

THE JOURNAL
OF
HELLENIC STUDIES

The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

THE JOURNAL

OF

HELLENIC STUDIES

VOLUME XII.

1891

KRAUS REPRINT

Nendeln/Liechtenstein

1971

Reprinted by permission of
THE SOCIETY FOR PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES

KRAUS REPRINT

A Division of
KRAUS-THOMSON ORGANIZATION LIMITED
Nendeln/Liechtenstein
1971
Printed in Germany

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Rules of the Society	ix
List of Officers and Members	xv
Additions to Library	xxxiii
Transactions of the Society, 1891	xxxvii
1. The North Doorway of the Erechtheum. (Plates I.—III.)—R. W. SCHULTZ and E. A. GARDNER	1
2. Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία. R. W. MACAN	17
3. Archaic Reliefs at Dhimitzana. (Plate XI.)—G. C. RICHARDS	41
4. Sculpture in Sicilian Museums.—L. R. FARNELL	46
5. Excavations in Cyprus, 1890. (Plates IV.—X.)—J. A. R. MUNRO and H. A. TUBBS	59
6. Notes on the Antiquities of Mykenae.—W. M. F. PETRIE	199
7. A Journey in Cilicia Tracheia. (Plate XII.)—J. T. BENT	206
8. Inscriptions from Western Cilicia. E. L. HICKS	225
9. On the Ancient Hecatompedon which occupied the site of the Parthenon. (Plates XVI.—XVIII.)—F. C. PENROSE	275
10. Excavations in Cyprus. Third Season's Work: Polis tes Chrysochou. (Plates XIII.—XV. A.)—J. A. R. MUNRO	298
11. Herakles and Eurytos on a Cylix at Palermo. (Plate XIX.)—P. HARTWIG	334
12. Mythological Studies. I. The Three Daughters of Cecrops.—JANE E. HARRISON	350
13. Vitruvius' Account of the Greek Stage.—LOUIS DYER	356
14. Two Vases by Phintias. (Plates XX.—XXIII.)—H. STUART JONES	366
15. The North Doorway of the Erechtheum.—SIDNEY H. BARNESLEY	381
16. An Inscription from Egypt.—W. H. D. ROUSE	384
17. Archaeology in Greece, 1890—91.—E. A. GARDNER	385
Corrigendum	397

LIST OF PLATES.

- I. The North Doorway of the Erechtheum.
 II. restored
 III. details
 IV. Excavations at Salamis, Cyprus. Sand Site.
 V. Plan of the Site and Neighbourhood of Salamis.
 VI. Salamis: The Columns: Zeus Temenos.
 VII. .. Loutron and Agora.
 VII. A. .. Other Sites.
 VIII. .. Architectural Details.
 IX. .. Male Figure: Terra-cotta. Drawn by F. ANDERSON.
 X. .. Fragments of Terra-cotta Statues.— Drawn by F. ANDERSON.
 XI. Bone Tablets from Sparta.
 XII. District of Olba, Cilicia.
 XIII. Polis: Lekythos with Figure of Aphrodite on Swan.—Drawn by
 F. ANDERSON.
 XIV. .. White Lekythos. Drawn by F. ANDERSON.
 XV. .. Jewelry and Terra-cottas.
 XV. A. .. Plans of Tombs.
 XVI. A Section of the Acropolis Rock as exposed by recent excavations,
 and showing the cells of the old Hecatompedon within
 that of the Parthenon.
 XVII. A restored plan of the old Hecatompedon.
 XVIII. A plan of part of the Archaic Temple on the Acropolis, restored
 in Fig. 1 as Ionic, and in Fig. 2 as Doric.
 XIX. Vase-fragment: Herakles and Eurytus. —Drawn by SIG. CARMELO
 GIARIZZO.
 XX. }
 XXI. } A Hydria by Phintias in the British Museum.
 XXII. } Fragments of a Stamos by Phintias in the possession of Dr. F.
 XXIII. } Hauser. Drawn by the owner.

	PAGE
Sepulchral Stele: a boy: Polis	319
Fragment of Altar: Polis	324
Mother and Infant „	325
Fragment of Vase: Kér	340
Interior of Kylix, inscribed <i>ἐποίησεν</i>	347
„ „ by Euergides	348
Sketch of Vase by Phintias	367

RULES

OF THE

Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

1. THE objects of this Society shall be as follows:—

I. To advance the study of Greek language, literature, and art, and to illustrate the history of the Greek race in the ancient, Byzantine, and Neo-Hellenic periods, by the publication of memoirs and unedited documents or monuments in a Journal to be issued periodically.

II. To collect drawings, facsimiles, transcripts, plans, and photographs of Greek inscriptions, MSS., works of art, ancient sites and remains, and with this view to invite travellers to communicate to the Society notes or sketches of archaeological and topographical interest

III. To organise means by which members of the Society may have increased facilities for visiting ancient sites and pursuing archaeological researches in countries which, at any time, have been the sites of Hellenic civilization.

2. The Society shall consist of a President, Vice-Presidents, a Council, a Treasurer, one or more Secretaries, and Ordinary Members. All officers of the Society shall be chosen from among its Members, and shall be *ex officio* members of the Council.

3. The President shall preside at all General, Ordinary, or Special Meetings of the Society, and of the Council or of any Committee at which he is present. In case of the absence of the President, one of the Vice-Presidents shall preside in his stead, and in the absence of the Vice-Presidents the Treasurer. In the absence of the Treasurer the Council or Committee shall appoint one of their Members to preside.

4. The funds and other property of the Society shall be administered and applied by the Council in such manner as they shall consider most conducive to the objects of the Society: in the Council shall also be vested the control of all publications issued by the Society, and the general management of all its affairs and concerns. The number of the Council shall not exceed fifty.

5. The Treasurer shall receive, on account of the Society, all subscriptions, donations, or other moneys accruing to the funds thereof, and shall make all payments ordered by the Council. All cheques shall be signed by the Treasurer and countersigned by the Secretary.

6. In the absence of the Treasurer the Council may direct that cheques may be signed by two members of Council and countersigned by the Secretary.

7. The Council shall meet as often as they may deem necessary for the despatch of business.

8. Due notice of every such Meeting shall be sent to each Member of the Council, by a summons signed by the Secretary.

9. Three Members of the Council, provided not more than one of the three present be a permanent officer of the Society, shall be a quorum.

10. All questions before the Council shall be determined by a majority of votes. The Chairman to have a casting vote.

11. The Council shall prepare an Annual Report, to be submitted to the Annual Meeting of the Society.

12. The Secretary shall give notice in writing to each Member of the Council of the ordinary days of meeting of the Council, and shall have authority to summon a Special and Extraordinary Meeting of the Council on a requisition signed by at least four Members of the Council.

13. Two Auditors, not being Members of the Council, shall be elected by the Society in each year.

14. A General Meeting of the Society shall be held in London in June of each year, when the Reports of the Council and of the Auditors shall be read, the Council, Officers, and Auditors for the ensuing year elected, and any other business recommended by the Council discussed

and determined. Meetings of the Society for the reading of papers may be held at such times as the Council may fix, due notice being given to Members.

15. The President, Vice-Presidents, Treasurer, Secretaries, and Council shall be elected by the Members of the Society at the Annual Meeting.

16. The President and Vice-Presidents shall be appointed for one year, after which they shall be eligible for re-election at the Annual Meeting.

17. One third of the Council shall retire every year, but the Members so retiring shall be eligible for re-election at the Annual Meeting.

18. The Treasurer and Secretaries shall hold their offices during the pleasure of the Council.

19. The elections of the Officers, Council, and Auditors, at the Annual Meeting, shall be by a majority of the votes of those present. The Chairman of the Meeting shall have a casting vote. The mode in which the vote shall be taken shall be determined by the President and Council.

20. Every Member of the Society shall be summoned to the Annual Meeting by notice issued at least one month before it is held.

21. All motions made at the Annual Meeting shall be in writing and shall be signed by the mover and seconder. No motion shall be submitted, unless notice of it has been given to the Secretary at least three weeks before the Annual Meeting.

22. Upon any vacancy in the Presidency, occurring between the Annual Elections, one of the Vice-Presidents shall be elected by the Council to officiate as President until the next Annual Meeting.

23. All vacancies among the other Officers of the Society occurring between the same dates shall in like manner be provisionally filled up by the Council until the next Annual Meeting.

24. The names of all candidates wishing to become Members of the Society shall be submitted to a Meeting of the Council, and at their next Meeting the Council shall proceed to the election of candidates so proposed: no such election to be valid unless the candidate receives the votes of the majority of those present.

25. The Annual Subscription of Members shall be one guinea, payable and due on the 1st of January each year ; this annual subscription may be compounded for by a payment of £15 15s., entitling compounders to be Members of the Society for life, without further payment.

26. The payment of the Annual Subscription, or of the Life Composition, entitles each Member to receive a copy of the ordinary publications of the Society.

27. When any Member of the Society shall be six months in arrear of his Annual Subscription, the Secretary or Treasurer shall remind him of the arrears due, and in case of non-payment thereof within six months after date of such notice, such defaulting Member shall cease to be a Member of the Society, unless the Council make an order to the contrary.

28. Members intending to leave the Society must send a formal notice of resignation to the Secretary on or before January 1 ; otherwise they will be held liable for the subscription for the current year.

29. If at any time there may appear cause for the expulsion of a Member of the Society, a Special Meeting of the Council shall be held to consider the case, and if at such Meeting at least two-thirds of the Members present shall concur in a resolution for the expulsion of such Member of the Society, the President shall submit the same for confirmation at a General Meeting of the Society specially summoned for this purpose, and if the decision of the Council be confirmed by a majority at the General Meeting, notice shall be given to that effect to the Member in question, who shall thereupon cease to be a Member of the Society.

30. The Council shall have power to nominate British or Foreign Honorary Members. The number of British Honorary Members shall not exceed ten.

31. Ladies shall be eligible as Ordinary Members of the Society, and when elected shall be entitled to the same privileges as other Ordinary Members.

32. No change shall be made in the Rules of the Society unless at least a fortnight before the Annual Meeting specific notice be given to every Member of the Society of the changes proposed.

RULES FOR THE USE OF THE LIBRARY.

I. THAT the Library be administered by the Library Committee, which shall be composed of not less than four members, two of whom shall form a quorum.

II. That the custody and arrangement of the Library be in the hands of the Librarian, subject to the control of the Committee, and in accordance with Regulations drawn up by the said Committee and approved by the Council.

III. That all books, periodicals, plans, photographs, &c., be received by the Librarian or Secretary and reported to the Council at their next meeting.

IV. That every book or periodical sent to the Society be at once stamped with the Society's name.

V. That all the Society's books be entered in a Catalogue to be kept by the Librarian, and that in this Catalogue such books, &c., as are not to be lent out be specified.

VI. That the Library be accessible to Members on all week days from eleven A.M. to six P.M., when either the Librarian, or in his absence some responsible person, shall be in attendance.

VII. That the Society's books (with exceptions hereinafter to be specified) be lent to Members under the following conditions:—

- (1) That the number of volumes lent at any one time to each Member shall not exceed three.
- (2) That the time during which such book or books may be kept shall not exceed one month.
- (3) That no books be sent beyond the limits of the United Kingdom.

VIII. That the manner in which books are lent shall be as follows:—

- (1) That all requests for the loan of books be addressed to the Librarian.
- (2) That the Librarian shall record all such requests, and lend out the books in the order of application.
- (3) That in each case the name of the book and of the borrower be inscribed, with the date, in a special register to be kept by the Librarian.

- (4) Should a book not be returned within the period specified, the Librarian shall reclaim it.
- (5) All expenses of carriage to and fro shall be borne by the borrower.

IX. That no book falling under the following categories be lent out under any circumstances :—

- (1) Unbound books.
- (2) Detached plates, plans, photographs, and the like.
- (3) Books considered too valuable for transmission.

X. That in the case of a book being kept beyond the stated time the borrower be liable to a fine of one shilling for each additional week, and if a book is lost the borrower be bound to replace it.

The Library Committee.

PROF. PERCY GARDNER.
 REV. H. A. HOLDEN, LL.D.
 MR. WALTER LEAF.
 MR. GEORGE MACMILLAN (*Hon. Sec.*).
 MR. ERNEST MYERS.
 REV. W. G. RUTHERFORD, LL.D.
 MR. ARTHUR HAMILTON SMITH.
 MR. E. MAUNDE THOMPSON.
 REV. W. WAYTE (*Hon. Librarian*).

Assistant Librarian, MISS HUGHES, to whom, at 22, Albemarle Street, applications for books may be addressed.

SESSION 1891—1892.

General Meetings will be held in the Rooms of the Royal Asiatic Society, 22, Albemarle Street, London, W., for the reading of Papers and for Discussion, at 5 P.M. on the following days :—

1891.

Monday, October 19.

1892.

Monday, February 22

Monday, April 11.

Monday, June 20 (Annual).

The Council will meet at 4.30 p.m. on each of the above days.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES.

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL FOR 1891-1892.

President.

PROFESSOR R. C. JEBB Litt.D., D.C.L., LL.D., M.P.

Vice-Presidents.

MR. SIDNEY COLVIN.
MR. E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., LL.D.
PROF. PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D.
SIR W. D. GEDDES, *Principal of Aberdeen University.*
THE RIGHT HON. SIR WILLIAM GREGORY, K.C.M.G.
MR. D. E. MONRO, *Provost of Oriel College, Oxford.*

MR. A. S. MURRAY.
MR. W. L. NEWMAN.
SIR CHARLES T. NEWTON, K.C.B.
MR. F. C. PENROSE.
REV. PROF. A. H. SAYCE, LL.D.
MR. E. MAUNDE THOMPSON, D.C.L.
REV. H. F. FOZER.
PROF. R. V. TYRRELL.

Council.

MR. J. THEODORE BENT
MR. J. B. BURY.
PROF. S. H. BUTCHER, LL.D.
MR. LOUIS DYER.
MR. ROBINSON ELLIS.
MR. TALFOURD ELY.
MR. ARTHUR J. EVANS.
MR. EDWIN FRESHFIELD, LL.D.
MR. A. E. HAIGH.
MISS JANE HARRISON.
MR. F. HAVERFIELD.
MR. D. G. HOGARTH.
REV. H. A. HOLDEN, LL.D.
MR. WALTER LEAF, Litt.D.
MR. W. WATKISS LLOYD.

MR. REGINALD W. MACAN
PROF. J. H. MIDDLETON
MR. ERNEST MYERS.
MR. W. R. PATON.
PROF. H. F. PELLIAM.
PROF. R. S. POOLE.
PROF. W. M. RAMSAY.
MR. J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D.
THE RIGHT HON. LORD SAVILE.
MR. H. BABINGTON SMITH.
MR. CECIL SMITH.
MR. R. ELSEY SMITH.
MR. A. HAMILTON SMITH.
MR. T. H. WARKEN, *President of Magdalen.*
REV. W. WAUTE.

Hon. Treasurer.

MR. JOHN B. MARTIN.

Hon. Secretary.

MR. GEORGE A. MACMILLAN.

Assistant Secretary.

MR. W. RISELEV.

Editorial Committee.

MR. INGRAM BYWATER.
PROF. PERCY GARDNER,

REV. PROF. BORT.
PROF. JEBB, M.P.

Auditors for 1891-92.

MR. DOUGLAS W. FRESHFIELD.

MR. ARTHUR J. BUTLER

Bankers.

MESSRS. ROBERTS, LUBBOCK & CO., 15, LOMBARD STREET.

CAMBRIDGE BRANCH

OF

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE FOR 1891-1892.

Chairman.

PROF. R. C. JEBB, LITT.D., D.C.L., LL.D., M.P.

Vice-Chairman.

MR. J. E. SANDYS, LITT.D.

Committee.

MR. OSCAR BROWNING.

MR. HENRY JACKSON, LITT.D.

MR. M. R. JAMES.

PROF. J. H. MIDDLETON.

MR. J. S. REID, LITT.D.

REV. E. S. ROBERTS.

MR. ARTHUR TILLEY.

MR. A. W. VERRALL, LITT.D.

MR. C. WALDSTEN, LITT.D.

Hon. Secretary.

MR. WALTER HEADLAM, KING'S COLLEGE.

HONORARY MEMBERS.

HIS MAJESTY THE KING OF THE HELLENES.

Mr. Alfred Biliotti, C.P., *H.B.M. Consul for Crete.*

Prof. H. von Brunn, *Leopold Strasse, 20 a¹/₃, Munich.*

Prof. D. Comparetti, *Istituto di Studii Superiori, Florence.*

M. Alexander Contostavlos, *Athens.*

Geheimrath Prof. Ernst Curtius, *Matthai Kirchstrasse 4, Berlin.*

Mr. George Dennis, 21, *Queen's Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W.*

Herr Wilhelm Dörpfeld, Ph.D., *Director of the German Archaeological Institute, Athens.*

Monsieur P. Foucart, 13, *Rue de Tournon, Paris.*

His Excellency Monsieur J. Gennadius, *Envoy Extraordinary for Greece, 2, Euton Square, S.W.*

Prof. W. Helbig, *Casa Tarpeia, Monte Caprino, Rome.*

Monsieur Homolle, *Director of the French School, Athens.*

Prof. A. Kirchhoff, *The University, Berlin.*

Dr. H. Köhler, *The University, Berlin.*

Prof. S. A. Kumanudes, *The University, Athens.*

Mr. Charles Merlin, 10, *Observatory Gardens, Campden Hill, W.*

Prof. A. Michaelis, *University, Strassburg.*

Monsieur A. R. Rangabé, *Athens.*

His Excellency Monsieur W. H. Waddington, *Membre de l'Institut, French Embassy Albert Gate, S.W.*

Mr. Thomas Wood, *H.B.M. Consul at Patras.*

His Excellency Hamdy Bey, *Keeper of the Museum of Antiquities, Constantinople.*

LIST OF MEMBERS.

* *Original Members.* † *Life Members.*

The other Members have been elected by the Council since the Inaugural Meeting.

Abbott, Evelyn, *Balliol College, Oxford.*

*Abercromby, Hon. John, 21, *Chapel Street, Belgrave Square, S.W.*

Abram, Edward, 1, *Middle Temple Lane, E.C.*

*Acland, Sir H. W., Bart., K.C.B., M.D., F.R.S., *Broad Street, Oxford.*

Adam, James, *Emmanuel College, Cambridge.*

Addinsell, W. Arthur, 16, *Bennett's Hill, Birmingham.*

Ainger, A. C., *Eton College, Windsor.*

†Ainslie, R. St. John, *The School, Sedburgh.*

Aitchison, G., A.R.A., 150, *Harley Street, W.*

Alford, Rev. B. H., *St. Luke's Vicarage, Nutford Place, W.*

Allbutt, T. Clifford, M.D., F.R.S., 3, *Melbury Road, Kensington, W.*

Amherst, W. A. Tyssen, M.P., *Didlington Hall, Brandon.*

Anderson, J. R., *Lairbeck, Keswick.*

Anderson, Prof. W. C. F., *Firth College, Sheffield.*

*Antrobus, Rev. Frederick, *The Oratory, S.H.*

Apostolides, S., 4, *Lansdowne Mansions, Lansdowne Place, Brighton.*

- Archer-Hind, R. D., *Trinity College, Cambridge*.
- † Arkwright, W., *Adbury House, Newbury*.
- Baggallay, Frank T., 66, *Conduit Street, W*.
- Bagley, Mrs. John, *Washington Avenue, Detroit, Michigan*.
- Bailey, J. C., 2, *Tanfield Court, Temple, E.C.*
- Baker, Rev. William, D.D., *Merchant Taylors' School, E.C.*
- * Balfour, G. W., M.P., 32, *Addison Road, W*.
- * Balfour, Right Hon. A. J., M.P., 4, *Carlton Gardens, S.W.*
- Ball, Sidney, *St. John's College, Oxford*.
- Barclay, James W., M.P., 5, *Clarendon Place, Hyde Park Gardens, W*.
- Barlow, Miss Anne, *Greenthorne, Edgworth, Bolton*.
- Barlow, Mrs., 10, *Wimpole Street, W*.
- Barnewall, Sir Reginald A., Bart., 6, *Park Street, Grosvenor Square, W*.
- Barnsley, Sidney H., 3, *Raymond's Buildings, Gray's Inn, W.C.*
- Bath, The Marquis of, *Longleat, Warminster*.
- Bather, Arthur George, *King's College, Cambridge*.
- Bayfield, Rev. M. A., *Christ College, Brecon*.
- † Beaumont, Somerset, *Shere, near Guildford*.
- Belcher, Rev. Henry, *High School, Dunedin, N.Z.*
- Belcher, Rev. T. Hayes, *The College, Brighton*.
- Bell, Rev. William, *The College, Dover*.
- Benachi, L. A., "Ortygia," *Livingstone Drive, Sefton Park, Liverpool*
- † Benn, Alfred W., 70, *Via Cavour, Florence*.
- Benson, E. F., *King's College, Cambridge*.
- Benson, W. A. S., 39, *Montague Square, W.C.*
- Bent, J. Theodore (Council), 13, *Great Cumberland Place, W*.
- Bent, Mrs. Theodore, 13, *Great Cumberland Place, W*.
- Bickford-Smith, R. A. H., 49, *Stanhope Road, Darlington*.
- † Bikelas, Demetrius, 4, *Rue de Babylone, Paris*.
- Birdwood, Sir George C. M., C.S.I., 7, *Apsley Terrace, Acton, W*.
- Blacker, C., 12, *Sussex Square, Hyde Park, W*.
- Blomfield, Sir A. W., A.R.A., 6, *Montagu Place, Montagu Square, W*.
- Blore, Rev. Dr., *St. Stephen's, Canterbury*.
- Boase, Rev. C. W., *Exeter College, Oxford*.
- Bodington, Prof. N., *Principal of the Yorkshire College, Leeds*.
- Bond, Edward, C.B., LL.D., 64, *Princes Square, Bayswater, W*.
- Bond, Edward, *Elm Bank, Hampstead, N.W*.
- Bosanquet, B., 7, *Cheyne Gardens, Chelsea, S.W*.
- Bosanquet, Rev. F. C. T., *Enfield Cottage, Sandown, I. of W*.
- Bousfield, William, 33, *Stanhope Gardens, S.W*.
- Bowen, Lord Justice, 14, *Albert Hall Mansions, S.W*.
- Bowen, Rt. Hon. Sir George F., G.C.M.G., D.C.L., LL.D., *Athenæum Club, S.W*.
- Boyd, Rev. Henry, D.D., *Principal of Hertford College, Oxford*.
- Bradley, Very Rev. G. G., D.D., *The Deanery, Westminster, S.W*.
- Bramley, Rev. H. R., *Magdalen College, Oxford*.
- * Brainston, Rev. J. T., *Culvers Close, Winchester*.
- Branteghem, A. van, 28, *Rue des Buisson, Bruxelles*.
- Brinton, Hubert, *Eton College, Windsor*.
- Broadbent, H., *Eton College, Windsor*.
- * Brodie, E. H., *H.M.I.S., Grassendale, Malvern*.
- Brooke, A. E., *King's College, Cambridge*.
- Brooke, Rev. Stopford A., 1 *Manchester Square, W*.
- Brooks, E. J., *The College, Dulwich, S.E*.
- Brown, Prof. G. Baldwin, *The University, Edinburgh*.
- Brown, Harry, 36, *George Street, Portman Square, W*.
- * Browning, Oscar, *King's College, Cambridge*.

