here only in quotation, by Robinson, p. 54) has well said, there have been many Alexanders, usually owing much of their colour to the personalities and social milieu of their authors: 'The problem is more than a purely historical problem. It is, essentially, a psychological one ... [It] is comparable, actually, only to the problem of Jesus.'

And it remains important, because it concerns many people's choice of a hero. As Badian, in 1958 (here, p. 287) said, 'Tarn's figure of Alexander the Dreamer has ... haunted the pages of scholarship, and even ... general histories of philosophy and ideas have begun to succumb.' Badian, with his careful examination of what the sources on the 'Marriage of East and West' actually tell us (which is needful; for Tarn was no impeccable scholar), says that he sets out 'to lay the ghost', without much hope of being immediately successful. He was all too right; in the latest *Encyclopædia Britannica*, E. R. Bevan's excellent and still serviceable article of 1911 is replaced by the full Tarn treatment, ably administered by Dr Agnes Savill, M.D.

*Quellenkritik* has done a good work in sorting out the strands of tradition underlying our sources on A.; but it has probably now gone as far as *Quellenkritik* can. Questions, such as that of the date of Cleitarchus, or whether the 'Plans' in Diodorus xvii come, like most of the book, from Hieronymus, will be found here still disputed. And neither *Quellenkritik* nor historical imagination is likely to conduct us inside A.'s skin, or to show that either the hostile or the admiring ancient accounts of him were entirely wrong. We can see the hero only from outside, in the light of what he did; and the main facts are seldom in dispute. Among them is the fact that A. continually risked his life, to the dismay of his officers, and yet never appointed anyone to take charge if he was killed (Arr. vii, 12 f.). He almost invited the chaos that set in when he did die. And as G. Walser, here given the last word, says in an agreeable paper first read to a History Society, *Zur neueren Forschung über A.*, there is no doubt, either, that his alleged unique responsibility for the Hellenizing of the Middle East has been greatly exaggerated. The chief thing that he did east of the Euphrates was to end 200 hundred years of stability under the Persian empire, and introduce an age of marked instability, only ended by the despoiled Parthians.

A. R. Burn.

*University of Glasgow.*

---


The three J. H. Gray lectures here presented dispel any thought the layman might nourish that, given the inadequate documentation and the work historians have already done, certain periods of history are 'played out'. This is because historians need—indeed should—no longer restrict themselves to
literary evidence but may find valid support from other sources which can be used in conjunction, notably those of archaeology and numismatics and also, as Professor Carpenter here shows with conspicuous effect, geographical, and more specifically, climatological data.

Doubtless much more is yet to be learned about the nature, causes, cycles and chronology of past climates yet enough is already well understood to justify recognition that this branch of modern science may supply 'the key to the riddle' of sharp and well-recognised cultural discontinuities in late prehistoric and early historical times. The reality of climatic change is beyond dispute and the incidence of unwanted drought (or indeed flood) can clearly induce radical social changes. In particular, the prolongation of drought in the east Mediterranean basin clearly spelled famine in response to which civilisation broke down, areas were deserted as movements of populations ensued. Professor Carpenter has made himself competently familiar with the work of experts in the field of past climates and offers explanations more reasonable and appealing than those hitherto advanced to explain such phenomena as the utter collapse and virtual extinction of late Mycenaean civilisation (1300–1000 B.C.), the catastrophic decline in culture and well-being in Greece in the seventh century A.D., and the folk migration into Greece of Slavs in the following century. He discusses many other such historical events and problems where it is profitable to consider seriously the part climatic aberrations may have played. Indeed Professor Carpenter introduces to readers unaware of such things a wide range of geographical changes not only of interest but of significance in history: such are the changing levels of the Mediterranean Sea, the shifting of climatic belts, and vulcanicity at Santorin (Thera) at the end of the fifteenth century B.C. (?) which may explain the legend of the lost Atlantis.

W. GORDON EAST.

Birkbeck College, University of London.


This work originally appeared in 1961 as a paperback in the series Que Sais-Je? under the title Devins et Orales Grecs. In crossing the Channel it has become rather inflated, for it has acquired a hard cover and sixteen handsome plates, some of which are very little related to the subject. For instance, there are three illustrations of the struggle for the tripod, two from the same vase, and still more peculiarly there is a picture of the 'allotment machine' found in the Athenian Agora. Though we know little about the Pythia's method of using lots, it is reasonably certain that she cannot have employed any contrivance like this.

Flacelière had written a fairly brief and pleasing essay on the question how the Greeks 'who invented philosophy' also accepted anything so basically irrational as divination. For his purpose he did not arrange the discussion chronologically, but by subjects. Five short chapters consider divination by signs, inspired divination, the oracle at Delphi, divination and politics, and finally and most briefly divination and philosophy. The argument is handled throughout with urbanity and charm, but not surprisingly it scarcely provides an answer to its original question: which in this form is probably insoluble. Flacelière ends by quoting some sentences of his master, Alain, which are almost as ambiguous as the utterances of the Pythia herself, though much more sophistically phrased.

As one who has edited the Delphic dialogues of Plutarch and investigated with penetration the probable procedure of the oracle there, Flacelière can be depended upon to handle this subject with a sure touch. The bulk of the discussion turns on Delphi, as is perhaps to be expected in a work intended originally for a general public. Other oracles mostly come in for no more than occasional mention. But he has made full use of Louis Robert's preliminary description of his exciting finds at Claros. Here Flacelière hopes to trace analogies to his own theories of Delphic procedure published nearly thirty years ago. He is right that the latest discoveries seem to support his earlier conjectures, but until Robert has fully published his excavation, one must remain somewhat in uncertainty.

On one point Flacelière makes a curious use of our very limited evidence. In the building accounts of the Delphic temple for 342 B.C., there is a reference to a 'shelter' (aréu) for those consulting the oracle. He treats this as if it proved that the normal accommodation was of a very simple style. But this is most unlikely. Herodotus calls the equivalent structure in the previous temple a méýapor. It is clear that the shelter mentioned in the building accounts was some temporary arrangement necessitated by the process of reconstruction, since the accounts also show that soon afterwards work was in progress near the omphalos.

Flacelière's discussions are always interesting, but perhaps at times he chooses the more picturesque example in preference to the most historically plausible. His account of the prophecies connected with the Sicilian expedition is quoted from Fustel de Coulanges and owes more to Plutarch than to Thucydides. Again his only instance of an oracular response connected with the foundation of a colony is Pausanias' story about Phalanthus and Aethra, which must be a perfect instance of those tales told by the Delphic guides which roused the contempt of Plutarch's philosophic friends.

The field covered thus brightly, if somewhat thinly, is even more extensive than the English title might
suggest. As the original French indicated, prophets and prophetesses are included as well as oracle-centres. In one particular Flacelière fails to note a distinction between the Pythia and the Sibyl, which is worth emphasis. Both spoke their prophecies in a trance state, but while the Pythia loses her personality and speaks in the name of Apollo, the Sibyl continues to speak in her own person.

It will be clear that this work, which is translated very competently, fulfilled its original purpose in French extremely well. It was a popular introduction to the subject which did not appear to offer information to the professional scholar. In its English version the 'summary bibliography' of the original publication has been broken up to form a series of footnotes, but Flacelière did not attempt originally to cite his ancient sources, and they continue without reference. An extensive index has been added, which was significantly lacking in the French version, but, while some readers may find it useful, it introduces a number of mis-spellings not present in the text.

H. W. PARKE.

Trinity College, Dublin.


This first publication of a new series associated with the 'Arbeitstelle für griechisches Recht' of the University of Freiburg in Breisgau is a modified dissertation which, unlike many of its kind, even the non-specialist may read with great profit. The problem is an important one: did the Greeks have a concept of equity as opposed to strict law, and is there any evidence in the sources that they were influenced by it in legal practice? As so often in such problems 'Greek' means 'Athenian' as far as the evidence of forensic speeches is concerned. Hellenistic papyri and the philosophers widen the field, as do a few Hellenistic inscriptions.

The larger part of the work is devoted to a consideration of forensic speeches dealing with cases where it might seem the issue could be considered and decided on terms of equity. The speeches are (Demosthenes) XXXII (the question is not taken up whether this might be a rhetorical exercise), (Demosthenes) LVI, Hypereides, in Athenogenum, Demosthenes XXX and XXXI, Isocrates XVIII: all considered in some detail to discover whether the nature of the approach to the court was determined by the admissibility of an appeal to considerations of equity or by strict law. In each case the author shows convincingly (given the nature of the evidence) that the speakers chose arguments based on strict law. Some valuable incidental points are made, as on δίκαιος ἐμπορικόν καὶ σύμβολα, which are well worth considering.

The same conclusion is established in the case of the rhetorical devices (ἐνεργού πίστευς) usually employed, and in a consideration of the functions of the jury (on the basis of the terms of their oath—καὶ περὶ ἄν ἂν νόμοι μᾶς ἔνοικας, γνώμη τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ κρίνεις), the question of discretion (34), interpretation (a good point made at 37), and the assessment of penalties. There is no question, it is argued, anywhere of equity, which does not emerge even when it is a matter of evolving a decision in a case not covered by the law. It is not hard to see that here opinions might differ on the interpretation of the sources.

The question is then considered of the assessors (διατηρηταί: with a little obscurity of definition as between public and private assessors), together with the passage of Aristotle's Rhet I 13, p. 1374b10 ff., with its distinction between ὁ ... διατηρητής τῷ ἐπεικεῖς ὄρθος, ὁ δὲ δικαικτής τῶν νόμων. Here again it would appear from Isaeus II 30 and the opposition of τὰ δίκαια διαγνώσατα καὶ τὰ συμφέροντα γνώναι that decision was by the letter of the law, except in the case of mutual agreement, when, none the less, συμφέροντα does not necessarily mean a basis of equity.

Finally, in a discussion of the philosophical theory of Aristotle it is argued from those passages dealing with ἐπεικεία and the ἐπεικική ἀνθρώποι: that this is a moral and personal question not related to forensic issues. This is a point which is perhaps worthy of fuller examination.

Something like the principle of equity is found to appear only in the post- Classical period of the Ptolemies (the period and area obviously determined by the availability of documents), as a result of authoritarian rulings by the ultimate source of all law. The non-expert must feel that it is a pity some brief consideration was not given of the circumstances in which considerations of equity versus law have at different times arisen: in circumstances, possibly, of a separation of legislature and judiciary? Or where the legal system has evolved in one way rather than another? In the case of Egypt, did it have anything to do with pre-Ptolemaic law? The democratically-constituted Athenian people were the makers of law, and the administrators of it in an especially direct way. They might therefore have been disposed to judge on grounds of equity as against the strict law of which they were the makers; but it seems they did exactly the opposite, following strictly their own enactments. It would be interesting to speculate why, and look at other times and places in a more extended manner. From the evidence here considered it seems that in Athens νόμος prevailed against γνώμη; the function of the court was δικαίωμα rather than κρίνεις. In choosing strict δίκαια rather than συμφέροντα they recognised perhaps the dangers which might otherwise arise from their system and their temperament.
It is clear that within its limits this work debates very usefully a number of issues of the widest possible interest.

R. J. Hopper.

University of Sheffield.


'Shades of Hasebrook', the reader will exclaim, as he notes the title chosen for the ancient history section of this Conference. And the very first contribution, by M. I. Finley, on 'Classical Greece', will force him to think afresh about the fundamental problems of Greek economic history, raised a generation ago by Hasebrook (whose first book, Staat und Handel im alten Griechenland, 1929, was translated into English as Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece, 1933). Hasebrook took the first essential step towards shattering the seriously false picture of Greek economic life built up in modern times by historians who conceived the Greek economy in largely anachronistic terms. Unfortunately, Hasebrook made some serious errors which are so patent that historians unable (as most still are) to rid themselves of 'modernising' conceptions have been able to laugh him off and continue in the old way.

Finley rightly insists that it is the basic concepts we bring to the study of Greek economic history that most of all need radical examination and re-formulation in terms appropriate to the Greek polis—rather than (I would add) the mediaeval and Renaissance trading city, the 'model' from which they have in great part been derived. The unconscious assumptions of the modernising historian 'hide beneath the mask of "common sense"', as Finley shrewdly puts it. He evidently feels, and rightly, that the 'modernisers' (many of whom might reject the title with some indignation) still hold the field, and that much more dead wood has to be cut away before we can profitably rebuild. The bulk of his paper, therefore, consists of a destructive attack upon three recent works: R. L. Beaumont's remarks on Epidamus, in JHS 1936, at p. 167; C. H. V. Sutherland's article, 'Corn and Coin', in AJP 1943, pp. 129-47; and J. Pouilloux's elaborate reconstruction of the political situation of fifth-century Thasos and her relations with Athens, in Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos, I (1954). He might well have been tempted to turn his guns on, for example, the book by A. French, The Growth of the Athenian Economy (1964), and the last seven or eight pages of F. A. Lepper's article in JHS 1962, pp. 25-55, had they been published before the Conference.

In 1954 (Annales IX, pp. 7-22) Édouard Will made one of the few important contributions to the great debate on the nature of Greek economic life which have appeared since Hasebrook's bombshell. His present paper, on archaic Greece (pp. 41-96, with Postscript, 107-115), is much the longest in the volume and provides a remarkably complete survey of recent work on Greek economic history (in the broadest sense) for the eighth, seventh and sixth centuries. Two topics are singled out for detailed consideration: colonisation, and problems connected with Solon. His paper is notable for a firm refusal to guess, when the evidence (as so often) is insufficient.

In reply to him Carl Roebuck is mainly concerned (pp. 97-106) with pressing his views on 'trade as a stimulant to colonisation'. Here, in marked contrast with Will's caution, we find much speculation, and hypotheses which go far beyond the evidence.

In the controversy which still continues about the reasons for the foundation of colonies, it is surprising that constant reference should be made to the two clearly 'commercial' foundations, Al Mina and Naucratis, without any clear realisation of the fact that these two settlements were not poleis, but mere emporia. It is very doubtful whether Al Mina ever became a proper polis; and (as I hope to show shortly) Naucratis can hardly have achieved that status until the fourth century, more than two hundred years after its foundation. The fact that the only two settlements (apart from those expressly called ἐμπορία) which were certainly 'commercial' were not real colonies (ἀποικίαι) at all is surely not without significance when the motives for the founding of colonies are being considered. Discussions of colonisation should entertain the simple possibility of (a) settlements from below (so to speak) by individual groups of merchants, whether from one city or from several, beginning as ἐμπορία and sometimes later growing into πόλεις (Naucratis is the obvious example), as quite a different category from (b) the official state foundations, from above, mentioned in our literary sources—Syracuse, Cyrene, Rhegium, Taras and the rest, where such scraps of evidence as we have point unmistakably to primarily agrarian settlement. Very relevant here is the constant failure of the 'modernisers' to distinguish between the activities and policies of individual merchants or groups of merchants and those of their cities. Thus, for example, Roebuck can say that 'Athens was active in the local Aegean trade of the tenth and ninth centuries' (p. 106), when in reality there is not a particle of evidence how far the Athenian products which went to other states, or the foreign goods which came to Athens, were carried by traders who were Athenians. (Cf., on the same page, the suggestion that 'the maritime cities of both Ionia and European Greece ... ventured into trade and colonisation for profit, rather than because of local agrarian discomfort'; and on p. 98 the assertion that 'Ionia's main effort, in the late seventh century, seems consciously mercantile in motivation'—my italics in both cases.)

Finley ends his admirable paper by recommending various lines of investigation which might be under-
taken as part of a systematic research programme in this field. To these I would add the following: (1) A collection of the specific evidence for the origins and objectives of wars in ancient Greece. Nothing can reveal more clearly the springs of foreign policy (seen of course at its height in a decision to make war), or can better help to show how far economic interests were involved in state policy. (2) An examination of Greek treaties, in comparison with others preserved from the ancient world (and from the mediaeval and Renaissance cities), in an attempt to make a further elucidation of the objectives of state policy. (3) An analysis of the evidence for the complex of the governing classes of Greek states other than Athens (from which the great bulk of our evidence of course comes), and about those who carried on mercantile and industrial activity there. There is a great deal of evidence under each heading which has never been properly used.

And there is one major consideration that needs to be added. Finley is thoroughly justified in what he says about the failure of recent economic historians to formulate adequate concepts and categories for dealing with the economic life of the Greek polis. But how can we make actual progress in the desired direction? There can be no doubt of the answer. There is a very large body of evidence about the economic life of the Greek city, on the basis of which, if we steadfastly clear our minds of all preconceptions derived from other periods of history, we can formulate the necessary categories, from the ground up, without resort to anachronistic 'models' and analogies. The great bulk of this evidence comes from the late fifth and (more especially) the fourth century. Now as a rule history must be reconstructed and written forwards and not backwards, and we must always be on our guard against reading back later evidence into earlier contexts in which it is not appropriate. But—and this is my point—here we must begin from the fifth/fourth century evidence, because it is very much the best we have. Those who assume that they can begin with the earlier centuries (a recent example is provided by French's book mentioned above), notwithstanding the virtual absence of all detailed evidence for that period, inevitably supply the thoroughly anachronistic ideas and categories they bring with them from the mediaeval and modern world. The fourth century may be a far from ideal 'model' for archaic Greece, but it is an infinitely better one than its only substitute: mediaeval and modern Europe—or even (contrast French, p. vii) modern 'underdeveloped countries', all of them already powerfully affected by the advanced industrial societies towards whose condition they aspire.

In this Journal, it will be sufficient to say that the relatively brief Roman section of this book (pp. 117–162) is in the very capable hands of P. A. Brunt and T. R. S. Broughton, who concern themselves mainly with the Equites of the late Republic and early Principate, in particular their economic activities and sources of wealth and the nature of their political influence. Their contributions are comprehensive and convincing. G. E. M. de Ste. Croix.

New College, Oxford.


Western scholars who know no Russian are uneasily aware that there is a great deal of published work on the Greek colonies of the North Pontic coast which is not directly available to them. An annotated bibliography of these books and articles in French is therefore most welcome, and the author of such a laborious but useful work earns the gratitude of all scholars in the field. The first edition (1960) was quickly exhausted, and so the opportunity has been taken of adding publications of the years 1958–62 to the second edition.

The general principles of selection and arrangement are clearly set out on pages x to xvi. The author’s aim is to give all the works published in Russia (in Russian or Ukrainian) between 1940 and 1962 which bear on the history and archaeology of the Greek colonies of the Northern Black Sea. Each work is given a separate number and arranged according to a sensible plan, which (together with three sketch-maps and an index of modern authors) makes it easy to find what one wants. The accuracy of the references can be relied on, though I noted misprints on page xvi (footnote) and in item 512, while the Introduction still strangely states that the bibliography does not go beyond 1957.

Although very comprehensive the bibliography cannot be called complete. Of the articles discussed in A. Kotevalov’s useful, if polemical, survey, АНТИЧНАЯ ИСТОРИЯ И КУЛЬТУРА СЕВЕРНОГО ПРИЧЕРНОМОРЬЯ В СОВЕТСКОМ НАУЧНОМ ИССЛЕДОВАНИИ (The History of the Ancient Culture of the Northern Black Sea Region in Soviet Research; Munich 1955), which is itself unfortunately not eligible for inclusion, several are not to be found in B. The author is not entirely successful in his attempt to give brief notes of the contents and character of the items listed—admittedly a most difficult task. The comments are sometimes vague and are not truly critical. Thus one cannot rely solely on this book for one’s knowledge of a given piece of work; English readers will supplement it with the brief but helpful survey by J. Boardman in Archaeological Reports for 1962–3.

A. J. Graham.

University of Manchester.

This slim volume by a young scholar, whose articles on Graeco-Roman subjects have attracted attention in the last few years, has a theme far beyond its size: there is a danger that those who think of grandios in terms of weight may underestimate its importance. It has long been known that Rome governed the orbis terrarum to a large extent through a network of personal links between eminent local families and the great dynastic houses of the city, later succeeded by the domus regnatis. I myself pointed out some years ago that, in the rather puzzling question of how the Roman world survived the generation of civil war, these links, superficially perhaps working for disintegration (one thinks of Juba or Cleopatra, and the East lined up, more than once, against the West), in fact provide a large part of the answer. Naturally, there was a solid basis of military power. B. knows this as well as anyone, and indeed documents the opposition and hostility to Rome in some important Greek circles (ch. VIII) which, but for the power of Rome, would have inevitably gained the upper hand. But military strength is not enough—as the modern observer can see better (perhaps) than the observer of thirty years ago. One must find a political and cultural framework that will invite acceptance. It is this that forms the great theme of B.’s book.

The first chapter briefly surveys the pattern of personal links between eminent Romans and the educated upper class of the Greek world—both those who took up residence in the city, often in the very houses of their patrons, and those who stayed at home, representing the interest of Rome in their communities and (no less important) the interest of their communities, through their patrons, in Rome. Greek ideas of euergetia and its rewards, as developed in the Hellenistic age, fortunately came to coincide with the Roman view of clientela, based on beneficia and corresponding officia. By the late Republic, Romans and Greeks, of the right class, understood each other.

The next chapter surveys some of the men and families sent to administer Greek provinces. It is argued that Augustus encouraged some specialisation in Eastern affairs; though he inevitably (in his position), and especially early in his reign, carefully scrutinised those who might be too powerful and, even where they lived in ease and honour in Rome, did not always trust them to use their power abroad. This is orthodox enough in outline, but the chapter is not satisfactory in detail. Eastern ‘experts’ had been well known ever since 200 B.C.: the Second Macedonian War was due to those of the day, and the line of great men and obscure can be traced on missions and commissions throughout the second century. Political conditions in the late Republic discouraged this tendency (it never was a system), and the case for Augustus’ revival of it is far from proved here. As B. recognises, M. Lollius, one of his ‘Eastern experts’, was best known (probably) for a defeat in Germany; and prima facie, the small number of ‘expert’ families he can produce, out of hundreds or thousands of administrators sent to the East during the reign, seems to argue against his case. Of course, this is not to deny that one or two men or families (provided they were not too powerful) might be allowed to develop a special expertise. But it perhaps obscures B.’s real (and important) case to dwell on them.

Ch. III gets to the centre of the argument, showing—in a fascinating style and presentation—Greek literary men (men like Athenodorus of Tarsus, Augustus’ teacher; Arius the court philosopher; Nestor of Tarsus, the teacher of Marcellus and Tiberius) penetrating the court with their ideas and, quite often, used on political missions by the Princeps, particularly (it seems) when they wanted to go home for their declining years: procurators in Sicily, idōi logoi in Egypt, dynasts in their own cities. Not all the functions are strictly political, of course. But facts like the power given to Athenodorus to reconstitute Tarsus (incorrectly described as imperium, incidentally, on pp. 39 and 141: this is unattested and inconceivable), and to one or two others, makes us wonder whether a mere procuratorship, given to a philosopher friend, did not have other purposes than to enable him to make money easily. In fact, one point that emerges is that we ought to think about procuratorships, even at this early stage, in a more political way that is now customary.

The next two chapters deal with vassal rulers and local dyauts, and with Roman colonies in the East. It is pointed out in detail how Augustus took over the Antonian system in the East (which was, of course, basically that of Pompey) and, on the whole, even the personnel—and, even more interestingly, that where he did not (as in the case of the Tarcondimotids in Cilicia Pedias or the family of Iamblichus of Emesa), he often came back to the Antonians later. Augustus emerges, as we know him in other respects, as eminently pragmatic, following what appeared the most profitable course, without letting himself be misled by private animosity or abstract ideas. Even in encouraging intermarriage among client dynasties, he had a long Republican tradition to follow. His only innovation, it seems, was to establish the principle that, once sufficiently urbanised under a king, the region might be annexed on his death. As for colonies, their purpose—in the East as elsewhere—was first of all defence; but B. makes the important point that many settlers were of Eastern origin, and that intermarriage with the great local families was apparently not discouraged. Far from being centres of Romanisation, the colonies were gradually Hellenised.

Ch. VI traces, in a few eminent examples, the attraction of Hellenism and the Greek way of life for upper-class Romans—whether as a permanent choice or (more commonly) as an escape and a relaxation. The anecdotes about Augustus’ own
NOTICES OF BOOKS

last years (p. 84) are indeed rather remarkable, and no doubt true at least in spirit. It is odd that B. nowhere clearly points out that under Augustus (and not for generations after) we find Oriental penetrations into the Senate: Castricius Myriotalenti f. (plainly a Greek, despite some fanciful recent speculation) quite probably reached the senate after being XVIII, and so did Artorius Geminus, the son (it seems) of Augustus' unfortunate physician, on whom Mommsen's comment (ad CIL vi 31761 ff.) is still highly plausible. Pompeius Mæcer gets a mention (p. 41). These men help to confirm the anecdotes, and they immensely strengthen one main part of B.'s thesis: that, with Actium out of the way and anti-Oriental propaganda no longer needed, Augustus proceeded to unify the two halves of the empire that had almost split.

Ch. VII surveys some of the cities (oddly enough, not making much of the new foundations); VIII deals with opposition among the Greeks (see above); IX with the Imperial Cult (spontaneous, but—of course—encouraged from above).

X is the most delightful and one of the most important: based on the (much neglected) investigations and conjectures of Cichorius in Röm. Studien, it surveys some of the Greek poets and prose writers under Augustus: from Crinagoras (of the Anthology) to Strabo (a fine conjecture on his name, linking him with Seianus) and Nicolaus. It is worth being reminded that Greeks of the time thought the Attic revival due to the taste of the Roman upper class. We might remember the Atticism that aroused Ciceron's suspicions in Latin letters. Though we should also perhaps be warned that this taste was limited to a small circle and did not last: L. Cestius Pius of Smyrna, plena deo and despised by a Messalla or Tiberius, was to the taste of the next generation. Perhaps, also, literature has been interpreted too strictly: Nicias of Cos gets his due earlier, as a dynast (p. 45); but the musician Demosthenes, lover of a Julia, might have crept in, helping to fill in the background of that Court. We should also have more on rhetors: men like Cestius (a bare mention) or Niceta (no mention), admittedly out of place among the political aristocrats, did as much as anyone to make Kulturgeschichte and thus create that unity of the Greek and Roman worlds that B. has so elegantly portrayed.

Ch. XI draws some of the morals (rightly, I think, protesting against the excessive distinctions scholars have tended to draw between colonial and native families) and rapidly—perhaps too sketchily: this last part might have been omitted—tries to show how the unity, saved and maintained by the first emperors, finally collapsed. There follow some effective specialised appendices, a sound bibliography and an index (chiefly of names).

There are the inevitable minor slips, and one will often legitimately differ on detailed points of interpretation. Perhaps—inevitably, again—evidence is sometimes pressed a little hard, as when Q. Didius is assumed (p. 27) to be an Antonian appointee in Syria (no evidence at all—RE and MRR disagree), or Philostratus (who was exiled to an oasis in the desert and died there, it seems: see Cichorius, RS 314 f.) is said to have been introduced into the imperial circle (p. 33). And there is one startling misprint (p. 36, line 2: the words 'the tutor of' have dropped out at the beginning of the line)—fortunately the facts are correctly stated p. 35, n. 5. But these are minor blemishes. The main thesis is sound and important. However, many details may be controverted, this book is bound to take its place among the classics of recent scholarship. We must hope that the author will continue his researches into the exciting subject of Greco-Roman history under the Empire.

E. Badian.

University of Leeds.


This is the third collection of Momigliano's essays on historical and historiographical subjects to have been published. It is rich in ideas and information and the reader is constantly staggered both by the range of Momigliano's interests and by his exhaustive reading. Although formally divided into four parts, the essays fall into three main sections. One is concerned with problems of historical method and approach. Momigliano is at his best in his penetrating analysis of the techniques and presuppositions of other historians; in particular the Remarks on Eastern History Writing (pp. 229-38) are full of suggestive ideas. A second section collects together eleven papers or reviews on early Rome. The period is one that has engaged much of Momigliano's attention during recent years and it is, furthermore, one of the fastest growing fields of ancient history. There is wide scope for further work both in the critical examination of historical texts and in the evaluation and extension of archaeological research. It is much to be hoped that Momigliano will one day synthesize the results of his work into a more prolonged study of the basis of early Roman history. Readers of this journal, however, will probably be more concerned with the third section of studies on Greek history and Greek historical writing. Many of these are early works ('alcuni saggi giovani'), published in the 1930s, but time has done little to supersede or controvert them.

Momigliano's views on the structure and date of the Xenophon's Lact. Pol. (pp. 341-5) and on the implications of Xenophon's account of the Theban hegemony (pp. 347-65) remain authoritative. His discussion of Theopompos (pp. 367-91), with a useful
appendix bringing the problems and bibliography up to date, and his study of the Koine Eirene (pp. 393-419: together with the subsidiary paper 'Per la storia della pubblicita sulla Koine Eirene' = pp. 457-87) have for long been too inaccessible to students. It is useful also to have his convincing demonstration (pp. 421-55) against Mathieu of the dramatic date of Isocrates' Platæus, which remains a key document for understanding the events of 375-73 B.C. Also reprinted here are the notes on the date of Pherecydes (pp. 335-40) and on the Rationalism of Hecataeus of Miletus (pp. 323-73).

The whole collection makes absorbing reading. It is also encouraging reading because Momigliano not only solves problems but points the way to future problems or future lines of approach. This is perhaps best indicated by the 'Conclusione e Prologo' (pp. 807-16) which discusses Oriental factors in Jewish historical writing after the Exile and in Greek historical writing. All through these papers Momigliano stresses the need to take into account not just the classical world and the native writers but the much wider world with its different traditions and different cultures which so often impinged directly or indirectly on Greece and Rome. Few of us can hope to master it as Momigliano does but his work is a constant challenge and a stimulus.

R. M. Ogilvie.

Balliol College, Oxford.


This is a most useful and clearly presented list of Mycenaean sites on the mainland of Greece and in the islands. Crete, which might be difficult in practice to fit into the scheme, is omitted. The author has visited some three-fifths (about 350) of the 574 numbered mainland sites, and about two-fifths of the 50 odd island sites which are listed but not numbered. Many of the sites were discovered or reported for the first time by the author and his collaborators. Most of these (in the South and West Peloponnese and the Dodcanean) have been published in articles in AJA and BSA; but some make their début here. There is also new information about already known sites, together with some interesting ideas and much sensible comment. P. 15: LH III B sherds were noted within the rubble fill of the walls round Palaikastro (Midea). P. 116 f.: Gla it is argued was a fortress rather than a town. P. 2 f.: the 'provincial', non-Mycenaean, character of the pottery from some sites even within the Mycenaean area is stressed. A new and revised edition of the Gazetteer may become desirable in a few years' time when the results of recent exploration, to which the author draws attention, in areas such as Arcadia and Euboea are available. The suggestions below are offered with this in mind.

It would be useful to have a short summary of the character of each site (i.e. if a settlement, whether it is large or small or a hamlet or farm, if a tomb of what kind it is), even in the case of sites well published by the author and his collaborators in recent articles.

The symbols on the maps are restricted to a triangle for settlements, a spot for tombs, and a ?. The ? is used for caves (e.g. No. 184: but some caves, e.g. Nos. 322, 325, and the well No. 345, have no symbols at all), and for sanctuaries (e.g. Nos. 49 and 379 which is also a cave), as well as for doubtful sites and for sites which may be assumed to have existed although there is as yet no evidence for them. Caves and sanctuaries at least might have separate symbols of their own without confusing the maps.

The author has taken into account P. Alín's important study of mainland Mycenaean sites published in 1962. But references to it are (reasonably perhaps) somewhat spasmodic; and a few sites listed by Alín are omitted, such as the cave at Pitsa (Alín, p. 61) and the settlement on the island at Porto Rafti which was briefly reported in JHS 1950, p. 4 (Alín, p. 107). This site is important as the possible settlement for the cemetery (No. 367) at Perati just across the bay from it. There are two boxes of Mycenaean sherds from this settlement in the Sherd Collection of the British School at Athens. Another interesting Mycenaean site represented in the Sherd Collection there lies high on the slopes of Hymentos just above the monastery of Kaisariani. It would clearly be desirable to work through the sherd collections of the British and American Schools (and any other such collections as may exist) for possible unpublished sites and for material which may throw fresh light on sites already published and listed. A valuable feature of the Gazetteer is the Partial Index on p. 195. But a general index of sites as in Alín's book might also be useful.

Nos. 2 and 32 on the map should presumably have dots for tombs as well as triangles. No. 6 Dendra is surely the cemetery which belongs to No. 7 Palaio-kastro (Midea). No. 315 should be represented by a dot, No. 369 by a dot and triangle on the map. No. 374 Asketari is some 2 km. south of the site at Rafina as Alín notes, and appears to be quite separate from it. Nos. 376 and 377: Alín (p. 110) also affirms Mycenaean sherds from the area of the Classical Herakleion. No. 545: the tholos tomb examined by Theochares may be the same as that reported by Arvanitopoulos; it was certainly shown to me as such in 1956. No. 554 Xeropoli (Lefkandhi) has evidently wandered on the map from its true position. P. 121: read 'Furumark's Type 164' for 'Type 64'.

Great Milton.

M. S. F. Hood.

Early Greek Art means Greek Art from 750 to 560 B.C. A second volume is promised for late Archaic and Classical Art. What we are given is a very skilful selection of mythological pictures well reproduced and with admirable short bibliography for each, map, nine genealogical tables, and index. Relief-vases, ivories, and particularly the bronze shield-bands from Olympia (published by Kunze) are a welcome addition to the normal range of illustrations from vases and sculpture; much of this material will be new to many readers. The three main chapters are called the age of Homer, the age of early lyricism, and the High Archaic period. Within each chapter the arrangement is first legends about the gods, then Bellerophon, Perseus, Herakles, Theseus, the Argonauts, the Theban and Trojan legends.

The introduction on the need to study illustrations and the way in which they should be studied is excellent. S. then deals with Bronze Age legends and the chronology of legends in the early Iron Age with full appreciation of borrowing from the East. The difficulty of interpreting eighth-century geometric pictures is notorious, and S., though giving a single positive interpretation, usually warns his readers that the interpretations are uncertain; his datings are sometimes rather early. (In particular the large wreath held by the woman in the abduction scene on the bowl from Theseks in the British Museum makes Ariadne a better choice than Helen.) Homer in the title of this chapter means the author of the Wrath of Achilles and the Return of Odysseus; the Iliad and the Odyssey are dated down in the sixth century, the High Archaic Period, so that the Age of Early Lyricism intervenes between Homer and them.

For this, the seventh century, there are many excellent pictures well interpreted. Perhaps to find a stylistic parallel between the arrival of Apollo on the well-known Melian amphora and Apollo's entry into Olympos in the Homer hymn is to underestimate the power and violence of the hymn here, and in general S. seems to me to press stylistic parallels between art and literature too far. (A minor confusing point: S. seems to use lekythos for what is usually called an aryballos in Protocorinthian.) About some interpretations a hesitation may be felt: a clay relief from Gortyn has a man and a woman attacking a man seated on a throne, holding a sceptre; they appear to be pulling a robe over his head; if this is really the death of Agamemnon, it fixes the robe in the story two hundred years before Aeschylus.

In the High Archaic Period (600–560 B.C.) a new interpretation is given of the Corfu pediment: the central Gorgon with Pegasos and Chrysaor is a monstrous being, who nevertheless belongs in the divine family; in the right corner Zeus kills a Titan (which is surely right); in the left Poseidon kills Kronos (This is doubtful, why a spear instead of a trident?)? The Gorgon separates the two corners, and the old interpretation of Neoptolemos and Priam on the right may be preferred. S. says nothing of the panthers, who make this Gorgon a queen of animals, even if she is also the mother of Pegasos and Chrysaor; I still feel that she may be a local interpretation of the goddess of the temple.

S. sees a very close analogy between the art of the first third of the sixth century and our Iliad and Odyssey and the Cyclic epics, all of which he ascribes to this period. One might prefer to think that the spread of epic recitations and the growth of festivals was responsible. S. never considers whether names which cannot be got into hexameters do not compel us sometimes to assume a lyric source (cf. my Greek Art and Literature 700–530 B.C., 21 p. 36, 22 p. 43). Some details are also doubtful. Do the wealth of Herakles scenes imply an epic in which his deeds were linked by the idea of guilt and atonement? On the Chest (not 'Ark') of Kypselos, S. says that the epic source may have combined the boiling of Pelias with his funeral games, since Jason had played no part in the murder and was now estranged from Medea; but could the daughters of Pelias have been present at the games if they had boiled their father? A shield-band (fig. 33) with a warrior leading off a woman who holds spindle and wreath is interpreted as Paris and Helen, but does not the wreath and spindle make the earlier interpretation of Theseus and Ariadne more likely? But doubts about interpretations must not be allowed to obscure the great value of this book.

There are too many mistakes in translation: e.g. p. 9. Gerat: not 'weapon', but 'vase'. P. 13. not 'gods were portrayed on stone pillars' but 'divinity appeared in stone pillars'. P. 23 not 'early painting' but 'representation' (engraving on bronze); not 'victors of Nestor' but 'victims'. P. 31, Antilochus should be Archilochus, who is always spelt without 'h'. P. 56 not 'but in some cases only one' but 'from each side only one'. P. 60, 'funeral games for Pelias', not Peleus. P. 65, Tityos was not a 'penitent' but was punished for his crimes. P. 92 not 'Achilles must now fight Memnon and in this encounter he falls' but 'afterwards he falls'.

T. B. L. Webster.

University College, London.


Any book, printed on fine paper, with nearly 400 good illustrations spread evenly through the text, is going to be a pleasure to look at, and this is no exception; indeed, it rivals in this respect even the most lavish pictorial volumes on Classical art of
recent years. But this is also a serious work, such as one would expect from Becatti, and tackles its vast subject with a determination that seldom flags.

Three obvious problems of demarcation must have confronted B. (though there is no introduction for them to be discussed in): what are the boundaries of 'Classical Art', first chronologically, then in terms of subject-matter, then geographically? To the first question B.'s answer is clear, and acceptable to many: his survey begins at the Protogeometric period and ends with the fifth century A.D. He solves the second problem in a less satisfying way. Architecture, for example, is considered relevant enough to be treated in a quite detailed, if selective, manner in a series of sections of the text; yet it is virtually excluded in entirety from the large corpus of illustrations. No less than three-quarters of these illustrations show works of (in its broadest sense) sculpture; this is perhaps inevitable in a series whose emphasis is heavily on the major arts, but it means that much else that is incontrovertibly 'art' is thinly represented here—though, again, it is in some cases discussed in the text. Of jewellery, one of B.'s own fields, sadly little is to be seen; of other metalwork, only the Vix krater and the Ficoroni cista; one gem-impression; one coin; a very few mosaics; no plate. Vase-painting and wall-painting are however adequately represented. Classical art may have left us an unavoidably lop-sided heritage, but a general survey can do something to mitigate this unevenness. Geographically, however, B. interprets his subject in a hearteningly wide sense. Etruscan art is fully covered, and the initial bridge from Greece to Italy is emphatically built in the first dozen pages through the Italian Geometric style. Greek influence on Iberian art is stressed and illustrated. By comparison, the East, and especially Cyprus, get little attention.

Within these limits, the treatment is remarkably thorough. It is surprising that any book on the whole of Classical art should, for instance, find space for even brief individual studies of the more important vase-painters, or of the better-known works of each main sculptor; though it may not always be clear to the general reader which of those works mentioned are known from monumental, and which only from written evidence (on pages 136 and 246 for example). One might further object that B.'s tendency to treat epochs in terms of individual artists and works, beginning with the painters of Attic Late Geometric, is more suited to a book where all (or nearly all) the works can be illustrated, which is hardly the case even in this sumptuous volume. But this makes his text the more useful to refer to for factual information; while his pictures are on the whole admirable both in choice and reproduction. Particularly striking are the unusual views of sculptures; the dying giant from the Selinus Temple F metope (p. 70) is a masterpiece of ingenuity.

A few points of comment or disagreement arise from the sections on Greek art:

pp. 12–13: It was perhaps a pity that, in the search for representational scenes in Protogeometric, B. chose the very untypical bell-krater from Fortetsa as one of his two illustrations. The Kerameikos belly-amphora with the horse is misdated by 200 years in the caption, presumably a slip.

On p. 16 this reviewer was delighted to see upheld the view, not yet widely supported, that the 'Dipy-
lon' shield of Attic Geometric is no more than a 'heroic' misrepresentation of the Mycenaean 8-
shield.

p. 33: It is extremely doubtful whether seventh
century Sparta had a 'rigida organizazione
tastale' to an extent that would affect her art;
'VIII' here must be a misprint for 'VII', and even then the date given for the beginning of Laconian
black-figure is a bit early (see Boardman, BSA lvi 1–4).

pp. 66, 68: Temple C at Selinus is twice given a date
(in the captions) of 520–10 B.C. This is improbable late, as is shown by the comparison with the
Foce del Sele metopes on the facing pages.

p. 179: B. still holds to the view that the date of the
Zeus of Pheidias was 448 or thereabouts, and that
the finds of the German excavations in the work-
shop date from a spring-cleaning some years later.
Would he adhere to this now that the publication (Olympische Forschungen V, which did come out in 1964) has shown that this explanation of the finds
cannot be right?

p. 205: B. resuscitates Blümel's view of 'der Hermes
eines Praxiteles'.

p. 220; cf. 214: B. evidently doubts Ashmole's asso-
ciation of the Demeter of Chidos with Leochares
(acknowledged in the caption, p. 222), but it is
strange that he revives the old belief that the body
of the statue is made of inferior 'marmo locale'.
See JHS lxxi, 13 n. 5.

The chapters on Etruria and Rome, though naturally briefer, seem thorough and perceptive, if uncontroversial. Other Italic art under Classical influence is not neglected; nor, later, is provincial Roman (including Romano-British) art. At the end of the book, besides the list of illustrations and table of contents, is a bibliography, twenty pages long but still consisting mostly of general works of synthesis, and containing few articles; this might have made way for an index, of which there is none. Even if the book follows a strict chronological scheme, this last is a serious lack when the treatment is as long, as detailed and as comprehensive as it is here. But students of any period of Classical art should not be discouraged from dipping into these pages, where they will find much that is rewarding.

A. M. SNODGRASS.

University of Edinburgh.

The reviewer must begin by apologising for the late appearance of this review, which is nobody’s fault but his own. Fortunately (though this is no excuse) this is not a book whose importance is in new discoveries or which will easily be put out of date by yet newer ones. For the reviewer’s money it will still be read with profit as well as pleasure in twenty or fifty years or more, which is more than he would dare prophesy for many books on classical art. After a Foreword in which the author amplies the title as ‘A Study of the Formative Evolution of Artistic Style in the Three Major Arts of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture from their Inception in Classical Greek Times until the Mid-Hellenistic Period’, he proceeds in I Generalities to consider the peculiarly visual approach to life of the Greeks and to relate this to their remarkable development of mimetic art; and goes on to demonstrate (entirely to the reviewer’s satisfaction) that the history of the art of classical Greece begins with Geometric pottery-decoration. II The Genesis of Graphic Form and III Early Figures treat the art of the Geometric period and its immediate following; an art which the author puts firmly in a place far below what many claim for it. IV Tectonic Form relates the ‘quality present in many early Greek bronzes . . . which . . . rescues technically immature productions from being merely amusing essays, childishly naive and artistically vapid’ (p. 70) to the quality of form found in Greek architecture and ceramics (disposing by the way of the myth of ‘dynamic symmetry’). With V The Genesis of Sculptural Form and VI The Early Evolution of Pictorial Style, VII Sculpture in Relief and VIII Attic Red-figure we are taken right through the archaic phase and prepared for IX The Creation of the Classic Formal Style in Sculpture, the core of the book. X The Further Development of Pictorial Style and XI The Transition to Naturalism in Sculpture are a kind of epilogue; while XII and XIII Evolution in Architectural Form—the Doric Order and The Evolution of the Ionic Order consider, and do much to explain, the curious problem, not often so overtly recognised, of the failure of Greek architecture to develop in the classical period in the kind of way that sculpture and painting did.

Professor Carpenter is a stimulating, indeed a provocative, writer. The reviewer was constantly making notes of disagreement or doubt, only to recognise after another page or further thought that, even if he could not accept that particular point, he was convinced by the general rightness of the argument. One may lift an eyebrow at the implied denial (p. 20) of sphinxes and sirens to classical Greek art; but on consideration this appears a simplification merely, not a falsification. So, one can question the absolute dismissal of influence from Mycenaean on Doric architecture (pp. 215–18); we have now (see p. 61) large-scale Mycenaean statues (in terracotta) from Keos; and the account of the beginnings of Greek seal-cutting (p. 29) is definitely wrong in denying any connexion with that of the Aegean Bronze Age; yet Carpenter is surely absolutely right in his essential point that there is a total breach of continuity in these and all other manifestations of art. (His argument against the theory that Linear B literacy might have lasted until the adoption of the Phoenician alphabet seems to the reviewer likewise conclusive.)

Carpenter is one of the very few students in this field who has bothered to think (or been capable of thinking?) deeply about what one means by style and stylistic development; and to put into clear words a model of that development. If the model has a fault it is (in the reviewer’s feeling) a tendency to too great a rigidity—the implication that an artist at any given moment could not have done other than he actually did. The evidence seems sometimes a little forced to fit this picture; as when (p. 132) he speaks of ‘the open eye in a profile face, perhaps first fully achieved by Sosias and thereafter destined quickly to become a commonplace in the potter’s art’, which seems to slur over the generation or two of vase-painters who, after the profile eyes of the Sosias cup, continued to draw a frontal eye in a profile face. Occasionally the reviewer would take issue on a more important point. The primacy of vase-painting over painting in other media is something he has himself argued, and he is delighted to find it so ably put forward here; but he thinks there is evidence (partly on the vases themselves) for other painting from the mid-seventh century on, whereas Carpenter doubts if it became important before the latter decades of the sixth century’ (p. 108). The account of relief sculpture (119–28) is wholly admirable as regards low relief and its relation to painting and later to sculpture in the round; but Carpenter does not seem to the reviewer to give sufficient importance to high relief, a new art form evolved by archaic Greek architectural sculptors; or to allow enough weight to continued interaction on one another of painting, low relief, high relief and sculpture in the round into the classical period: the metopes at Olympia show not only (p. 126) ‘attraction towards free-standing sculptural form’ but also influence, seen in the pediments too, from Polygnotan painting. These disagreements, however, do nothing to weaken the reviewer’s conviction that the author’s approach is fundamentally right and his book of the highest quality and importance.