- *Bryce, James, D.C.L., M.P., 54, *Portland Place, W.*
- *Burn, Rev. Robert, *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Bury, J. B. (Council), *Trinity College, Dublin.*
- Butcher, Prof. S. H., LL.D. (Council), *The University, Edinburgh.*
- Butler, Arthur J., *Wood End, Weybridge.*
- *Butler, The Rev. H. M., D.D., *Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Buxton, F. W., 42, *Grosvenor Gardens, S.W.*
- Buxton, Mrs. Alfred, 5, *Hyde Park Street, W.*
- Bywater, Ingram, 93, *Onslow Square, S.W.*
- †Bywater, Mrs., 93, *Onslow Square, S.W.*
- Calvert, Rev. Thomas, 15, *Albany Villas, Hove, Brighton.*
- †Calvocoressi, L. M., *Messrs. Ralli Bros., Mellor's Buildings, Exchange Street East, Liverpool.*
- Cameron, Dr. James, *Registrar of the University, Capetown.*
- *Campbell, Rev. Prof. Lewis, *St. Andrews, N.B.*
- †Canterbury, The Most Rev. His Grace the Lord Archbishop of, *Lambeth Palace, S.E.*
- Capes, Rev. W. W., *Bramshott, Liphook, Hants.*
- Carapános, Constantin, Député, *Athens.*
- Carey, Miss, 13, *Colosseum Terrace, Regent's Park, N.W.*
- *Carlisle, A. D., *Haileybury College, Hertford.*
- Carlisle, Miss, *High Laven, Bowdon, Cheshire.*
- †Carr, Rev. A., *St. Sebastian's Vicarage, Wokingham.*
- Carstens, C. C., *Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa, U.S.A.*
- Carter, Frank, *St. Paul's School, Kensington, W.*
- Cates, Arthur, 12, *York Terrace, Regent's Park, N.W.*
- Cave, Lawrence T., 13, *Lowndes Square, S.W.*
- Chambers, C. Gore, *The Grammar School, Bedford.*
- Chambers, Rev. F. C., *Howard House, Fulford Road, York.*
- Chance, Frederick, 51, *Prince's Gate, S.W.*
- Chavasse, A. S., *University College, Oxford.*
- †Chawner, G., *King's College, Cambridge.*
- †Chawner, W., *Emmanuel College, Cambridge.*
- Cheetham, J. C. M., *Christ Church, Oxford.*
- Chettle, H., *Stationers' School, Bolt Court, E.C.*
- *Christie, R. C., *The Elms, Rochampton, S.W.*
- Christian, J. Henry, 18, *Devonshire Place, Portland Place, W.*
- Christian, Rev. G., *Redgate, Uppingham.*
- †Clark, W. Gilchrist, *care of Miss Talbot, 42, Grosvenor Road, S.W.*
- †Clarke, Hyde, 32, *St. George's Square, S.W.*
- Clarke, Joseph Thacher, *College Road, Harrow, N.W.*
- Clauson, A. C., 12, *Park Place Villas, Paddington, W.*
- Clay, C. F., 38, *Great Ormond Street, W.C.*
- Cobbold, Felix T., *The Lodge, Felixstowe, Suffolk.*
- *Cobham, C. Delaval, *H.B.M. Commissioner, Larnaca, Cyprus.*
- Cohen, Mrs., 3, *Devonshire Place, Portland Place, W.*
- Colby, Rev. Dr., *Litton Cheney, Dorchester.*
- Cole, A. C., 64, *Portland Place, W.*
- Colfox, William, *Westmead, Bridport.*
- *Colvin, Sidney (V.P.), *British Museum, W.C.*
- Compton, Rev. W. C., *Uppingham.*
- Conroy, Sir John, Bart., F.R.S., *Balliol College, Oxford.*
- *Constantinides, Prof. M., *care of Gen. Rogers.*
- Conway, W. M., 21, *Clanricarde Gardens, Bayswater, W.*
- Cook, Arthur Barnard, *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Cookson, C., *St. Paul's School, Kensington, W.*
- Cookson, C. A., C.B., H.B.M. Consul, *Alexandria.*

- Coolidge, Rev. W. A. B., *Magdalen College, Oxford*.
 Cordery, J. G., C.S.I., 47, *Albemarle Street, W.*
 Corgialeagno, M., 21, *Pembridge Gardens, W.*
 Cornish, C. J., *St. Paul's School, Kensington, W.*
 Courtney, W. L., 53, *Belsize Park, N.W.*
 Courtenay, Miss, 34, *Brompton Square, S.W.*
 Covernton, J. G., *St. John's College, Oxford*.
 Covington, Rev. W., *The Vicarage, Brompton, S.W.*
 Covington, W. H. W., *The Vicarage, Brompton, S.W.*
 Cowper, The Right Hon. Earl, K.G., *Panshanger, Hertford*.
 Craik, George Lillie, 2, *Halkin Street West, S.W.*
 Crawley, Alfred Ernest, *Lutterworth, Leicestershire*.
 Crewdson, Wilson, 60, *Courtfield Gardens, S.W.*
 Crockett, John D., *Union Place, Dungannon, Co. Tyrone*.
 Crosfield, Miss Margaret C., *The Dingle, Reigate*.
 Cruikshank, Rev. J. A. *Harrow, N.W.*
 Curtis, Rev. Canon, *Constantinople*.
 Cust, H. J. C., *Ellesmere, Salop*.
 Cust, Lionel, 43, *Park Lane, S.W.*
 Cust, Miss Beatrice, 13, *Eccleston Square, S.W.*
 Dakyns, H. G., *Higher Coombe, Haslemere, Surrey*.
 Danson, J. T., F.S.A., *Grasmere, R.S.O.*
 David, W., 15, *Norfolk Street, Park Lane, W.*
 Davidson, H. O. D., *Harrow, N.W.*
 Davies, Rev. Gerald S., *Charterhouse, Godalming*.
 Davies, T. Harold, *University College, Oxford*.
 Deibel, Dr., *care of Messrs. Asher, Berlin*.
 *Dilke, The Right Hon. Sir Charles W., Bart., 76, *Sloane St., S.W.*
 Dill, S., *Montpelier, Malone Road, Belfast*.
 Dillon, Edward, 13, *Upper Phillimore Gardens, W.*
 Dimsdale, M. S., *King's College, Cambridge*.
 Dobson, Miss, 77, *Harcourt Terrace, Redcliffe Square, S.W.*
 Donaldson, James, LL.D., *Principal of The University, St. Andrews*.
 Donaldson, Rev. S. A., *Eton College, Windsor*.
 Drisler, Prof. Henry, *Columbia College, New York, U.S.A.*
 Drummond, Allan, 7, *Ennismore Gardens, S.W.*
 Drummond, Edgar, 8, *Princes Gardens, S.W.*
 Duchâtaux, M. V., 12, *Rue de l'Echauderie, à Reims*.
 Duhn, Prof. von, *University, Heidelberg*.
 Duke, Roger, 8, *Neville Terrace, Onslow Square, S.W.*
 †Dunham, Miss, 37, *East Thirty-Sixth Street, New York*.
 Dyer, Louis (Council), 68, *Banbury Road, Oxford*.
 Dyson, Rev. Frank, *The College, Liverpool*.
 Earl, Mrs. A. G., *The Priory, Tonbridge*.
 Edwards, G. M., *Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge*.
 Edwards, Miss Amelia B., *The Larches, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol*
 Egerton, Mrs. Hugh, 11, *Tite Street, Chelsea, S.W.*
 Eld, Rev. F. J., *The Grammar School, Worcester*.
 Ellis, Robinson (Council), *Trinity College, Oxford*.
 Eliot, C. N. E., *British Embassy, St. Petersburg*.
 Elwell, Levi H., *Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.*
 Ely, Talfourd (Council), 73, *Parliament Hill Road, Hampstead, N.W.*
 Erichsen, Miss Nelly, *Grove Cottage, Upper Tooting, S.W.*
 Eskrigge, R. A., *Liscard Vale, Liscard, Birkenhead*.
 Eumorfopoulo, A., 1, *Kensington Park Gardens, W.*
 Evans, A. J. (Council), 33, *Holywell, Oxford*.

- Evans, John, D.C.L., F.R.S., *Nash Mills, Hemel Hempstead.*
 Eve, H. W., 37, *Gordon Square, W.C.*
 Everard, C. H., *Eton College, Windsor.*
 Farnell, L. R., *Exeter College, Oxford.*
 Farrar, Rev. Canon A. S., *Durham.*
 Farrow, Frederic R., 2, *New Court, Carey Street, W.C.*
 *Fearon, Rev. W. A., D.D., *The College, Winchester.*
 Fenning, W. D., *Haileybury College, Hertford.*
 Field, Rev. T., *Kings School, Canterbury.*
 †Fitzmaurice, Lady Edmond, *Leigh, Bradford-on-Avon.*
 Fitz-Patrick, Dr. T., 30, *Sussex Gardens, Hyde Park, W.*
 Flather, J. H., *Cavendish College, Cambridge.*
 Flower, Wickham, *Old Swan House, Chelsea, S.W.*
 †Forbes, W. H., *Balliol College, Oxford.*
 Ford, His Excellency the Right Hon. Sir Francis Clare, G.C.B., G.C.M.G. H.B.M.
 Ambassador, *British Embassy, Constantinople.*
 Fowler, Harold N., Ph.D., *Exeter, New Hampshire, U.S.A.*
 *Fowler, Rev. Professor, *President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.*
 Fowler, W. W., *Lincoln College, Oxford.*
 Fox, Ernest Long, 18, *Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.*
 †Franks, A. W., F.R.S., *British Museum, W.C.*
 Frazer, J. G., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Freeman, C. E., *Parkhouse, Southborough, Tunbridge Wells.*
 *Freeman, Edward A., D.C.L. (V.P.), *Somerleaze, Wells, Somerset.*
 *Freshfield, Douglas W., 1, *Airlie Gardens, Campden Hill, W.*
 †Freshfield, Edwin, LL.D. (Council), 5, *Bank Buildings, E.C.*
 Freston, Henry W., *Eagle's Nest, Prestwich, Lancashire.*
 *Fry, F. J., *Eversley, Leigh Wood, Clifton.*
 †Furley, J. S., 12, *Kingsgate Street, Winchester.*
 Furneaux, L. R., *Rossall School, Fleetwood.*
 Furneaux, Rev. W. M., *Repton Hall, Burton-on-Trent.*
 Fyffe, C. A., 64, *Lexham Gardens, South Kensington.*
 †Gardner, E. A., *British School, Athens.*
 *†Gardner, Prof. Percy, Litt.D. (V.P.), 12, *Canterbury Road, Oxford.*
 Gardner, Miss Alice, 1, *Granchester Meadows, Cambridge.*
 Gardner, Samuel, *Spring Hill, Upper Clapton, E.*
 Gardner, W. Amory, *Groton, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*
 Geddes, Sir W. D. (V.P.), *Principal of the University, Aberdeen.*
 Gibbs, F. W., Q.C., C.B., 24, *Mount Street, W.*
 Gibson, Mrs. Margaret D., *Castle-brae, Chesterton Road, Cambridge.*
 Giles, P., *Caius College, Cambridge.*
 Gilkes, A. H., *The College, Dulwich, S.E.*
 Gilliat, Rev. E., *Harrow, N.W.*
 Gilman, D. C., *President of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, U.S.A.*
 Glazebrook, Rev. M. G., *Clifton College, Bristol.*
 Goodhart, Prof. H. C., *The University, Edinburgh.*
 Goodwin, Prof. A., *University College, Gower Street, W.C.*
 Goodwin, Prof. W. W., D.C.L., *Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*
 †Gordon, R. G., *King's School, Canterbury.*
 Gore, Rev. C., *Pusey House, 61, St. Giles, Oxford.*
 Gow, James, Litt.D., *High School, Nottingham.*
 Gower, Lord Ronald, *Stafford House, St. James's, S.W.*
 Granger, F. S., *University College, Nottingham.*
 Gray, Rev. H. B., *Bradfield College, Berks.*
 Greenwell, Rev. Canon, F.R.S., *Durham.*
 Greenwood, J. G., LL.D., 34, *Furness Road, Eastbourne.*

- Gregory, Right Hon. Sir William H., K.C.M.G. (V.P.), 3, *St. George's Place, S.W.*
 Griffith, G., *Harrow, N.W.*
 Guillemaud, W. G., *Harrow, N.W.*
 Gwatkin, Rev. T., 3, *St. Paul's Road, Cambridge.*
 Hadley, W. S., *Pembroke College, Cambridge.*
 Hager, Herman, Ph.D., *Owens College, Manchester.*
 Hagenbotham, Miss, 3216, *Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, U.S.A.*
 Haig, James R., *Union Club, Trafalgar Square, S.W.*
 Haigh, A. E. (Council), 2, *Crick Road, Oxford.*
 Hall, Rev. F. H., *Oriel College, Oxford.*
 Hall, Miss S. E., 15, *Brookside, Cambridge.*
 Hall, Rev. F. J., *Wymondley House, Stevenage, Herts.*
 Hall-Dare, Francis, 10, *Bury Street, St. James's, S.W.*
 Hallam, G. H., *The Park, Harrow, N.W.*
 Hamerton, P. G., *Pré Charmoy, Autun, Saône-et-Loire, France.*
 †Hammond, B. E., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Harcastle, Wilfrid, *Beechenden, Hampstead, N.W.*
 Hardie, W. Ross, *Balliol College, Oxford.*
 Hardinge, Miss, 3, *Norfolk Crescent, Hyde Park, W.*
 Hardwicke, Philip, 2, *Hereford Gardens, W.*
 *Harrison, Charles, 29, *Lennor Gardens, S.W.*
 †Harrison, Miss J. E. (Council), 45 (D), *Colville Gardens, W.*
 Harrower, Prof. John, *The University, Aberdeen.*
 Hartsoune, B. F., 41, *Elm Park Gardens, Chelsea, S.W.*
 Haslam, S., *The School, Uppingham.*
 Haussoullier, B., 80, *Rue de Rennes, Paris.*
 †Haverfield, F. J. (Council), *Lanin, College, Shoreham.*
 Hawes, Miss E. P., 89, *Oxford Terrace, W.*
 †Hay, C. A., 127, *Harley Street, W.*
 †Haynes, Miss Lucy, 7, *Thornton Hill, Wimbledon.*
 Hazzopulo, S., *Bella Vista, Manchester.*
 Headlam, Rev. A. C., *All Souls' College, Oxford.*
 Heilam, W. G., *King's College, Cambridge.*
 Heard, Rev. W. A., *Fettes College, Edinburgh.*
 †Heathcote, W. E., 114, *Elbury Street, S.W.*
 Heberden, C. B., *Brasenose College, Oxford.*
 Hedgecock, Mrs. Harrison, 21, *Caversham Road, N.W.*
 Herschell, The Rt. Hon. Lord, 46, *Grosvenor Gardens, S.W.*
 Heydemann, Dr. Heinrich, *The University, Halle.*
 Hicks, John Power, *Cliffen Lodge, Blomfield Road, Maida Hill, W.*
 Hicks, Rev. E. L., *Halton Hall, Manchester.*
 Higgins, Alfred, 61, *Baker Street, W.*
 Hirschfeld, Prof. Gustave, Ph.D., *Mittel Tragheim 29, Königsberg, Germany.*
 Hobhouse, Walter, *Christ Church, Oxford.*
 Hodgson, F. C., *Education Department, Whitehall.*
 †Hodgson, J. Stewart, 1, *Audley Square, W.*
 Hogarth, David G. (Council), *Magdalen College, Oxford.*
 Holden, Rev. H. A., LL.D. (Council), 20, *Redcliffe Square, S.W.*
 Holiday, Henry, *Oak Tree House, Branch Hill, Hampstead, N.W.*
 Holland, Miss Emily, 20, *Kidgway Place, Wimbledon.*
 Holloway-Calthrop, H. C., *Stanhoe Hall, King's Lynn.*
 Hornby, Rev. J. J., D.D., *Provost of Eton College, Windsor.*
 Horn, Rev. Prof., D.D., *St. Peter's Terrace, Cambridge.*
 Howarth, Henry H., M.P., *Bentcliffe, Eccles, Manchester.*
 Hugel, Baron Friedrich von, 4, *Holford Road, Hampstead, N.W.*
 Hughes, Rev. W. Hawker, *Jesus College, Oxford.*