MARTIN ROBERTSON.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

can School of Classical Studies at Athens. 1964. Pp. xix + 235. 18 plates (incl. 5 in colour). 144 text figures. $35.00.


Water supplies are the lifeblood of cities. How to maintain an increasingly expensive urban civilisation amid a rainfall which was always scanty and seldom adequate was the perennial problem of the Mediterranean city states. The elaborate means by which water was brought from distant springs by aqueduct, or how rainfall was stored in great cisterns were among the first objects of enquiry by the earlier generation of archaeologists. Scholars are still grateful to the Enquête sur les installations hydrauliques de Tunisie compiled by Paul Gauckler and his assistants between 1895–8 for the French Protectorate authorities. This survey included the water supplies to a number of smaller centres as well as cities such as Thysdrus (el-Djem) and Thelepte. It remains one of the basic works for understanding how the Roman cities in Tunisia lived.

Though published in 1964 the work of Bert Hodge Hill on Corinth belongs to the same generation of archaeology. It was in 1896 that the American School at Athens working on the site of Corinth first turned its attention to a broad paved way in the valley at the east foot of the hill on which the old temple still stands. During this work the foreman drew the excavation staff’s attention to the fact that a well in a nearby garden communicated with an extensive subterranean water-system. This was one of the tunnels leading a copious spring which proved to be the Peirene of Corinth, the fountain referred to by Euripides (Trojan Women, 205–6), Plautus, Strabo and Pausanias.

In his Foreword, Professor Carl Blegen pays a handsome tribute to Hill’s work on Peirene and the Sacred Spring in a series of excavations carried out in the years 1896–1903. Hill apparently finished his draft report in 1911 and fourteen years later, after further work by William B. Dinsmoor on the location of the water sources the report was ready. Even allowing for Hill’s perfectionist spirit and difficulties caused by the outbreak of the war, it seems to this reviewer at least, a fantastic state of affairs that it has only now seen the light of day almost sixty years from the original discovery.

Making allowances for the fact that one is dealing with the account of an excavation conducted very largely before the First World War, the report on Peirene is a very complete document. Hill was a keen observer, who examined his evidence exhaustively. The result is a detailed account of each phase in the story of Peirene from Helladic times down to its final disuse probably in the eleventh century A.D. Though the detail is sometimes difficult to follow and a summary at the conclusion of the account would have been welcome there can be no doubt that this is a definitive report.

The account of the finding and excavation of the Sacred Spring which was supervised by Hill himself and the fountain known as Glauke are of the same high standard. The reader is taken step by step from a small absideal temple south of the Propylaea to the water channel and Fountain House that piped water from a spring whose waters provided a regular supply for the use of the temple. Excavations revealed a large sacred area whose full extent is still undetermined. Within it, the complex of buildings appears to have belonged to the Classical period of Corinth, and to have been obliterated by the sack of the city in 146 B.C. It is to the greatest credit of the excavator that the Fountain House, the Reservoir and the temple were unearthed so that they could still so easily be related to each other despite interruption by later building on the site.

The fountain of Glauke to which the final section of the Report is devoted was also a large and impressive work. It was still surviving in part in rock-hewn remains which could be seen west of the Temple of Apollo. The exact source of its water supply was never ascertained but the four reservoirs, to which one was later added, seem to have provided good drinking water for the centre of the city. Like the Peirene but unlike the Sacred Spring it does not seem to have been destroyed by the Romans.

The excavations and the accompanying Plans provide a complete coverage of the sites and together form a comprehensive account of the system of water supply of ancient Corinth. Particularly fine are Duell’s water-colour representation of the surviving wall-paintings from the Peirene. This is the real value of this long and often difficult report. Yet Bert Hill’s excavations, even at sixty years’ remove, still remain a classic treatment of the subject and a monument to his author’s pioneer accuracy and thoroughness of method. The architectural drawings are of a very high standard, and the photography, considering the period of the work, remarkably effective.

W. H. C. FRENZ.

Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.


The ruins of an Early Christian cathedral overlie and incorporate remains of a Ptolemaic sanctuary.
Both are buildings of the highest importance for architectural historians, and both had suffered from unsatisfactory excavation and from their exposed condition. With the primary aim of supplying an adequate record of this vulnerable material, work was undertaken in 1949–51 by the late Professor Wace and his Alexandrian colleagues. Failing to obtain a specialist in Greek architecture for the Ptolemaic material, they did secure the services of Mr Megaw, then Director of Antiquities in Cyprus, for the church, and this is largely his report. Atrax Fortuna has dogged its progress mercilessly, but it has appeared; technical imperfections (misprints and lamentable plates) are outweighed by more positive considerations.

The Ptolemaic sanctuary is presented in a short chapter by Wace. Its identity is given by an inscription (on 5 Doric architrave blocks recovered from the church in 1945), dedicating τά ἁγιάζματα καὶ τῶν ναῶν καὶ τῆς ἐλίτας ἐν τῷ τεμένους καὶ τῆς στοά(ῶ)ν to Ptolemy III and Berenice, probably c. 240. Traces survive of an oblong peristyle court with propylaea at the western end and a temple (or altar) towards the eastern, and there are many architectural elements with which to juggle. The importance of this site, reflecting the lost monuments of Alexandria and pointing to influence upon architectural forms in the Roman world (particularly the peristyle Kaisareia) can be gauged by reference to Sjöqvist (Opusc. Rom. I, 1954, p. 86), Ward Perkins (PBR, XXVI, 1958, p. 178), and Boethius (Golden House, 1960, p. 69). The suggestion that the Ptolemaic cult here may have persisted into late Roman times receives some support from Skeat’s useful synopsis of the comparative documentary evidence.

The church is an early example of the triconchos type, to be dated somewhere between Theophrastus’ basilica at Abu Mina (c. 400) and the Sohag monasteries (c. 440). Distinguished from them by function (for it was a city-church), it too may reflect the lost architecture of metropolitan Alexandria. The nave was defined on three sides by colonnades which continued round the deep transeptal arms. The central triconchos bay was oblong (this is a century before the Lycian examples with central dome on pendentes [AS. XIII, 1969, p. 117]), but the cruciform plan was modified in the superstructure: Megaw convincingly restores a pitched roof over the nave extending to the apse, and lower flat roofs over the transepts and galleries. The church was surrounded by an elaborate complex of ancillary buildings, and there is a wealth of fine architectural carving. Megaw’s description, discussion, and drawings are characteristically lucid.

This monograph amply demonstrates the importance of the site and points the way to further investigation. Conditions were patently difficult, and the report should be received with sympathy.

R. M. Harrison.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne.


‘C’est à tort que longtemps Géa a été identifiée avec Licata, qui correspond à l’antique Phintias. Le site de Géa doit être cherché à Terranova ... qui a repris depuis quelques années son ancien nom.’ Thus Jean Bérard in 1941, expressing the communis opinio. The idea that Licata is the site of ancient Gela, already undermined by Orsi in his excavations early this century, would, one might think, have been given its coup de grâce by the discoveries of the great fortifications on Capo Sopranò at Podierna Gela and the sanctuaries at Molino a Vento, and by the researches in the hinterland so ably carried out by Piero Orlandini and Dina Adamestu. Not a bit of it. Licata, defended a generation ago by Giuseppina Pagoto, has found a new champion in Dr Navarra, a native son who advances the claims of his city with passionate energy, and his book’s unassuming title does nothing to indicate that the work is constructed to prove this one major point.

That he is arguing against a well-entrenched point of view and what he considers as the vested interests of the professional archaeologists lends to Navarra’s book an added vehemence and a tendency to be repetitious in hammering his points home. He is nothing if not thoroughgoing. Like all worthy champions of unorthodox causes, he has read voluminously and his data are at his fingers’ ends. Any argument, good, bad or indifferent, which he thinks will help his case has been thrown into the scales. Having enunciated a hypothesis he proceeds to use it as an established datum, and to build on it further: so that the final edifice though imposing is brittle.

His order of attack is interesting and may be conveniently surveyed through the full summaries in French, English and German which preface the book. He wisely keeps until last his consideration of the battle of the Himeras in 311 B.C. and Dionysius’ defence of Gela in 405, since both are weak links for him and an interpretation which would place the latter at Licata and deny Agathocles the desperate retreat evident in Diodorus’ narrative argues against the probabilities. But Navarra has the eye of faith, and will not accept that there is any other probability. A good deal of the argument is hazardous. I leave to competent philologists the many deductions from similarity of ancient and modern place-names. A typical example concerns the equation of πολιομάκτινα τι in Polybius I. 53.8 with Policia, the name of the hill above the western branch of the Salso. One might with equal effect use the farm named Casa Battaglia, north of Gela-Terranova on route SS 117, to locate Dionysius’ battle. And the meaning of the sources is sometimes distorted to make a point; e.g. Plutarch Timoleon 35, ὑπὸ Καρχέρδων ἀνατέτατος γεγενημένας, so far from meaning ‘destroyed at the Carthaginians’ hands’, has to mean ‘diverne spopolate sotto i Cartaginesi’, so that Gela-Licata
may be on the right bank of the Salso, within the Punic eparchy up to 339 B.C.

Navarra shows the art of the skilled propagandist in 'guiding' his reader. The Maroglio, for example, the river of Gela-Terranova, is always referred to as a miserable stream unworthy of the epithet immannis—although in antiquity when the area was well wooded its character may have been different. Schubring's widely-accepted theory that it may have changed its course is rejected by appeal to the conclusive evidence of aerial photography; but the photographs are not reproduced and in so flat and well-cultivated a plain the hypothesis remains not unreasonable. A mention of the Salso, on the other hand, is frequently accompanied by some such remark as 'il fiume il più grande di Sicilia'. Not only is it the Himeras and the Gelas; it is also the Halycus, giving its name to Licata, and the reader is invited to amend all his former notions about the shifting boundaries between the Syracusan and Carthaginian zones in the fourth century. There are other exciting transpositions too. Dorieux' Heraelea was Gela-Terranova, the Eryx in his story not Erice but Eruke, which for Navarra is Monte Desusino.

However, he has not only to advance his own theory; he must also dispose of that currently held. In attempting this it is a pity that he has to attack the good faith of such careful, assiduous and distinguished archaeologists as Griffio, Orlandini and Adamestanu, all of whom are accused of prejudice and circularity in argument—Orlandini even of the suppression of vital evidence. For Navarra the site of Gela-Terranova was, in the classical period, a large sanctuary piously maintained by the Gelosans from a distance of 33 kms. The great walls are those of Phintias. He underestimates the size of the classical city, and overestimates the argument to be drawn from the lack of secular buildings, a characteristic which Gela shares with Syracuse and other Sicilian cities. He does not observe the attraction of the great plain of Gela for early settlers—more extensive and inviting than the less hospitable ex feudo-country behind Licata, beside a brackish river. He passes hurriedly, and with vague references to unappreciated finds, over Licata's own lack of classical material.

Being at odds with the 'establishment', the author could use for his photographs only material in his own possession. Nearly all his illustrations lack captions and, in the circumstances, relevance and value. The reader would have been much helped by several good maps and by a better standard of composition (few Greek quotations are free from excerption misprints, and authors' names—even those of Italians—are gratuitously manhandled). All the same, even if Navarra's book has not proved his case either conclusively (as he thinks) or at all (as those against whom he is writing would think), it is a case which deserves a fair hearing and a proper reply. The last work of Griffio known to me (Gela, 1964), published without knowledge of Navarra's Ciità, shrugs off the Licata theory with scarcely a gesture. This is now not good enough. Griffio and Orlandini (Adamestanu having been transferred to the mainland) are the only scholars competent to give Navarra full answer. He has well earned it, and unless he gets it he could be justified in claiming that the verdict is his by default.

A. G. WOODHEAD.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.


The Antikythera shipwreck is known to many because of the bronze boy in the National Museum at Athens (N.M. 13396, Lullies and Hirmer, pl. 218-26) and to some because of the extraordinarily interesting astrological machine, which was republished by Dr. D. de Solla Price in the Scientific American 200, 6 (1955), p. 60, and which recalls the so-called globe of Archimedes described by Cicero, Republic 1, 14. Dr Price concluded that the gears of the machine had been set about 80 B.C. (or 120 years earlier or later). The bronze boy is claimed as an original of the fourth century B.C. It is therefore a matter of some interest to establish the date of the wreck from the ordinary pottery. Miss Virginia Grace reviews the wine-amphorae, and with her unrivalled knowledge decides that all might be assigned to a period in or close to the decade 80-70 B.C. (some twenty or more years later than the amphorae found in the Mahdia wreck). G. Roger Edwards discusses the Hellenistic pottery, a Megarian bowl, lagynoi, unguentaria, a lamp, etc., and suggests that it was made on the coast of Asia Minor early in the second quarter of the first century B.C. Henry S. Robinson compares the Roman pottery (probably from the Eastern Mediterranean) with the pottery from Agora Group F, and says that the vases suggest a date for the wreck around the middle of the first century B.C. The date for the pottery could presumably be pushed back to coincide with Miss Grace's date since the top date given for Group F is 75 B.C. (The Athenian Agora V, p. 10).

The glass vessels (unlike the pottery) are fine work, probably made for export in Alexandria. Mrs Weinberg writes a commentary on them, and gives parallels with glass found in Europe, mostly in contexts of the first century A.D. Here it is the wreck that dates the glass, not vice-versa.

Finally Peter Throckmorton discusses the surviving bits of the ship. Pieces of elm-planking have been dated by radiocarbon within the approximate range of 260 to 180 B.C., but this date 'may have been earlier than the cutting of the tree by an amount equal to the age of the tree'. Miss Grace's wine amphorae, then, give the most precise and reliable date.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University College, London.
In this agreeable lecture Professor Cook traces the treatment of the slaughter of the Niobids through classical antiquity. The story is told in the Iliad, and remains essentially unchanged, though details vary (as, the number of Niobe's children, and their allotment as victims between Apollo and Artemis). Until recently no representation was known in art before the fifth century, but it is now found on two mid-sixth century Attic amphora of the so-called Tyrrhenian Group. Cook catalogues all works of art which he thinks certainly or probably represent the subject: two archaic, ten of fifth or early fourth-century date or derivation, two dozen Hellenistic or Roman. In his text he runs through these examples, pausing half-way to consider why the theme is so rare in vase-painting and finding the answer in the difficulty of adapting the subject to a vase-field within the dominant conventions. This conclusion is surely right, though backed by some scarcely tenable generalisations. It is hardly even 'very roughly true' that 'till the 550's the normal field for decoration of a pot was long and low, and afterwards it was high and relatively narrow'; nor does it seem to me likely that 'the popularity of Theseus can be explained in this kind of way'. Still, the approach is a welcome corrective to more highfalutin explanations of iconographical problems; and his warning against expecting literature and art to run always parallel is also valuable. The slaughter of the Niobids does seem a subject recalcitrant to vase-painting; and it is worth noting that the scene most closely allied to it formally, the slaying of the suitors by Odysseus and Telemachus, is even rarer. The only certain Attic example I know is, like the Niobid krater, a work of the mid-fifth century painted surely under the influence of a larger composition. (Cook's no. 4 could conceivably be a suitor and not a Niobid.) He concludes his survey of the monuments with an interesting discussion of the distribution of the theme in ancient art. For him purely aesthetic reasons dictate its appearance in some sculptural contexts and absence from others. Here again, while I feel it valuable that this aspect should be stressed, I am not convinced that it is the only one. The last sentence of the lecture, reverting to this matter, runs: 'After all, Greek and even much Roman art was produced not by scholars, officials or illustrators, but by artists who were working in a tradition that was not hieratic or propagandist but aesthetic.' But artists were working for patrons; few would deny some hieratic and propagandist influence in the decoration of the Parthenon; and I doubt if it can be entirely discounted on other temples.

The second part of the lecture is an attempt to reconstruct the pediment-composition to which the Terme and Copenhagen figures belonged. Cook carefully considers and conclusively rejects Dinsmoor's ingenious attempt to attach them to the Temple of Apollo at Bassae, showing by reference to the earlier discussion that not Niobe but the two offended deities are the necessary centre of the composition; and those cannot be fitted in with the surviving figures to the Bassae frame. He shows reason for rejecting also Langlotz's Apollo, and for positioning in either wing a running figure between the surviving girls and the deities. He modestly estimates the chances of his restoration being right as 'no better than one in thirty'; but the bases of the calculation are so arbitrary that I cannot share his feeling that this is 'a test of a kind classical scholars do not use nearly enough'. What does it really add to his careful statement of the reasoning on which his admittedly conjectural and fallible but eminently sensible restoration is based?

Martin Robertson.

Lincoln College, Oxford.


It would indeed be pleasant if the evidence for the 'heavy' events of Greek athletics were sufficient to justify a book on the subject, even a volume of such modest size as this. Unhappily this is not so; the surviving evidence is inadequate, and even the little we have is hopelessly conflicting. Under such circumstances an author is tempted to assert as proven truth what should be put forward only as the most tentative hypothesis, and error is hardened, not dispelled.

Rudolph's methods in attacking the problems do not inspire confidence. His sub-title, Faustkampf, Ringkampf und Pankration in den griechischen Nationalfestspielen, together with the Olympischer of his main title, is unfortunate. At best, it limits an already restricted field of enquiry still further by confining it to the national festivals; at worst, it implies that the heavy events at these festivals differed from those at other meetings, a view for which there is no evidence whatever. He starts with a portentous bibliography of the kind regrettably demanded nowadays in the academic world; the few useful books on the subject are lost in a mass of obsolete, worthless or irrelevant material. British readers will be amused to see that the infuriating ambiguities of the English language have led R. to include A. J. Butler's Sport in Classic Times; that charming work deals only with field sports—and field sports are not even the field events of athletic sports.

The pattern of R.'s method is revealed in his Grundlagen. He gives the dates of the introduction of the various events into the Olympic Games—for which the sole source is Pausanias—on the authority
This book has many attractive features, and with its declared aim to bring fresh air and common sense into dusty libraries, I have every sympathy. I myself have learnt much from it. I am delighted to be able to recognise a Roe stag in the flat horns of a Geometric figure (Sagenbilder pl. 30). Mr Hull is instructive on hares too. I did not know that hares came back directly on their tracks and then quit them some way back, with a wide side-ways leap, leaving hounds with a dead end. There is a Proto-attic jug in the British Museum with a cock on the neck and three hounds proceeding sadly homewards. The hare is running up a hill laughing at hounds below (R. Hampe Frühattischer Grabfund 40). Mr Hull should study seventh-century vases: that was the great age of the hare hunt.

I am glad to be able to recognise a boar spear-head by the bar or hook on the hilt. Mr Hull would have been wiser not to have meddled with weapons of war. We have no surviving shafts, but I doubt war spears being nine feet in average length. What of the many socketed bronze spear heads that have survived, some of them not more than six inches in length? Many are not of Bronze Age type; were not some of them classical hunting spears?

Lists and illustrations of hunting gear and lists of animals are useful. I would add ἱερὸς the weasal mentioned by Aristophanes, compare Vectis the Roman name for the Isle of Wight: πυκτις: Rogers suggests Hedgehog, but what about Porcupine? σκάλους cannot be the same form as ἀναλέας: Rogers says mole but it might be ἄσκαλώνως, or σκάλων, the woodcock (Ach, 886).

It is amusing that Xenophon thought that a breed of dogs could be descended from foxes. I cannot, however, agree that the name for an Ostrich στροβίκωμος implies a mesalliance (94): anyway the classical Greeks did not use it. I am not convinced that Molossian Hounds were Mastiffs. I prefer to believe that Mastiffs were Xenophon’s Indian Hounds and came from Tibet where in Ridgeway’s phrase of sixty years ago, the family watch-dog was also the family vault. I prefer to think that the hound that adopted me in Ithaca was a Molossian Hound, and that the breed received reinforcements in Ithaca from Epirus with the four families; it was indistinguishable from Hull’s Laconian hounds. The breed is black or white or mixed: Odysseus’ hound was white: my hound had four white socks, the Homeric ἀδιάριμον.

In his translations of Xenophon, Arrian and Polloss, Mr Hull’s school-boy adherence to Greek order of words and turns of speech, makes them dreary reading: he does not seem to think that clarity is necessary. With Marchant’s smooth and lucid version of the Kynegitikos in his hands, why write so obscurely? He often takes the first meaning in the dictionary regardless of context.

Mr Hull may bring some fresh air but he takes the sparkle out of Greek.

S. BENTON.

NOTICES OF BOOKS


Gnathia vases have long deserved a full-length study; they are extremely decorative with their decoration in added white, yellow, red, or polychrome on the black-glaze; the subject-matter is sometimes extremely interesting for historians of Greek stage-production and is always relevant to the use of the vase.

Besides the great mass of Apulian Gnathia, similar ware was produced in Paestum, Campania, and Sicily (including the very beautiful variety known from Lipari—Bernabò Brea’s big publication Meligunis-Lipara II with its wealth of examples and its very useful chronological collocations with red-figure, Apulian Gnathia, and terracottas was presumably too late for her to use): these are dealt with in the last chapter. The first appendix discusses an interesting local group from the island of Lissa and the second Beazley’s Volcani group (EVP, 210), which may have been made by a Tarentine vase-painter who settled in Etruria.

The main part of the book is concerned with Apulian Gnathia. The first chapter discusses the scholarship of the subject, the second the relation to earlier and contemporary over-painted wares: examples are given of Gnathia vases actually found in Greece. In the third chapter she establishes her chronology. For the upper limit of about 350 b.c. she publishes three tombs in Taranto, which give good synchronisms with red-figure. The date may be rather too low: the use of white in the eye, which is the chief criterion, is already found with the Lycurgus painter, who belongs to the second quarter of the century (e.g. New York 56.171.64; B.M.M., 1962, 25) and the syntax of early figured Gnathia reflects the syntax of red-figure before rather than after 360 B.C. (e.g. the Dionysiac painter and the Ilipersis painter). For the lower limit she has a good dating by shapes of unguentaria (of which she has published a most useful study in Rend. Nap. 37, 1962, 143); she makes a good case that minor Gnathia goes on into the second century, but interesting figured and floral Gnathia does not run later than 270 B.C.

In the fourth chapter she discusses the repertoire of decoration and in the fifth shapes, with particular emphasis on the shapes which are not shared with red-figure. For some shapes (particularly the chous) a convincing chronological series can be shown, but Gnathia potters have a daunting habit of switching handles and feet from one type of vase to another. One evolution traced by Dr Forti seems attractive: from the bell krater (pl. 24c) to the ‘soup tureen’ (pl. 25c), but the difficulty is that the ‘soup tureen’ and the intermediate shape (Bernardini pl. 5, 7) both appear to be at least as early if not earlier than the bell-krater (pl. 24c), and it may be wiser to recognise the ‘soup tureen’ as a separate shape.

The sixth chapter is called ‘Elementi orientativi per una classificazione’. Here Dr Forti first shows the difficulties in Bulle’s original grouping, subsequently named the Konnaki group, and then says that my grouping (Manchester Memoirs 83, modified for the classification of dramatic vases only J.H.S., 71, 1951, 222, A.K., 1960; cf. A. D. Trendall, J.H.S., 83, 1963, 208) offers no criteria for dating or for allotting to a particular workshop. She does not offer a classification herself but only a ‘general line of development’. This she defines impeccably at the end of the chapter: figure decoration and ornamental decoration run side by side from about 350 to 310 B.C., but later ornamental decoration predominates; delicate polychromy gives way to simple juxtaposition of colours in the last quarter of the fourth century, for which white is substituted in the latest simple vases.

In fact she offers a great deal more than this—not only a useful division of vases between 350-325, 325-300, 300-275, 275-250 B.C. but also a number of smaller groupings, which need discussion. I hope my account is accurate, but absence of index, absence of museum numbers on the plates, absence of references from the plates to the text, and a sprinkling of misprints in references to plate numbers makes cross reference difficult.

(1) p. 25, Madrid 11569, same hand as Naples CV 3, pl. 69, 13. This looks good, but Jongkees (Arch. Trajectina, 1, 1957, 18) added to the Naples vase an alabastron in Utrecht; Naples, pl. 69, 1; pl. 70, 1; pl. 66, 1; Bernardini, pl. 1, 1. I find very doubtful about the last and not entirely sure about Naples, pl. 66, 1, or whether the link between Naples, pl. 69, 13 and 69, 1 is good, but this whole group needs exploring.

(2) p. 25, Athens 2277 same workshop as Lecce 3802 (Bernardini, pl. 37, 5). These belong to my yellow spray group and take with them oinochoai, London F572, Florence 4381, Motya (Whittaker, fig. 95); probably also krater, Taranto 3, pl. 20; bell-kraters, Würzburg 833, Lund (J.H.S., 71, 1951, 225, fig. 1), Warsaw, Vogell no. 572.

(3) pp. 25 and 33, Athens 2279, Lecce 1301, London CV, pl. 4, 11; and unpublished Taranto, same hand. Perhaps Lecce 1080 (Bernardini, pl. 31, 1) and other good early florals should be connected.

(4) pp. 25, 83 n. 61, London F533, Bari 3199, Cleveland 52.16, same hand. In her earlier article, Rend. Nap., 33, 1958, 222, she quoted the Taranto psyker (here plate 26a), London hydria CV, pl. 5, 8, and Taranto bottle CV, pl. 2, 1 with these, and they surely all belong together. The head on the last seems to me to bring in two Taranto plates, here pl. 28h and CV 3, pl. 21, 27 and the Copenhagen pelike CV 7, pl. 275, 4.

(5) p. 26 n. 21, Athens 2340, Lecce 1874, Bari 595, Lecce 1084. This ties ribbed and unribbed vases together; I am not sure that Lecce 1084 belongs.

(6) pp. 41 ff. Taranto pelike (here pl. 6b), Ruvo 1334, Ruvo 1735, and red-figure Vatican AA2.
NOTICES OF BOOKS

(7) p. 43. Taranto lekythos (here pl. 6a), Naples 2922, hydria, and red-figure Naples 3249 (which has a lid in Gnathia technique). It is not quite clear how far Dr Forti wishes to separate (6) and (7); I am impressed by the likeness of the Naples hydria both to Ruvo 1735 and to Vatican AA2.

(8) p. 43. Taranto oinochoe (here pl. 7c); Würzburg actor and Konnakis fragment (both by the same painter); lid of Naples 3249; Leningrad Eumenides; Boston phylax; Berlin F3486; Berlin F3444. This is a loose group dated 360–40 B.C. with the Zinner fragment (here pl. 13b) as the earliest. Also early, p. 124 n. 18, two fragments from Taranto (here pl. 33b and c). These two fragments, the Würzburg skenographia, the Würzburg actor, the Konnakis fragment, the lid of Naples 3249, Bari 35284 (here pl. 33a), the Leningrad Eumenides, the Boston phylax, and the Harvard phylax should be accepted as the work of the Konnakis painter. The other three vases are close but each has its own closer associates: (a) the Taranto oinochoe with Oxford 1898.828 (J.H.S. 71, 1951, 225 fig. 2) and other vases with the same ivy with twisted stems and no figure decoration, (b) Berlin F3849 with London F549, (c) Berlin F3444 with the Harvard tragic messenger, the Matsch phylax, and the Compiègne reveller.

(g) p. 75 n. 13. Louvre F507 (here pl. 27b); Toronto 354; Madrid 11356; Milan Sforzesco 341; Bernardini, pl. 16, 1. These belong to my dotted spray group: add as by the same hand the Beazley fragment (J.H.S. 71, 1951, pl. 45a), Oxford V487, Schiller 421, Lecce 1181, Naples 1172, Capua (Patroni 200), Toulouse 26.389, Copenhagen CV7, pl. 274, 6.

(10) p. 131. The group already put together by Dr Forti in Rend. Nap., 32, 1957, 57: London F548, two krates in Materia, Leningrad B676. These are tied together by the white swan’s necks rising from the handles. Both the Matera krates have ivy with twisted stems like the Taranto oinochoe (pl. 7c) and in any case the whole group is early.

() pp. 159, 163. The Volcani group has cross-connexions with no. 4 above and with certain late ribbed oinochoai like the Guggielmi vase (here pl. 21b).

I have treated these groups at some length because it seems to me that they open the way for further constructive thought about Gnathia.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University College London.


A scholar who is willing to spend time on rescue work deserves our condolences as well as our thanks. Morel has carried out a singularly unattractive task with clarity and care. He has collected together the black-glaze fragments from forty-seven different areas of the Roman forum and the Palatine, mostly excavated in the early 1900s but never published. This material is mainly to be seen in the antiquaria of the two sites and M. has been given free access to store-rooms. The author passes no judgment on the excavators who paid so little attention to the material on which he lavishes his care, and the motto from Sartre ("La céramique ne me fait pas rire") is his only weakening.

The text is arranged as follows. First, an explanation of terms, which is essential if the reader is to understand the full and detailed descriptions that accompany the catalogue. Next, a most useful section on sites in Italy and elsewhere which have provided comparative material; the list includes such key sites as Albintimilium and Cosa, as well as half a dozen shipwrecks. The catalogue follows, and is arranged by find-spots (from the slopes of the Capitol to the Velia, then on to the Palatine); those interested in shapes and chronology are given help later. The material, from the fourth century to the first, does not include Attic, Gnathia or Galene. Important points arising from each piece are discussed immediately afterwards, and much attention is given to the stamped decoration. It might be asked here whether double columns might not have given a less wind-blown appearance to the catalogue, as well as saving a great deal of space.

After the catalogue, there comes a supplement to Lamboglia’s list of shapes. Lamboglia’s work is rightly considered fundamental for this study, and perhaps it is not unfair to have expected a page giving the list of shapes as now constituted, as a constant reaching for previous lists is liable to end in lethargy. M.’s concluding section on black-glaze pottery at Rome distils the essence of the rest of the book, and stress is put on the variety of black at Rome in comparison with other sites, and the obvious conclusions are drawn. M. makes a plea for more tolerance towards Roman workshops which his research has shown are not distinguished solely for poor workmanship (p. 243). The usual apparatus of bibliography and subject indexes follow.

The folio of plates is almost equally divided between profile drawings and photographs, the size of the former being very generous, usually 11 by 23. It is to be hoped that the trimming of the photographs was inevitable and not chosen policy; given the conditions under which M. has had to work, one can readily believe it was unavoidable. However, it will certainly be the excellent profile drawings that will prove the most useful.

M. has added one more practicable collection of material to the corpus of black pottery in Italy, and it will be useful not only for a greater understanding of the history of pottery there but will help to elucidate the still gloomy picture of Republican Rome.

B. A. SPARKES.

The University of Southampton.
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This is very much the mixture as before for German CVA volumes: good reproduction of photographs, on one side of the plate only; excellent typography; indexes under various headings; a Foreword containing a brief history of the collection. There is no vane that is really first-rate here, the general level is mediocre with just one or two pieces of more than passing interest. The contents range from Early Cycladic to Late Hellenistic, and there are stretches of dismal hackwork over which one can hardly expect the compiler to communicate enthusiasm. The text is, however, sadly below the level of recent German CVA texts. I append some of the more important corrections and omissions.

P. 7: The Contents list needs adjustment where the two typefaces used to indicate the span of plates for a particular category are used inconsistently. Pl. 15, 12–13 and 15; These, from the form of the foot, should be later than early sixth century; see now Corinth xiii, The North Cemetery. Pl. 16, 5: Better called a lekythos, for that is what it is. Pl. 16, 6: A reference to the list of black lekythoi in Haspels' ABL would help. Pl. 16, 11: References to Villard and Vallet's article on Ionian cups in Mélanges 1955, to Hanfmann's work on the Tarsus material in The Aegean and the Near East and Tarsus iii, and to Shefton's discussion in Perachora ii, should have been given. Pl. 17, 3–4: Add Scheibl, Jahrb. lxv (1961) on the early olpe. Pl. 18, 7–9: More comment needed on the shape. Pl. 19, 1–2: An allied piece, also by the Theseus painter, is in the Noble collection, New York; see ABV 704 and von Bothmer, Ancient Art from New York Private Collections (1961) pl. 76, 221. Add also Ure's article 'Krokotos and White Heron', JHS lxv (1955) for the workshop associations. Pl. 25, 12–15: For Attic pemochai, add ABV 348–9. Pl. 28, 1–3: Published also in Powell, The Celts (1958) figs. 16–17. Pl. 29, 6 and 9: Text and plates do not match. Pl. 35, 7: The name 'Saint-Valentin' should have had a mention, with the primary references, not a derivative CVA mention. Pl. 36, 7–11: These are without doubt Attic. Pl. 36, 7–11: Why 'Spätes 5 Jhdt'? Early, surely. Pl. 38, 1–2: Mrs Thompson has much to say on the Ptolemaic jugs and queens in Troy, Supplementary Monographs, iii. Pl. 40, 4–6: On Hadra hydria, see now Guerrini, Vasi di Hadra (1964) and B. Cook, 'Inscribed Hadra Vases', MMA Papers 12 (1966). Pl. 42, 3: Some indication should have been given of the widespread distribution of this type of jug in Sicily and South Italy. Pl. 45, 5–8: Add Del Chiaro, The Gemellia Group (1957) and Arch. Class xi (1959), p. 134 f. Pl. 45, 6 and pl. 47, 1–2: This has been attributed to the Eton-Nika painter, see Cambiogiu and Trendall, Apulian Red-figured Vase-painters of the Plain Style (1961), p. 43, 7. Pl. 59, 8: If the decoration is stars, add Schauenberg, AK v (1962), pp. 51–64. Pl. 61, 8: 'Einhenkelige Schale' will hardly do here. On exaleiptra, see now Scheibl, Jahrb. lxix (1964). Pls. 63–7: Although it is difficult to distinguish good Italian from poor Attic work in photographs of black vases, it is rarely difficult in front of the actual objects, and one would like to know whether, e.g., pl. 63, 12, pl. 64, 1, pl. 67, 1–2 and 20 could be Attic. It would have been helpful to have had the Italian black arranged as in CVA Geneva.

University of Southampton.

B. A. SPARKE.


This joint production is a model catalogue. Every object is well illustrated, and the entries are excellently designed for quick reference as well as for fuller study: a brief physical description (height, material, condition, etc.) in italics; a full account and discussion; and, again in italics, a brief statement of the authors' conclusions on date, etc. An Introduction gives an interesting history of the collection. The main text is in ten chapters, mostly subdivided. I, Neolithic and Bronze Age Statuettes, consists of one Neolithic, a dozen Cycladic idols (three in shell; these, with two Roman-Egyptian plaster heads, 179–80, are the only things not in stone included), and one Minoan. The 'Fitzwilliam Goddess' appears in IX, Sculpture of uncertain date or authenticity, 186; but the authors maintain an open view on the still difficult question of her status—the technical grounds on which Casson condemned her appear less than sure. II, Sculpture of the Archaic Period, falls into two sections: (a) Limestone statuettes in a mixed style from Naucratis, etc., (b) Cypriot limestone statuettes, and (c) A Cretan graffito. The last, a dolphin and signature of apparently the later sixth century, is an amusing piece. The difficult section (a) is well treated, though the wording 'predominantly East Greek work', 'predominantly Cypriot work' is unfortunate—'style' would have been better, or 'character'. There is no good archaic sculpture in the collection (two poor heads in a late archaic manner, 187–8, are rightly classed in IX as later and almost certainly modern), but III, Sculpture of Classical Date, includes some fine pieces. The fragment from the Erechtheum frieze, 26, is slight, but a nice thing to have, as are the bit of architectural ornament, 167, almost certainly from the same building, and the antefix from the Parthenon, 166; but the grave-stele fragment, 30, is beautiful, and there are other good fragments of sepulchral and votive reliefs. The figure in 35 may have been
holding something up, e.g., a torch, like a similarly posed figure on the relief from Rhamnus, AJA 66 (1962), pl. 59, figs. 1 and 3, which also offers a certain analogy of style. 37, surely rightly identified as part of a base-relief, is also of interest and quality. IV, Ancient Copies from Classical Originals, has some very fine sculptures, notably the Polyceleidan head of the Westmacott type, 42; and the Praxitelean torsos, Apollo Sauronos and Eros, 51 and 52. The sphinx-heads, 40–1, afford a most interesting discussion of a lost group. Silianos’ Plato is assumed (under 53), as generally, to have been made in the sitter’s lifetime. We know that it was set up in the Academy; and it hardly seems consistent with Plato’s views on art to have allowed such a thing. However, even philosophers are not always consistent. V, Sculpture of Hellenistic and Roman Republican Date, is a mixed bag with many subsections. 64: for the three armed horsemen in a sepulchral context, one might perhaps compare the Alexandrian tomb-painting in Mustafa Pasha Tomb 1 (Brown, Piolemaic Painting and Mosaic, pl. 241). 78: a more recent and fuller discussion of colour on classical sculpture in Reuterdw’s definitive book, Studien zur Polyromie der Plastik: Griechenland und Rom (1960). 81, the Eleusis catatid: interesting discussion, particularly in its revival of Svoronos’ idea about the dedicator’s daughters. VI, Ancient Copies from Hellenistic Originals, is a short chapter but contains good pieces, notably the fluting satyr, 83, and the river-god, 84. VII, Sculpture of Imperial Roman Date, is another very mixed bag. The outstanding piece is the Dionysiac sarcophagus, 161; but 162 is also excellent and there are other good things. 124: could it be relevant to the curious inscription to note that καλεμός is one of the commonest of modern Greek words of pity or abuse (‘wretched man’)? In VIII, Architectural Pieces, Furniture, etc., besides 166–7 already mentioned, the miniature Ionic capital, 168, is of particular interest. X, Renaissance and Later Sculpture formerly considered Ancient, is a list of two dozen pieces with brief description and bibliography but no illustration. The plates are good, the book is well indexed, and there is a useful glossary.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

Martin Robertson.

Karageorghis (V.) and Vermeule (C. C.) Sculptures from Salamis, 2. Nicosia: Department of Antiquities, 1966. Pp. x + 41. 20 plates. 10 text figures. £2 10s.

The record of publication on the part of the Cyprus Department of Antiquities since the change in the island’s political status in 1960 is worthy of the highest praise. A great share of such praise belongs to Dr Karageorghis, Director of Antiquities and joint author of the work under review. It is largely due to his energy and determination that the steady stream of discoveries which continue to be made in the soil of Cyprus are published with the minimum of delay.

Salamis Sculptures i was published in 1964, and was reviewed in volume 86 of this journal, p. 290–1, where reference was made to the fact that the sculptures in question (most of which are datable to the second century AD) had been recovered from the excavated remains of the Theatre and the Gymnasium on the north side of the city. The new volume (which publishes two excellent oblique air views of these buildings in their present state) continues where its predecessor left off, providing illustrations and detailed descriptions of another thirty-eight items of sculpture, of which two are of terracotta, the rest of marble. Eighteen pieces come from the Gymnasium, twelve from the Theatre. The two terracottas were found in the sea opposite the harbour; the remaining pieces were found at a number of different points within the ancient city. Six of the marbles were found as long ago as 1890, when the site was excavated by Munro and Tubbs; one of these pieces is now in Oxford, two are in London, while the others were left in Cyprus. The sculptures found since the Department of Antiquities resumed excavation at Salamis in 1952 are divided between the Cyprus Museum in Nicosia and the Famagusta District Museum.

Most of the sculptures described in this volume found since 1952 are extremely fragmentary and do not, in themselves, greatly enlarge the picture drawn in Salamis Sculptures i. But the authors now point to the many parallels for the Salamis sculptures in the major Greco-Roman centres of Crete, and at Cyrene. They cite similarities between the fortunes of these two regions and of Cyprus. They suggest that the sculptors who came to Cyprus to undertake commissions in the Trajanic to Antonine periods probably also had connexions with Cyrene, with Gortyna, Lyttos and Knossos. These sculptors came, they think, from workshops in greater Athens and in western Asia Minor.

Of interest amongst the newly published sculptures themselves is the shaft of a herm whose inscription shows it originally carried a portrait of Chryssippos. It comes from the Theatre, where other finds are chiefly of different categories—Muses, or the like, on the one hand, cuirassed figures of emperor-benefactors on the other. Two new fragments of this last category are published, one from the Theatre, one from the Gymnasium. Dionysus, Asklepios and Hygeia are each represented by several fragments. Of the 1890 finds, the well-known capital in London, with bovine protomes, is the most important; nothing about it seems very certain, for it has been dated to the fourth century B.C. but could, it seems, just as well be Julio-Claudian. In view of a possible connexion with the Sanctuary of the Bulls at Delos, the capital may have adorned a building commemorating a sea-battle; an alternative suggestion
NOTICES OF BOOKS

would make it top a 'cultus-pillar', in which case the bulls may allude to the Zeus of Salamis.

Only three heads are included, of which the most interesting is no. 103, an 1890 find left in Cyprus, which Vermeule tentatively suggests may be a Late Antique portrait of Hadrian. Salamis certainly had every reason to continue to revere that emperor's memory for the great programme of building carried out in the city during his reign.

The volume includes a bibliography for the archaeology of Salamis, and a history of excavations at the site, which is prefaced by a useful collection of mediaeval and post-mediaeval literary testimonia relating to the ruins of the city. The plates are better than those in many catalogues of sculpture, but it is a mistake not to have provided them with a cross-reference to the text, especially as their order does not coincide with that of the text. No. 92 ('Architectural section with head of lion') is illustrated both by photographs and by drawings; there are rather disconcerting discrepancies between the two media.

H. W. CATLING.

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

BARRON (J. P.) The silver coins of Samos.

No comprehensive treatment of Samian coinage has appeared since Professor Gardner's Samos and Samian Coins (1882); this included both electrum and Greek imperial issues, but for the silver was not nearly so detailed and complete as is Dr Barron's treatment. Silver began unpretentiously about 530 B.C., with small denominations; this first brief issue was succeeded by a plentiful series of drachms lasting until c. 500. Already the facing lion's scalp, the characteristic device of Samos, is almost invariably present as an abbreviation of the lion's skin which lay at the foot of the cult-statue of Samian Hera.

Tetradrachms do not begin until about 500, but thereafter they form the standard major denomination until the island became an Athenian cleruchy in 365. The lion's scalp is now normally accompanied by the forepart of an ox, probably once again connected with Hera, and perhaps the beast which drew her chariot in processions. The date of these early tetradrachms is assured by their relation to the issues made at Zancle from 494 by the Samian refugees from the Ionian Revolt.

About 480 begins the most interesting period of coinage, from which B. makes important historical deductions. Down to c. 460 the coins are usually marked with symbols, the order of which can be largely determined by die-links. The fabric and designs were then modernised, and on one issue the ox wears an ornamental harness; this was immediately succeeded by issues marked with letters of the alphabet from B to Ε, which B. convincingly argues indicate years. This whole complex has to be related to the history of the Delian League, to the Athenian Coinage Decree (for which B. retains the orthodox date of c. 448/7), and to the revolt of Samos 440/39. B. concludes that this latter event terminated the sequence of annual issues, which, therefore, will have begun in 454/3 (counting the issue with ornamental collar as the otherwise absent letter Α). Certain historical conclusions follow. Samos revolted from Athens in 440 under an oligarchic government, so that the alphabetical dates represent an oligarchic and anti-Athenian 'era' going back to 454/3. But in that very year Samos had proposed the transference of the League treasury from Delos to Athens: this then was the year of the change of government, and B. suggests that the ornamental harness may fix its occasion as the Heraic festival, which had witnessed similar coups d'état in earlier Samian history. As to the Coinage Decree, B. produces evidence that it applied to Chios, and, a fortiori, to Samos: but Samos coined annually until 439 in contravention of the Decree. This is good evidence that the government of Samos was not wholly pro-Athenian in these years, but it is doubtful whether the overstriking of an Athenian tetradrachm c. 447–5 should be interpreted as a public gesture of defiance (p. 84). The economic need for metal for a Samian issue may sometimes have called for the overstriking or melting down of other coinages without any political motives being involved. After 439, when Samos lost her autonomy, there is no more Samian coinage until the period of close association with Athens from 412 to 404, when tetradrachms with traditional Samian types reappear, but now on the Attic standard.

The fourth century brought no change of type, but, as often elsewhere, a new standard, the Rhodian. The tetradrachms, now carrying 'magistrates' names, are arranged in sequence by die-links and style from 396 to 365, when the island became an Athenian cleruchy. Most of the remaining silver coinage was struck in small denominations in three periods:

1. 321–281 B.C. mainly 'reduced Rhodian' didrachms,
2. 281–221 B.C. mainly octobols on the Ptolemaic standard, reflecting the importance of Samos as a base for the Egyptian fleet, and
3. c. 200 B.C. a group comprising Attic tetradrachms with the types of Alexander the Great and distinctively Samian symbols, and Attic tetrobols and diobols with autonomous types.

B. has assembled over one thousand coins as the foundation of his work; for the tetradrachms down to 365 he has aimed to record details of all known specimens, for the remaining issues at least the majority of known examples, and amply sufficient to establish the history of the coinage. The argument, though sometimes necessarily complex, is always lucid, thorough and persuasive. The plates, on which all dies are illustrated, are good, though perhaps not
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quite clear enough to follow die-identities on the smaller denominations. Altogether this is an important study of a major mint.

C. M. Kraay.

Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.


Since its first publication in 1918, Ling Roth’s ‘Studies in Primitive Looms’ has been for most British readers the usual starting point in the study of early looms and textiles. Without belittling this work in any way, it has a particularly grave defect for those concerned with textiles of Old World antiquity, since the only mention of the warp-weighted loom (the type of loom in which the warp-threads are held under tension by weights) is a reference to a rather sophisticated piece of equipment described by Johannes Braunius in 1680. Of the looms used in the ancient world, Ling Roth said nothing, although the warp-weighted loom is that invariably depicted by vase-painters and to which there are many literary references from antiquity. The precise working details of the looms of antiquity seemed lost.

Marta Hoffmann, a curator in that bright and lively place, the Norsk Folkemuseum, was distressed to find in the collection a number of looms of this type for which there were no records of the working details; and so, in 1951, she set about to discover if there were still in Norway people who knew how to operate this antiquated kind of device. Her success was greater than, one suspects, she dared anticipate. The first two hundred pages of her book are devoted to a detailed description of looms, their working, and the textiles produced in Western Norway, Lapland and Iceland in the last and early part of this century.

For the larger part these early chapters are good, honest recording and the reader might be tempted to feel that, excellent though it is, this is hardly the stuff to help one understand the looms of antiquity. This would be wrong: the author is laying a good, solid foundation. Towards the end of this section, in her chapter on starting borders (the first lines of weft put in at the top of the loom) the implications of this study begin to become apparent. One has only to examine the similarity—or even identity—of fragments of this type of weaving from places as far apart geographically and in time as Phrygian Gordium, Qumran, Neolithic Robenhausen, Bronze Age Ireland (Armoy) or Medieval Norway (Skjoldehamn) to appreciate the very real relevance of this study to that of weaving in antiquity.