- Hutton, Miss C. A., 52, *Lower Sloane Street, S.W.*
 Inge, W. R., *Hertford College, Oxford.*
 Ingram, J. K., LL.D., *Trinity College, Dublin.*
 Inman, Rev. Henry Turner, *Woolston Rectory, Bletchley.*
 † Ionides, Alex. A., 1, *Holland Park, W.*
 Ionides, Luke A., 17, *Upper Phillimore Gardens, Kensington, W.*
 Jackson, Henry, Litt.D., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Jackson, Rev. Bloomfield, 20, *Mecklenburgh Square, W.C.*
 Jackson, Rev. W. W., *Rector of Exeter College, Oxford.*
 James, A. C., *Eton College, Windsor.*
 † James, The Rev. H. A., *Principal of The College, Cheltenham*
 James, Rev. S. R., *Eton College, Windsor.*
 Jeans, Rev. G. E., *Shorwell, Newport, Isle of Wight.*
 * Jebb, Prof. R. C., D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., M.P. (President), *Springfield, Newham, Cambridge.*
 Jenkin, Miss M. L., *o N. Lovejoy, Esq., Hillside, Hartley Road, Exmouth*
 Jenkinson, F. J. H., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Jenner, Charles, *Easter Duddingston Lodge, Portobello, Mid-Lothian.*
 Jenner, Louis Leopold C. A., *Trinity College, Oxford.*
 Jenner, Miss Lucy A., *The Palace House, Bishop's Waltham, Hants.*
 Jevons, F. B., *The Castle, Durham.*
 Jex-Blake, Miss, *Girton College, Cambridge.*
 Jones, H. Stuart, *Trinity College, Oxford.*
 Keep, R. P., Ph.D., *Free Academy, Norwich, Conn., U.S.A.*
 Keltie, J. S., 52, *Cromwell Avenue, Highgate, N.*
 Kemp-Welch, Mrs., *The Red House, Campden Hill, W.*
 Kennedy, Rev. John, *Grammar School, Aldenham, Elstree, Herts.*
 Kenyon, F. G., *British Museum, W.C.*
 Ker, Prof. W. P., 95, *Gower Street, W.C.*
 Kerr, Prof. Alexander, *o City Bank, Threadneedle Street, E.C.*
 Kieffer, Prof. John B., 232, *Lancaster Avenue, Lancaster Pa., U.S.A.*
 King, J. E., *Grammar School, Manchester.*
 King, Rev. J. R., *St. Peter's Vicarage, Oxford.*
 Lacaita, Sir James, K.C.M.G., *Florence, and Athenaeum Club, S.W.*
 Lambros, Spiridion, *Athens.*
 Lang, Andrew, LL.D., 1, *Marloes Rd., Kensington, W.*
 * Lang, R. Hamilton, G.M.G., *Ottoman Bank, 26, Throgmorton St., E.C.*
 Langhorne, Rev. J., *Rochester.*
 Lathbury, Miss Mary, 19, *Lingfield Road, Wimbledon, S.W.*
 Lathbury, Miss Maria Millington, 16, *Chenies Street Chambers, Bloomsbury, W.C.*
 Lautour, Miss D., 85, *Harcourt Terrace, Redcliffe Square, S.W.*
 Lawford, Frederick le Breton, 65, *Fitzjohns Avenue, Hampstead, N.W.*
 Layard, Sir Austen Henry, G.C.B., 1, *Queen Anne's Street, W.*
 Leaf, Mrs. C. J., 6, *Sussex Place, Regent's Park, N.W.*
 Leaf, Herbert, *The Green, Marlborough.*
 † Leaf, Walter, Litt. D., (Council), *Old Change, E.C.*
 Leathes, Stanley, *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Lecky, Mrs., 38, *Onslow Gardens, S.W.*
 Leeper, Alexander, *Warden of Trinity College, Melbourne.*
 Leichtenstein, Moritz, *Fairfield, Tooting, S.W.*
 Leigh, Rev. A. Austen, *Provost of King's College, Cambridge.*
 Leigh, W. Austen, *King's College, Cambridge.*
 Leighton, Sir Frederick, Bart., P.R.A., *Holland Park Road, W.*
 Lewis, Miss Agnes Ellen, *Newtonham College, Cambridge*
 Lewis, Harry, 51, *Holland Park, Kensington, W.*

- † Lewis, Mrs. S. S., *Castle-brac, Chesterton Road, Cambridge.*
 † Lewis, Prof. T. Hayter, 12, *Kensington Gardens Square, W.*
 *Leycester, Mrs. Rafe, 6, *Cheync Walk, S.W., or Toft, Cheshire.*
 †Liddell, Very Rev. H. G., D.D.
 Lindley, Miss Julia, 10, *Kidbrook Terrace, Shooter's Hill Rd., S.E.*
 Lindley, William, 10, *Kidbrook Terrace, Shooter's Hill Rd., S.E.*
 Lingen, The Right Hon. Lord, K.C.B., 13, *Wetherby Gardens, S.W.*
 Litchfield, R. B., 31, *Kensington Square, W.*
 Livingstone, Rev. R. G., *Pembroke College, Oxford.*
 Lloyd, W. Watkiss (Council), 3, *Kent Terrace, Regent's Park, N.W.*
 Lloyd, Miss A. M., *Caythorpe Hall, Grantham.*
 Lloyd-Roberts, H., 1, *Pump Court, Temple, E.C.*
 †Lock, Rev. W., *Kieble College, Oxford.*
 Lockyer, J. Norman, F.R.S., 16, *Pen-y-Wern Road, South Kensington, S.W.*
 Long, Prof. Albert Limerick, *Robert College, Constantinople.*
 Loring, Frederick R., *Markt 11, Weimar, Germany.*
 Loring, William, *St. Mary's Lodge, Ewshott, Farnham.*
 *Lubbock, The Right Hon. Sir John, Bart., M.P., *High Elms, Hayes, Kent.*
 Ludlow, T. W., *Cottage Lawn, Yonkers, New York.*
 Lushington, E. L., *Park House, Maidstone, Kent.*
 Luxmoore, H. E., *Eton College, Windsor.*
 Lyttelton, Hon. and Rev. E., *Haileybury College, Hertford.*
 *Macan, R. W. (Council), *University College, Oxford.*
 Macdonald, Miss Louisa, 62, *Gower Street, W.C.*
 MacEwen, Rev. Alex. Robertson, 4, *Woodside Place, Glasgow.*
 Macmillan, Alexander, 21, *Portland Place, W.*
 *Macmillan, George A. (Hon. Sec.), 29, *Bedford St., Covent Garden, W.C.*
 Macmillan, Mrs. George A., 19, *Earls' Terrace, Kensington, W.*
 Macmillan, M. C., 52, *Cadogan Place, S.W.*
 Macnaghten, The Rt. Hon. Lord, 3, *New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.*
 McPherson, Miss Florence, *Bank House, Maghull, Liverpool.*
 †Magrath, Rev. J. R., *Provost of Queen's College, Oxford.*
 *Mahaffy, Rev. Prof. J. P., D.D., *Trinity College, Dublin.*
 Mann, J. S., 6, *Blandford Square, N.W.*
 Manning, Percy, *New College, Oxford.*
 Manos, Grégoire, *Greek Legation, Vienna.*
 Marchant, E. C., *St. Peter's College, Cambridge.*
 †Marindin, G. E., *Hillbrow, East Liss, Hants.*
 †Marquand, Prof. Allan, *Princeton College, New Jersey.*
 Marshall, R., *Broomfield, Duppas Hill, Croydon.*
 Marshall, T., *Highfield, Chapel Allerton, Leeds.*
 Marshall, V. G., *Spanish Consul, Patras.*
 †Martin, John B. (Hon. Treasurer), 17, *Hyde Park Gate, S.W.*
 †Martyn, Edward, *Tillyra Castle, Ardrahan, County Galway.*
 Mason, H. C. F., *Haileybury College, Hertford.*
 Matheson, P. E., *New College, Oxford.*
 Mavrogordato, Pandeli, *South Sea House, Threadneedle St., E.C.*
 Merriam, Prof. A. C., *Columbia College, New York.*
 Merry, Rev. W. W., *Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford.*
 *Middleton, Prof. J. H. (Council), *King's College, Cambridge.*
 Miller, Sir Alex., Q.C., LL.D., 28, *Gordon Square, W.C.*
 Miller, Thomas, 8, *Geismar Chaussée, Göttingen, Germany.*
 Mills, Rev. W. H., *Grammar School, Louth.*
 Milne, J. G., *Albert Square, Boredon, Cheshire.*
 Milner, Alfred, *Ministry of Finance, Cairo, Egypt.*
 †Misto, John P., *Smyrna.*

Mitchell, C. W.

- †Mocatta, F. D., 9, *Connaught Place, Edgware Road, W.*
- *Monk, C. J., 5, *Buckingham Gate, S.W.*
- Monson, Hon. Sir E. J., K.C.M.G., C.B., H.B.M. Minister, *Athens.*
- *Monro, D. B. (V.P.), *Provost of Oriel College, Oxford.*
- Montague, H., 34, *Queen's Gardens, Hyde Park, W.*
- Morgenthau, J. C., Ph.D., 17, *Lexington Avenue, New York.*
- Morice, Rev. F. D., *The School, Rugby.*
- *Morley, The Rt. Hon. the Earl of, 31, *Princes Gardens, S.W.*
- Morris, J. E., *The Grammar School, Bedford.*
- †Morrison, Alfred, 16, *Carlton House Terrace, S. W.*
- †Morshead, E. D. A., *The College, Winchester.*
- Moss, Rev. H. W., *The School, Shrewsbury.*
- Moule, C. W., *Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.*
- Moulton, Rev. W. F., D.D., *The Leys, Cambridge.*
- Mount, Rev. C. B., 14, *Nerham Road, Oxford.*
- Mudie, Mrs., *Budleigh, Maresfield Gardens, Hampstead, N. W.*
- Munro, J. A. R., *Lincoln College, Oxford.*
- Murray, A. S. (V.P.), *British Museum, W.C.*
- Murray, Prof. G. G. A., *The University, Glasgow.*
- *†Myers, Ernest (Council), 31, *Inverness Terrace, W.*
- Myres, J. Linton, *New College, Oxford.*
- Neil, R. A., *Pembroke College, Cambridge.*
- Nettleship, R. L., *Balliol College, Oxford.*
- Newbold, Rev. W. T., *Grammar School, St. Bees.*
- Newman, W. L. (V.P.), *Pittville Lawn, Cheltenham.*
- *Newton, Sir Charles T., K.C.B. (V.P.), 2, *Montague Place, W.C.*
- Nicholson, Sir Charles, *The Grange, Totteridge, Herts.*
- Nicolson, Rev. W., 4, *New Isaac Street, St. Petersburg.*
- Northampton, The Most Noble the Marquess of, K.G., 44, *Lennox Gardens, S. W.*
- †Oxford, The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of, *Cuddesdon Palace, Oxford.*
- Page, T. E., *Charterhouse, Godalming.*
- Palmer, Ven. Archdeacon, *Christchurch, Oxford.*
- Park, Rev. Mungo T., *Grammar School, Oundle.*
- Parker, R. J., 27, *Brunswick Gardens, Kensington, W.*
- †Parry, O. H., *Magdalen College, Oxford.*
- Parry, Rev. R. St. J., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Paton, W. R. (Council), *Grand Holme, near Aberdeen.*
- Pears, Edwin, 2, *Rue de la Banque, Constantinople.*
- Peers, C. R., *Harrow Weald Vicarage, Stanmore, Middlesex.*
- Peile, John, Litt.D., *Master of Christ's College, Cambridge.*
- Pelham, Professor H. F. (Council), 20, *Bradmore Road, Oxford.*
- Pember, E. H., Q.C., *Vicar's Hill, near Lymington, Hants.*
- *Penrose, F. C. (V.P.), *Chapter House, St. Paul's, E.C.*
- *†Percival, F. W., 2, *Southwick Place, Hyde Park Square, W.*
- Percival, Rev. J., D.D., *School House, Rugby.*
- Perkins, Miss Emma Read, *Newnham College, Cambridge.*
- *Perry, Walter C., 5, *Manchester Square, W.*
- Peterborough, The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of, *Peterborough.*
- Phelps, Rev. Lancelot Ridley, *Oriel College, Oxford.*
- Pickard, John, *Bayerische Vereinsbank, Munich.*
- Pierides, D., *Larnaca, Cyprus.*
- Pollock, Sir Frederick, Bart., 48, *Great Cumberland Place, W.*
- Pond, C. A. M., *St. John's College, Cambridge.*
- Poole, Reginald Stuart (Council), *British Museum, W.C.*
- Port, Dr. H., 48, *Finsbury Square, E.C.*

- Porter, Miss Sarah, *Farmington, Connecticut, U.S.A.*
 † Postgate, Prof. J. P., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Powell, John U., *Borcham, Warminster.*
 Poynter, Edward J., R.A., 28, *Albert Gate, S.W.*
 Pretor, A., *St. Catherine's College, Cambridge.*
 Prickard, A. O., *New College, Oxford.*
 Prideaux, Miss Sarah, 37, *Norfolk Square, Hyde Park, W.*
 Proctor, R. G. C., *Corpus Christi College, Oxford.*
 Prothero, G. W., *King's College, Cambridge.*
 † Pryor, Francis R., *Home Park Mills, King's Langley.*
 Psychari, A., 25, *Boulevard des Capucines, Paris.*
 Radcliffe, W. W., *Fonthill, East Grinstead, Sussex.*
 † Raleigh, Miss Katherine A., 106, *Great Russell Street, W.C.*
 † Ralli, Pandeli, 17, *Belgrave Square, S.W.*
 † Ralli, Mrs. Stephen A., *Cleveland House, Thornton Road, Clapham Park, S.W.*
 † Ramsay, Prof. W. M. (Council), *The University, Aberdeen.*
 Rathbone, Mrs. F., *Woodgate, Sutton Coldfield, Warwickshire.*
 Raven, Miss, *Grove Cottage, Frognal, Hampstead, N.W.*
 Rawlins, F. H., *Eton College, Windsor.*
 Rawnsley, W. F., *Parkhill, Lyndhurst, Hants.*
 † Read, General Meredith, 128, *Rue La Boetie, Champs Elysees, Paris.*
 Reed, Percy R., *Rusholm, Grove Road, Surbiton.*
 Reeve, Henry, C.B., 62, *Rutland Gate, W.*
 Reid, J. S., Litt.D., *Caius College, Cambridge.*
 † Reinach, Salomon, 31, *Rue de Berlin, Paris.*
 Rendall, Rev. F., 82, *Philbeach Gardens, S.W.*
 † Rendall, Prof. G. H., *Principal of University College, Liverpool*
 Renieri, M. Mario, *Athens.*
 Richards, G. C., *Hertford College, Oxford.*
 Richardson, B. W., M.D., F.R.S., 25, *Manchester Square, W.*
 Richards, H., *Wadham College, Oxford.*
 Richmond, W. B., A.R.A., *Bevor Lodge, West End, Hammersmith, W.*
 Ridgeway, Prof. W., *Queen's College, Cork.*
 Ridley, Edward, 48, *Lennox Gardens, S.W.*
 Rivington, Septimus, *Kilmenny, Arterberry Road, Wimbledon, S.W.*
 Robb, Mrs. Gordon, 46, *Rutland Gate, S.W.*
 Robins, Miss Julia, 95, *Mount Vernon Street, Boston, U.S.A.*
 Robinson, Sir J. C., 107, *Harley Street, W.*
 Roberts, Rev. E. S., *Caius College, Cambridge.*
 Roberts, Professor W. Rhys, *University College of North Wales, Bangor*
 Robertson, Charles, *Redfern, Colinton Road, Edinburgh.*
 Robertson, Rev. Archibald, *Hatfield Hall, Durham.*
 Robinson, G. G., *Hill Side, Godalming.*
 Robinson, T. P. G., *Ashfield, Rothsay Place, Bedford.*
 Rogers, Major-General, 24, *Bassett Road, North Kensington, W.*
 Rome, W., *The Red Lodge, Putney, S.W.*
 † Rosebery, The Right Hon. the Earl of, 38, *Berkeley Square, W.*
 Rotton, J. F., 3, *Boltons, West Brompton, S.W.*
 Roundell, C. S., 16, *Curzon Street, W.*
 Rous, Lieut.-Colonel, *Worstead House, Norwich.*
 † Rouse, W. H. D., 45, *Montpelier Terrace, Cheltenham.*
 Rublee, George, 17, *Prospect Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis., U.S.A.*
 Runtz, Ernest, *St. Romans, 160, Lordship Road, N.*
 Rushbrooke, W. G., 13, *Cathcart Hill, Highgate, N.*
 Rutherford, Rev. W. Gibson, LL.D., 19, *Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.*
 Rylands, W. H., 11, *Hart Street, Bloomsbury, W.C.*

- †Ryle, Rev. Prof. H. E., *Meadowcroft, Cambridge*.
 Savile, The Right Hon. Lord, G.C.B. (Council), 38, *South Street, Park Lane, W.*
 *Samuelson, Sir B., Bart., M.P., 56, *Princes Gate, S. Kensington, S.W.*
 †Sandys, J. E., Litt.D. (Council), *St. John's College, Cambridge*.
 Saumarez, Sir James St. V., Bart., *Shrubland Park, Coddenham, Suffolk*.
 Savage-Armstrong, Prof. G. F., *Queen's College, Cork*.
 *†Sayce, Rev. Prof. A. H., LL.D. (V.P.), *Queen's College, Oxford*.
 †Scaramanga, A. P., 18, *Borkston Gardens, S. Kensington, S.W.*
 Schilizzi, John S., 93, *Westbourne Terrace, W.*
 Schultz, R. Weir, 9, *Hart Street, Bloomsbury, W.C.*
 Schuster, Dr. Ernest, 12, *Harrington Gardens, S.W.*
 Scot-Skirving, E., *The College, Cheltenham*.
 Scouloudi, Stephanos, *Athens, Greece*.
 Scull, Miss, *Smethport, McKean Co. Pennsylvania*.
 Seaman, Owen, *The Durham College of Science, Newcastle-on-Tyne*.
 Seebohm, Hugh, *The Hermitage, Hitchin*.
 Sellers, Miss Eugenie, 9, *Kensington Square Mansions, Young Street, W.*
 †Selwyn, Rev. E. C., *School House, Uppingham*.
 Selwyn, Rev. E. J., *Pluckley Rectory, Ashford, Kent*.
 †Sendall, Sir Walter J., K.C.M.G. *Colonial Office, S.W.*
 Seymour, Prof. Thomas D., *Yale College, Newhaven, U.S.A.*
 Shadwell, C. L., *Oriel College, Oxford*.
 Sharkey, J. A., *Christ's College, Cambridge*.
 Sharpe, Miss, *Harold House, Lansdowne Road, W.*
 Shewan, Alexander, 9, *Pilmour Links, St. Andrews, N.B.*
 Shuckburgh, E. S., *Fair View, The Avenue, Cambridge*.
 Sidgwick, Arthur, *Corpus Christi College, Oxford*.
 Sidgwick, Henry, *Trinity College, Cambridge*.
 Sikes, Edward Ernest, *St. John's College, Cambridge*.
 Simpson, H. B., 45, *Gloucester Terrace, Hyde Park, W.*
 Sinclair, Captain H. M., R.E., *Junior United Service Club, S.W.*
 *Skrine, H. D., *Claverton Manor, Bath*.
 *Skrine, Rev. J. H., *Trinity College, Glenalmond, Perthshire*.
 Smith, A. Hamilton (Council), *Riverbank, Putney, S.W.*
 Smith, B. Leigh, *Glattenham, Robertsbridge, Sussex*.
 Smith, Cecil (Council), *British Museum, W.C.*
 Smith, H. Babington (Council), *Riverbank, Putney, S.W.*
 Smith, Rev. J. Hunter, *King Edward's School, Birmingham*.
 †Smith, Prof. Galwin, *The Grange, Toronto, Canada*.
 Smith, Prof. T. Roger, 7, *Gordon Street, Gordon Square, W.C.*
 Smith, R. Elsey (Council), 7, *Gordon Street, Gordon Square, W.C.*
 Smith, R. J., 2, *Taufield Court, Temple, E.C.*
 Smith, William, LL.D. 94, *Westbourne Terrace, W.*
 Smith, W. G., *St. John's College, Oxford*.
 †Snow, T. C., *St. John's College, Oxford*.
 Soames, Miss Laura, 44, *Marine Parade, Brighton*.
 †Somerset, Arthur, *Castle Goring, Worthing*.
 Sonnenschein, Prof. E. A., *Greenfield Cottage, Harborne, Birmingham*.
 †Southwell, The Right Rev. the Bishop of, *Thurgarton Priory, Southwell*.
 Spooner, Rev. W. A., *New College, Oxford*.
 Spratt, A. W., *St. Catherine's College, Cambridge*.
 Spring-Rice, S. E., 9, *Wilton Street, Grosvenor Place, S.W.*
 Stanton, Charles H., 65, *Redcliffe Gardens, S.W.*
 Statham, H. Heathcote, 40, *Gower Street, W.C.*
 Steele, Dr., 33, *Via S. Gallo, Florence*.
 Stephen, J. K., 18, *Trinity Street, Cambridge*.