In the second half of the book Marta Hoffmann works systematically backwards in time, considering first the impact of the horizontal loom on medieval weaving and textiles, to arrive finally at her section on the looms of classical antiquity. For all its brevity this is a well-balanced account of the classical Greek loom, and emphasises that, despite the fact that the vase-painters were, correctly, more intent upon depicting the salient features of a loom rather than a working diagram, there remains a highest common denominator that allows us to reconstruct the device with more than a fair degree of certainty. It is a great pity that time has deprived us of any textile remains to reinforce the argument. What emerges is a loom, not standing vertically, as is so commonly believed, but with the uprights set at a slight angle. The warp-threads, held under tension by two rows of weights, were manipulated by a shed-rod and heddle, while the made cloth was commonly rolled, during weaving, on to the upper beam.

The book is both profusely and well illustrated, and it is a pity only that in illustrating textiles the same recording system has not been used throughout (cf. figs. 72 and 89). The photograph of two rows of loom weights lying in situ (fig. 192) must be amongst the most quietly poignant illustrations ever to come from an archaeological source.

In her introduction Marta Hoffmann thanks Mrs Seeberg for her translation into English. She is right to do so. To translate a work of this sort, full of technical terms, as it must be, into straightforward, easily-read English is no easy matter. We, in turn, must thank Marta Hoffmann for having provided us with such a clear yet erudite account of the warp-weighted loom.

H. W. M. Hodges.

Institute of Archaeology, University of London.


The author’s intention was to describe metaphors of the cult-site as caused by the changes of creed reflected in the Greatest Church of Hama (ancient Epiphania), Syria. This basilica has been transformed into what is now the principal prayer hall of the Great Mosque, a complex which also gives evidence of the existence of a Roman pagan sanctuary on the same spot. From other cases of such a taking over of alien sanctuaries by a new religion, we know that that conversion could be done in different ways and, consequently, it would be dangerous to draw any general conclusion if based on one single example, even if its history could be reconstructed more completely than is the case here. But that fact hardly diminishes the interest of this study, for Ris deals with a mosque which came into being at the very moment of the Arab conquest of Syria, through the conversion of the Greatest Church of Epiphania whose bishop is mentioned as early as 325 A.D.
As in many other parallel cases, one cannot get over the impression that the re-usage of an already existing building was undertaken only if its shape and size in the main lines answered the cult requirements of the new religion, and corresponded with the architectural iconography, formed before and independently of this adaptation. It seems, for example, more and more clear that certain Roman basilicas—either pagan temples or buildings of any other civil function—were converted into Christian churches only when the idea of the basilical shape of a church building had already been established. This conclusioncredits largely traditional theories about the influence of re-used Roman basilicas on Church architecture. In the same way, the building which the Moslems took over for the hall of prayer had first of all to correspond in a general sense to their idea of such a building. The general attitude towards Christianity in the latter case, as well the attitude of the Christians towards the pagan religions in the former, played an important rôle too.

Regarding the conversion of the church building at Epiphaneia into a mosque, R. could hardly add anything new to that already established by Creswell. The doors on the west and east sides were walled up and a new one—if it did not exist there before—was opened in the north wall, and that was enough to provide a suitable hall for the Moslem Arabs who prayed facing South. R. concentrates his attention more on the earlier phases of the building complex. The very limited and abruptly stopped excavation which he undertook on the outer side of the east wall of the mosque showed that this wall was part of a Roman structure. R. suggests an identification of an enclosure wall of the temenos of a temple, and not the west façade wall of the temple itself, as Creswell thought. Consequently, a Christian church was built in the S.E. corner of the temenos, using its enclosure wall as its entrance façade. R.'s attempt to determine the exact position of the door—whose moulded frame points to the third century A.D.—in the east wall of the temenos remains a hypothetical reconstruction. The uneven placement of fourediculae suggests that either the wall was radically rebuilt at a certain later date, or that the scheme proposed by R. is basically wrong. If, as he claims, a projecting base of this wall existed only north from the door, then it would be more probable that the door was near the N.E. corner of the building, and not near the S.E., as R. would like us to believe.

The reader remains, also, unconvinced that the first church was already constructed here in the fourth century. R. does not provide any archaeological evidence for this hypothesis, which he in fact accepted from Creswell, who was the first to suggest that a Roman wall was re-used as the eastern, entrance wall of a Christian basilica. To justify the occidentation of the church, C. listed many Early Christian basilicas having the sanctuary on the West, but neither he nor R. gave any explanation of the complete disappearance of the western apse of that hypothetical fourth-century basilica. R. mentioned, and a sketch of his confirms this, that at least one small, southernmost portion of the now existing western wall—built in the sixth century—seemed to have rested on an earlier, i.e. Roman, piece of masonry, tailed into the south wall of the mosque's garden, in which, again, R. recognised a part of a Roman structure. It seems very probable that these two walls in fact constituted the S.E. corner of a Roman building, but whether there was a direct constructive link between it and the much thinner Roman wall (recognised in the eastern wall of the mosque's Hall of prayer) we do not know. We shall see later that the distance between these two fragments of Roman masonry is in a sense ideally regular, but one may doubt that it was so obvious in the third century, when the measuring unit was certainly different from the one used three centuries later. There is only one element seemingly supporting the idea of a church constructed here in the fourth century: a fragmentary Greek inscription which was once to be seen in the mosque was restituted as ὁ ἐν οἴκῳ τῆς βασιλείας (Kωνσταντίνος), though there are many other possibilities which would, however, give a quite different date. Another inscription, still in situ, which I will mention again later, brings the name of a donor Elias, 'who had been honoured by the Imperial House (ἄνωτος'). This expression would suggest Justin I or Justinian (Cfr. Anth. Pal. VII 570). A construction of a church in the mid fourth century in the S.E. corner of the temenos of a pagan temple remains by and large hypothetical.

The picture about the sixth-century church, the one which the Arabs turned into a mosque only four years after Muhammad's death, is much more clear. The northern of the three doors in the western wall has the moulded frame typical for the sixth century. The inscriptions on the lintel of the windows (one is still in the west wall, though probably not in its original position, and the other is now in a neighbouring church) give the year A.D. 595. The already mentioned Greek inscription which gives the name of the donor Elias, was found on the pilaster on the west wall of the praying hall. Creswell already recognised in that pilaster, and in two columns engaged in the eastern wall of the hall, the remaining elements of the colonnades which were replaced in the eighteenth century by the new columns still existing today. That would be all one can say about the sixth-century basilica. R. tried to add some more details and followed Creswell's idea that the length of the nave should have been as 3:2 as regards its breadth. But one is not certain whether this ratio is to be expected here because Butler, who inspired Creswell in this point, claimed that this ratio was typical for the earliest churches in Syria, those from the fourth century, while there was no constant proportion between the inside width and the length

---

1 I owe this remark to Mr R. C. McCail, University of Edinburgh.
of the Syrian basilicas built two centuries later. The other, and this time more dangerous, mistake R. has made was that he, against all rules in proportioning, included in the length of the nave the thickness of the west (but not east!?) wall. One can, however, hardly resist the temptation of the attractive suggestion that the classical idea of an ἀκρότριμμον was close to Elias, the founder of this church, the inscription under whose portrait began with an allusion to the Odyssey. But in that case, the basic measure of 100 feet should be sought in the internal length of the nave which, according to Riis, gives 31.40 m. (Cresswell gives 31.42 for the northern, and 31.17 for the southern wall of this slightly trapezoidal hall). Significantly enough, this dimension provides a measuring unit which is only different by \( \frac{1}{4} \) mm. from the one so often recognised in the buildings of the sixth century. If we still want to believe in the ratio 3:2, then an ideal internal width should be 20.93 m. and R. measured along the western wall 20.90 m.—the difference being absolutely tolerable. R. however failed to observe this almost ideal correspondence. If it is not accidental, then it would mean that the existing northern and southern walls are either contemporary with the western one, or, if not, then they were erected later (Cresswell dated them in the eighteenth century) but on the same tracks.

All this affects R.'s hypothesis about the shape of the altar of the basilica. It is, of course, possible that the three doors on the eastern side of the Hall of prayer at that time led into the tripartite sanctuary, but conclusive support is still to be found. R. does not seem to have been sufficiently aware of the importance for his conjecture of a more precise date for the arch above the central door in the western wall. Its horse-shoe shape, he claims, cannot be earlier than the mid-fourth century, but as such it could be much later as well. On grounds of the rather flat moulding, Sauvaget dated the arch in the fifth/sixth century. If this arch is a part of Elias' church, one has to wonder why the moulded face of the arch was turned outwards. R. wants to link the construction of the arch with the opening of two lateral doors in the same wall, as well as raising the threshold of the central one by inserting a big monolith there. If the last change makes known a raising of the pavement eastward of the door, then a hypothesis that the bema was established there gets an important indication. At any rate, the hypothesis about an altar established outside the present Hall of prayer should be divorced from the discussion about the original width of the nave. One has an impression that it has been preserved in the existing hall. If so, the much thinner eastern wall fits even better with R.'s idea that in the sixth-century basilica it played the role of a screen between the sanctuary and quadratum populi.

G. STRIČEVIĆ.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne.


This book makes large claims for itself: to fill the need for a complete history of early Byzantine literature which should define its general direction and divisions, and not be a mere handbook. In appearance, however, it comes uncomfortably near the latter, not least because of its mechanical arrangement under author headings.

374 small pages of text including bibliographical notes do not, of course, allow the author to do justice to all the ground he proposes to cover (he includes ecclesiastical as well as secular writers) and there are bound to be disagreements of emphasis. Nonetheless, he could have minimised this if he had fulfilled his promise of indicating general trends and movements instead of trying to cover every writer individually. The groupings are disappointing and give little idea of the chronological relation of the various writings. Some authors have two entries according to classification (e.g. Eunapius and Agathias), which is understandable but confusing, and above all, obscures the considerable variety which often existed in the output of a single writer. Yet Nonnus' paraphrase of St John, which is not separated from the Dionysiaca, finds itself under the general heading of 'ultima letteratura dell' ellenismo'. And what, after all, is meant by early Byzantine literature? Impellizzeri makes a strictly linguistic demarcation; but if 'Byzantine' is not a geographical term (the Cappadocians, for instance, are included), can we really exclude Corippus, who wrote his Laudes Justinii II in Constantinople? Or even Claudian, who wrote many Greek works, even if they have not survived? And Ammianus belongs with the secular Greek historians of the fourth century on; he was after all a Greek himself. There are other gaps, mostly in the secular field (a disproportionate amount of space is devoted to Patristic writers on whom information is readily obtainable elsewhere); among the areas hardly touched are the flourishing poetic activity in Egypt and elsewhere in the fourth and fifth centuries (Alan Cameron, Historia 14 [1965] 470 f.), the work of Palladas, important because untypical, and the sudden flowering of epigrams collected in the Cycle, which is backed by a lively sub-literary inscriptive tradition. With no notes, little detail and hardly any biographical material, the book can hardly stand up to the claims I. makes for it in the introduction.

The bibliographical notes. Their professed aim is to cover the most important and most recent works; in practice they vary a good deal. In some cases I. could simply have referred to the very full existing bibliographical handbooks (Quasten, Altaner, Moravcsik), as he does at other times, instead of duplicating large quantities of their information. Why need there be so much bibliographical material
on the authenticity of the Vita Constantini? Or why so much on Romanos, when we are referred also to Wellesz and the Maas-Trypanis edition? Surely on the other hand a reference to Th. Büttrnner-Wobst, Philologus 51 (1892) 561 ff. would have been in place in the notes on Julian; and now we have W. Kaege's survey in Classical World 58 (1965) 229 ff. It would have been vastly more useful (though also more difficult) if only the bibliographies made some pretence of being critical. As it is one is still generally at a loss to know which are the important works.

In general, Impellizieri is well-informed, and my quarrel is mainly methodological. But a few points occur to me. Surely some space ought to have been devoted to sixth-century Neoplatonism and the relations between Athens and Alexandria before the closing of the School of Athens. There is only an isolated entry for John Philoponus which fails to indicate his real importance; I. might have referred to S. Samuelsky, The Physical World of Late Antiquity (1962). It is hard to separate Byzantine literature from the history of ideas; hence we might have asked for more information on the aftermath of the doctrines of Arius. Lamblichus is wrongly dated (cf. J. Bidez, R.E.G. 27 [1919] 32). When I. states that two poems of Tryphiodorus were unimportant scholastic exercises (perhaps, but one would like to have some supporting arguments) he gives the impression that they both survive. It is misleading, despite Porphius, Bibl., cod. 98, to say that Zosimus starts his history with Augustus.Procopius is very conventionally treated, and had not Mazzarino commented on the passage in an article (cited by I.) it is hard to see why his attitude to the Persian Mazdakite movement merited half a page of discussion here; there is nothing unusual about it.

These are small points. A larger one is this: at what audience is the book aimed? Presumably not the specialist, for the treatment is too general for that. But if not, is not the bibliography disproportionately long? In either case it would have been more useful to have a more detailed text, with some indication of disputed points. And if this is meant to illuminate the general course of early Byzantine literature as distinct from authors in isolation, it seems reasonable to regret that Impellizieri has not treated any general problems such as, for instance, the gradual development of the distinction between popular and formal literature, the Byzantine ideal of imitation of classical authors, the linguistic aspects of the classifying aim or, above all, the changing Christian/pagan ambivalence in secular works. We are often told by I. that a work is excessively rhetorical; what I should like to have been told is what rhetoric really meant to the Byzantines. In part, surely, the rhetorical handbooks fulfilled for them the same function as the many lexica and learned compendia (again scrappily treated here), by providing a guaranteed way to literary success. But Impellizieri does not tell us how the Byzantines regarded their own literary activity, nor, except incidentally, what was new and forward-looking in their approach.

Averil Cameron.

King's College, London.


This is a work conceived on the grand scale, and it would be unreasonable to pass final judgment on it while, essentially, it is only dealing with the preliminaries of its subject. By the time that Mr Stratos has reached the end of this portion of his history of Byzantium in the seventh century, extending over more than eight hundred pages of narrative, many elements central to the period have yet to take shape. The Arab invasions have yet to threaten the actual existence of the Empire. The consequences of the great Slav influx into imperial territory, the challenge of the new Bulgarian state, are still in the future. The endless theological disputes are in no decisive phase. The reform of the army, of the administration, of the economy generally, is still in its early stages. These first two volumes deal mainly with the disastrous reign of Phocas (602–10) and with the wars of Heraclius against the Persians culminating in his victory in 628. The beginning of the reorganisation of the provinces into military 'themes' is discussed at some length, and there are comparatively short sections on the internal economy of the Empire, on the Church, and on the Jewish question. At the end of the second volume, there appears a set of historical notes, mainly devoted to an extended discussion of the sources, and one of geographical and topographical notes, including references to buildings in Constantinople. Mr Stratos has given a highly detailed if, at times, a somewhat pedestrian, account of events, together with an equally detailed survey of both primary and secondary authorities.

In estimating a work of this character, it is not unfair, therefore, to complain about details. Why does St Sophia not appear among the buildings? If it is because it is considered to be too well known, why should the Palace of Blachernae be included (p. 936, vol. 2—the pagination is continuous for the two volumes)? Melchite does not come from the Arabic (p. 864, vol. 2) but from a Semitic root common to Arabic, Syriac, Aramaic and Hebrew. A mention of its connection at least with Syriac would be relevant in the context of the Monophysite opposition to the central government. The method of citation, especially from secondary authorities, might have been improved. A long list of opinions, on any point of importance, is bodily introduced into
the text, after which Mr Stratos gives his own. Had these been relegated to the historical notes they would not have interrupted the continuity of the story—and it might have been possible to estimate the present-day value of some of them. Mr Stratos might then have decided not to refer to Rambaud on the themes (p. 705, vol. 2), to Oman on Asia Minor during the Persian invasions (p. 478, vol. 1), or to Drapeyon on the weather during the winter of 627–8 (p. 574, vol. 2). So far as the bibliography is concerned, the present reviewer would limit himself to the items bearing on the Jewish question. It is a pity that Mr Stratos did not include Joshua Starr’s ‘Byzantine Jewry on the Eve of the Arab Conquest’, Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society, 15 (1935); the same author’s ‘St Maximus and the Forced Baptism at Carthage in 632’, Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Jahrbücher, 16 (1940), and Jacob Mann’s ‘Changes in the Divine Service of the Synagogue due to Religious Persecution’, Hebrew Union College Annual (1927). All three are of some importance to any discussion of the Heracleian persecution. Finally, these volumes would have benefited considerably from an index, since, in the nature of things, we shall have to wait some time for an index to the complete work.

Even at this stage, a general comment will not be out of place. It was the reforms of the seventh century which gave Byzantium her peculiar political and social identity, her ‘imperial centuries’—as Professor Jenkins has so happily put it. Mr Stratos agrees that these reforms were only begun by Heraclius in the later stages of the Persian War, and, no doubt, he will stress in his subsequent volumes the contributions of other members of the Heracleian dynasty. In other words, it is difficult to conceive of the seventh century, as such, possessing a character of its own. A specific study of the Heracleians would have a greater internal unity, and it is to be hoped that that aspect will eventually emerge in its proper perspective. Of course, there was no clean break in 610 followed by a plethora of innovations. The roots of the reforms, as Mr Stratos rightly says, are to be found in the time of Maurice and Justinian. Yet one feels that the pre-Heracleian chapters (I–V inclusive) might, with advantage, have been compressed into a couple of introductory sections. With all these reservations in mind there is little doubt, nevertheless, that, by the time Mr Stratos has reached the end of his great labour, he will have provided an important source of reference which no worker in the field will be able to ignore.

Andrew Sharp.

Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan.


The new book by the Greek scholar N. Panayotakis deals with the Byzantine chronicler of the twelfth century, Leo the Deacon; it is an introduction to the future critical edition of his History. The necessity of this new publication is to be explained not only by the fact that the first edition, by Ch. B. Hase (1819 and reprints), has long been a rarity; not only by the fact that Hase—withstanding the high quality of his work—had committed a number of errors, the list of which is now compiled by P. (pp. 117–20)—but also by the fortunate discovery of the Greek scholar, who made a study of a new manuscript of the Leo’s History. Until this discovery, Byzantinologists assumed that the text of the History was preserved in only one manuscript—Parisinus 1712, which is now extensively described by P. (pp. 43–84); he tried to date it—although with some hesitations—to the twelfth century (p. 56). The edition by Hase was based on this manuscript.

But there is another manuscript (Escorialensis Y-I-4, sixteenth century) which also contains the same text; E. Miller, who was compiling the catalogue of the Greek manuscripts in the Library of the Escorial, omitted this item; C. de Boor was the first who drew attention to the version of the Escorialis. But de Boor was wrong, when he supposed that Leo’s History was preserved in this manuscript in largely epitomised shape.

P. now presents the thorough description of the new manuscript (pp. 85–103), which unfortunately turned out to be a mere copy of the Parisinus (p. 93). Only in particular cases P. could find some useful corrections made by the learned Greek scribe of the sixteenth century (see pp. 98, 102). To sum up, the Codex Escorialensis can be used for a critical revision of the text, although we should not expect to get any considerable help from it.

Both the analysis of the manuscript tradition and the characteristic of the first edition (and its re-editions) of the History are to be found in the last part of the P. book. The first part is devoted to the career of the chronicler.

Our sources, in relating the facts concerning Leo’s life, are very scant. On the basis of these facts, using the whole literature (it is noteworthy that P. is acquainted with the works of Russian scholars: M. Ja. Sjuzjumov, P. O. Karyshkovsky and others), the author defines more exactly than was possible before his investigation, the poor information accessible about Leo the Deacon. P. places his birth before 950 (p. 5); on the basis of the encomium addressed by Leo to the emperor Basil II Bulgaroctonus (this encomium was first published in 1933), P. maintains that between 976 and 980 the chronicler got the appointment of the ‘imperial deacon’ (p. 9); P. supposes that Leo did not die prematurely,

1 He had already edited the poem by another Byzantine author of the tenth century, Theodosios the Deacon, on the capture of Crete: N. M. Panagiotakis, Θεοδόσιος ὁ Διάκονος καὶ τὸ ποιήμα αὐτοῦ Ἀλως τῆς Κρήτης. Iraklion, 1960.
immediately after his completing the History (as he did, according to the opinion of K. Krumbach at), but lived for several years afterwards, and that in these years the episcopal dignity was conferred upon him; P. argues very carefully that Leo Asinos (or Asianos), mentioned in the preface to the Chronicle of Scylitzes, is to be identified with Leo the Deacon (this nickname, Asinos, takes its origin, according to P., from the toponym Asius or Assas; this locality was mentioned by Strabo, which places it nearby Tmolos—and the region of Tmolos was, as it is well known, the birthplace of Leo [pp. 29–51]); finally, P. identifies the chronicler with Leo, metropolitan of Caria, whose letters appear in the first edition in this volume (pp. 32–4); he attempts also to show the stylistic relationship between these letters and the History (p. 33). On the contrary, P. refuses to acknowledge the hypothesis identifying Leo the Deacon with Leo of Synada.

The much discussed problem concerning the significance of Leo's work as an historical source is not treated in the book under review: P. promises to deal with this question in the preface to the future edition. That Scylitzes not only used a common source with Leo, but also had read the History itself, the author touches upon only in passing (p. 26). This assumption remains a mere conjecture and needs to be demonstrated at full length.

A. KAZDAN.

Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the U.S.S.R., Moscow.


The wall paintings at Asinou first attracted serious attention in 1934, when they were examined and published by a group of scholars under the leadership of the late W. H. Buckler. Since then they have constituted a key monument in the story of mid-Byzantine art because of an associated inscription which records the name of the patron responsible for their execution, together with the date 1105/6. In fact, as Madame Sacopulo shows, some of the work is of later date, but there are twenty-two scenes from the New Testament which in the main belong to the original phase of decoration, as well as a number of full-length portraits of saints, many of them rather obscure personalities. In the volume under review Madame Sacopulo not only provides new and better illustrations, for the paintings have been cleaned since they were first examined, but also a fuller text, undertaken with the authority of a scholar trained in the study of Byzantine iconography.

The text is divided into three sections. In the first the scenes are described and analysed; the second is devoted to a study of the figures of individual saints; the third is entitled 'conclusions', but is in fact in the main concerned with the origins and external relationships of the various iconographic themes. From the point of view of style the paintings are wholly provincial, but iconographically they take up a place midway between the Cappadocian and the Constantinopolitan traditions, a place in fact which is very similar to that of the Island of Cyprus itself. They are thus of considerable interest, and throw a not insignificant light on the history of the Island. The publication will be warmly welcomed by all interested in Cyprus, as well as by those who are concerned with the wider study of Byzantine iconography.

D. TALBOT RICE.

University of Edinburgh.


Travellers in Greece find it easier to escape from the well-kept ruins of classical antiquity than from the comparatively neglected but ubiquitous monuments of the Byzantine, Frankish and Italian periods of the country's history. Those who wish to explore rather than explode these memorials of post-classical disillusionment will soon discover that, although there are monographs on the castles of the Morea (such as that by K. Andrews) and architectural studies of many of the Byzantine churches (such as those of Orlandos, Pelkaniades and others), there is no reliable or comprehensive guide to the monuments of Byzantine and post-Byzantine Greece as a whole. The brave souls who then embark upon doing their own homework with the literary and documentary sources find that the identification of place-names presents a basic problem. Even classical scholars who have habitually ventured into these sources may be familiar with such well-known mediaeval forms as 'Sathines' for Athens, 'Cerigo' for Cythera, or even 'Estives' for Thess. But they may well be baffled by, e.g., 'Pellestello' for Souinion, 'Val di Compare' for Itha, or 'San Mondracho' for Sanmichethe.

Dr Otto Markl has had the useful idea of compiling what amounts to a small dictionary or glossary of the topography of Greece in 'Frankish' and Venetian times. Confronted, for example, with the name of a place called 'Gitane' in a text the reader may now consult Markl s.v., and be referred to a bold-type entry called 'Lamia', where he will discover all the other mediaeval variants of the name of that city conveniently listed ('Cethon', 'La Gyrona', 'Zeitounien', etc.). Each variant of the most familiar or normal form of the place-name carries a reference to the bibliography at the front of the book to show the source of the variant. The bibliography has 196 titles, but one could still add to the list. The
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invaluable works of Col. W. M. Leake, e.g., should at least receive honourable mention; the Greek edition of the Chronicle of the Morea by P. P. Kalonaros (Athens, 1940), which has several topographical notes in its commentary, should be included; so also the Chronicle of Galaxidi as edited by K. N. Sathas (Athens, 1914) and more recently by G. Valetas (Athens, 1944). The two solid and informative works of P. Lemelre, Philosophie et la Macedoine orientale (Paris, 1945) and L’Emirat d’Aydin: Byzance et l’Occident (Paris, 1957), are strange omissions; likewise the old but learned work of T. L. F. Tafel, De Thessalonicia eiusque agro dissertatio geographica (Berlin, 1839).

Inevitably, since the field in time and space is large, the list of place-names and their variants could also be lengthened. This may be partly due to some indecision as to what constitute the geographical limits of what may properly be called 'Frankish' Greece, especially on its northern perimeter. But if Thessalonike is included why not also Serrai (Serres, Phereai) or Bera (Vera, Veros, which is mentioned in Villachardouin); if Domokos (which incidentally is the ancient Thaumakoi) is included why not also Pharsalos (Fersala); if Thomokastron, Suboto and Rogi (also known as Rogous and Kastron ton Rogon and situated to the south-west rather than 'nordwest, von Arta') are listed why not also other places in Epios as Bouthroton (Bothrotum, Bythrotum, Butrinto), Avlona (Valona), Vagenetia (Bagenetia) and Sinarss (Sinaritsa or the Sphenariti Lophoi); if Moglena in western Macedonia why not also Berat (Bellagarada, Veligrada, etc.)?

The fastidious will sometimes bicker for references to the primary sources rather than to the Encyclopaedic Lexikon of Eleutheroudakes or the Great Greek Encyclopaedia which are somewhat too frequently cited; while references such as that on 'Lipso-Aedipos' (leg. Aedipos) to what turns out to be only one of the genealogical tables in Karl Hopf’s Chroniques grec-romanes are about as valuable as the many other unverifiable statements of that relentless bookworm, who was prone to make up from memory the notes that he had mislaid or could not decipher. There are times too when the author might have been more generous with his references. Stagol, e.g., is identified with the modern Kalabaka and Photike with the modern Bellâ without any hint of the controversies which these identifications have aroused. Chrysopolis or Christopolis, on the other hand, is not said to be identical with the modern Kavalla. The entry 'Romania' should surely have included a reference to R. L. Wolff’s article on the significance of the term in Speculum, XXIII (1948). The entry 'Halmuros' does not mention that there were in fact two places of this name in mediaeval times (Tafel and Thomas, Urbunden (no. 163 in the Bibliography), I, pp. 266, 487: ‘duo Almyri’; cf. Lemelre, L’Emirat d’Aydin, p. 77 and n. 1). ‘Kapraina’ is, rightly or wrongly, identified with Chairencia on the evidence only of William Miller’s Latins in the Levant (whose citations are notoriously vague), although a Kapraina (modern Koprena) is known to have existed near Kalabaka. ‘Levadia’, listed as a variant of Lebadeia (though curiously not of ‘Leukas’), derives only from a manuscript reading, emended by its editor, in Hopf’s edition of Marino Sanudo Torsello. Lykostomion, once a Latin bishopric in Thessaly, receives no mention, though ‘fluvius de Lykostomo’ is given as a variant name of the river Peneios. Other minor variations could be added. ‘Citro’, e.g., is a form of the name Kitros found in Catalan documents; and Mesene might be inserted as a well-attested variant of Mosynopolis. Finally, there are at least two interesting derivations of place-names from personal names which seem to have escaped the author’s notice: Merbaka in the Argolid is perhaps to be connected with the residence in that district of William of Moerbeke, the celebrated scholar and Latin Archbishop of Corinth in the thirteenth century; while Lidiriki in Phokis (or its harbour called Euanthia) was renamed Cantacuzinopolis in the fifteenth century after an energetic governor of Aigion.

This is a valuable contribution to the study of mediaeval Greece. It is attractively and carefully produced, but the alphabetical order of the names has occasionally gone astray (e.g. p. 29: Davila is placed before Davia, and Dhoko before Despotiko; p. 38: Karyupolis should come after Karystos and Karytaina). As the first in a new series of Byzantine Studies to be published by the University of Vienna it promises well.

D. M. NICOL.

University of Edinburgh.


Το Χρονικόν του Γεώργιον Βουστρόνιου περιέχει την εξής ἐξήγησις τῶν ἐν Κύπρῳ γεγονότων ἀπὸ τοῦ έτους 1456 μέχρι τέλους του 15ον μ.Χ. κυρίως δὲ πραγματεύται περι τῶν ἐργῶν καὶ ἡμερῶν του τελευταίου ἐπὶ Φραγκοκρατίας Λουξεμβούργου βασιλείας 'Ιακώβου Β', του ἐπιλεγόμενου Νίκου. Κατ’ οὖν των Χρονικον τουτον συνέχει το τέτον κυπριακόν Χρονικον, το ὧν οὐκέτα προηγούμενοι ἔρει Λεωντίνος Μαχαιρά, Κύπρος ἐπίτους.

'Ο γαλακτικὴς καταγωγῆς Γεώργιος Βουστρόνιος διέτελε ἐπὶ μακρὸν ὑπηρετῶν πατοῦ της βασιλείας τῆς Κύπρου Ἰάκωβος Β', διὰ τοῦτο το Χρονικόν του ἔνεχεν ἐνδιατέρας δέξια καὶ σπονδάκτης ἀσ προερχόμεναν ξένα αὐτότος μάρτυρος τῶν διαδιδακτικῶν ἐν Κύπρῳ γεγονότων ἀπὸ τοῦ έτους 1456 καὶ ἔξις.

Επὶ τέλους το Χρονικόν εἶναι καὶ πολύτιμον μνημείον τῆς μεσοσακάς κυπριακῆς διάλεκτος, διότι ὁ συγγραφέας τοῦ ἕκκληθη οἱ παράδειγμα τοῦ Λεοντίνου Μαχαιρᾶ.

les relations diplomatiques entre les deux États. D'une manière générale on constate que, bien que les rapporteurs aient été choisis, presque tous, parmi les arabisants, l'accent est mis sur l'attitude des Byzantins face aux Arabes, à la seule exception du travail d'Oleg Grabar (cf. ci-dessous) sur les influences byzantines dans l'art islamique; on ne voit point traité, ne fût-ce que dans ses lignes générales, le problème des survivances de certaines pratiques (administratives et autres) byzantines dans l'organisation du Califat, et le rôle de Byzance pour la transmission de l'héritage de l'Antiquité aux Arabes est à peine évoqué; mais cela peut constituer, il est vrai, le sujet d'un Colloque à part. Nous analysons les articles concernant les relations arabo-byzantines dans l'ordre qu'ils occupent dans le volume.

GEORGE C. MILES, Byzantium and the Arabs: Relations in Crete and the Aegean area (pp. 1–32, avec 94 illustrations h.-t.). G. M. essaie de tracer le tableau géographique des invasions arabes dans la région égéenne aux IXe-Xe siècles, en se basant surtout sur les renseignements des textes hagiographiques. Il englobe dans son exposé les attaques contre le littoral et les îles de la mer Ionienne, mais il néglige le littoral, portant égale entren l'Asie Mineure occidentale; les renseignements des chroniqueurs et des historiens de l'époque et de quelques textes hagiographiques (p. ex. de la Vita de saint Antoine le Jeune, de saint Grégoire le Décapolite, des Miracula de saint Nicolas, etc.) permettraient de combler cette lacune. Quoi qu'il en soit, le répertoire offert par G. M. est riche, bien documenté et de ce fait particulièrement utile; G. M. précise la date de certaines invasions (p. ex. celle contre l'Eubée qu'il place avec vraisemblance après 883) et ne néglige pas l'apport de la toponymie dans son effort pour déceler la présence arabe à tel ou tel endroit: sa note sur les lieux-dits composés de sarrakinos est éclairante, mais en ce qui concerne Styrobolys il nous semble hors de doute qu'il s'agit du port de Lycie, étape de l'itinéraire qui mène de la mer de 'Syrie' à la mer Égée. La seconde partie de ce travail, la plus intéressante parce qu'entièrement neuve, est consacrée à l'étude de l'émirat de Crète. G. M. nous propose une image inédite de cet État arabe: en s'appuyant sur divers témoignages, disparates et pauvres il est vrai, il essaie de combattre l'opinion selon laquelle l'émirat de Crète fut un État de pirates dépourvu de toute culture. L'étude des monnaies frappées par les émirs de Crète, déjà très avancée grâce aux travaux du même auteur, vient à l'appui de cette thèse et permet à G. M. d'enrichir la prosopographie des émirs crétois: le tableau généalogique qu'il nous donne dans ce travail, tout en montrant par ses lacunes et ses incertitudes les difficultés du problème, repose sur l'ensemble du matériel dont nous disposons et constitue le point de départ pour l'étude de l'organisation de l'émirat crétois. Dans la dernière partie de son travail, G. M. examine les influences arabes sur l'art byzantin des régions égéennes. Après l'inventaire de quelques monnaies et inscriptions arabes trouvées sur le sol grec, il étudie les monumens qui montrent une quelconque influence arabe: ornements coufiques dans l'architecture, détails décoratifs dans certaines mosaïques et peintures, et bien entendu, motifs orientaux des étoffes; G. M. définit les voies par lesquelles cette influence arabe pénétra dans le monde grec, il insiste, sans pourtant apporter les preuves nécessaires, sur le rôle des Arabes crétois installés dans la région égéenne après 961.

MARIUS CANARD, Les relations politiques et sociales entre Byzance et les Arabes (pp. 33–56). Les relations sociales et commerciales byzantino-arabes, qui se sont régulièrement poursuivies malgré les conflits et les guerres, restent encore mal connues et peu étudiées. M.C. après avoir étudié le statut des ambassades échangées entre l'Empire et le Califat (les ambassades permanentes sont inconnues à l'époque), les modalités de la réception des ambassadeurs, leur séjour et leur activité pendant la période, souvent assez longue, de leur mission, insiste sur les contacts réguliers entre les deux peuples, encouragés par le pèlerinage aux Lieux-Saints. Quelques exemples du constant va et vient entre Arabes et Byzants illustrent cette thèse, étayée, selon M.C., par l'existence d'un fond commun de croyances populaires (prophéties, etc.), surtout chez les populations des frontières que M.C. considère comme bilingues. On regrette de ne pas voir évoqué le problème de l'épopée de Dégénis Akritas et du cycle akritique en général, produits de ce monde particulier des frontières byzantino-arabes, de ne pas trouver quelques lignes sur les Paulicians, qui finirent par créer une sorte d'État tampon entre Byzance et les Arabes, et de ne pas avoir une liste des termes que Byzantins et Arabes employaient chacun à l'égard de l'autre. Beaucoup plus substantielle est la partie de ce travail consacrée au statut des mercenaires et au règlement du commerce. Après avoir indiqué les voies des échanges (maritimes par Chypre, terrestres par l'Arménie et Trébizonde), M.C. essaie, en s'appuyant surtout sur les listes de cadeaux échangés entre les califes et les empeures, de préciser la nature du commerce (articles échangés) et l'importance des transactions, points particulièrement mal connus; à cet égard on aimerait avoir, sinon la liste, du moins une note analytique sur les clauses commerciales insérées dans les divers traités arabo-byzantins, à commencer par le traité conclu à la fin du Xe siècle.

FRANCESCO GABRIELLI, Greeks and Arabs in the central Mediterranean area (pp. 57–65). Une rapide mise au point des objectifs arabes et des moyens utilisés pour les atteindre (maritimes sous les Ommeyades, surtout terrestres sous les Abbassides, mais toujours maritimes, avec un fort caractère pirate, chez les Arabes occidentaux) sert à expliquer la perturbation qu'a connue la Méditerranée centrale au IXe siècle. A l'encontre de H. Pirenne, F.G. conteste la suprématie maritime des Arabes dans cette partie de la Méditerranée: la vigueur de la résistance byzantine, qui se manifesta à travers l'effort constant pour la recon-
quette de l’Italie, empêcha les Arabes de dominer la mer Ionienne et de s’installer en Italie continentale. Sans le dire expressément, F.G. croit, et à juste titre, que la fin de la thalassocratie byzantine ne signifie pas obligatoirement l’établissement de la thalassocratie arabe. On aimerait voir cette thèse développée: elle est étayée par la situation créée par la perte de la Crète, dont curieusement F.G. ne fait pas état, par la perturbation des communications entre l’Orient et l’Occident byzantins qui en découla, et, surtout, par l’éclatement de la puissance maritime arabe en plusieurs flottes indépendantes. F.G. souligne le fait que depuis l’installation des Arabes en Sicile, Grecs et Arabes s’affrontent dans le domaine italien, désormais frontière entre deux mondes et deux civilisations antagonistes. Les influences artistiques et linguistiques mutuelles sont considérables, mais la vraie coexistence de ces deux éléments hostiles a été réalisée dans le royaume normand, qui a beaucoup profité des pratiques administratives byzantines et de la culture arabe. La lutte dans la Méditerranée centrale, considérée comme secondaire par le Califat, menée pour des raisons idéologiques par les Byzantins, (ils défendaient les valeurs de l’antiquité classique et la foi chrétienne), et qui se déroula dans des régions éloignées du centre des États ennemis, a épuisé à la longue les deux antagonistes. Cependant la résistance obstinée de Byzance a empêché la ‘sémisation’ de l’Italie du sud, et a permis aux traditions grécoromaines de survivre et de former, avec l’élément germanique de l’Italie du nord, la base de l’Italie actuelle.

Oleg Grabar, Islamic art and Byzantium (pp. 67–88 avec 29 illustrations h.-t.). Ce travail commence avec la conquête arabe, c’est à dire le moment où furent réunies les conditions pour la formation d’une culture arabe autonome. L’influence, ou plutôt l’apport de Byzance, reste prédominant, particulièrement en Syrie et en Palestine, pendant la période du classicisme arabe (de 661 à 800), tandis que plus tard les influences entre les deux civilisations deviennent réciproques: on peut les suivre à travers le cérémonial des deux cours, l’illustration des manuscrits, etc., jusqu’au XIIe siècle. O.G. limite son étude aux influences dûes à la transformation d’un élément culturel byzantino-chrétien en élément islamique, et à celles qui révèle l’étude d’un thème iconographique particulier, celui de la représentation du pouvoir. Le premier sujet fait constater que les survivances byzantines sont plus tenaces en Syrie et en Palestine, à cause de l’histoire antérieure de ces régions. On remarque la présence de divers éléments byzantins dans la construction des mosquées qui cependant par leur plan architectural et par leurs dimensions rappellent, selon O.G., le temple romain. L’aspect des villes a subi peu de transformations sous les nouveaux maîtres; le minaret carré, dérivé de la tour du temple romain ou de l’église byzantine, apparaît planté dans le centre de la ville: il symbolise la présence triomphante de l’Islam parmi une population en majorité hétérodoxe. En revanche la campagne, intensément exploitée pendant l’époque précédente comme en témoignent les multiples travaux d’irrigation, change très vite d’aspect; O.G. le constate, sans s’attarder aux raisons de ce changement important: il indique, à notre avis, l’introduction de nouveaux modes d’exploitation rurale, et des modifications dans le statut de la propriété et dans la composition démographique du pays. Les fermes des exploitants de l’époque antérieure cèdent maintenant la place à des résidences princières, d’aspect majestueux, avec plusiers dépendances, parcs et bains. La construction de ces palais, caractéristiques des Ommeyades, conserve quelques éléments byzantins, mais leur plan et leur aspect extérieur rappellent plus les constructions des Romains. Cependant en dépit de diverses influences, le caractère de ces palais reste spécifiquement arabe; ils constituent, avec les mosquées de cette période, les premières réalisations de l’architecture islamique. La seconde partie de ce travail est consacrée à l’étude du thème iconographique du pouvoir. Les Ommeyades ont illustré ce thème par les monnaies, rares il est vrai, sur lesquelles figurent le portrait du calife ou les symboles (p. ex. la lance) de son pouvoir, et par la représentation dans les mosquées de Damas et de Jérusalem d’une couronne suspendue sur un paysage vert, et symbolisant la domination de l’Islam sur la Chrétienté. Des inscriptions à la gloire de l’Islam remplacent par la suite la représentation figurative du pouvoir, ce qui éloigne les Arabes des modes byzantines et constitue une manière typiquement islamique pour illustrer le thème du pouvoir, commun à tous les empires, mais dont l’iconographie a été particulièrement développée par les Romains et par les Byzantins. De même l’emploi par le califé al-Walid d’ouvriers byzantins est tenue par O.G. comme une manière, pour les Arabes, d’exprimer leur domination, le calife donnant des ordres à des chrétiens venus de Byzance. Beaucoup plus simplement, il nous semble que l’utilisation de techniciens byzantins montre soit un «esnobisme» artistique de la part du califé, soit des besoins en ouvriers spécialisés que ce califé constructeur ne pouvait pas se procurer sur place. Quoi qu’il en soit, la prédominance artistique des Byzantins a été vite acceptée par les Arabes, dont l’art fut ouvert à plusieurs influences. Ainsi les peintures et les sculptures des palais omeyyades révèlent, par leurs thèmes et par leur style, des influences orientales, tandis que l’habitude, peu répandue il est vrai, de représenter le prince est une survivance de pratiques des pays occupés par les arabes: c’est dans des costumes byzantins et sassanides que les princes arabes sont représentés. Les monuments faisant défaut entre le IXe et le XIIe siècle, nous manquons d’éléments pour suivre l’évolution de l’iconographie du thème du pouvoir chez les Arabes. Les manuscrits illustrés des XIIe-XIIIe siècles, avec la présence du portrait de l’auteur, ainsi que certains éléments architecturaux, montrent de nouvelles formes de l’influence byzantine sur l’art musulman.
Il est de fait que Byzance n’a jamais cessé d’exercer son influence directe sur l’iconographie arabe, mais il semble que l’apport byzantin soit moins important dans la formation de l’art islamique, qui suit s’inspirer de plusieurs sources et finit par créer un monde artistique autonome.

**Gustave E. von Grunebaum**, *Parallelism, Convergence and Influence in the Relations of Arab and Byzantine Philosophy, Literature and Poetry* (p. 89-111). Sous ce titre compliqué G.G. étudie les relations intellectuelles byzantino-arabes. Arabes et Byzantins, considérant leurs cultures respectives comme autonomes, ont vite constitué deux mondes intellectuels à part: l’erreur étant exclue pour chacun d’eux, elle appartenait forcément à l’autre. Ainsi fermés l’un à l’autre, ces deux mondes firent par devenir hostiles et antagonistes. Aussi peut-on difficilement parler de vraies relations intellectuelles. G.G. se contente de souligner quelques parallélismes dans l’évolution de la pensée arabe et byzantine, qui s’expliquent plus par le contexte historique que par une communauté de vues et de préoccupations. Cependant une divergence reste constante et fondamentale: la différence de la conception de l’homme dans les deux cultures, les Arabes n’étant jamais parvenus à créer un véritable humanisme. Cette différence s’explique, selon G.G., par l’attitude de chacun de ces deux cultures face à l’héritage classique. Byzantins et Arabes sont tributaires de l’esprit de l’Antiquité, mais Byzance a su garder cet esprit vivant dans l’élaboration de sa conscience tandis que l’arabisme, qui connut l’Antiquité à travers les peuples soumis au Califat, se contenta d’utiliser son enseignement pour se donner des cadres intellectuels et spirituels; de ce fait, il n’a point connu les antinomies avec lesquelles a eu à lutter le christianisme pendant les premiers siècles de sa vie. Cette différence mise à part, on constate plusieurs similitudes dans la démarche intellectuelle des Arabes et des Byzantins: chez les deux peuples, la révélation prime la connaissance rationnelle, chez les deux peuples l’enseignement religieux est distinct de l’enseignement profane. Arabes et Byzantins ont vécu sous le contrôle étroit des autorités religieuses qui, en défendant la vraie foi, défendaient les intérêts de la communauté, et qui ont enfin connu de forts courants mystiques quand le pouvoir temporel commença à décliner. On est tenté de conclure que les mêmes causes créent les mêmes effets; c’est pourquoi nous pouvons difficilement suivre G.G. dans son effort pour lier l’hésychisme byzantin aux mystiques arabes, et que nous nous écartons entièrement de lui quand il cherche des modèles arabes à l’autobiographie de Michel VIII. Ce texte est le produit d’un genre particulièrement florissant à Byzance, les typika des fondateurs des institutions pieuses, et même les textes sacres; il n’a rien à voir avec les autobiographies arabes, ni avec celle de Libanius, et l’opinion qui veut que Libanius ait été constamment enseigné dans les écoles byzantines demande à être prouvée. Par contre on regrette de ne pas trouver dans ce travail particulièrement suggestif ne fût-ce qu’une simple allusion aux croyances populaires des Byzantins et des Arabes qui, exprimées par un fonds commun d’écrits prophétiques et par l’amour des écrits apocalyptiques et apocryphes, montrent souvent une mentalité commune.

Aréthas n’a rien à voir avec ce grand érudit: R. Jenkins a démontré qu’elle est l’œuvre de Choirospaktès. La quatrième catégorie de textes, les textes hagiographiques, représente l’opinion du Byzantin moyen à l’égard des Arabes. Par les exemples cités et qui sont glanés dirait-on au hasard, on voit le Byzantin forcément hostile aux Arabes, qu’il considère comme l’incarnation du mal, tout en étant souvent capable de faire un effort de compréhension et de nuancer son comportement. On regrette de ne pas voir les textes hagiographiques présentés dans l’ordre chronologique et dans leur cadre géographique, ce qui permettrait sans doute d’expliquer l’attitude byzantine et ses fluctuations par la situation historique du moment et du lieu. De même il est regrettable que l’attention de l’auteur n’ait pas été attirée par une autre catégorie de textes, les écrits militaires, dont l’examen permettrait de relever une série d’arguments contre l’Islam qui alimentaient la propagande militaire et servaient à exalter le courage des combattants.


HÉLÈNE AHRWEILER.