- Sterrett, J. R. Sitlington, *University of Texas, Austin, Texas.*
- †Stevenson, Miss E. C., 13, *Randolph Crescent, Edinburgh.*
- Stickney, Austin, *care of Messrs. J. S. Morgan and Co., 22, Old Broad Street, E.C.*
- *Stillman, W. J., 46, *Fontinella di Borghese, Rome.*
- Stillwell, James, 1, *Victoria Park, Dover.*
- Stogdon, J., *Harroze, N.W.*
- Stone, Rev. E. D., *Stonchouse, St. Peter's, Isle of Thanet.*
- Strachan-Davidson, J. L., *Balliol College, Oxford.*
- Strachan, Prof. John, *Oxens College, Manchester.*
- *†Stuart, Sir William, K.C.B., *Sutton Park Cottage, near Guildford.*
- *Sturgis, Julian R., 2, *Gloucester Place, Portman Square, W.*
- Sturgis, Russell, 304, *East 17th Street, New York.*
- Sullivan, John, *Reform Club, Pall Mall, S.W.*
- Surr, Watson, 57, *Old Broad Street, E.C.*
- Swanwick, Miss Anna, 23, *Cumberland Terrace, N.W.*
- †Tait, C. W. A., *Clifton College, Bristol.*
- Talbot, Rev. E. S., *The Vicarage, Leeds.*
- Tancock, Rev. C. C., *Rossall School, Fleetwood.*
- Tarbell, F. B., *Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass.*
- Tarring, C. J., *Assistant Judge of H.B.M. Supreme Consular Court, and Consul, Constantinople.*
- Theologos, Pantaleon, *Director of the Credit Bank, Athens.*
- Thomas, Rev. T. Ll., *Jesus College, Oxford.*
- *Thompson, E. M., D.C.L. (V.P.), *British Museum, W.C.*
- Thompson, E. S., *Christ's College, Cambridge.*
- Thompson, F. E., *Cotton House, The College, Marlborough.*
- Thorley, G. E., *Warden of Wadham College, Oxford.*
- Thursfield, J. R., *Fairhill, Great Berkhamstead.*
- Tilley, Arthur, *King's College, Cambridge.*
- Todhunter, John, *Orchardcroft, Bedford Park, W.*
- Tottenham, H. R., *St. John's College, Cambridge.*
- *†Tozer, Rev. H. F. (V.P.), 18, *Norham Gardens, Oxford.*
- †Truell, H. P., F.R.C.S., *Clonmannon, Ashford, Co. Wicklow.*
- Tubbs, H. A., 48, *Burlington Gardens, Acton, W.*
- Tuck, Rev. A. J., *Great Munden Rectory, Hertfordshire.*
- *†Tuckett, F. F., *Frenchay, near Bristol.*
- *Tuckerman, Hon. C. K., 12, *Iacopo da Diacceto, Florence.*
- Tudeer, Dr. Emil, *Helsingfors, Finland.*
- †Turnbull, Mrs. Peveril, *Sandy-Brook Hall, Ashbourne.*
- Tylor, E. B., D.C.L., F.R.S., *The Museum House, Oxford.*
- Tyrrell, Prof. R. Y. (V.P.), *Trinity College, Dublin*
- *Tyrwhitt, Rev. R. St. J., *Ketilby, Oxford.*
- Upcott, E. A., *Wellington College, Wokingham.*
- Upcott, L. E., *The College, Marlborough.*
- Urquhart, Miss Margaret, 5, *St. Colme Street, Edinburgh.*
- *Valetta, J. N., 16, *Durham Terrace, Westbourne Park, W.*
- †Valieri, Octavius, 2, *Kensington Park Gardens, W.*
- Vanderbyl, Mrs. Philip, 51, *Porchester Terrace, Bayswater, W.*
- Vardy, Rev. A. R., *King Edward's School, Birmingham.*
- Vaughan, The Very Rev. C. J., *Dean of Llandaff, The Temple, E.C.*
- †Vaughan, E. L., *Eton College, Windsor.*
- Venning, Miss Rosamond, 28, *Westmoreland Road, Westbourne Park, W.*
- Verrall, A. W., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
- Verrall, Mrs. A. W., *Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge.*
- Vince, C. A., *The School, Mill Hill, N.W.*
- *Vincent, Sir Edgar, K.C.M.G., *Imperial Ottoman Bank, Constantinople.*

- †Vlasto, T. A., *Bouevaine, Sefton Park, Liverpool.*
 †Wackernagel, Prof. Jacob, *Steinenberg, 5, Bâle.*
 †Wagner, Henry, 13, *Half Moon Street, W.*
 †Waldstein, Charles, Ph.D., Litt.D., *King's College, Cambridge.*
 Walker, Rev. F. A., D.D., *Dun Mallard, Shootup Hill, Brondesbury, N.W.*
 Walpole, Rev. A. S., 46, *Glenthorne Road, Hammersmith, W.*
 Walters, Henry Beauchamp, *British Museum, W.C.*
 Walters, W. C. Flamstead, *Christ's College, Christchurch, N.Z.*
 *Ward, A. W., Litt.D., *Principal of The Owens College, Manchester.*
 Ward, T. H., 25, *Grosvenor Place, S.W.*
 Warr, Prof. G. C., 16, *Earl's Terrace, Kensington, W.*
 †Warre, Rev. Edmond, D.D., *Eton College, Windsor.*
 Warren, Col. G. E. Falkland, C.M.G., 57, *Cornwall Road, Westbourne Park, W.*
 Warren, T. H. (Council), *President of Magdalen College, Oxford.*
 Waterhouse, Miss M. E., 3, *Edge Lane, Liverpool.*
 Waterhouse, Mrs. Edwin, 13, *Hyde Park Street, W.*
 Watson, A. G., *St. Cross, Winchester.*
 *Way, Rev. J. P., *King's School, Warwick.*
 Wayte, Rev. W. (Council), 6, *Onslow Square, S.W.*
 †Weber, F. P., 10, *Grosvenor Street, W.*
 Weber, Herman, M.D., 10, *Grosvenor Street, W.*
 †Welldon, Rev. J. E. C., *The School, Harrow, N.W.*
 Wells, J., *Wadham College, Oxford.*
 Wheeler, James R., Ph.D., *University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont.*
 †White, A. Cromwell, 3, *Harcourt Buildings, Temple.*
 White, J. F., LL.D., *Craigtay, Dundee.*
 White, Prof. J. W., *Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*
 Whitehead, R. R., *Palazzo Canevaro, Lung' Arno, 38, Florence.*
 Whitehouse, F. Cope, 8, *Cleveland Row, St. James', S.W.*
 Wickham, Rev. E. C., *Wellington College, Wokingham.*
 Wicksteed, Francis W. S., M.D., *Chester House, Weston-super-Mare.*
 Wilkins, George, *High School, Dublin.*
 Wilkins, Prof. A. S., LL.D., Litt.D., *The Owens College, Manchester.*
 Willert, P. F., *Exeter College, Oxford.*
 Williamson, J. W., *Limasol, Cyprus.*
 Willson, S. B. Wynn, *St. John's College, Cambridge.*
 Wilson, Donald, *Lincoln College, Oxford.*
 Wilson, H. F., *The Osiers, Chiswick Mall, S.W.*
 Winkworth, Miss, *Holly Lodge, Campden Hill, W.*
 *Winwood, Rev. H. H., 11, *Cavendish Crescent, Bath.*
 Wiseman, Rev. Henry John, *Clifton College, Bristol.*
 Wither, H. S., *Grammar School, Manchester.*
 Wood, Rev. W. S., *Ufford Rectory, Stamford.*
 †Woods, Rev. H. G., *President of Trinity College, Oxford.*
 Woodward, Rev. W. H., 13, *St. Domingo Grove, Everton, Liverpool.*
 Woolner, Thomas, R.A., 29, *Wclbeck Street, W.*
 †Wren, Walter, 2, *Powis Square, W.*
 Wright, Sir R. S., 1, *Paper Buildings, Temple, E.C.*
 †Wright, W. Aldis, *Vice-Master, Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Wroth, Warwick W., *British Museum, W.C.*
 †Wyndham, Rev. Francis M., *St. Charles' College, St. Charles Square, W.*
 †Wyse, W., *Trinity College, Cambridge.*
 Yates, Rev. S. A. Thompson, 43, *Phillimore Gardens, W.*
 Yorke, V. W., *King's College, Cambridge.*
 *Young, Rev. E. M., *The School, Sherborne.*
 †Yule, Miss Amy, 42a, *Chester Square, S.W.*

X X

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS TO THE JOURNAL OF HELLENIC
STUDIES.

- The University College, *Aberdeen*.
 The Amherst College Library, *Amherst, Mass.*
 The Andover Theological Seminary, *Andover, Mass., U.S.A.*
 The Peabody Institute, *Baltimore, U.S.A.*
 The Royal Museum Library, *Berlin*.
 The Royal Library, *Berlin*.
 The Mason Science College, *Birmingham*.
 The Bibliothèque Universitaire de Bordeaux, *Bordeaux*.
 The Public Library, *Boston, U.S.A.*
 The Library of Clifton College, *Clifton, Bristol*.
 The University Library, *Breslau*.
 The University Library, *California*.
 The Harvard College Library, *Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*
 The Library of Trinity College, *Cambridge*.
 The Library of St. John's College, *Cambridge*.
 The Fitzwilliam Archaeological Museum, *Cambridge*.
 The Girton College Library, *Cambridge*.
 The Library of Canterbury College, *Christchurch, N.Z.*
 The Public Library, *Cincinnati, U.S.A.*
 The Adelbert College, *Cleveland, Ohio*.
 The University of Colorado, *U.S.A.*
 The University Library of State of Missouri, *Columbia, Missouri, U.S.A.*
 The Royal Museum of Casts, *Dresden*.
 The King's Inns Library, *Dublin*.
 The National Library of Ireland, *Dublin*.
 The Royal Irish Academy, *Dublin*.
 The University College, *Dundee*.
 The Durham Cathedral Library, *Durham*.
 The University Library, *Erlangen*.
 The University Library, *Freiburg*.
 The University Library, *Glasgow*.
 The Ducal Library, *Gotha* (Dr. W. Pertsch).
 The University Library, *Halle, a.S. Germany*.
 The University Library, *Göttingen*.
 The Philological Society of the University of *Glasgow*.
 The Royal University Library, *Greifswald*.
 The Dartmouth College Library, *Hanover, U.S.A.*
 The University Library, *Heidelberg* (Dr. Zangmeister).
 The School Library, *Harrow, N.W.*
 The Cornell University Library, *Ithaca, N.Y.*
 The University of Kansas, *Lawrence, U.S.A.*
 The Royal and University Library, *Königsberg*.
 The Public Library, *Leeds*.
 The Philologische Leseverein, *Leipzig*.
 The Bibliothèque Universitaire, 3, *Rue des Fleurs Lille, Nord*.
 The Free Library, *Liverpool*.
 The University College, *Liverpool*.
 The Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, *British Museum, W.C.*
 The Library of University College, *London*.
 The Athenaeum Club, *Pall Mall, London, S.W.*

- The Burlington Fine Arts Club, *Savile Row, London, W.*
 The London Library, *St. James's Square, London, S.W.*
 The Reform Club, *Pall Mall, London, S.W.*
 The Royal Institution, *Albemarle Street, W.*
 The Foreign Architectural Book Society (Charles Fowler, Esq.), 27, *Queen Anne Street, W.*
 The Sion College Library, *Victoria Embankment, E.C.*
 The Chetham's Library, *Hunts Bank, Manchester.*
 The Royal University Library, *Marburg.*
 The Königliche Paulinische Bibliothek, *Munster, L.H.*
 The Royal Library, *Munich.*
 The Archaeological Seminary, (Dr. Brunn), *Munich.*
 The Newberry Library, *Newberry, U.S.A.*
 The Library of Yale College, *Newhaven.*
 The Astor Library, *New York.*
 The Columbia College, *New York.*
 The Hobart College, *Geneva, New York.*
 The Metropolitan Museum of Art, *New York.*
 The Library of the College of the City of New York, *New York.*
 The University Library, *Christiania, Norway.*
 The Library of Worcester College, *Oxford.*
 The Library of Christchurch, *Oxford.*
 The Library of Exeter College, *Oxford.*
 The Library of St. John's College, *Oxford.*
 The Library of New College, *Oxford.*
 The Library of Queen's College, *Oxford.*
 The Library of University College, *Oxford.*
 The Union Society, *Oxford.*
 The University Galleries, *Oxford.*
 The Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France, *Paris.*
 The Bibliothèque de l'Université de France, *Paris.*
 The Bibliothèque des Musées Nationaux, *Paris.*
 The Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, *Paris.*
 The École Normale Supérieure, *Paris.*
 The Bryn Mawr College Library, *Pennsylvania.*
 The Vassar Library, *Poughkeepsie, N.Y.*
 The University, *Prague* (Dr. Wilhelm Klein).
 The Archaeological Seminary, *Prague.*
 The Brown University, *Providence, Rhode Island, U.S.A.*
 The School Library, *Rossall.*
 The School Reading Room, *Rugby*, care of Mr. A. J. Lawrence.
 The St. Louis Mercantile Library, *St. Louis, U.S.A.*
 The Archaeological Museum, *The University, Strassburg* (per Prof. Michaelis).
 The Imperial University and National Library, *Strassburg.*
 The Public Library, *Melbourne, Victoria.*
 The Free Library, *Sydney, New South Wales.*
 The Sachs Collegiate Institute, *New York.*
 The University Library, *Toronto.*
 The General Assembly Library, *Wellington, N.Z.*
 The Library, *Westminster School, S.W.*
 The Boys' Library, *Eton College, Windsor.*
 The Public Library, *Winterthur.*
 The Free Library, *Worcester, Mass., U.S.A.*
 The Williams College Library, *Williamstown, Mass., U.S.*

LIST OF JOURNALS, &c., RECEIVED IN EXCHANGE FOR THE
JOURNAL OF HELLENIC STUDIES.

- The Transactions of the American School, *Athens*.
 The Parnassos Philological Journal, *Athens*.
 The Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique (published by the French School at *Athens*).
 The Publications of the Archaeological Society, *Athens*.
 The Mittheilungen of the German Imperial Institute at *Athens*.
 The Journal of the Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece, *Athens*.
 Bursian's Jahresbericht für classische Alterthumswissenschaft.
 The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
 The Jahrbuch of the German Imperial Archaeological Institute, Cornelintrasse No. 2
 II., *Berlin*.
 The Revue Archéologique, *Paris* (per M. Georges Perrot, 45, *rue d'Ulm*).
 The Numismatic Chronicle.
 The Publications of the Evangelical School, *Smyrna*.
 The Revue des Études Grecques, Publication Trimestrielle de l'Association pour
 l'Encouragement des Études Grecques en France, *Paris*.
 The Mittheilungen of the German Imperial Archaeological Institute, *Rome*.
 The Mélanges d'Histoire et d'Archéologie, published by the French School at *Rome*.
 The Journal of the American Archaeological Institute, *Boston, U.S.A.*
 The Publications of the Imperial Archaeological Commission, *St. Petersburg*.
 The Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society, and the Journal of Philology.
 The Proceedings of the Hellenic Philological Syllagos, *Constantinople*
 The American Journal of Archæology (Dr. A. L. Frothingham), 29, *Cathedral Street*,
Baltimore, U.S.A.
 The Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects, 9, *Conduit Street, W.*
 Mnemosyne (*care of Mr. E. J. Brill*), *Leiden, Holland*.
 The Revue Critique et Littéraire, 66, *Rue de Vaugirard, Paris*.
 The Revue de Philologie, 67, *Rue Richelieu, Paris*.
 The Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift.

JOURNALS, &c., SUBSCRIBED FOR.

- Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie.
 Philologus. Zeitschrift für die klassische Altertum.
 Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.
 Neue Philologische Rundschau.
 Hermes. Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie.

ADDENDA

OF

BOOKS, PERIODICALS, &c.

IN THE

LIBRARY OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF HELLENIC STUDIES.

JANUARY 1892.

- Angell (S.) and T. Evans. Sculptured Metopes in Sicily. Fol. London. 1826.
Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, translated by E. Poste. p. 8vo.
London. 1891.
Bernoulli (J. J.). Aphrodite: ein Baustein zur Griechischen Kunst Mythologie.
8vo. Leipzig. 1873.
Boetticher (Adolf). Die Akropolis von Athen. 8vo. Berlin. 1888.
——— Olympia: das Fest und Seine Stätte. Roy. 8vo. Berlin. 1886.
Brondsted (P. O.). Bronzes of Siris. An Archaeological Essay. Large fol.
London. 1836.
Brunn (H.). Bildwerke des Parthenons und des Theseion. 8vo. München. 1874.
——— Gesch. d. Griech. Künstler. 2 Vols. 8vo. Stuttgart. 1889.
——— Ueber die Sogenannte Leukothea. 4to. München. 1867.
Cavallari (S.). Zur Typographie von Syrakus mit eine Karte. 8vo. Göttingen.
1845.
Carnarvon (Earl of). Reminiscences of Athens and Morea with Map. 8vo.
London. 1869.
Cauer (F.). De Fabulis Graecis ad Romam conditam pertinentibus. Pamphlet. 8vo.
Berolini. 1884.
Cesnola (A. P. di). Salamina: History and Antiquities of Salamis. Roy. 8vo.
London. 1882.
Conze (A.). Reise auf den Inseln des Thrakischen Meeres. 4to. Hannover.
1860.
——— Reise auf der Insel Lesbos. 4to. Hannover. 1865.
Creuzer (F.). Symbolik und Mythologie der Alten Völker. Vols. I., II., III., IV.
8vo. Leipzig und Darmstadt. 1819.
Curtius (E.). De Portibus Athenarum. Pamphlet. 8vo. Halis. 1842.
——— Inscriptiones Atticae nuper repertae duodecim. Pamphlet. 8vo.
Berolini. 1843.

- Curtius (E.). *Anecdota Delphica*. 4to. Berolini. 1813.
 ——— Die Ionier. 8vo. Berlin. 1855.
 ——— Attische Studien. I. Pnyx und Stadtmauer. 4to. Göttingen. 1862.
 ——— 7 Karten v. Athen mit Text. 8vo. und fol. Gotta. 1868.
 ——— Gesch. u. Top. Kleinasiens. 4to. Berlin. 1872.
 Dyer (L.). *Studies of the Gods in Greece*. Cr. 8vo. London. 1891.
 — (T. H.). *Ancient Athens*. Roy. 8vo. London. 1873.
 Durand (E.). *Des Antiquités.....le Cabinet de*. 8vo. Paris. 1836.
 Elgin Marbles. Report of Select Committee of House of Commons. 4to London. 1816.
 Engelmann (R.). *De Ione*. Pamphlet. 8vo. Berolini. 1868.
 Fellows (C.). *Inscribed Monument at Xanthus*. 8vo. London. 1842.
 Foerster (R.). *Der Raub und die Rückkehr der Persephone*. 8vo. Stuttgart 1874.
 Fredericks (K.). *Apollon mit dem Lamm*. 4to. Berlin. 1861.
 Friederichs (Carl). *Die Gipsabgüsse Antike Bildwerke in historischer Folge erklärt*. cr. 8vo. Berlin. 1885.
 Froehner (W.). *Mélanges d'Épigraphie d'Archéologie*. 8vo. Paris. 1873.
 ——— Notice de la Sculpture Antique du Musée National du Louvre. 1^{er} Vol. p. 8vo. Paris. 1876.
 Furtwängler (Adolf). *Der Satyr aus Pergamon*. 4to. Berlin. 1880.
 Gell (Sir W.). *Narrative of a Journey in the Morea*. 8vo. London. 1823.
 Herondas, a first Recension by W. G. Rutherford. 8vo. London. 1891.
 Heuzey (L.). *Le Mont Olympe*. 1 Vol. 8vo. Paris. 1860.
 Heydemann (H.). *Griechische Vasenbilder*. Fol. Berlin. 1870.
 Hirschfeld (G.). *Tituli Statuariorum etc.* 8vo. Berolini. 1871.
 ——— (J.). *Athena und Marsyas*. 4to. Berlin. 1880.
 Homolle (Th.). *Les Fouilles de Delos*. 4to. Paris. 1879.
 Hopf (C.). *De Historiae Ducatus Atheniensis Fontibus*. Pamphlet. 8vo. Bonnæ. 1852.
Inscriptiones Regni Bosphorani. Ed. B. Latyschev. 4to. Petropoli. 1890.
 Jahn (Oto). *Ephesischen Amazonen Statuen*. 8vo. Pamphlet.
 ——— *Archäologische Beiträge*. 8vo. Berlin. 1847.
 Kekulé (R.). *Balustrade des Tempels der Athena*. 8vo. Leipzig. 1869.
 ——— Die Gruppe des Künstlers Menelaos. 4to. Leipzig. 1870.
 ——— De Fabula Meleagrea. Pamphlet. 8vo. Berolini. n.d.
 ——— *Antiken Bildwerke im Theseion zu Athen*. 8vo. Leipzig. 1869.
 Koutourga (M. de). *Récherches Critiques sur l'Histoire de la Grèce*. 4to. 1869.
 Krüger (G.). *Charon und Thanatos*. Pamphlet. 4to. Berlin. 1866.
 Kuhnert (E.). *De Cura Statuarum apud Graecos*. Pamphlet. 8vo. Berolini 1883.
 Lange (K.). *Das Motiv des Aufgestutzten Fusses*. 8vo. Leipzig. 1879.
 Leake (Lieut.-Col. W. M.). *Topography of Athens*. 8vo. London. 1821.
 ——— *Peloponnesiaca. Supplement to Travels in Morea*. 8vo. London. 1846.
 Le Bas (R.). *Voyage Archéologique*, pub. par S. Reinach. Roy. 8vo. Paris. 1888.