The Byzantine mission to Moravia in 863, a response to an appeal for Christian missionaries from Prince Rostislav of Moravia, can be seen as an event of considerable importance in the developing rivalry between East and West; but from the earliest times it has also been recognised as an even more significant turning point in the history of the Slavs. The ancient Russian chronicles acknowledge the debt of the Eastern Slavs to Constantine-Cyril, inventor of a Slavonic alphabet, and Methodius, the Thessalian brothers chosen for the mission by the Emperor Michael III. By their translation of the essential parts of the Bible and liturgical works into Old Church Slavonic or Old Bulgarian, in fact, the Macedonian dialect spoken in the area from which they had come, they created a literary language which was to be used by all the Slavs who joined the Eastern Church. In doing so, they may have emphasised and helped to make permanent the division between Catholic and Orthodox Slavs and, in relieving the latter of the need to learn Latin and Greek, they may also have removed a stimulus to intellectual development; but the benefits conferred by their work far outweigh its few negative consequences. Russia proved to be the main beneficiary, and writing was undoubtedly the most important of the ‘five gifts’ brought to her by Byzantium. It not only led to the birth of Russian literature, but also provided the means by which the whole Byzantine cultural and religious heritage could be widely disseminated and assimilated. Above all, the Russians were able to conduct their worship and to hear the Gospels in a language close to their own, which made the impact of Christianity upon them the more immediate and profound.

The recent eleven hundredth anniversary of this historic mission was marked by a Symposium on ‘The Byzantine Mission to the Slavs: St Cyril and St Methodius’, held at Dumbarton Oaks in 1964 and attended by a number of distinguished Byzantinists and Slavists. Four of the papers read are published in full in the issue of Dumbarton Oaks Papers under review, while the contents of the remainder are summarised by Professor Roman Jakobson in a concluding report on the work of the Symposium. Professor George Ostrogorsky, ‘The Byzantine Background of the Moravian mission’, emphasises that the mission was only one of a series of successes achieved by Byzantine missionary activity among the Slavs in the single decade which began, significantly enough, with the Russian attack on Constantinople in 860. These achievements were made possible, indeed, ‘historically inevitable’ in Ostrogorsky’s opinion, by a general resurgence of Byzantine power and influence, signalled by its victories over the Arabs in the same period and by the gradual re-establishment of Byzantine control over at least part of the Balkan Peninsula.

The fact that the Moravian mission was no isolated phenomenon ensured the continued survival and further development of the Cyrillic-Methodian tradition after the death of the two brothers and the expulsion of their disciples from Moravia in 885. Converted to Christianity by Byzantium in 864, yet anxious to establish an independent, national Church,
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Bulgaria saw in the disciples of Cyril and Methodius, who followed their masters in stressing the equality of all peoples and languages in Christianity, the opportunity to achieve her aim and welcomed them warmly. As Professor George Souli shows in 'The Legacy of Cyril and Methodius to the Southern Slavs', Ochrid and Preslav became the new centres of Slavonic culture built on the foundations laid by the Apostles of the Slavs. A new generation of Slavonic priests and scholars was prepared and, a mere thirty years after her conversion, Bulgaria, under Tsar Simeon, entered her Golden Age of literature. As a result, Bulgaria, in her turn, was able to transmit the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition to Russia. Here, once again, the potency of the heritage was made apparent: within fifty years of Vladimir I's conversion in 987, unmistakably Russian works of literature were being produced. Indeed, the very speed of this development and the remarkably high quality of the writing can be explained only on the assumption that the history of Christianity in Russia began long before 987. In 'The Heritage of Cyril and Methodius in Russia', Professor Dimitri Obolensky adduces the evidence in the sources, meagre but convincing, which supports this hypothesis and reveals the strong current of Cyrillo-Methodian thought in medieval Russian literature. Of particular interest is his demonstration of the link between certain passages in the Russian Primary Chronicle and the Vita Constantini, based on a composite quotation from Isaiah which embodies the characteristically Cyrillo-Methodian concept of the Pentecostal negation of Babel.

In discussing 'The Origins of the Slavonic Liturgy', Professor Antonin Dostal reviews the conflicting opinions and gives his reasons for rejecting the view that it was the liturgy of S Peter which Cyril and Methodius translated for use in Moravia. He thinks that it was more likely to have been the liturgy of St John Chrysostom, but emphasizes that a great deal more research must be done before any firm conclusions can be reached.

The Dumbarton Oaks Symposium has clearly made a valuable contribution to Cyrillo-Methodian studies, and it is only to be regretted that all of the papers could not have been published in full in this volume.

A. D. Stokes.

School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London.

Dölger. (F.) Polychronion: Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag. Hrsg. von P. Wirth. (Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit, Reihe D: Beihette, Forschungen zur griechischen Diplomatik und Geschichte, 1) Heidelberg: C. Winter. 1966. Pp. 536. 10 plates. DM 68. This is one of two separate Festschriften offered to the distinguished Professor Emeritus of Mediaeval and Modern Greek Philology and former Director of the Institut für Byzantinistik at the University of Munich. It opens with a bibliography of Dölger's publications from 1919 to 1966, comprising 365 items—short reviews, encyclopaedia articles and the like being omitted—and continues with a list of 36 doctoral dissertations published by his pupils, some of which are by now standard works of reference—a few have even been reprinted. This bibliography supplements those in B.Z. 44 (1957) and in F. Dölger, ΠΑΡΑΣΙΠΟΡΑ. 30 Aufsätze zur Geschichte, Kultur und Sprache des byzantinischen Reiches, Etal 1961. The main body of the book is occupied by 45 articles on Byzantine literature and history. Fourteen countries are represented. Space forbids listing the titles, and to select would be invidious. There are several editiones principes of texts, several detailed descriptions of important manuscripts, and many useful studies of institutional and administrative history. Festschriften tend to be rather disappointing mixed bags. But this one is outstanding by the unity of its subject-matter and the high level of its contributions. It does honour to its editor, Dr P. Wirth, and is a worthy tribute to a scholar from whom every Byzantinist now alive has learned much.

ROBERT BROWNING.


This useful little guide book belongs to the series 'The World in Colour' the object of which is to show the reader exactly what the country looks like'. It deals in turn with Greek history, Greek art, the Greek people and the tourist in his encounter with the contemporary scene and its actors. Half the book is taken up with colour photography.

Eva Keuls starts somewhat inauspiciously with the Lucretian description of Epicurus, well known to us as 'primum Graius homo . . .' but rendered by her as 'some Greek fellow was always first'. To state at the very outset that 'the Rome of Lucretius has crumbled but the empire of the Greek mind has never been assailed' is to introduce a needless and false contrast. She would have done better to quote another Latin tag 'Greacia capta ferum victorem . . .' Schliemann is justly named for his archaeological pioneering but not a word is said about Evans and Ventris. We may wonder whether the true nature of the γκλωσσικο ϶ητμα has been understood when we read (p. 36) that the genesis of katharewaza [sic!] was the dislike through 'patriotic fervour' by Greek intellectuals of 'the residue of Turkish words' in demotiki. The author does not elaborate on 'a completely new light' (p. 37) shed on Homer by
recent study of 'Kleptica' [sic]. She mentions the Stoa of Attalus (p. 69) as though it were a survival ('a gift of that Pergamene ruler') instead of a reconstruction by Dr. Homer Thompson through the munificence of the modern American Attalus John D. Rockefeller. Byzantine mosaics at Thessaloniki are referred to (though not depicted) but those of St. Demetrius in his eponymous church are ignored (p. 71). Castoria (a fresco from it is shown in plate 43) is worthy to be ranked with Mistra on p. 72. Hyperbole is one of the author's favourite tricks. We read of 'centuries of Turkish invasions of Europe' (p. 34) and of 'millions of refugees thrown upon the Greek shores' (p. 39). On p. 92 'drunkenness is unknown'. Rather, it is comparatively rare. The Patriarchate 'is still in Istanbul... The Greeks will not have it differently' (p. 95). This is in fact the result not of modern whim but of some 1600 years of Byzantine history. Statements about what a Greek thinks about romantic love seem just as useful as generalisations would about 'the American' attitude towards divorce. It is true enough, alas, that 'meat is a luxury' (p. 93), but to insist that this is due to the doctrine of the Orthodox Church is quite wrong. As to the odd belief that priests who seek ecclesiastical preferment 'must divorce their wives' (p. 96) the author could have found out from any Greek that this is a preposterous utterance as the situation does not arise. She is much less than fair to Greek tourism when she complains about 'commercial hotels' growing everywhere 'shoddily built on the “get-rich-quick” principle'. Such warped criticism as this hardly helps the traveller for whom the book is intended, one who wants 'to know about making the most of his time there'. Unless, of course, he shares the author's cynicism, e.g. 'No matter what you do, you'll probably get cheated' (p. 104).

Yet within its narrow compass this work gives an objective and colourful insight into the history, the art and the lives of the Greeks. One must allow for the picturesque transatlantic use of English, that bite that is sometimes missing from guide books published here in England. Demosthenes 'ran with the fastest of them' (p. 29) and the Goths and Vandals were 'unwashed barbarians in pants' (p. 33). In the Plaka are 'eaters ranging from folkly-and-loud to quaintly posh' (p. 101). For Englishmen who would classify themselves in case of need as katharevounian rather than demotikidas the style must seem at times harsh and grating. But the letterpress is readable. We occasionally succumb to the infectious enthusiasm as when (on p. 66) we read of the 'towering genius of Periclean Athens', Phidias, who 'masterminded the decoration of the Parthenon'. The colour photography is excellent—refreshingly original views of well-worn subjects. Mykonos (48) appears without a windmill. Meteoria (62–3) looks quite uninhabited. The present reviewer is glad to observe the Iseon at Delos confronting the Tholos at Delphi (50–1) as though to prove the continuity of Egyptian influence mentioned more than once in the text (pp. 57 and 64).

The printing of the book in Holland may explain some, though hardly all, of the frequent mistakes, e.g. pp. 28 (Persian's, Ayran, semitic, greater, Peloponesian), 30 (Memmius bis for Mummius), 31 (Anthony), 34, 37, 39 (Venezios), 40 (guerrilla bir'), 62, 89, 90 (bouzoukia), 95 (their bir'), 96 and 99 (attempts, mayonnaise).

R. E. Witt.

London.


If I may summarise my general impression after a careful reading of this book, I would say: splendid and gorgeous photographs, especially those in colours; a vivid piece of high quality journalism; an interesting book for the general public, but not at all a work at a scholarly or academic level.

The permanent value of this book is in the beauty, the originality, and the suggestive value of its 63 plates. This volume is, without any doubt, one of the finest albums and collections of photographs published about Mount Athos. These Athonite albums are indeed very numerous, but rarely do they reach the aesthetic and technical quality of this book.

The two joint-authors, Lord John Julius Cooper, Viscount Norwich, and Mr. Reresby Sitwell, as well as their Greek interpreter and professional photographer, Mr. A. Costa, sojourned during a fortnight on the Holy Mountain of Athos, in the first weeks of June 1964. They visited almost all the twenty ruling monasteries (sometimes the visit lasted only one or two hours); they took an enormous quantity of photographs, of which very few (only 63 plates, but very well chosen) are reproduced in this attractive book. They sank deeper and deeper under the Mountain's spell, and they decided to translate in writing the outstanding experiences of their Athonite travel. In their own words, they found themselves by turns entranced and revolted, bewildered and enlightened, depressed and exhilarated, terrified and consoled. They emerged beset with a maelstrom of conflicting emotions and impressions that could only be resolved on paper.

The result of their literary activity is a very good piece of outstanding journalism, especially by the former diplomat, Lord John Julius Cooper, Viscount Norwich, son of the late statesman Duff Cooper, educated at Eton and Oxford. The noble Lord, who is generally felicitous in his choice of words, has composed a highly readable, often amusing, and sometimes thrilling essay: Something of Byzantium (pp. 17–102). He gives an account—not always accurate—of the history of Athens from its origin to the present day, and relates this to the life of the monks them-
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selves. He tries to interweave this account with a general impression of how the Holy Mountain strikes the modern English traveller. His companion, Mr Reresby Sitwell, wrote a more detailed narrative of their journey, day by day (pp. 103-82). The point of view of these gentlemen is modern, partly sympathetic, partly strongly critical, secular—a mixture of compassion, admiration and sneer. These writers have an infallible flair for discovering and reporting all the curious, bizarre, odd, and laughable things, which the Holy Mountain supplies in abundance. They are not indeed in sympathy with this 'Europe's greatest stronghold of superstition and prejudice' (p. 101), and they do not show a deep appreciation of Christian spirituality, theology and liturgy, which is a notable shortcoming in an Athos book. The pages on the works of art are few and disappointing (pp. 90-91, 95-96), whereas Lord Norwich expatiates, in a genuine Gibbonian spirit, on the 'unsavoury field' of relics (pp. 91-2) and miraculous ikons (pp. 92-5). The authors, including the Greek Orthodox A. Costa, are persuaded—and I cannot gainsay this fact—that Mount Athos is dying, and dying fast. They saw, in nearly every monastery, the writing looming, all too plainly, on the wall. They think that the disease is incurable, and that there is no hope. As for me, I retain some hope concerning the continuation of ascetic life in a few skites and kalyves, but not in the ruling monasteries.

This book, which is a piece of journalism of the highest quality, is not, however, a work written for historians or scholars. The bibliography (p. 183), in which one may detect unjustifiable omissions, is reduced to 17 lines! It would be unkind to draw up a list, however restricted, of the many factual and historical inaccuracies, especially in the essay Somewhere of Byzantium. But, I am sure, it was not the intention of the authors to write a book for either historians or theologians or experts in Byzantine art and liturgy. They have kindly put at our disposal 69 very beautiful, original, wonderful photographs of a small Byzantine and monastic world in process, alas! of internal disintegration.

EMMANUEL AMAND DE MENDIETA.

The Close, Winchester Cathedral


This catalogue was produced to accompany the fine exhibition of Greek manuscripts held at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, in honour of the Thirteenth International Congress of Byzantine Studies in 1966. It consists of an Introduction by Mr R. W. Hunt, the Keeper of Western Manuscripts, brief descriptions by Miss R. Barbour and Dr J. J. G. Alexander of the 104 books in the exhibition, and twenty excellent plates 'chosen to illustrate the history of Greek script'. As a guide to the exhibition it served its purpose admirably, but its usefulness will extend far beyond this original function: it will be a valuable supplement to Croke's catalogues for the manuscripts it describes, and students of Greek palaeography will be glad to acquire twenty facsimiles at so modest a price.

The manuscripts were naturally drawn largely from the Bodleian Library, but about a dozen came from the libraries of Corpus Christi, Lincoln, New and University Colleges, and the Codex Peribleptos was lent by the University College of South Wales. There is a rich diversity and range of interest in these manuscripts, which were imaginatively chosen with an eye to the various specialisms of the visiting scholars. They fall into the following groups: uncial manuscripts, early texts, dated manuscripts, scholars' copies, Greek in the West in the Middle Ages, Renaissance (including two printed books, with notes by Budé and Politian respectively), illuminated manuscripts (not illustrated in the plates, because most of them have already appeared in O. Pächt's Bodleian Picture Book Byzantine Illumination), liturgical manuscripts, Slavonic manuscripts, bindings. Mr Hunt's introduction does not cover all these groups, but confines itself to three topics: the study of Greek in the medieval West, the westward movement of manuscripts during the Renaissance and the acquisition of Greek books by Oxford libraries. These were no doubt the most important points on which visiting byzantinists might need further enlightenment, and the six pages that Mr Hunt devotes to them are packed with useful detail; the post-exhibition reader of the catalogue is tempted to wish that some of the other groups of manuscripts had been given similar treatment, but it would be unreasonable to criticise Mr Hunt for not writing a full-scale essay to accompany a publication of this kind.

The descriptions of each item are admirable: date, scribe and provenance are given where known, points of palaeographical and artistic interest are noted and the particular historical or textual significance of the manuscript is briefly made clear, together with the relevant references to facsimiles and articles. All this is presented, with great clarity, in an average of a dozen or so lines for each manuscript. These notes are potentially so useful that one cannot help but wish that the catalogue had an index.

It was a particularly happy idea to include a group of manuscripts illustrating the study of Greek in the West in the Middle Ages, since this is a subject that is still waiting to be treated comprehensively and the Bodleian's richness in this field is very striking. Plates XIII-XVIII, which cover this section, seem to me to be the most interesting of the photographs, partly because some of the manuscripts they illustrate are such oddities in themselves, like the extraordinary thirteenth-century Ps.-Dionysius Areopagita (no. 36), which Miss Barbour has studied in detail elsewhere,
and the palimpsest copy of Roger Bacon's Greek grammar, written in England in the fourteenth century (no. 39), partly because this aspect of Greek palaeography is naturally not very fully illustrated in the standard handbooks.

Some of the other plates are less unusual; for example, Plate XI shows a page of the earliest dated and signed manuscript in the hand of Demetrius Triclinius. This has been illustrated by both Koster and Turyn together with other Triclinian autographs and it would perhaps have been more interesting to reproduce a less famous scholarly hand. Similarly, one would have welcomed one or two specimens of lesser-known Renaissance hands instead of that of Zacharias Callierges, attractive as it is. (This is Plate XX, illustrating no. 62. There is a misprint in the description of no. 45 on p. 39, where Plate XIX is erroneously referred to as Plate XX.)

This is a first-rate catalogue which handsomely lives up to the high standards expected of the Bodleian Library.

P. E. Easterling.

Newnham College, Cambridge


This interesting and useful compilation is the tenth volume in the series of Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft edited by Bruno Snell and Hartmut Erbse. It avoids the usual ground of collections of specimens of Greek handwriting, and aims rather to provide manuscript texts for seminar exercises in reading Greek manuscripts and in textual criticism.

Each of the specimens here chosen is in itself interesting, coherent, and complete, and the range is wide: hymns of Homer, Kleanthes, Arifron; the Certamen Homer et Hesiodi; a Platonic Epistle; pieces from Aristotle, Theophrastos, Arrian, Marcus Aurelius, Clement of Alexandria, Pseudo-Longinus; excerpts from novelists, fables of Babrius, and miscellaneous other items. The thirty excerpts chosen are not arranged in strict chronological order of authors, nor by the dates of the manuscripts.

All but two of the specimens come from Codices unici or from manuscripts known to be archetypes of all other extant manuscripts with the relevant texts. All periods of medieval book-making are represented, from the fifth/sixth century parchment of Cassius Dio.

Both variant traditions of Antonios Diogenes are shown, and the most important variants of the Alexander Romance of Pseudo-Callisthenes are given in the brief descriptive inventory of the items. The method of reproduction, chosen to make a low price possible, is reasonably satisfactory. I was astonished how well the printer had presented a page of Xenophon of Ephesos from the notoriously illegible Laurentianus Conventi Soppressi 627. The exact size of the original page and script are not normally given, and unimportant marginalia are often omitted. A few of the specimens of writing are small and/or dim, but I found even those satisfactorily legible with an ordinary reading glass.

The dates assigned to manuscripts are taken from editions or library catalogues, and a warning is issued against over-confidence in dating by watermarks. For two only of the ten fourteenth- or fifteenth-century manuscripts the editors detail their watermarks. The short bibliography mentions F. J. Bast's Commentatio Palographica of 1811, which is seldom obtainable in commerce, but not E. Maunde Thompson's Greek and Latin Palæography or F. W. Hall's Companion to Classical Texts, which are almost equally unbuyable, but are most valuable aids to those who can find them in libraries.

The brief descriptions of manuscripts are uneven in their citation of learned literature and in the details offered. Thus we are told that no. 16 was written by Baanes for Arethas, and that Marsilio Ficino annotated no. 28; but we are not told that Nonnos in Laurentianus 32, 16, was written by Planudes, as detailed by H. G. Beck in a work the editors elsewhere cite, the Geschichte der Textüberlieferung . . . , I (1961), by H. Hunger and others (p. 458 f.).

About the famous Florence codex with the novelists, Conv. Soppr. 627, we are regaled with Jacobs' theory that the novels are sandwiched among writings of holy men so that the frivolous works should escape the notice of stricter folk. Surely the presumed stricter folk would be likely to pick up a volume with writings of holy men. Further, Merkelbach himself wrote a remarkable book, Roman und Mysterium . . ., arguing that all Greek novels, except Chariton's, were basically expositions of religious mysteries. A thirteenth-century monk, adept at allegorical exegesis, could doubtless have defended Chariton also. Moreover, he could have claimed that Achilles Tatius had been a bishop, as was Heliodorus. The small format of the volume does not prove that the motive of its scribe was rapid concealment if a too strict person intruded. There are medieval Greek grammar books of like format.

Merkelbach and van Thiel state that a corresponding reader for Latin manuscript texts is being prepared.

D. C. C. Young.


The task of making a Greek dictionary, ancient or modern, is formidable. There is, in both periods,
the extreme variety and flexibility of the language; the multiplicity of dialects, the lack of an accepted norm, the intensity of local patriotism, the facility of forming compounds and derivatives, the idiosyncrasy of literary artists, the rooted assumption that different sorts of matter are couched in different sorts of Greek. Classical scholars of the old school may be reluctant to recognise it, but there is, even in the ancient language, a certain childish, anarchic, antigrammatical tendency both maddening and charming.

Then there are historical considerations. Ancient Greek is roughly conceived as running from Homer to the New Testament, Modern Greek from Digenis Akritas to the present day; a stretch, in each case, of a thousand years, and which in each case saw revolutionary social and political changes.

For Ancient Greek, there is Liddell and Scott; all in all, the world's best dictionary. But it did not come till the mid-nineteenth century, and would never have come at all without the immense prestige, resources and incentive which till lately underlay British classical studies.

For Modern Greek, in English, till now there was next to nothing. There were catchpenny hack-productions, aimed at the tourist and immigrant; by respectable philologists, two or three special vocabularies and limited studies; some party-books, expressive of this or that extreme of pedantry or radical reform. Nothing that was accurate, level-headed, and of modest but widespread general utility; nothing that had all these qualities at once. Now there is, and it is deeply welcome, but it is not enough. A dictionary of 219 pages at 25 shillings can cover the bread-and-butter business of daily life; can serve the learner to follow most conversation, read most of the newspaper, grasp the meaning of a business letter, obey the instructions to enter by the rear door and not talk to the driver, discover where to pay the electric bill and which chemist stays open all night. It can, and Pring does; more fully, not less accurately, and much more cheaply than, for instance, Swanson.

When we come to imaginative literature, even to the least ebullient, it is another matter. It could not be otherwise, given the compass of the book. Since publication in September 1965, Pring has been in regular use in my classes, in which the texts read are selections from a pretty obvious list. Though this ranges back into the Tangokratia and Cretan Renascence, let us ignore anything earlier than the present century, in which we have, for instance, portions of Palamas, Sikelianos, Cavafy, Seferis, Elytis; Vlachoyianni, Xenopolos, Myrivilis, Theotokas, Venezis. Experience suggests that there is probably not anywhere in any of these texts a passage of two hundred words together, every one of which the student can find in Pring. The students are grateful for Pring, but are repeatedly frustrated by his gaps. When so frustrated, they often find the answer in Pernot. For anyone with a knowledge of French, it seems demonstrated that Pernot remains the best buy. Pernot will also go in the pocket, as Pring will not, and contains a perfectly invaluable appendix of proper names.