- Meier (H. M. G.) u. G. F. Schumann. *Der Attische Proceß*, 2 Vols. Post 8vo
Berlin, 1883—7.
- Mnemosyne. N. S. Vol. XIX. Pt. I.
- Müller (K. O.). *Kunstarchäologische Werke*. Vols. I.—V. Post 8vo
Berlin, 1873.
- *Handbuch der Archäologie der Kunst*. 8vo. 1878.
- Müller (L.). *F. Ritschl—eine Wissensch. Biog.* Pamphlet. 8vo. Berlin, 1878
- Mure (W.). *Tour in Greece*. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. Edinb. 1812.
- Murray (A. S.). *History of Greek Sculpture*. Revised ed. 2 Vols. 8vo.
London, 1890.
- Newton (C. T.). *Travels and Discoveries in the Levant*. 2 Vols. 8vo. London.
1865.
- Paton (W. R.) and E. L. Hicks. *The Inscriptions of Cos, with a Map*. Roy. 8vo.
Oxford, 1891.
- Perrot (G.) and C. Chipiez. *Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité*. Tome I—2. Nos
1—112. 8vo. Paris, 1883.
- Peterson (E.). *Die Kunst des Phidias*. 8vo. Berlin, 1873.
- Pittakys (K. S.). *L'Ancienne Athènes*. 8vo. Athens, 1835.
- Praktika*. 1889. 8vo. Athens, 1890.
- Puchstein (Otto). *Das Ionische Capitell*. 4to. Berlin, 1887. (47th Proj. zum
Winckelmannsfeste).
- Ramsay (Prof. W. M.). *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*. 8vo. London, 1890.
- Rangabé (A. R.). *Littérature Néo-Hellenique*. 2 Vols. Pamphlet. 8vo.
Berlin, 1877.
- Reinach (Salomon). *Esquisses Archéologiques*. Roy. 8vo. Paris, 1888.
- Ritter (Dr. J.). *De Compositione Titulorum Christianorum Sepul. in Corp. Insc.*
Græc. Pamphlet. 4to. Berolini, 1877.
- Robert (Carl). *Bild und Lied*. 8vo. Berlin, 1881. (Part v. of *Philolog.*
Untersuchungen.)
- Roehl (H.). *Schedæ Epigraphicæ*. Pamphlet. 4to. Berolini, 1876.
- Sabouloff. *La Collection Sabouloff—Monuments de l'Art Grec, publiés par*
Adolphe Furtwaengler. 2 Vols. fol. Berlin, 1883.
- Stark (C. B.). *Archäologie der Kunst*. 8vo. Leipzig, 1880.
- Schoenborn. *Der Zug Alexander's durch Lyeien*. Pamphlet. 4to. Posen, 1848.
- Schreiber (T.). *Die Athena Parthenos des Phidias*. Roy. 8vo. Leipzig, 1883.
- Schuchardt (Dr. C.). *Schliemann's Excavations*, translated by E. Sellers.
Introduction by W. Leaf. 8vo. London, 1891.
- Schultz (Otto). *Die Ortsgottheiten, etc.* 8vo. Berlin, 1889.
- Smith (W.), W. Wayte, and G. E. Marindin. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman*
Antiquities. 3rd ed. Vol. I. 8vo. London, 1890.
- Wedgwood (J.). *Description of the Portland Vase*. 4to. London, 1790.
- Williams (H. W.). *Select Views in Greece, with Classical Illustrations*. Vol. I.
Roy. 8vo. London, 1829.
- Winckelmannsfeste 27^{en}, 23^{en}, 29^{en}, 47^{en}, 48^{en}, Programmes: viz.
21. Friedrichs (K.). *Apollon mit dem Lamm*.
23. ————— *Der Doryphoros des Polyklet*.

29. Curtius (E.). Die Knieenden Figuren der altgriechischen Kunst.
47. Puchstein (O.). Das Ionische Capitell.
48. Hermann (P.). Das Gräberfeld von Marion auf Cypern. 4to. Berlin.
1861, 1863, 1869, 1867, 1888.
- Winkelmann (M.). Histoire de l'Art d'Antiquité traduite de l'Allemand par M.
Huber. 3 Vols. 4to. Leipzig. 1781.
- Wolfius (F. A.). Prolegomena ad Homerum. 2nd ed. p. 8vo. Berolini. 1885.

The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies

SESSION OF 1890-91.

THE FIRST GENERAL MEETING was held on October 20th, 1890, Professor Jebb, President, in the chair.

Mr. A. H. Smith read a paper on the sculptured drum from Ephesus which is now in the British Museum, and which is commonly interpreted as relating to the story of Alcestis. He tried to show that the subject of the relief is the making and sending forth of Pandora as told by Hesiod. According to this theory Pandora stands, ready to depart, between Eros and Hermes (who is seen conferring on her the gift of speech). Hephæstus stands on the left of the scene. On the right a goddess, perhaps Peitho, holds out a necklace, and beyond her is a seated figure of Zeus. The writer adduced an unpublished vase in the British Museum to support his argument (*J. H. S.*, vol. xi. p. 278). Miss Harrison said the suggested interpretation was interesting, but doubted if it could be accepted as final. Mr. Watkiss Lloyd and Mr. Cecil Smith also took part in the discussion.

Mr. Theodore Bent gave an account of his recent researches in Cilicia, and regretted that, owing to the bulk of epigraphical material, the paper on the district of Olba would not be ready for the next issue of the *Hellenic Journal*. He described first of all the coast towns of the district, Augusta Sebaste, Corycos, and a third town Korasios, which he has identified as the pseudo-Coraccium of Stephanus Byzantius. He then proceeded to describe his identification of the Corycian cave by means of inscriptions and the long list of Cilician names, 160 in all, which he found on the outer wall of the temple of Zeus over the cave. He then spoke of the adjoining

cave, only alluded to by Pomponius Mela as Typhonia, and a third cave, on the lip of which was a fortress with an inscription on it stating that it was built under the priest-king Teucer, in honour of the Olbian Jove, under the superintendence of one Pleistarchos of Olba. Mr. Bent gave an account of several cave-temples of Hermes which he found in this district, and associated them with the worship of the deity of the Cilician pirates, and Corycos, which Oppian calls the city of Hermes. Mr. Bent then described his exploration of the gorge of the Lamas river, with its numerous rock fortresses, each with its own particular symbol, and evidently the eyries of the Cilician pirates. Then an account was given of the discovery of the capital of Olba itself, at a spot called Oura, up in the mountains, and its identification from an inscription on the aqueduct. Mr. Bent described the great temple of the Olbian Jove, where the priest-kings mentioned by Strabo held their court, and other ruins still standing in this city in the Taurus. In conclusion, Mr. Bent described his identification of the ruins of Boudroum on the Cilician plain with Hieropolis-Castabala, the last place where Alexander the Great halted before the battle of Issos (*J. H. S.*, vol. xi. p. 231).

Mr. Hogarth, who had recently been partly over the same ground with Professor Ramsay, bore testimony to the thoroughness of Mr. Bent's researches, though differing from some of his conclusions. The whole district, and especially the city of Olba, were, in his opinion, of unique interest.

Sir Charles Newton also commented on the paper.

THE SECOND GENERAL MEETING was held on February 23rd, 1891, Professor P. Gardner, V.P., in the chair.

The Chairman read a paper on the life and work of Dr. Schliemann, dwelling much on the sterling character of the man, his indomitable perseverance and triumph over difficulties, and arguing that, whatever might be thought of his theories, Schliemann's discoveries had revealed for the first time a new world. Without the labours of his spade we should have had no true idea of the prehistoric age of Greece. (The paper was published in *Macmillan's Magazine*, April, 1891.)

Mr. R. W. Schultz read a paper on the north doorway of the Erechtheum. This doorway had generally been accepted as contemporary with the rest of the building. Recent investigations, however, had led Mr. Schultz to think that the doorway as it now stands is not part of the original structure at all; that the thin inner jamb linings are of Christian times, the main jambs of a period not far removed from the date of the building, but not contemporary, and the lintel brackets and cornice still later insertions. He argued that the original lintel was probably of a plainer nature, and of a depth of two courses of the wall-face; and he alluded to a curious notched stone to the west of the present lintel as likely to have been one end of this still in position. He thought the original

door-jambs were thinner marble casings, in two pieces in height, and probably identical with the four *θύραι* of the inscription, which fit the opening exactly. The original lintel having been damaged, it was cut out, leaving, however, the ends in, and the present heavy door jambs were inserted to support a second lintel, which was again broken, and gave place in its turn to the one which now exists. At the time of the insertion of the last lintel brackets were added to each side and a cornice inserted above, and in order to do this holes, which cannot be easily seen from below, were cut in the wall stones over to take the beams necessary for their temporary support. The difference in the nature of the carving of the same ornaments on the jambs and lintel implies clearly that the latter must be of later time, and the workmanship of the cornice shows none of the characteristics of contemporary Erechtheum work, but rather that of a later period. Last of all, the thin inner linings were put in in order to conceal as much as possible the damage done at some later time to the present main lintel (*J. H. S.*, vol. xii. p. 1).

THE THIRD GENERAL MEETING was held on April 13th, 1891, Professor Jebb, President, in the chair.

The following papers were read: "On some Small Reliefs in Bone preserved at Dimitzana and found in the Neighbourhood of Sparta," by Mr. G. C. Richards. On them are represented two warriors and a lady, possibly the Dioscuri and Helen. They are executed in a very rude and very early style, not unlike that shown on early Spartan *stelæ* (*J. H. S.*, vol. xii. p. 41).

"On Cecrops," by Miss J. Harrison. The writer pointed out that Erechtheus had long been regarded as the double of Poseidon, and tried to show that Cecrops must in similar fashion be regarded as representing a very early local form of Zeus, the serpent tail showing connection with the soil. The evidence brought forward was derived in part from the recently discovered archaic Athenian pediment, in which Cecrops is represented as present at the contest of Heracles and Triton, holding in his hand an eagle, the attribute of Zeus, an attribute which is replaced on later monuments by the olive bough. The writer also pointed out that the three daughters of Cecrops were closely paralleled by the Charites, the three daughters of Zeus and Eurynome, who in her Arcadian temple was represented as of semi-human form. Probably a Cecropian Zeus occupied the Acropolis hill of Athens before he was dispossessed by Athena and sank into the position of a demi-god (*J. H. S.*, vol. xii. p. 350).

A paper by Mr. Nicolaides, of Athens. In it the writer attacked certain views as to Athenian topography originated by Dr. Dörpfeld and adopted by Miss Harrison in her recent work, especially as to the position of the spring Callirhoe, the identification of the Eridanus, and the ancient notices of the Erechtheum.

Miss Harrison briefly replied.

THE ANNUAL MEETING was held on June 22nd, 1891, Professor Jebb, President, in the chair.

The following report was read by the Hon. Secretary on behalf of the Council :—

There is not much that calls for special comment in the progress of the Society during the past year. Two Parts of the *Journal* have been published as usual, and there has been no lack of good articles in various departments of Hellenic study. The General Meetings have been as well attended as in previous years, and interesting communications have been made and discussed.

The British School at Athens has again had a successful season, its chief work having been the continuation of the important excavations at Megalopolis, which have excited so much interest from the light they have thrown upon the vexed question of the Greek theatre. It is hoped that the final results of the excavation may be published in the next volume of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. While the School is doing work of this kind, besides giving its students the opportunity of pursuing various branches of Greek archæology in Athens itself, the Council feel confident of receiving the approval of members for the renewal last autumn for a term of three years of the grant of £100 which has been made annually to the School since it was opened.

The only other enterprise in which the Society has been called upon to assist during the past year, is that exploration of Asia Minor, which has so long and so honourably been associated with the name of Professor W. M. Ramsay. Towards the expenses of a new expedition, upon which Professor Ramsay started early in May, and was followed a month later by Mr. D. G. Hogarth and Mr. J. A. R. Munro, the Council have thought it right to contribute the sum of £50. Unhappily Professor Ramsay has been struck down by fever and obliged to return to England. But his companions will carry out as far as possible the programme of research, mainly in the region of the Anti-taurus.

In the course of last autumn it was suggested by a member of Council that the Society should undertake the collection and management of a series of lantern slides in Greek archæology which might be lent to those lecturing on the subject. The proposal was at once agreed to, and a Committee, consisting of Mr. Walter Leaf, Mr. Cecil Smith, Mr. H. Babington Smith, Mr. R. Elsey Smith and Miss Harrison was appointed to carry out the scheme in detail. It has naturally taken time to communicate with the owners of slides and to collect and classify those contributed, but the matter is now so far advanced that the collection will become almost immediately available for purposes of demonstration. Grateful acknowledgment is due to the following members who have generously contributed slides to the collection, viz. Miss Jane Harrison, Mr. Louis Dyer, Mr. Elsey Smith, Mr. J. S. Furley, Professor Gardner, Mr. Talfourd

Ely, and Mr. Walter Leaf. The collection already amounts to some 400 slides, of which nearly 300 have been contributed by Miss Harrison and Mr. Dyer. The conditions under which the slides are to be lent have already been stated in a circular which was issued to members with the last number of the *Journal*. The collection is under the control of the Library Committee and it is to the Sub-Librarian at 22 Albemarle Street that all applications for slides should be addressed.

The Council have to announce with much regret that owing to a large increase in the rent of the premises at 22 Albemarle Street, consequent on the falling-in of the old lease, the Royal Asiatic Society has found itself under the necessity of raising the sum payable by the Hellenic Society for the exclusive use of one small room, occupied by the Library, and the right of meeting in the two larger rooms on the first floor, from £30 to £50 per annum. The Council did not agree to this increase of liability without full consideration, but they came to the conclusion that the prospect of finding as good accommodation in as convenient a situation for a lower rent was very doubtful, while there were obvious objections to moving from the quarters which the Society had always occupied.

The Treasurer's accounts show ordinary receipts during the year of £898, as compared with £746 during the financial year 1889-90. The subscriptions show an increase of £53, and the receipts from Libraries and for back volumes an increase of £23. The receipts from Life Subscriptions show an increase of £32, and in respect of arrears the increase has been £13. The receipts from dividends are slightly increased, owing to a further sum of £46 having been invested since the last balance-sheet was made up. Life Subscriptions to the amount of £32 have come in since the date of this investment. The advance made some years ago towards the cost of reproducing the Laurentian MS. of Sophocles was entirely repaid during the past year, leaving a balance of £37 to the credit of the Society in respect of this undertaking.

In the matter of ordinary expenditure, stationery, postage, and sundry printing show an increase of £8. The cost of the *Journal* exhibits an increase of £43, being £440 as compared with £397 during the preceding financial year. The difference is partly accounted for by the fact that, in the year 1889-90, the *Journal* was published in one Volume instead of in two Parts, which diminishes the cost of carriage. The total ordinary expenditure has therefore been £598 as against £536. The financial year, which began with a balance at the bankers of £150 19s. *od.*, closes with an effective balance in favour of the Society of £254 12s. *od.* This balance remains after making allowance for the grant of £100 to the School at Athens and of £50 to the Asia Minor Exploration Fund. There were on 31st May arrears amounting to £165, of which £20 have been since received. The analysis of the annual receipts and expenditure for the last ten years is appended.

Since the last Annual Meeting 49 Members have been elected. On

the other hand by death or resignation the Society has lost 28, showing a net increase of 21. The present total of Members (including 20 Honorary Members), is 693. To the Subscribers 8 Libraries have been added, bringing the total to 101.

On the whole, the Council feel that the Society may fairly congratulate itself upon the progress made since the last Report. Good work has been done, as many new members have been elected as in any recent year, and in spite of losses by death and resignation, the total of members shows a substantial increase. Nor is the financial position of the Society at all less satisfactory. It only remains to express the hope that the number of members will continue to grow, and that all who are interested in the welfare of the Society will use their influence to that end.

In moving the adoption of the report, Professor Jebb delivered the following address :—

It is the custom that, at this Annual Meeting, reference should be made to some of the more noteworthy incidents which have marked the course of Hellenic studies during the year. The account can make no attempt to be systematic or exhaustive ; its aim is rather to bring a few salient points into a single view.

The first place in such a survey is due to the exploration of ancient sites, whether the work has been actually performed within the past twelve months, or has first been published during that period. To begin with Greece Proper ;—in Attica, the eastern and north-eastern regions are those which have furnished the principal results. At Rhamnus, on the north-east coast, the Athenian Society of Archaeology has been clearing the precincts of the two temples. The larger of these was sacred to Nemesis ; it has now been shown that the smaller was a temple of Themis, as had long ago been conjectured, from the fact that a marble thronos, dedicated to her, had been found there (Leake, *Demi* 2, 10). At Marathon the famous mound has been further explored, and the traditional view, that it was the tomb of the Athenians who fell in the battle, has been placed beyond doubt by the discovery of vases belonging to that period. At Velanideza, on the east coast, and at some other places, prehistoric tumuli have been found. In Athens the principal work has consisted in excavating the greater part of a large Roman stoa, on the north side of the Acropolis, near the Tower of the Winds.

In Euboea, members of the American School have been working at Eretria. An interesting theatre has been laid bare ; among other discoveries are a stoa, and several tombs. One of these is the tomb which Dr. Waldstein conjectures to have been the family grave of Aristotle. The belief rests partly on an inscription, which, as restored, contains the name 'Ἀριστοτέλου, partly on some objects found in the tomb, viz., a pen and two styli of silver, and a statuette, which seems to be that of a

philosopher. Chalcis, where Aristotle spent his last days, is only a few miles distant.

In the Peloponnesus the centre of interest has been Megalopolis, where members of the British School have continued their work. The excavation of the theatre has now been completed, laying bare the orchestra, the seats (so far as preserved), the parodi, the scene-buildings, and the part of the stoa immediately adjoining. It now appears that the restoration suggested in the *Journ. Hellen. Stud.* of 1890 must be modified in some respects. The raised stage which that restoration supposed was a stage to which a flight of six steps led up from the orchestra. The three lower rows of these steps exist; the three upper rows were conjecturally restored. But it has now been shown that the three lower rows, whether added in the fourth century or later, did not form part of the original plan. On the other hand, two of the three upper rows, which had been conjecturally restored, have been found. Thus the fact remains that the level of the orchestra was lower than the top of the steps. This justifies the English excavators in still holding that they are right on the main point, viz., that there was a raised stage in the fourth century, though it was not so high as they first supposed. Their view is not affected by another detail in which their former restoration has to be corrected. The wall which they believed to have been the back-wall of the stage,—containing the thresholds of three doors,—is found to be of later construction. With regard to Dr. Dörpfeld's view, that the topmost step once supported columns, the explorers hold that the evidence is not strong; but they wish to await technical advice. Even if columns had stood there, however, the existence of a raised stage would not be disproved; the difference of levels would remain unchanged. The explorers hope to have the assistance of an architect next autumn; with his aid, they propose to weigh the whole evidence, and to embody it in their final publication. Meanwhile they reasonably ask that judgment may be suspended. It remains to observe that the work at Megalopolis has not been confined to the theatre. On the opposite, or northern, side of the river Helisson, the Stoa Philippeios, which bounded the Agora on the north, has been identified, and its plan has been determined. Another building, which almost certainly enclosed the temenos of Zeus Soter, has been completely cleared. The explorers may well be congratulated on the progress which they have made in their difficult and important task. It has been carried on from the first by Mr. Ernest Gardner and Mr. W. Loring, who were subsequently joined by Mr. Richards and Mr. Milne.

We may now turn to Asia Minor. The *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. xi. No. 2, (Oct. 1890,) contains Mr. J. Theodore Bent's interesting account of 'Recent Discoveries in Eastern Cilicia.' Among the sites identified by him is that of Hieropolis-Castabala, with its temple of Artemis Perasia. He also copied a large number of inscriptions. Mention is due likewise to the expedition of Professor W. M. Ramsay, with Messrs. Hogarth and Headlam, into Pisidia, Isauria, and Cappadocia,—

supplementing Mr. Bent's work in the Kalykadnos valley, and carrying on new and important researches in the region of the Anti-taurus. Here we may note with satisfaction that the work of the Austrian Expedition in Asia Minor is prospering. The first fruits of it have appeared in vol. i. of Lanckoronski's splendid publication, 'Les Villes de la Pamphylie et de la Pisidie.' It has been announced that Prince John of Liechtenstein has offered to the Academy at Vienna an annual sum of 5000 florins for five years, in aid of these researches.

At Salamis in Cyprus the English Committee have continued their excavations, under the direction of Mr. Munro and Mr. Tubbs. Among the objects found has been a series of terra-cotta statuettes, with drapery painted in imitation of elaborate embroidery. We may recall the fact that two natives of Cyprus, Acēsas and his son Helicon, are recorded as having excelled in the art of embroidery (Athenaeus, p. 48 B).

With regard to Egypt, mention is due to Mr. Flinders Petrie's discoveries at Kahun and elsewhere, showing that the earliest geometrical pottery, of the Mycenae type, occurs in Egypt as early as 1400 B.C., and is followed, about 1100 B.C., by the beginning of natural designs. Mr. Petrie's summary of these discoveries appeared in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* for October last. He is disposed to think that a European civilisation, little indebted to Asiatic lands, may have arisen before 2000 B.C. Such are some of the more notable points in the record of exploration during the year.

With respect to the literature of Hellenic Studies for the same period, it must suffice to indicate a few characteristic features. First we may notice some great works directly illustrative of archaeology. Such are, the first volume of the Berlin Corpus of Sarcophagi Reliefs: the first instalment of the Sidon Sarcophagi, by Hamdi Pasha and Th. Reinach: the Grave-Reliefs published by the Vienna Academy: Furtwängler's Olympian Bronzes (vol. iv. of the official publication). In a kindred province, we have had Professor W. M. Ramsay's 'Historical Geography of Asia Minor,' published by the Royal Geographical Society: also Humann and Puchstein's 'Reisen in Klein-Asien und Nord Syrien.' In other departments of literature, no event has excited so much interest as the publication by the British Museum, from the newly-found papyrus, of the Treatise on the Constitution of Athens. Those who have seen either the papyrus itself or the Autotype Facsimile can best appreciate the difficulty of the task imposed on Mr. F. G. Kenyon, who transcribed and edited the text. Great credit is due to him for his work, as has been cordially recognised on the Continent, and by competent opinion at home. As might have been foreseen, Aristotle's authorship has already been questioned; but thus much, at least, is certain; this is the treatise which passed in antiquity as his; and it was written either in his life-time or soon after his death. It will be long, perhaps, before all the questions which the book raises will have been sifted; but at any rate it is a valuable addition

to our knowledge of an important period. Another volume, shortly to be published by the Museum, will contain other texts from new papyri,—including seven poems by the iambograph Herodas ; part of a hitherto unknown oration, perhaps by Hypercides ; a grammatical treatise ascribed to Tryphon ; and collations of papyrus MSS. of Isocrates' *De Pace*, parts of the *Iliad*, etc. When we remember that fragments of Plato and Euripides are to be added to the newly-found texts, it is apparent that the range of literature over which new light may be looked for from new papyri is a wide one ; and it does not seem too sanguine to hope that Egypt may have more such gifts in store for us. At any rate, the experience of the year agreeably reminds us that this generation can still feel a ripple of excitement at the discovery of a new Greek classic,—such a ripple as a similar occurrence might have sent through the Italy of Petrarch.

But these are not the only literary discoveries which have been published during the last twelvemonth. Mr. W. Loring has edited, in our *Journal* the new portion of the Edict of Diocletian, in a Greek version, found on a stone at Megalopolis. The date of the edict was 301 A.D. : its object was to fix the *maximum* prices for various commodities. The prices are reckoned in the copper denarius, worth about $\frac{1}{5}$ of our penny. The chief interest of the new fragment consists in the proof that gold—of which copper was then, as it is now, merely the token—was then extremely dear : *i.e.*, the value of gold, relatively to commodities, was extremely high. Another point of interest consists in the local epithets given to commodities,—showing whence they came. A kind of woollen cloak is called a *βίρος Βρεταννικός*. It has been suggested that the epithet may mean 'Bruttian' ; but if it means 'British,' then this is probably the earliest reference to an exportation of wool or woollen stuffs from Britain.

Another remarkable discovery, published this year, is as yet, perhaps, less widely known. During a visit of the Emperor Hadrian to Athens—probably at his first visit, in 123—126 A.D.—an Athenian philosopher named Aristides addressed to him an eloquent Apology for Christianity. The fact is noticed by Eusebius and Jerome ; but the Apology itself was not extant. In 1889 Mr. J. Rendel Harris, formerly Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge, and now Professor of Biblical Languages at Haverford College, Pennsylvania, found a Syriac translation of this Apology at the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. He transcribed it, and prepared to edit it, with notes and an English version. The proof-sheets of the English version were read by Mr. J. Armitage Robinson, Fellow of Christ's College. Shortly afterwards, Mr. Robinson happened to be reading, in the Latin version, that once-famous romance, the 'Life of Barlaam and Josaphat.' Josaphat, the son of an Eastern king who persecutes the Christians, is converted by the monk Barlaam ; the king his father thereupon lays a plot for re-converting him : an old man named Nachor, a good actor, shall personate the monk Barlaam,—shall make a pretended defence of Christianity,—and shall be publicly confuted by the Pagan advocates.

But, when the hour of trial arrives, the utterance of Nachor, like that of Balaam, is miraculously overruled; he delivers an Apology for Christianity which convinces his pagan hearers. This story was originally written in Greek, probably in the fifth or sixth century, A.D.; the Greek text was first printed by Boissonade, in his *Anecdota*, vol. iv. (Paris, 1832). In reading the Latin version of this story, Mr. Robinson suddenly came on something which reminded him of Aristides, whom he had just been reading in the English version from the Syriac. He turned to the Greek text of the Life. A comparison with the Syriac version of Aristides then showed that the speech which the author of Barlaam and Josaphat had put into the mouth of Nachor must be, at least in substance, the original Greek text of the long-lost Apology. We see at once how the author of the romance came to think of his Eastern king; he suited his plot to the Apology which he wished to frame in it, and which was addressed to an emperor. It may be mentioned that the recovered Apology, which cannot be later than 133 A.D., contains a distinct allusion to a written Gospel. Adolf Harnack justly calls this 'a brilliant discovery.' It may serve to remind us that the Christian—we might add, the Jewish—regions of Greek literature still offer a comparatively fresh field to research. That fact is exemplified by another recent Greek book. The so-called Psalms of Solomon are believed to have been written by a Pharisee of Jerusalem about 70—40 B.C.; they were translated into Greek at some time before 40 A.D. A very complete edition of this Greek version has lately been published by Prof. Ryle and Mr. M. R. James. Students of Roman history will find in one of those Psalms the cry with which Judaea greeted the tidings of Pompey's death.

Among other works, bearing on Hellenic studies, which the year has produced, there is one which stands conspicuous, alike by the great scale on which it is planned, and by the author's reputation. Mr. Freeman has given us the first two volumes of his Sicily, carrying the story down to the beginning of Athenian intervention (433 B.C.). The narrative will be continued, he hopes, to a point not earlier than the death of the great Sicilian Emperor, Frederick II., in 1250 A.D. No previous writer has essayed to tell the story of Europe's central island, 'the meeting-place of the nations,' as a whole; nor has any, probably, been so well qualified to relate alike the strife of Phoenicians with Greeks, and the strife of Saracens with Normans. This year has seen also the completion of a work which may fitly receive mention here, both on account of the labours which have conspired to produce it, and on account of the wide interest which it possesses for various classes of students,—I mean the third edition of Dr. William Smith's 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities,' edited in the first volume by Mr. Wayte, and in the second by Mr. Marindin. Forty-three years have elapsed since the last preceding edition,—the second,—appeared in 1848. No one who remembers how fruitful this long interval has been in fresh materials of every kind can wonder that the new

issue is almost a new book. Scarcely twenty articles remain as they stood ; two-thirds have been largely altered, and one-third has been entirely re-written. One more work must be named, which has just come forth at Leyden,—an addition, almost unique in its kind, to that instructive and stimulating branch of scholarly literature, the biographical memorials of illustrious scholars. It is a collection of letters written by Cobet from Italy between November, 1840, and July, 1845,—his own account of the studies which were making him what he became. The great Dutchman relates with gusto a remark which a German friend of his overheard from a person of another nationality : ‘Those dreadful Germans actually work for the love of working !’

The obituary record of this year includes the names of several members whose loss we deplore. Among these are Dean Church, whom this Society had the honour to number among its Vice-Presidents ; Archbishop Thomson ; Canon Liddon ; Sir Robert Fowler, who had been a member of the Society from its foundation ; Samuel Savage Lewis, F.S.A., Secretary of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society, a scholar of rare accomplishments, of untiring industry, and of most genial disposition ; Anthony Rich, the well-known author of an excellent Dictionary of Antiquities ; and Dr. Henry Schliemann, whose brilliant and indefatigable services had won the lasting gratitude of archaeologists throughout the world.

In concluding this retrospect, necessarily a very slight and incomplete one, I may remind you that this year is memorable for something more than the additions which it has made to the record of achievement. It has also determined the destiny of a great future enterprise,—one to which scholars in all countries have long looked forward with exceptional interest. No response of the Pythian Apollo, in days when the fate of some national undertaking might hang upon his utterance, could easily have been awaited with more suspense than that which the archaeological world had lately felt, while waiting to see what nation was to have the honour of exploring Delphi. We in this country should have felt a natural satisfaction if, as seemed at one time possible, that task had been committed to the competent hands of our kinsmen. But this was not to be ; and they, like ourselves, will, we may be sure, cordially recognise the worthiness of their successful competitors, the French. It may be said, indeed, that there is a certain historical fitness in the award of this privilege to the nation, which was the first to establish a regular School of Archaeology on Hellenic soil ; and to whose archaeologists, we may add, Delphi is not new ground. We offer to the French our congratulations and our best wishes in the full confidence that their execution of this momentous task will be marked by all those admirable qualities which we are accustomed to expect in their best work, and which recently distinguished, in so eminent a degree, their exploration of Delos.

The report was adopted.

Mr. E. Gardner, Director of the British School at Athens, spoke of the great debt that the School owed to the Hellenic Society, and made some reference to the excavations at Megalopolis, asking his hearers to suspend judgment until the results were finally published. Professor Jebb was re-elected President ; Mr. Colvin, Mr. E. A. Freeman, Professor Gardner, Sir W. Gregory, the Provost of Oriel, Mr. A. S. Murray, Mr. W. L. Newman, Sir C. Newton, Mr. F. C. Penrose, Professor Sayce, Mr. E. Maunde Thompson, Rev. H. F. Tozer, and Professor Tyrrell, were elected or re-elected Vice-Presidents ; Mr. L. Dyer, Mr. R. Ellis, Dr. Freshfield, Miss J. Harrison, Mr. W. R. Paton, and the President of Magdalen College, Oxford, were elected to vacancies on the Council.

THE NORTH DOORWAY OF THE ERECHTHEUM.

[PLATES I.—III.]

WHILE engaged recently on a careful analysis of the architectural detail of the Erechtheum, I chanced to observe certain peculiarities in connection with the north doorway which, as far as I am aware, have not been previously commented on, and which may be of sufficient importance to warrant my bringing them forward.

The date of the north doorway of the Erechtheum has been generally accepted as contemporary with that of the rest of the building, at least I have not found any published evidence which calls it in question: this of course excludes the thin inner linings which are supposed to have been added by the Christians when they turned the temple into a church. My investigations have led me to the conclusion that none of the original doorway is *in situ*, that the main jambs are of a period not far removed from the time of the building but not contemporary, and that the lintel, brackets and cornice are still later insertions. I shall endeavour in the following paper to state my reasons for these assumptions, and it may help us to follow them more clearly if we commence by observing the various parts which go to make up the composition of the doorway as it now stands.

First, then, we have the thin inner linings to the jambs and lintel, and inserted over these a second thin lintel piece; next come the main heavy door jambs, with their enriched mouldings and carved rosettes, extending each in one piece the whole height of the opening; resting entirely on these is the main lintel of a similar ornamental nature, with an additional moulding on the top worked on the same stone; and over this again is the cymatium or cornice, with a richly carved band of ornament running along its face. Abutting on the lintel at each end and apparently supporting the ends of this cornice were two carved brackets or consoles, one of which has disappeared. The combined depth of the lintel and cornice is equal to that of two courses of the adjacent walling. Above the doorway are two courses of plain walling, and over that again the band of richly carved so-called honeysuckle ornament and enriched moulding forming a continuation of the capitals of the antae along the wall face as a cornice, and coming immediately below the heavy-beamed and coffered ceiling of the portico.

We may now proceed to examine the evidence in favour of an earlier door, and in this connection I would draw attention to the fact that all the

lintels of the smaller existing doors are equal in height to two clear courses of the walling, while the present lintel of this the largest door in the building has two stones in the same depth.

Adjoining this present lintel on the west is a curious stone (Fig. 1) equal in depth to two of the wall courses and rebated on its upper part to allow the topmost of these two courses to lap over on to it. This may have been one end of the *original lintel* of the door. On the end abutting on the present lintel it has a carefully cut joint, but the finer arris from one to two inches wide, which we see on the return face of the other wall stones against the jambs, is wanting in this instance, which seems to be a further indication that the stone was cut short here and this end piece allowed to remain when the second lintel was inserted. This




FIG. 1.

appears to be the most reasonable explanation of the existence of this curious stone, which, as far as I can see, was not wanted for any other purpose. The rebating of the upper end can be very simply explained as a necessity in order to carry up the regular alternation of the jointing of the wall surface (see Plate II.). In the other doors, where the thick lintels have straight joints at the ends, this was not requisite, the door in the west wall having a string course immediately over it; and in the case of the small door in the north porch the lintel extends right across from the anta to the side of the large door.

At the other side of the lintel this rebated stone is not apparent, although it must have existed there also, but the deep part has been cut off to allow of the insertion of the console, which on the west side was only dowed on to the face of this stone. Another thing which tends to confirm me in my opinion about this lintel is that the courses of the north anta of the west wall of the building which comes immediately behind this rebated stone are, both above and below the lintel, formed, in conjunction with corresponding courses of the north wall, out of one stone, while the part of the anta behind this one stone is a separate piece two courses high, thus obviously showing that our rebated stone was part of a big lintel, other-




FIG. 2.

wise there seems to be no reason why it should not have been wider and formed part of the anta like the others.

We will now turn for a moment to the references from the inscription,¹ and consider the position of the *θύραι* which were lying unfixed at the time the inventory was made. These were four in number, and were each of a length of eight and a quarter and of a breadth of two and a half *Attic feet*.

¹ See Appendix to this paper: 'Note on the Evidence from the Inscription' by E. A. Gardner.

The Attic foot was slightly less than an English foot, the latter being $\cdot 305$ of a metre and the former $\cdot 296$ or $11\frac{5}{8}$ inches.¹ The length of each of these stones is therefore practically eight *English feet*.

These *θύραι* have been usually appropriated for the east door, but if we compare the relative heights of the two porticoes we shall see that there is a difference of nearly three and a half feet between them.² The east door must therefore have been proportionately smaller. I think we are thus safe in saying that they did not belong to the east door, which would have been about thirteen feet high. As to the smaller doors, although the height of eight feet would suit the one in the north portico, when we examine it we see that there is nothing to lead us to suppose that it ever had any linings at all. In the case of the one in the west wall, although it has been widened and the cill lowered in later times, it was always a subsidiary door and not generally seen, and originally it was too low to suit these; and it is unlikely that it was ever more than a plain opening like the other. Therefore, as they evidently did not belong to these smaller doors, let us see how they would do for the original north door. The height of the present door, leaving out of account the later Christian linings, measures sixteen English feet from the top of cill to the underside of lintel, so that two of these slabs placed one above the other on each side would exactly fit in. Having been mere linings to be fixed after, and not constructional parts, there was no particular reason why they should have been in one piece in height, and two stones would have been lighter and more easily raised and fixed. These *θύραι* might therefore very well have formed part of our first door. But we have not yet examined how their breadth, which is given at $2\frac{1}{2}$ Attic feet, would fit in. $2\frac{1}{2}$ Attic feet is equal to about 29 inches. The thickness of the wall adjoining the door measures 2 feet $2\frac{5}{8}$ inches, or practically $26\frac{1}{2}$ inches. Let us assume that they were fixed flush with the inside face of the wall as the present ones are, and we get a projection of $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches beyond the face of the wall outside. This agrees with the projection of the moulding on a slab forming part of another door lining of a similar nature which is lying near the Erechtheum (Fig. 3), and which I shall refer to further on as likely to have been part of the east door.

I have already shown that the lintel of the first door was possibly a block of the height of two courses, built in as a structural part of the wall and rebated at ends for adjacent wall stones. We have also seen that it is probable that the jamb linings were thinner than those now in position, and were made of two stones in their height and fixed afterwards. We now come

¹ See W. Dörpfeld in the *Mittheil. d. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. zu Athen*, vol. vii. 1882, pp. 277 sqq. Since this article was set up in type another paper by Dr. Dörpfeld on this subject has appeared in the same periodical (1890, pp. 167 and 234) in which he withdraws his previous assertion that the Attic foot was $\cdot 296$ and tries to prove that it was $\cdot 328$, but his previous arguments seem at least as convincing in them-

selves as his later ones and have the advantage of being confirmed by the positive testimony of the Oxford Metrological relief. See article by Michaelis in this journal (*J.H.S.* Vol. IV. p. 335).

² See Penrose, *Athenian Architecture*. Plate 42 gives the height of the pillars of north portico as 25.030 feet. Plate 41 gives those of east portico as 21.612 feet.

to consider what was the decorative nature of this earlier door. I am inclined to say it was much simpler in every way.

The east door is generally thought to have been the main entrance to the temple or at least the entrance to its most sacred part, the shrine of Athena Polias. As I have already remarked, it must have been smaller in proportion to our north door, as the east portico is of less height. The decoration of the east portico is simpler than that of the north; the continuous ornamental band round the necks of the capitals and antae and along the wall is less elaborate, the bases to the columns are much plainer, having a series of simple parallel channels running round the upper and lower torus, as against the richer guilloche on those of the north pillars. I do not however think that this extra richness was given to the north portico as an approach to the




FIG. 3.


temple, but rather follow the view that it was done to emphasize it for its own sake as a special shrine outside the temple, the shrine in which stood the important altar of the *θυηχός*, and under which lay the sacred trident marks of Poseidon who shared with Athena the honour of the worship here. And these reasons may also account to a great extent for the squarer form of its plan, a form essentially more suitable to its peculiar purpose than the usual flat porch like that at the east end, which is more traditional of an approach to a shrine within.

Thus while the east portico was simpler, its doorway may have been more elaborate; and while the north portico was more decorative for its own sake, its doorway may have been plainer as being an entrance to a less sacred part of the temple. I am thus inclined to accept the view that the fragments of the somewhat elaborate doorway which I have alluded to as lying near the

Erechtheum (Fig. 3) belong to the destroyed eastern door and not, as one would have liked to suppose, to our original north door.¹

This we ought to feel more strongly when we know that no fragments of a third door have been brought to light. It is very likely that the Greeks removed completely the old pieces of the earlier door when they altered it; whereas the Christians, when they pulled down the east door to build their apse, probably used portions of it elsewhere, or at any rate as building material, and so these fragments have been preserved to us. These pieces give us valuable data for reconstructing our first door. I have already shown how they tally with the projection which our jambs would have had from the wall face. They are also comparatively thin ($6\frac{3}{4}$ inches), and a piece of the lintel remains showing the starting of a cornice moulding over that of the jambs. I should therefore say that our jambs were very similar but less ornamental, and that the lintel had the same mouldings running round it, with perhaps a simple cornice over.

Another important point to notice on these fragments is that the return in of this lining is only dressed back about two inches,² and beyond that it is rough. This leads me to think that the original doors had an additional lining of bronze inside the stone frame.



A PLAN OF THE DOOR

1" = 1' 0" 2" = 2' 0" 3" = 3' 0" ENGLISH FEET

FIG. 4.

We now come to consider the door as it stands (Plates I. and II.).³ We will begin with the thin inner linings (a, a, Fig. 4), which can be put down

¹ Inwood (p. 15) mentions that two pieces of this door lining were found built into a late wall which used to stand immediately to the west of the Erechtheum. One piece is now in the British Museum.

² Letter A on figure 3.

³ See also figures 4 and 5 and details of the

same figures, plate III. figures 3 and 4. I should like here to draw attention to the fact that many of the details of this building which are given in Inwood's work (*The Erechtheion at Athens*, H. W. Inwood, F.S.A., London, 1831) and reproduced in the German edition (*Das Erechtheion zu Athen*, A. F. von Quast, Berlin,

as quite late, even later than the conversion of the temple into a church. They were undoubtedly added after the present lintel met with the accident




FIG. 5.

which cracked it across, and which broke away a considerable part of its lower surface; but when this happened we have no means of saying. It seems reasonable to suppose that these stones were put in to conceal this damage to the lintel rather than mainly to support it, for as a matter of fact they do very little of the latter (see Fig. 5). The top of the thin lintel is about five inches below the underside of the broken one; the second lintel piece is merely a facing to hide the damaged part of the main lintel, and it goes back only about six or eight inches at the foot, and is quite thin at the top and splayed away. The five-inch space between the two lintels shows clearly from the inside, and there are only a few small pieces of stone roughly put in as a prop at one end, which may have been done quite recently. Of the existing lintels the only one that is not cracked is the lowest of all. The feet of these thin inner linings are sunk in chases cut into the threshold about one inch deep.¹ The surface of these stones is very roughly dressed; you can see distinctly the chisel lines running the long way of the stones in parallel rows about half an inch wide, and with a slight ridge between each indicating that the workman held his chisel in a slightly bevelled manner while working; but although the manner of finishing the dressing is roughly done, the stones are fairly worked with a good level surface and bed. The oggee moulding tells us nothing as to the date.

Let us next examine the main part of the door. Possibly the first lintel was seriously damaged through an earthquake or from some other cause, and necessitated the insertion of

1840) are not actual outlines of the ornament and mouldings as they exist but are rather diagrams enlarged from the originals for use in the building of the church of St. Pancras,

London, the detail of which is an exact copy of that of the Erechtheum but to a considerably larger scale.