Using Pring daily since publication, I have not yet noticed a misprint, or a translation or explanation with which I seriously disagree. I somewhat regret the fount; clear, but too different from those of Greek printers; a minor psychological error. The Preface includes an account of the development of Modern from Ancient Greek that is both brief and balanced; yet one cannot but grudge the pages it takes away from the dictionary proper. Otherwise there is no dead wood; a good job of pruning has been done. But how thin and small a book, in comparison with the rich profusion of the literature of which it ought to hold the key! If the editor and publishers have correctly gauged the market, and the degree of interest which my countrymen can be expected to take in Modern Greek, it is cause for sorrow. If they have not correctly judged, perhaps a second edition will be much expanded on the side of literature.

Hector Thomson.

University of Aberdeen.


Whether or not the word organ (organon, organum) is derived from a Hebrew word for ‘love of mankind’ as post-Commonwealth English sermon-writers claimed, it is true that the instrument has an immense history, that Greeks and Romans, Turks and Persians, Arabs and western Europeans knew an instrument of recognisable organ-type, and that its adoption by the Christian Church was brought about despite predictable—and recurrent—resistance. Indeed, the great tenth-century organ at Winchester was much more primitive than that described by Vitruvius which had different tone-colours, could change stops and had a keyboard allowing fair virtuosity. Non-Gallic writers might avoid M. Perrot’s determination to lay the invention dramatically at the feet of a particular man (Ktesibios, a contemporary of Archimedes) or to see the modern organ as one that ‘ne diffère de la machine originale de Ktésibios’; but they must be grateful to have all the evidence and suppositions between two covers, evidence technical and poetic, archaeological and historical, musical and acoustical, constructional and reconstructural.

The subtitle étude historique et archéologique is indeed modest, though as far as I can say, they are the most reliable aspects of the book. Over 200 texts and 70 phototype illustrations—all from sources irritatingly difficult to pinpoint—suggest a most interesting development from third century B.C. Alexandria to eighth-century Frankish Gaul and beyond. The
simple history seems to be that Alexandria saw various experiments in physical engineering including hydraulics—which very word ἕδραλικός is musical in original meaning, the aulos being an instrument; that the 'water-organ' was one of the results of such work, in which pipes (presumably reed, not flue) were sounded by a flow of air kept both constant and pressurised by means of a column of water at the bottom of a conical air-reservoir; that the pipes were not 'sounded by water' as described by later Jesuit scholars, whose counter-reforming took the shape of boundless fantasy; that by Vitruvius' time the 'keyboard' had become sprung tabs or levers which returned to the 'off' position of their own accord; that compass was small and pitch high; and that after the gothic organ-less a-culture, the Byzantines reintroduced a backward version of the instrument to the Franks and hence to the western—but not eastern—Church. The word organ is itself difficult to explain, since there were at least four classical and medieval uses: (i) a tool (cf. 'instrument'), (ii) a specific musical instrument, (iii) instruments in general (organum), (iv) a species of musical counterpoint, the earliest written polyphony (organum). M. Perron satisfactorily discusses the first three; but the suggestion that organum was so called (first in a tenth-century source) because its simple 2-part polyphony imitated classical-medieval organ-playing is uncomfortably ingenious. True, some things are in its favour as an explanation: the coincidence of place for both music and instrument (ninth-tenth century north-central France), the MS illuminations and descriptions of two organists playing one instrument (as at Winchester), the organ's original imitation of the aulos which had two pipes, presumably playing two different notes.... But organum as written music is much more systematically arranged than the harmony extemporised by organists, which must have been at best feeble heterophony. I almost wrote 'more systematically organised', for the most likely explanation is that organum described a 'carefully contrived type of music' as distinct from simple chant. But the verbal connexion between organon, organum, organ and organise is one by no means yet explained—eighteenth-century French writers spoke of 'organising' a pianoforte by adding a pipe-chest to it, for instance.

Indeed, the more musical sides of M. Perrot's book do leave doubts and questions. Despite summarising chapters, a reader could still come away with very little idea of the probable sound of the hydraulicon. Certainly written sources say little, the sound of an instrument belonging neither to the respectable science of engineering nor to the respectable quadrivial philosophy of music; and it is too much to ask that wind-pressure or voicing details of pipes be known. But it should have been made clearer whether the pipes were predominantly flue or reed—whether the sound was made as in the oboe or as in the flute. It seems to me most likely that by at least the third century A.D. a small organ would have dry bellows and flue pipes, a large organ hydraulic pistons and reed pipes, but I can think only of baroque parallels for such a generalisation, and what classicist is interested in those?

PETER WILLIAMS.

University of Edinburgh.


This ambitious study is an outgrowth of two comparative-etymological studies 'Wolfram's Gral und Wolframs Kyot' by H. and R. Kahane, Zfd.A. 89 (1959) pp. 191-213, in which the authors derived the word 'grail' from eder, the Greco-Latin designation of a vessel, identified Wolfram's grail with a Hellenistic constellation and related it to the Krater of the fourth treatise of the Corpus hermeticum. The authors also claimed to have identified Wolfram's informant Kyot as the Catalan poet William of Tudela. Whereas most attempts to resurrect Kyot now tend to be rejected out of hand, this latest theory was treated with some respect by experienced Wolfram scholars. It is regrettable that a potentially valuable hypothesis should now be obscured by the present fantastic attempt to interpret the whole of Parzival's spiritual experience in his quest for the Grail in Hermetic terms and to hold William of Tudela responsible for transmitting Hermetic materials to Wolfram. There is no evidence to show that William was a Hermetic nor have any of the Hermetic treatises been preserved in Arabic, the language in which Kyot was supposed to have discovered the story of the Grail, 'sgrales aventiur', Parzival 453, 30.

The starting-point for Chapter II, The Story of a Myst, is the assumption that one can equate Hermeticism's Krater with Wolfram's grail, i.e., the symbolic vessel in which the souls dip themselves in Intellect (Nous) with the life-preserving and food-providing stone of Wolfram's Parzival. Equally unconvinning is the suggestion that in Wolfram's stein we have the Hermetic metaphor of the lodestone, which in any case represents not the Krater but the sight of God. It is surely not permissible to draw a parallel between the knightly brotherhood who guard the Grail and a community of mysts seeking baptism in the Krater, when much closer literary parallels are to hand in the religious communities gathered around the Grail, admittedly not in Chrétien's account (Wolfram's only established source) but certainly in later French versions of the Grail cycle. And an assertion such as: 'In Parzival, the Arthurian society is just such an obstructive force, its glamour and philosomatism tend to keep the myst, Parzival, from his goal, the Grail' (p. 27), betrays a completely mistaken interpretation of Wolfram's attitude to the world of
chivalry and attributes to him an asceticism he did not possess. This chapter abounds in such forced parallels. Hypotheses are repeatedly disguised as established facts, introduced by such misleading adverbs as, e.g., 'clearly': 'Clearly the Parzival passage (465, 19–27) sounds like a paraphrase of the quotations from Lactantius' (p. 4). Equally unconvincing are the Hermetic prototypes suggested for some of the principal characters, such as the mystagogue Hermes for the hermit Trevirizent (pp. 55–63).

In Chapter III the authors trace the transmission of the Hermetic materials through the intermediate stages of Syriac and Arabic literature to William of Tudela, a town in Navarre within the bishopric of Tarazona, a region noted in the twelfth century for the activities of a group of translators, rendering Arabic works of learning, mainly on astrology and geomancy, into Latin. On the basis of linguistic and biographical data the authors restate their reasons for wishing to identify Kyot with William of Tudela. The evidence is not conclusive but at least it is factual. They would hold Kyot responsible for providing Wolfram with vital source material for the religious story within the Parzival, i.e. some form of the Corpus hermeticum in an Arabic version which he mediated to Wolfram in French and which led Wolfram to weave Hermetic elements into his adaptation of Chrétien's account. They would attribute Wolfram's attested interest in astrological geomancy to his contact with William of Tudela who refers to himself as a geomancer in his Chanson de la croisade albigeoise (c. 1210). Further, they point out that William showed a certain sympathy with the Cathars and a number of scholars have made determined attempts to show that Catharistic beliefs are reflected in Parzival, for example in the dualistic concept of God and the topos of the neutral angels.

The final chapter includes a summary of the would-be Hermetic elements in Parzival and these are related to the treatise of the Krater. The arguments are no more persuasive in tabulated form than in Chapter II. What a pity that a Kyot so nearly 'redivivus' should be saddled with all this! One suspects that many a sober Germanist, weary of the Story of a Myst, will turn straight to the intriguing plates at the back of the book and empty out the bathwater.

Sylvia C. Harris.

Birkbeck College, London.


Mademoiselle Claire Préaux is a spell-binder as well as a scholar. Wishing to pay tribute to the impact she had made on the intellectual life of their country, the Brussels Section of the Federation of University Women has founded a number of University bourses in her honour. The Section had the happy idea of adding to its publication of the speeches at the presentation a bibliography of her writings from 1927 to December 31st, 1965, drawn up by her distinguished pupil M. Th. Lenger. Her colleagues abroad who have submitted to her enchantment (and they are many) will welcome this list with gratitude, and hope that it will be much extended. When they read the presentation speeches, they will note that the young Miss Préaux 'hated critical apparatuses and supposed that, every papyrus document being unique, there wouldn’t be any in this branch of scholarship'. The paradox is that Miss Préaux is one of the select company of editors of Greek ostraca because she has insisted (as M. Th. Lenger points out) on the study of the diplomatic of documents as a first requisite.

E. G. Turner.

University College London.


Kühner-Gerth's Griechische Satzjahre cites some 35,000 passages from authors ranging from Homer to Eustathius, and thus provides comment on what is syntactically noteworthy in most classical authors—with certain exceptions to be discussed below. The trouble was to find the comment. Professor Calder has undertaken the Herculean task of compiling an Index locorum. One might call it a thankless task; but surely generations of scholars who will use his book will be grateful to him. It is an indispensable tool of the trade.

The first requirement of such a work is accuracy. No doubt someone will find a mistake or two as the years go by, but the reviewer has failed to find a single false reference. And, just to show his mettle, Calder provides the reader at the end with three pages of references which Kühner got wrong.

Two interesting points emerge, to which the author draws attention in his preface. First, the range of texts on which Kühner and Gerth based their study of Greek Syntax was limited to what may be called the school authors—Homer, Pindar, the Attic dramatists, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, and the orators. There are only thirteen references to Aristotle, and Hellenistic prose and poetry alike get scant treatment; six passages from Polybius, five from Diodorus, one from Diogenes Laertius, five from Callimachus, and so on. More surprisingly, the early lyric poets are hardly cited: four references to Archilochus, two to Alcaeus, three to Sappho, none to Steichoros. There is much work still to be done before the Greek language is adequately described.

The second point is that again and again one finds
that the passages discussed by commentators on
texts and writers on Greek grammar are precisely
those cited by Kühner-Gerth. As Calder remarks,
‘Kühner auctores antiquos; epigoni, illum per-
legerunt.’
This is a book which will often be consulted but
seldom quoted. But its excellence, though unob-
trusive, is great.

ROBERT BROWNING.

Birkbeck College, London.

DEMETRIUS (J. K.) Greek scholarship in Spain
and Latin America. Chicago: Argonaut.
1965. Pp. 144. $5.00.

This book is not a history of scholarship, in spite
of its title, but a bibliography of material which the
compiler hopes will be of use to other scholars working
on this subject. His own researches have been
hampered by ‘a great lacuna of a bibliographical
nature’; his foreword gives a short account of his
attempt to improve matters: ‘This work does not
purport to be a complete bibliography. Still the
books . . . cited herein do contain, in many cases,
bibliographies of their own.’ (Unfortunately he
rarely specifies which cases these are.)

The book is arranged in ten broad subject sections
(and a sub-section on El Greco), with an index of
ancient and modern authors, the former distinguished
by being printed in capital letters. There are some
oddballs of classification: Paulys-Wissowa and the
Oxford classical dictionary are not under ‘Works
of reference—Bibliographies’ but under ‘Greek schol-
arship—its history and influence’; Rhodos’s Psyché, on
the other hand, appears three times: p. 104 (History
—Geography—Law), ‘E. Rohde, Psyché, México,
1942’; p. 111 (Mythology—Religion), ‘Erwin Rohde,
Psyché. El culto de las almas y la creencia en in-
mortalidad entre los griegos, Madrid, 1942’; p. 114
(Philosophy—Science), ‘E. Rohde [sic], La inmortali-
dad del anima entre los griegos, Madrid, 1943’. As well
as including one of the very few misprints, these
entries are good illustrations of the inconsistency in
style and typography, and the tendency to prefer
translations to originals (often without indicating
that they are translations), which suggest that the
majority of entries were taken verbatim from library
catalogues and published lists, without further editing
or verification. (Compare also the overdated
description of Byzantinische Zeitschrift (p. 37) with the
inadequate one of PW (p. 58).)

Most of the shortcomings of this work result from
lack of practical experience and of familiarity with
good bibliographies. Prof. Demetrius nowhere
mentions L’Année philologique, Bibliotheca philologica
classica, or the complementary works of Engelmann,
Klussmann, Lambrino and Marouzeau (an omission
which reflects no credit on the librarians whose help
he acknowledges). In spite of this he has managed
to narrow the ‘great lacuna’. Perhaps others will
now be encouraged to complete the task, thus
enabling him to return to his study of the impact of
Hellenism on Spain and Latin America.

A. E. HEALEY.

Institute of Classical Studies, London.

WALBANK (F. W.) Speeches in Greek historians.
(J. L. Myres memorial lecture, 3.) Oxford:

Britain’s foremost authority on Polybius devotes
the greater part of this J. L. Myres Memorial Lecture
to that historian. He concludes that the speeches
recorded by Polybius contain the substance of what
was actually said, in accordance with his own avowed
principles. They are thus more authentic in content
than those of Thucydides, but show the same uni-
formity of style which betrays the historian’s hand in
shaping their literary form. They also emphasise
more strongly than the main body of the narrative
the fact that Polybius is writing primarily from the
Greek standpoint and for the instruction of his
countrymen. Those who are familiar with the pains-
taking scholarship and copious documentation in the
first volume of Professor Walbank’s ‘Polybius’, will
discern the same qualities here, and will the more
eagerly look forward to the appearance of its sequel.

S. Usher.

Royal Holloway College, University of London.

GREIFENHAGEN (A.) Antike Kunstwerke. 2nd
+ 56. 108 plates. 2 text figures. DM 38.

This revised and reset edition has the same format
and arrangement as the first, but there is a complete
renumbering of the objects. Some are new to the
book, though not to Berlin (the Dodona hoplite, pl.
16; the Orpheus krater, pl. 51), some new to Berlin
(Ephesian ivory fragment, pl. 1; the Altamura
painter’s chous with satyrs in a torch race, pls. 54–5),
others, already in the earlier edition, are shown in
new details (the Andokides amphora with its lid,
pl. 39). Two items have been omitted: a white-
ground pyxis and the Athena and Marsyas chous.
The text is the same with some slight additions, the
bibliographies have been brought up to date. The
only students likely to quarrel with this new edition
are the collators, for whom it will be an undoubted
headache, as there is no concordance.

BRUNEAU (P.) and DUCAT (J.) Guide de Délos.
folding plans. 24 plates. 37 text figures.
Price not stated.

A first-rate introduction to the antiquities of Delos,
well arranged both in the presentation of the actual site and in the introductory chapters on legends, cults and the different types of archaeological material to be encountered. The plans are crystal clear, the photographs, mercifully of objects for the most part, not ruins, are well chosen and reproduced. We are promised guides to other sites excavated by the French school; let us hope they keep to the standard set by the first.


Though a bit hard-going for the layman, this account provides a useful compendium on South Italian. Photographs good, the map much too fussy, the profile drawings inexplicably antediluvian.


The subject is a good one for this series, the text is straightforward, neatly balancing local history and craftsmanship. The photographs are a little dim, and something has gone sadly astray with the references to the plates, some missing, most out of joint.


This masterly publication is concerned with a group of terracottas found in 1868 in a barrow in the Taman peninsula known as the Great Blismitza. Six burials were found in this barrow, five of them undisturbed and richly furnished. The character of the grave-goods it was deduced at an early stage that the whole barrow was used by an influential family whose womenfolk were hereditary priestesses of Demeter.

The figurines here published were found together in one of the burials (no. 4). Twenty-eight in number, they were made in the fourth century B.C., most in Attica. Twenty-seven of them reached the Hermitage Museum. Some represent standing and seated women, but most are either grotesques or actors from the Middle Comedy. They have long interested P. and here, in a model publication, she produces evidence, both archaeological and literary, to show that all the types represented are relevant, one way or another, to the worship of Demeter.

The illustrations are generous, and are reproduced in a manner wholly worthy of the text.

REYNOLD HIGGINS.

British Museum.


This is a useful though not very systematic survey of various elements of Cypriot culture and folklore with, in many cases, their historical antecedents.

It has long been recognised that by virtue of geographical position and historical circumstances Cyprus has preserved many items of Homeric, classical, Hellenistic and Byzantine culture. These have attracted the attention of scholars like A. Sakellariou, K. P. Chatzioannou and X. P. Pharmakides. Κυπριακὰ ἱη καὶ ἱημα, after a general introduction purporting to show the predominantly classical origins of Cypriot culture, includes chapters on Ancient Games (as they have survived), Birth (and Babyhood), with an interesting Babies’ Vocabulary, Customs of Baptism, Marriage, Burial, Agricultural Pursuits, Lore of the Months and Various Superstitions. The work is enriched by numerous new versions of folk songs and the musical notation for ten of them by K. D. Ioannides.

In general the author seems over-anxious to trace the roots of Cypriot culture and mores to classical Greece even when the items he presents are far wider than the classical or even the Greek cultural tradition. At the same time he does not give due prominence to the Byzantine heritage. In fact, he seems to derive his parallels in this respect almost exclusively from Kukules’ massive but far from complete work.

The most serious flaw of the book, however, stems from the fact that the author does not appear to have utilised the powerful methods and results of modern cultural anthropology which would not only have conferred theoretical interest on his rather Baconian collection but would also have made his difficult task a lot easier.

All the same, Papacharalambous has done much fieldwork in several parts of the island over a number of years and has enriched the literature of Cypriot folk studies. The most urgent desideratum of these studies, the gathering of the most atomic elements of culture in a comprehensive lexicon of the Cypriot dialect, is still awaiting publication.

S. A. SOPRONIOUT.

London.

This new and much enlarged edition is very welcome. It is meticulously compiled, catholic in its scope and easy to consult. The introduction stresses that the catalogue contains aids, not substitutes, for teaching, and the final page promises an annual duplicated sheet of omissions, corrections and additions. With such guidance, we have only ourselves to blame if we fail to follow it.


The author seeks to show, by attention to philology, etymology and natural evolution, that the Cyclopes had originally two eyes but lost the use of one through concentration on archery.

CORRECTION AND APOLOGY
In my review of Professor Tarán’s edition of Parmenides (JHS lxxxvi 1966, 223–4) I pointed out a few misprints which it seemed might cause confusion. I regret to say that my own corrections were in one case misprinted and in another case misguided. Taran’s ‘axes’ is a misprint for axles not ‘axels’, and his ‘importunate’ is correct and not, as I suggested, a misprint for important. I do apologise for these errors and any offence or confusion they may have caused.

A. A. Long

University College London.


ADAM (S.). The technique of Greek sculpture in the archaic and classical periods. (British School at Athens, supplementary vol. 3.) London: British School of Archaeology at Athens and Thames and Hudson. 1966. Pp. viii + 137. 72 plates. 9 text figures. £4 10s.


EURIPIDES. The Trojan women. Trans. N. Curry. London: Methuen. 1966. Pp. 64. 13s. 6d. (bound); 6s. (unbound).


ISAN (J.) and ROSENBAUM (E.). Roman and early Byzantine portrait sculpture in Asia Minor. London: Oxford University Press for The British Academy. 1966. Pp. xxv + 244. 1 folding map. 186 plates. £7 7s.
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The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies

31-34 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1

President: Professor A. D. Momigliano, D.Litt., F.B.A.

The Society was formed to promote the study of the history, archaeology and art of Rome, Italy and the Roman Empire in general down to about A.D. 700. In particular, so far as it resources permit, and so far as it is possible without prejudice to its wider objects, the Society endeavours to encourage the study of Britain under Roman occupation by devoting space in its Journal to articles on Romano-British history and archaeology. The Society maintains, in conjunction with the Hellenic Society, a joint library of works on classical antiquity and a collection of lantern slides. Members are entitled to borrow books and postcards, which can be sent to them by post, and may also consult books in the library of the London University Institute of Classical Studies, which is complementary to that of the Societies. Communications about books and postcards should be addressed to the Librarian.

Meetings for the reading and discussion of papers are held in London about four times a year. Meetings are also held in various parts of the country. Notices of all meetings are sent to members.

The Journal of Roman Studies contains articles written by leading British and foreign scholars, an annual summary of Romano-British discoveries, and reviews of recent publications. It is abundantly illustrated. It is published annually, and is sent to members free of charge, the price to the public being £4.

The annual subscription for membership of the Society is £5. Any member who is 60 years of age or over may compound for annual subscriptions by a single payment of £5. Student associates are admitted at the reduced subscription of £3.

All inquiries should be addressed to the Secretary.

The following may be obtained from International University Bookellers, 39 Store Street, W.C.1.


2. Supplementary Papers:

No. I EXCAVATIONS AT MEGALOPOLIS (1890-91)

No. VI CORINNA

No. VII PERSPECTIVE IN ANCIENT DRAWING AND PAINTING

No. VIII THE GREEKS AND THEIR EASTERN NEIGHBOURS

No. IX THE GRECIANS AND THEIR LANTHONY SOURCES: SOURCES AND LECTURERS

No. X ISLAND GEMS

No. XI EUPIDES AND THE JUDGEMENT OF PARIS

Note: Supplementary Papers II, III, IV and V are out of print.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

The main aims of the Classical Association are to promote and sustain interest in classical studies, to maintain their rightful position in universities and schools, and to give teachers and teachers opportunities of meeting and discussing their problems. It organizes an annual conference, lasting four or five days, in a university centre, and sponsors thirty-one branches, most of which hold Greek and Latin Reading Competitions for Schools. Its activities are fully reported in its annual Proceedings, issued free to all members.

The present membership of the Association is approximately 4,000. Membership is open both to individuals and to institutions at an annual subscription of £2, life membership for individuals, £5 5s. Members may obtain the Classical Review and Classical Quarterly at reduced prices (Review, 45s.; Quarterly, 40s.). Combined subscription, £5 17s. 6d. Greece and Rome may also be obtained through the Association for an annual subscription of £5. Applications for membership and subscriptions for the journals (which should normally be received by January 31st in each year) should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Professor L. A. Motz, University College, Cardiff.

The Association can also supply copies of the Index to the First Series of the Classical Review (price 25s. for members, 30s. for non-members, post free) and of the Supplement of the Index to the First Series. The Journal of the Year's Work in Classical Studies, covering the years 1929-35 and 1944-5 (price 6s. each volume, post free), are also available. Details of both the above publications are obtainable from the Hon. Secretary (Professor P. R. Rees, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. R. G. Teetor, University College, Cardiff).

Contribution to the Journal should be sent to Dr. B. Sparkes, The University, Southampton, S09, 5NH.

Books intended for review should be addressed to The Librarian, Hellenic Society, 31-34 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1
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