¹ See elevation of door, plate II.

another. It would have been difficult, almost impossible, to have cut out the whole of the lintel and replaced it as it stood, so they altered the arrangement and design of the door by putting in new heavy jambs (b, b, Fig. 4) in one stone strong enough to support the new lintel, and so did away with the necessity of again resting and tying it into the wall on each side; and to facilitate the raising of this lintel they made it in two pieces in height instead of in one stone, which would have been a great weight to lift and fix in position at one time.

The return face of the jambs and lintel into the door is smoothly dressed right through from back to front, which seems to show that when the thicker jambs were inserted the bronze inner lining which, as I have already observed, may have existed in the earlier door was done away with.

I feel convinced that the lintel now in position is not contemporary with the jambs. I take this view after a careful examination of the architectural detail. The ornament of the Erechtheum, although varying to some extent in elaboration or in minor points of detail, has still the same general characteristics throughout. The ornament on these door-jambs differs considerably from that on the rest of the building. The detail, however, is quite equal to that on any other part of the building for delicacy and excellence of execution, and here as elsewhere it shows a general refinement throughout. While on the lintel-stone, which repeats the same detail, it varies considerably in different places, alters its style and proportion, and is generally more clumsily done; in fact, it looks like the work of a man who had tried to copy what he found but lacked the spirit and appreciation to reproduce it with all the refinement of the original. This is to be noticed all through—on the running leaf ornament, which is much coarser, on the rosettes, and even in the plain mouldings. I do not mean to uphold a mechanical repetition; but what we find on this lintel is not legitimate variety, but rather general carelessness of execution. The bed moulding of the cornice, which may not have been copied from the older lintel but have been an addition or alteration when this one was made, is quite late in section when contrasted with other similar ones in the building; and the same remarks about the carving apply to the egg and tongue enrichment, where we find the foot of the eggs at one end are quite pointed and altogether different to those at the other. To return to the rosettes, those *on the jambs* (see Plate II.) have the centres bored out for the purpose of inserting a wooden plug on which was fixed a bronze disc. These circular holes taper slightly to allow of the wood being firmly wedged in.¹ Inwood mentions a bronze disc which was found amongst the rubbish formerly filling up this doorway, and the diameter of which would just fit the centre of these rosettes. It had been fixed to the wood by a bronze nail or pin going through a hole in the centre, and by four sharp points on the back. It was divided into twelve leaves like the rosettes.² On the lintel the centres are

¹ Remnants of these plugs still remain in some of the holes.

² Inwood thinks that this bronze disc belonged

to the door itself, which may have been bronze covered, but it is more likely that it formed the centre of one of the rosettes on the marble jamb,

solid of a convex form, and must have been merely painted or gilded over; and the general form and section of the leaves are much less refined.

I should therefore think that the first alteration to the door and the insertion of these second jambs took place very shortly after the completion of the building, say within fifty years, while the tradition of the carving and the accuracy of the workmanship and finish was still to be found; and that the lintel of that time having again become damaged was replaced by the present copy at a later date, perhaps contemporary with the columns and entablature of the temple of Jupiter Olympius, the enriched bed-mould of which corresponds fairly well with that on this stone.¹

Let us now look at the brackets or consoles on each side of the lintel. These, I consider, may have been put in when the lintel was renewed for the second time. The inscription tells us that the east door had consoles, but no mention is made of any on the north door, and it is probable that none existed here before this time.

I am inclined to believe that the second lintel had no bed-moulding and cymatium, or, if it had, that they were of a different character from the present ones. An interesting point to notice is that the width of the jambs and of the part of the lintel corresponding with them is exactly that of one course of the walling. There seems to have been some particular reason for making them of this width, and I think it may be explained in the following way. The second lintel was probably made in two pieces of equal thickness, the lower piece being the continuation of the mouldings of the sides; having narrowed the door by inserting heavier jambs, they probably thought that this thickness would be strong enough for the lintel. Over this they inserted a plain block or blocks, and either cut on them, having made them project slightly from the face of the wall, or fixed on in front afterwards, some ornamental scroll and leaf work in the form of an acroterion. There exists in the Central Museum at Athens the top of a stele of the beginning of the fourth century B.C. which was found in the Ceramicus, and which is ornamented in the way I mean. I have roughed out, as a mere suggestion, a sketch showing this treatment used thus over the lintel of the door (Fig. 6). This form of finishing was not an uncommon one amongst the Greeks. It often occurs on stelae, but I cannot recollect an example of its actual use on a doorway. Some of the restorations, however, of this identical north door of the Erechtheum show such a finish on the top of the present cornice,² although there are no marks or other indications to lead us to assume that anything had ever been placed there.

This construction allowed the lintel and stones over to be fixed without

as it was found in the rubbish filling up the doorway close to the underside of the bracket and far above the ground. It is quite probable that it had become detached from its wooden plug during the building up of the doorway and had remained where it fell. See Inwood, *Erechtheum*, page 15 and plate 20.

¹ I take Penrose's view (*Athenian Architecture*, p. 76) that this work at the temple of Jupiter Olympius is more likely to belong to the age of Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 175-164, than to the time of Augustus or Hadrian.

² See Inwood, *Erechtheum*, plate 3.

damaging the wall by cutting holes for supports. The broken lintel having been gradually cut out and let down, the wall over was supported by beams of wood running through under the stones above and resting on strong uprights both outside and inside of the wall. The jambs having been set up, the lintel was hoisted into position on the top, and the side bearers being removed, the smaller stones were inserted, taking part of the bearing of the wall on to them, and through them to the new lintel and jambs, and finally the central stone was put in.

When the lintel was again damaged and the third one substituted, as we have assumed during the second century B.C. or even later, the brackets were probably added for the first time.




FIG. 6.

This last lintel has a square joint at each end, rather rougher than we find in the earlier work; and against the east end abuts the bracket which still remains in position, and which is tailed right through the wall, the thicker part of the end of the first lintel having been cut off to make way for it. The bracket on the west side which no longer exists was only dowelled in to the face of the end of the old lintel, and the holes for the two dowels by which it was fixed are still visible (Fig. 1, see also Plate I).

The reason why this one did not also go through the wall may possibly be explained thus. The north anta of the west wall, as we have already noticed, being immediately behind this, any further cutting of the old lintel would have disturbed it and have been rather a difficult business. This may

not be very apparent as the anta now stands, as it is rebated back half its thickness (Fig. 7), and the stone could easily be got at from behind in




FIG. 7.

order to cut it; but I do not think that this rebating is earlier than the period when the west wall was altered to its later form, probably in Roman times; when these brackets were added to the doorway the anta stretched across the full thickness of the west wall. There are many points about these brackets which would lead one to suppose they were better workmanship than that of this later time, but on closer examination we see that the work is less careful in many parts. The whole design, how-

ever, is very good, as is also the general detail: the palmetto on face, for instance, being quite of the same character as those on the carved wall-bands. The inner side next the end of the lintel is only worked as far back as it can be seen, and the rest of it is plain. I cannot think that the men who built the Erechtheum would have, originally, placed brackets in this position, which seems to me both constructively and decoratively false, set back as they are, in reality supporting nothing and half hid behind the projecting architrave so that only a small part of the inner face can be seen, and their full value lost to any one standing in front of the door. The most we can say for them is that they may have been copied from the original consoles of the east door, which were probably of similar detail, but I trust more suitably placed in relation to the other parts of the composition. They also seem to me to be too small in proportion to the great architrave and cornice of this door as it now stands. It is curious to note how the tail part of the bracket, which is built into the wall, goes up the full height of the two courses, and is notched to receive the cymatium over it at the top, and how the leaf under, which is now broken away, has hung over the face of the stone below.

There remains yet the cymatium of the cornice for us to examine.¹ This stone, which is considerably thinner than the main lintel, goes right through the wall and is finished flush with inside face. It is longer where it projects beyond the wall, and is rebated to pass in front over the brackets (fig. 8).



FIG. 8.

I can hardly think that it is of the same date as the lintel and the brackets under it; the nature of its ornament varies so much from that on the others, in fact it is of quite a different type (plate III. fig. 2). While that on the lintel and brackets is a fairly faithful copy, although, as I have already said, wanting in the delicacy of the original, this on the cymatium is much rougher in composition and outline; and although evidently intended to be on the lines of that on the wall-band over (plate III. fig. 1)

¹ See section fig. 5 and detail on plate III. fig. 4.

—one can see at a glance the general similarity—it has been executed by a man who was not a mere copyist, but who worked in his own way, getting his main idea from something else but putting his own impression into it, and doing it in a way perhaps rougher and coarser but more straightforward. You notice this in every line. Compare the sections of the two ornaments and you see that he did not trouble about how it went on the original, but put it in as he thought it ought to go. You see it in the scrolls, in the curves, and in the leaves; they are bad in many ways, much worse than the Roman copyist would have done them, but they still show life and vigour. You will observe the difference between the deadness of a good Roman copy and the rough life which still existed in this later Greek work, if you compare it with the copies of Erechtheum detail on the remains of the temple of Rome and Augustus lying to the east of the Parthenon.

We must however, I think, believe that this cymatium is contemporary with the lintel and brackets, and that whereas in the latter the workman had to stick closely to a copy, in the former he had a freer rein. The line of the curve of the moulding shows us that it may very well be of the second or third century B.C., and there are various points in the carving which remind one of characteristics in the later Ionic temples in Asia Minor.

Before closing there are still one or two points of miscellaneous evidence to be considered.

On the underside of the stones immediately over the cornice are a series of somewhat roughly cut square holes about five inches wide by four inches deep, and going right through the wall from front to back.¹ These were almost certainly cut there, at the time the last lintel and cornice were inserted, for the beams necessary to temporarily support the wall. On account of the nature of the cornice stone these beams could not have been put in under the stones, which, as I have already explained, might have been done on a former occasion. There are six of these holes in all, three under each stone. On the top bed of the cornice there are also some flat sinkings corresponding to them in position and made no doubt during the progress of the fixing in order to get the stone more easily into its place. In the exact centre, from the ends, of the top bed of this cornice an oblong lewis hole is sunk in. It is $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide, $4\frac{1}{4}$ inches long, 4 inches deep, and about 1 inch longer at the foot, bevelling down at the ends but of the same width across. It is six inches back from the front of the cornice. If we were able to examine the top bed of the cornice under the wall we should probably find another hole further back. These were used for raising the stone which was balanced and drawn up much as we should do the same thing to-day.

The upright joints on either end of the main lintel were left from $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches to $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide in order to get the stone more easily into position.

¹ See d, d, fig. 5, and also plate II. The projection of the cornice of the doorway prevents these holes from being seen by any one standing in the portico below.

In these joints have been inserted iron wedges, probably two in the thickness of the wall, which could have been let down from above before the cornice was fixed. There still remains at the east end a wedge run in with lead, but I should not like to say it is an old one although it may be. In front these wide joints would be concealed to a great extent by the projection of the brackets, and at the back they may have been hid perhaps by a lining. On the back of the console block on the side next the lintel is a sunk hole which also extends across into the top of the lintel itself: a cramp has evidently been fixed here, let in from above before the cornice stone was put in position. I should think there were two of these in the width of the lintel stone.

The back of the main lintel is now very much broken away, but there are still traces of a series of bevelled holes running along its inner face about four inches above the underside. Two of these remain and they measure 4 inches long, $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide, and 4 inches deep, and they are bevelled wider as they go in. Assuming that they continued along at equal intervals there would have been eight in the length of the lintel. I should think they were used for the purpose of fixing a bronze hood or cornice over the doorway to receive the top of the door which was hung clear of the wall inside, as we know from the sockets for the hinges, which remain in the threshold. I have however found nothing to indicate the existence of a complete bronze lining round the door on the inner face of the wall.

On the top of each door jamb is a pin or dowel hole which has no corresponding sinking in the lintel over. These holes may have been used for dowelling on the second lintel and were probably discarded when the last one was inserted.

On the upper part of the jamb at the east side of the door and on the inside angle is a long rebate extending down four feet eight inches from the lintel (see plan of this, Fig. 9). It measures seven inches from the back and five inches from the side. In one face of it are cut two small dowel holes one above the other. I do not find any trace of a similar sinking on the opposite jamb, but it might have existed as the jamb is very much broken away at this point. This rebate may have been for two purposes: either, the actual door was not the full height and a great flat slab was filled in across the upper part of the opening on the inside to this depth, or, this corner of the jamb had got damaged in fixing, and the defective part was cut out and a new piece inserted. The dowel holes seem to favour the latter view, which I think the more likely one.




FIG. 9.

In every course of the walling at the sides of the opening we find traces of iron cramps, sometimes one, sometimes two, in the width of the wall (c, c, c, fig. 4); they were of a T shape, the cross end having been fixed in the wall as it was built, and the tail projecting out to receive the jambs. Their principal use would have been to steady the jambs not to actually tie

them back, and the slightly wider and downward turn of the holes cut in the jambs themselves would be necessary in adjusting them into position. We must assume that they were intended originally for the thin earlier linings, and they may have extended right through the thickness of the slabs and been turned over or wedged up tightly from the outside. This would have been possible, as we have already shown how the inside face of the first jambs was probably rough and had an inner bronze casing. When these first linings were discarded the ends of the cramps were probably cut off and left, and the holes made to suit them in the present jambs.

Let us now sum up very briefly the main points which I have advanced. The door as it stands is presumably not the original one. The original door had a lintel the depth of two courses of the wall face. The original jambs were thinner casings and in two pieces in height, and were probably identical with the *θύραι* of the inscription. The original lintel having been damaged not long after the completion of the building it was cut out, leaving however the ends in, and the present heavy door jambs were inserted to support a second lintel which was again broken and gave place in its turn to the one which now exists.

At the time this last lintel was fixed, brackets were added to each side and a cornice inserted above, and, in order to do this, holes were cut in the wall stones over to take the beams necessary for their temporary support. The difference in the nature of the carving of the same ornaments on the jambs and lintel implies clearly that the latter must be of later time, and the workmanship of the cornice has none of the characteristics of contemporary Erechtheum work, but shows rather those of a later period. The brackets were of no use constructively but merely badly placed decorative shams. Along the inside of the lintel was probably fixed a bronze hood or capping over the door. The second jambs were steadied in their place by the iron cramps or dowels which had been used for the purpose of fixing the first linings. Last of all, the thin inner linings were put in in order to conceal, as much as possible, the damage to the present main lintel.

I do not offer this paper as a final solution of any of the points I have brought forward. I give my investigations and theories merely for what they are worth, trusting that they may open up grounds for a further and more complete analysis of this door and of the complex building of which it forms such an interesting part; and I venture to say in conclusion that, altered and transformed as I have endeavoured to prove it has been, the north doorway of the Erechtheum as it stands to-day is still the finest and most beautiful example of a doorway that has been handed down to us from classical times.

ROBT. WEIR SCHULTZ.

APPENDIX.

NOTE ON THE EVIDENCE FROM THE INSCRIPTION.

AT Mr. Schultz's request I have collected the passages in the Erechtheum inscription which may be connected with the north door, and added such notes upon their interpretation as are necessary. For the architectural inferences deduced from these passages Mr. Schultz is alone responsible; but I have endeavoured to present them in such a form as to enable any reader to judge for himself whether they afford sufficient ground for the conclusions arrived at. No previous explanation of these passages in the inscription is satisfactory, or free from grave difficulties; and there is therefore every reason for applying to them a new theory, which certainly seems to suit them much better than any which has previously been suggested.

Several passages in the great Erechtheum inscription (*C. I. G. I.* 322; *Brit. Mus. Inscr.* (Hicks) I. xxxv.) have been or may be referred to the north door. The clearest of these is that which calls it the *θύρωμα*, and uses it to define the *πρόστασις ἢ πρὸς τοῦ θυρώματος*, which still lacked the altar of the *θυηχός* and parts of the roofing, clearly the north portico. But this tells us nothing about the door itself, except that it was a recognized and conspicuous part of the building. A second passage referred by Boeckh to this door must now be given up. The inventory, describing the unfinished parts of the building *in situ*, mentions certain portions as *ἀκατάξεστα*, lacking their final work and polish. Among these are 32 feet of the curved moulding (*γογγύλος λίθος*) of the internal wall (Hicks corrects *ἐντός*, for Boeckh's *ἐκτός*), and 48 feet of the wall in the *προστομαῖον*. Boeckh had read 8 for 48 (*τετραποδίας δύο* for Δ I I), and had suggested accordingly that *προστομαῖον* meant the lintel of the door; but with the change of the number his theory falls to the ground of itself. It may be added that no probable explanation has, to my knowledge, been suggested for *προστομαῖον*, for the number equally precludes Bötticher's suggestion that it is the little porch outside the S.W. door of the N. portico. But with the loss here of any reference to the N. door disappears all documentary evidence for its decoration with a richly decorated moulding such as we now see round it. Of course the silence of the documents cannot be quoted as evidence against such a moulding, for the lintel may have been finished before the rest and so be passed over in silence, or may have been mentioned in a missing part of the inscription. A third passage referring to some door or doors of the Erechtheum offers considerable difficulty. Among portions of the buildings lying on the ground, and partly or completely finished and ready to be set in their places, are mentioned the following:—

'Four marble *θύραι*, $8\frac{1}{4}$ feet long and $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet broad. These were otherwise completely finished, *ἐς τὰ ζυγὰ δὲ ἔδει τοὺς λίθους τοὺς μέλανας ἐνθεῖναι,*'

which we may translate 'but there was wanting for the ζυγά the setting in of the black stones.'

The first problem is the meaning of θύραι and ζυγά. In an inscription (Michaelis' *Parth.* p. 317) the word θύραι is used to mean the leaves of the great door of the Hecatompedos, and ζυγά for the 'rails' of the same door. Michaelis seems to think that the same meanings must be accepted in this Erechtheum inscription; and if so, all attempts to associate the inscription with extant parts of the building must be given up. But there are serious difficulties in the way of such an interpretation, especially since a door with marble leaves seems very improbable; and therefore most authorities have taken θύραι to mean jambs and ζυγά to mean lintel and cornice. The principal objection to this is that in such a case the obvious method of description would have been to mention two θύραι and two ζυγά—not to mention four θύραι and in the very next line to call two of them ζυγά—at least in a list intended to be readily intelligible. That ζυγά should be first included under θύραι and then used to mean ὑπέρθυρον, which occurs in the next line in its proper sense, seems an absurd suggestion, unless it was the intention of those who make this inventory to puzzle their successors. Throughout the rest of the inscription all technical terms seem to be used, so far as can be judged, with perfect accuracy. Again, if ζυγά meant lintel and cornice, it is hard to see why the lintel, cornice, and upper parts of the two jambs, as Boeckh suggests, should be in four pieces of equal length and breadth, while the lower parts of the jambs were not prepared at all. On the other hand, the number four precludes our supposing that the lintel only and jambs are meant by the θύραι. The only explanation left, therefore, is that these four θύραι, if they belong to one door, must be the upper and lower part of the jamb on each side, each jamb being made in two parts, to avoid the awkward necessity of a block of marble $16\frac{1}{2}$ Attic feet long by $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet broad. This measurement I give merely from the inscription; the accuracy with which it fits the aperture of the north door of the Erechtheum is very remarkable, and might alone suggest the inference which Mr. Schultz has drawn from quite different evidence. The measurement is, on the other hand, much too large for the east door of the Erechtheum, with which Boeckh and others associated their θύραι.

If then these four θύραι are the jambs, what are we to make of the ζυγά? This is a difficulty I cannot solve with certainty; and I doubt if it can be solved without a more exact knowledge than we possess of the meaning of the architectural terms employed. But I may add that no even probable explanation seems to have been suggested by those who have adopted other interpretations, and therefore that my interpretation is in this respect no worse—though no better—than theirs. One thing is clear—the ζυγά must be some part of the θύραι as we see from the expression 'τούτων τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἐξετετέλεστο, ἐς δὲ τὰ ζυγά ἔδει κ.τ.λ.' So far as we can judge from the usual meanings of the word, ζυγά ought to signify cross-bars of some sort; and for these—or into these—black stones were to be let in. I do not know that we can get any nearer to the meaning than this. If we possessed the

original jambs, we should probably be able to make it out; but those who have compared conjectural restorations of any building or part of a building with the original, when discovered, know how little use there is in theorizing on such a matter, and how little probability of hitting on the real meaning.

One more passage may be noticed, which immediately succeeds the last; it mentions an *οἶς* or console for the cornice of the east door, half finished.

The order here is worth noticing. After stones for the pediment, the inventory mentions as lying on the ground these *θύραι*, then the console for the east door, and then the stones for the altar of the *θυηχός* in the north portico. I do not think we can infer much from this; but it does not seem to tell for Boeckh's association of the *θύραι* with the east door; if the console belonged to the same door as the *θύραι* mentioned immediately before, it seems improbable that the east door would be mentioned in connexion with the console only.

E. A. GARDNER.

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑ.¹

THE object of the following article is not to review the work achieved by the first editor of the newly recovered *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*, still less to discuss the plan adopted for its publication by the authorities of the British Museum. It would, however, be an exaggerated and perhaps a misleading reticence, if no reference were made to those preliminaries and mere points of procedure. Many sharp things have been thought and said in various quarters about the matter: but there are several sides even to these minor questions. The Museum from amid its priceless cuneiform and hieroglyphic treasures, all crying for publication, need not have regarded the mission of this small Greek argosy as marking so great an epoch. A committee, indeed, might have worked more surely, but it would have worked more slowly than our single industrious and indeed brilliant editor: had assessors been voted him, we might still be waiting the result. Now, as may be observed with satisfaction, the resources of the whole world of learning are being concentrated upon the new text, and the earlier murmurs of critical dissatisfaction are in a fair way to be lost in good-humoured collaboration for a reconstruction of the text. This work, indeed, has been carried so far already, as appears from the March number of the *Classical Review*, that it will not be deemed premature to raise some questions in regard to the value of the new text, viewed from the side of the historian. It is the design of the present paper to define some of the points which must be considered before the exact place of the new text among our historical sources can be determined. It is no reproach to the editor to say that he has dealt somewhat curtly with these problems in his Introduction and notes. It will require that many minds should independently be brought to bear upon the multitude of questions which present themselves in connexion with the more strictly historical criticism, or, as it was in some quarters too proudly termed of yore, 'the higher criticism,' before definitive results can be reached. If the present paper contribute to elucidate some of the points to be discussed in relation to the historical authority of the recovered treatise on the *Athenian Constitution*, it will fulfil its purpose, and not be considered a *petitio principii*.

Here, then, leaving on one side all questions of strictly palaeographical significance, and assuming the given text in a fairly correct edition, a student who is looking to employ it for the reconstruction of Athenian history will have to satisfy himself at starting not merely as to the *unity* and *date* of its composition, and if possible the name and person of its

¹ *Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens*, edited by F. G. Kenyon, M.A. Second Edition. H.S.—VOL. XII.

author, but also as to the *spirit* or purpose with which the treatise was composed; as to the *sources* from which the author derived his information, especially in regard to events and persons more or less remote; as to the *method* or manner of the history presented. The solution of these problems will involve not merely a careful analysis of the internal indications and evidences afforded by the text itself, but an elaborate comparison of the text with other extant or indirectly recoverable authorities. *Primo facie* the work might be a political pamphlet, like the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* found among the works of Xenophon; or it might be a strictly scientific monograph, not unworthy of the hand of Aristotle. It might be derived from sources superior to any others now to a greater or less extent open to us, and those sources carefully and critically used; or it might be a careless *réchauffé* of second-rate authorities. It might be a methodical treatise, or it might be a bundle of anecdotes. There is no end to the possibilities which might be imagined for the sake of an argument. It may be useful to indicate and discuss, in somewhat tentative fashion, the leading questions.

And first it is difficult to read the text carefully through and to doubt that we are here in possession of a work which, though fragmentary in its present form, was originally a literary work, and the work of a single author. From the bulk which remains the outline of the whole may be restored with more assurance than the figure of the so-called 'Venus of Milo': at least it is evident that we are dealing with a literary unity. The structure of the work is indeed highly artificial, and its several parts are closely related to each other. This observation points to a single author and a single date for the composition. True, the work falls into two divisions: the first and longer (cc. 1—41), as the text stands at present, tracing the historical course of constitutional reform at Athens from the beginning to the great epoch marked by the Restoration of the Democracy in the Archonship of Eukleides (403—2 B.C.); the second (cc. 42 ff.) giving a descriptive analysis of Athenian institutions in the latter part of the following century, *i.e.* the fourth century B.C. But will any one argue from this division that the existing text comes from two different authors? It will be time enough to discuss that hypothesis when it is seriously projected. Meanwhile it is sufficient to observe that the two parts, the historical retrospect and the analytical description of the Athenian *polity*, or *politics*, were obviously composed to complete each other. This is proved (on internal grounds) less by cross references from the one to the other (see c. 55 for a somewhat doubtful case, p. 137 last line: also p. 139 compared with c. 7, p. 17), than by the natural connexion between the description of the present constitution and the account of how and through what changes it has come to its present form. This assumption of the unity of the work is well borne out by a considerable number of more or less analogous *asides* in the two parts respectively. In the first or historical part these *asides* contain references to circumstances or features in Athenian institutions belonging to the writer's own age, and contrasted with the circumstances of the past which he is recording; in the second or descriptive part these references are to antecedent and even archaic

details, which have become obsolete in the writer's own day. Examples of the first class may be found cc. 3, 7, *survivals* in regard to the Archons: c. 7, p. 21, c. 8, p. 22, existing restrictions on sortition: c. 22, p. 57, the Bouletic oath: c. 21, p. 56, the origin of the use of the *Demolikon*: and some others. Examples of the second class of references, from the present to the past, may be found in the very opening words of Part II. (c. 42), ἡ νῦν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας implying a contrast with its antecedent stages: further, in the remarkable passages on the former jurisdiction and, so to say, *dikastic* functions of the Council (*βουλῆ*), c. 45, p. 117, cp. c. 48, p. 121, c. 49, p. 123, c. 55, p. 138. (Cp. also in Part I. c. 40, p. 103, c. 41, p. 106.) Further, in regard to changes in the conditions of the appointment of various officials: e.g. the *γραμματεῖς*, c. 54, p. 135, the Archons, c. 55, p. 138, the *σιτοφύλακες*, c. 51, p. 127, the Strategē, c. 61, p. 149. Cp. further c. 53, p. 132, c. 55, p. 139, c. 56, p. 140, c. 56, p. 141, c. 60, p. 149, c. 62, p. 153. All these passages contain references to the past, and contrast the past and the present practice or institution. Another argument for the unity of the work may be found in the clear articulation of each of the two parts of which it is composed. In any case it will be worth while to realize more fully than could be gathered from the editorial Introduction the artificial structure of the two parts of the work. And here it will be convenient to deal first with the second part (cc. 42 ff.), as well because it is shorter and simpler, as because it is concerned with matters for which, it appears, the author will rightly rank as a primary authority. It is moreover the part containing less of novelty and of disputable matter, apart from the many difficulties arising from the fragmentary condition of the text. It can thus, for present purposes, be more shortly disposed of. A brief passage in the editor's *Introduction* (pp. xlvi., xlvii.) summarises the contents, or at least the main heads, or subjects, handled in the second part: but this summary hardly follows the exact lines of the original. As there stated, this second part is to be conceived of as consisting or having consisted of four sections, dealing successively with the following topics:—I. The admission of the Athenian citizen to his place in the Constitution (presumably c. 42). II. A section dealing with the Ecclesia and Council 'in turn.' (This extends, presumably, from c. 43 to c. 46 inclusive.) III. A section on the various magistrates and their powers and duties. (This section the editor apparently conceives as beginning c. 47 and extending to c. 62, for he describes it as 'fully included within the six columns of MS. which occupy the third roll of the papyrus'; and the third roll begins with column 25 on p. 118 and extends over part of the next section to p. 116.) IV. A section, 'the final section,' dealing with the Law-courts (*τὰ δικαστήρια*), represented by the text of c. 63, and by the *Fragments* (pp. 161—170).

These *Sections* are not, however, quite so clearly distinguishable as is implied in the above analysis, nor is the author's point of view underlying the text quite so logical as seems to be implied in the editor's summary. Or rather, let it be said, the political logic of the author is not quite represented in the editor's analysis. A modern writer upon the subject, after dealing with the admission of citizens to the full franchise, might very prob-

ably proceed 'to describe in turn the functions of the Ecclesia, the Council, the magistrates, whether elected by lot or by direct vote, and the courts of law' (*l.c.* p. xlvii.). These, however, are not exactly the lines upon which the author proceeds. The Ecclesia is very curtly dealt with in the extant text, and in complete subordination to the Council, in c. 43, and in c. 44, in connexion with the Prytaneis and Proedri; a separate and approximately complete account of the Ecclesia, and its procedure, such as afterwards follows with respect to the Dikasteria, there is not in the treatise as it now stands. Either such a treatment followed the section on the Dikasteria, or the author considered 'psephisms' of less significance than 'krisis' (cf. p. 106, lines 10 ff.), and treated the ecclesiastic function as a sort of process of the Bouletic. The Boule itself is indeed treated with remarkable fulness, as is right for a body that sits every day, *πλὴν εἰν τις ἀφέσιμος ἤ* (c. 43, p. 111), and combines (if such treacherous modern analogies be in order!) many of the functions of a modern cabinet and of a modern civil service, or civil service commission. It may be, indeed, that the treatment of the Boule in this work will bring home afresh to students of Athenian history the great prominence and importance of that institution in the governmental machinery of the Athenian state. But the Boule is not separated from the 'magistracies,' if that English (or rather, Latin) word corresponds to *ἀρχαί*. The Boule is treated in close connexion with the *ἀρχαί*; it is treated, in fact, as one *ἀρχή* among the rest, as an office, magistracy, authority, or organ of government as much as any *ἀρχή ἐγκύκλιος* or *ἀρχή κληρωτή*. This position is perfectly plain from the opening of c. 43. It is made still more plain when we find the *ἄλλαι ἀρχαί* treated in connexion with the Boule, cc. 47, 48, and c. 49 returning to special functions of the Boule. It is not, in fact, until c. 50 that we get quit of the Boule and find ourselves among institutions which would be generally described as magistracies, or quasi-magistracies. In fact, the second portion of the treatise is only concerned with one single subject, *αἱ ἀρχαί*, to which the account of the franchise and its conditions (*τὰ περὶ τὴν τῶν πολιτῶν ἐγγραφήν*) in c. 42 is introductory. The Council, or Boule, is first dealt with, perhaps as the busiest, the most permanent and most popular, or at least numerous, of all *ἀρχαί περὶ τὴν ἐγκύκλιον διοίκησιν* (c. 43 *ad init.*). But beside the Boule there are included under the term *ἀρχαί* the various officials, boards of officials, or magistrates as they may perhaps be called, if it be remembered that we are using a Roman *terminus technicus* for Athenian institutions, treated in connexion with or independently of the Council. The term *ἀρχή* also covers the office of *δικαστής*, and the Dicasts were for the writer of the treatise in a sense *ἄρχοντες*. Is it quite certain that the term covered no more? Anyway, the whole extant portion of the second part of this treatise has for its one subject, as the editor indeed very well puts it, a description of the mechanism of (Democratic) government. It deals accordingly first with the Council of Five Hundred, with various official boards of ten, nine, or other number, and finally with the Dikasteria. The brief section on the enrolment of new citizens, and the training of the Ephebi, forms an introduction to the description of various *ἀρχαί*, posts of power or service,

honour or emolument, for which the Athenian citizen becomes eligible or qualified sooner or later once the franchise is conferred on him. There are, in fact, four rough and unequal sections in the second part of the treatise, the lines of which fall as follows: I. The conditions of the franchise (c. 42). II. The exercise of the full franchise in the *ἐγκύκλιοι ἀρχαί* (cc. 43—62), first the *κληρωταί*, the Council with sundry other authorities, (43—54). The Archons (cc. 55—59). From these may be detached, III. The *χειροτονηταὶ ἀρχαί* or *ἀρχαὶ πρὸς πόλεμον* c. 61. IV. The *Dikasteria* c. 63 ff., not placed here, perhaps, because they were proper to the *γέροντες*, veterans so to speak, but as permanent and not concerned with administration (*ἡ διοίκησις*) though recruited by the Lot.

Can it be necessary to point out—the editor has not done so—that, although there is little of political philosophy in this treatise, the classification of the *ἀρχαί*, the ideas underlying the second part of the work, are conspicuously Aristotelian? The distinction between *ἄρχειν* and *ἄρχεσθαι* and its relation to the franchise; the definition and essence of citizenship¹; the description of the *Dikast* and the *Ecclesiast* as *ἄρχοντες ἀόριστοι χρόνῳ*, and the ridicule poured upon the contrary hypothesis; in short the theory of citizenship in the *Politics*, especially in Bk. III. *ad init.*, might seem to be presupposed in the treatment of the *ἀρχαί* in the work now under consideration. This resemblance does not, however, extend to details (cp. *Politics* VII., viii, p. 1321 B). It makes at first sight for a belief in an Aristotelian influence rather than for a belief in the Aristotelian authorship of the work in question. The reply might be made that the greater subtleties and refinements of classification in the *Politics* are due to after-thought, due to possibilities as well as actualities being taken into account, due to the induction of facts embracing many democratic states beside Athens. But this reply is merely negative, or deprecatory of a premature judgment adverse to the assumed Aristotelian authorship. Meanwhile the artificial and coherent structure of the second part of the treatise furnishes an argument against its being regarded as a mere hotchpotch, a mere compilation from various hands, or the upturning of a common-place book. It is a treatise, or part of a treatise, on Athenian institutions with which we are here presented.

The external evidences point in the same direction. Citations in Pollux, Harpocration, Suidas and others are especially numerous from this part of the work. The virtual continuity of the text in the newly discovered papyrus is of course evidence for the same conclusion. The simplest and most obvious hypothesis is that we are dealing with a continuous text. The *onus probandi* here at any rate lies on the other side. But it is a very different question whether every chapter, or every paragraph and sentence is from the same hand, and of the same date, or whether there are any considerable interpola-

¹ Arist. *Pol.* III. i. 6 (1275 a. 22) *πολίτης δ' ἀπλῶς οὐδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων δρίζεται μάλλον ἢ τῷ μετέχειν κρίσεως καὶ ἀρχῆς.* (*ἀρχῆ* here used for the moment [in a specific sense.] Cp. III. i. 12 (1275 b. 22) *ᾧ γὰρ ἐξουσία κοινωρεῖν ἀρχῆς βουλευ-*

τικῆς ἢ κριτικῆς πολίτην ἤδη λέγομεν εἶναι, and so on. The definition of citizenship (the Franchise) suits Democracy best, III. i. 10. Add the notably democratic character of a *Βουλή*, VII. viii. 17, 24 (1322 b. 12 seq.).

tions. It will be verily a remarkable text if none such are discovered in it. Two somewhat suspicious passages may here be mentioned: viz. c. 54, p. 133, on the *λογισταὶ* and *συνήγοροι* compared with c. 48, p. 121, on the *λογισταὶ* *ἐξ αὐτῶν* (*sc. τῶν βουλευτῶν*) and *εὐθύνοι*. The words from Harpocration quoted in the editor's note to c. 54 suits the first-mentioned passage: some words in Pollux, 8, 99, not quoted by the editor or V. Rose, rather suit the passage last mentioned. The editor remarks, apparently without having observed this possible 'doublet,' that 'it is unlikely that Aristotle would have had two descriptions of the same officers in this one treatise.' But is it certain that the ten Logistae of c. 48 do not represent the same board as the ten Logistae of c. 54?¹ If they do, then to acquit the author of repetition, of inconsequence, not to say self-contradiction, we must suppose one of the passages from a different hand.

The citation from the *Lex. rhet. Cantabrig.* (note to c. 54), which gives a passage as from the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* of Aristotle to which no passage in the British Museum MS. corresponds, may suggest a doubt as to the character and quality of this MS. and its claim to represent the original and authentic text. This copy made in Egypt according to the editor some four centuries at least after the original text was composed at Athens, and made from an already mutilated copy, and made by four different hands, one of them at least 'not a well educated person,' and two others, mainly concerned with the second part, not above suspicion:—how far is this copy from being an exact or faithful representation of the original work? True, it is vastly older than any MS. of Plutarch or of Pollux, of Harpocration, or of Suidas: older, indeed, than the original texts of all those authors, save Plutarch. But is it certain that this MS., even if affiliated to a copy in the Alexandrian Library, is as good a copy as that in the hands of Plutarch at Chaeroneia, or as that in the hands of Pollux at Athens, a while later? Fragments of those versions have filtered through to us, more or less imperfectly, in the texts of their works, and may sometimes be preferable to the corresponding passages in this text. For example the passage on the third and fourth Ecclesiae in each prytauy, c. 43, p. 113, looks less intelligible than the corresponding passage in Pollux. On the other hand the new text scores a good point against Suidas in the excellent *πρόγραμμα*, c. 44, p. 116, line 1 (the Agenda List, or Order of the Day for the session of the Ecclesia). Suidas has *πρῶγμα*. But until an exhaustive comparison has been made (and displayed) between this text and the corresponding passages cited by ancient authorities from the work, the materials for the verdict upon the quality of this text, viewed simply as a copy, are incomplete.

Turning to the first part of the text we observe without much difficulty that it is constructed on an artificial scheme, and divided more or less clearly into successive portions; it is a structure, and more or less a literary unity. This observation, which must presently be verified by a brief analysis of the contents of this first part (a task not distinctly undertaken in the first edition

¹ The editor's *Index* indeed identifies the two.

of the text), again makes for the belief in the unity of authorship, without precluding the recognition of larger or smaller passages added or inserted by later hands, and of inferior or highly questionable authority. The first part, now specially under discussion, contained a retrospective narrative of the constitutional history of Athens from the settlement of Ion, *i.e.* from primitive times, down to the Restoration of the Democracy in the Archonship of Eukleides on the eve of the fourth century B.C. This portion, albeit the beginning be lost, is, in the existing condition of the work, considerably longer than the second: its contents possess more of startling novelty, and will give rise to many more varieties of opinion and judgment among historical students, than the second part of the work. It is not to-day or to-morrow that the last word will be said upon the value, for historical purposes, of this part. It is only fair to remember, in justice to the first editor, that he recognises an uncertainty in 'some of the conclusions' which he has drawn in regard to the inner history of Athens from the new material (*Introduction*, p. xx.); but it is impossible to welcome his 'short sketch of the history of Athens from the new standpoint' (*Introduction*, pp. xx.—xlv.) as a fundamental contribution towards a critical construction; it is impossible to admit that 'the traditional views of the chief crises in that history have been modified' to the extent which he implies, or require modification forthwith to any such extent. However, before discussing further the authority of the new history, the unity of authorship must be established for this part, and it must be shown that we are not in presence of a mere hotchpotch of historical notes on sundry or successive changes in Athenian institutions, but in possession of a literary treatise, or part of a treatise, the work of one age and probably of one author, except in so far as this unity and authenticity may be invalidated by second or third hand insertions.

Apart from the presumption created by the obviously *continuous* nature of the story of constitutional changes, and apart from the external evidence afforded by citations in ancient authors, there are two arguments which make for a belief that this part of the work is from a single author; the one turns upon the literary construction of the part, the other upon the chronological scheme or system which underlies it, or seems to be implied in it.

I. The literary structure is clear enough, and the author, or some one else for him, has supplied the clue in c. 41. Some suspicion as to the authenticity of this chapter in its present form and extent may well be aroused by the three following considerations: (1) It contains a date, in the fourth line, which is not only erroneous but flatly contradicts c. 39, p. 100, where the correct date for the Restoration of the Democracy is given. (2) The terms or titles by which some of the successive *καταστάσεις τῆς πολιτείας* are described do not range exactly with the titles to be derived from a careful reading of the preceding text as it stands. This observation applies in particular to the *δευτέρα καὶ πρώτη τάξις ἢ ἐπὶ Θησέως γενομένη* as compared with cc. 3, 4, where the author's formula is *ἡ τάξις τῆς ἀρχαίας πολιτείας τῆς πρὸ Δράκοντος αἰῆς ἢ πρώτη πολιτεία*. Again, the seventh revolution (*μεταβολή*), the eighth constitution, is entitled *ἦν Ἀριστείδης μὲν ὑπέδειξεν Ἐφιάλτης δ'*

ἐπετέλεσεν, the legislation of Ephialtes (cc. 24, 25) being thus taken as the terminus or epoch for this stage. But cc. 26, 27, 28, record developments under Perikles and his successors which would entitle Perikles at least to take the place here assigned to Ephialtes. Neither of these two cases are, however, at all conclusive. In the first, the *πρώτη* might be a reminiscence of the *πρώτη πολιτεία*, c. 4, line 1. In the second the first two lines on p. 106 may be taken to supply a cover for cc. 26, 27, 28. The Constitution of the Five Thousand (c. 33) is not specified in the summary. To be sure, the original author could afford to be a trifle inexact in his summary quite as well as a later interpolator. Still, this very explicit table of contents, inserted at the close of the historical sketch, has somewhat the air of an intruder. (3) It is followed by a passage on the sovereignty of the *δῆμος* (*ἀπάντων γὰρ . . . χάρισιν*), p. 106, not unworthy of Aristotle, but somewhat like an afterthought, and the part is closed by a colophon on the ecclesiastic wages, which comes in full quaintly to finish the story. In any case it is obvious that, if the MS. had omitted the whole passage constituting c. 41 in the editor's numeration, no one would ever have missed it, or suspected an omission.

If this chapter, or any part of it be an insertion, it is not the only insertion in the first part. It is certainly very extraordinary to find in the summary in c. 41 the constitution of Theseus described as *μικρὸν παρεγκλίνουσα τῆς βασιλικῆς*, and to find in c. 2 this constitution described as utterly oligarchic. Moreover the title in c. 41 suits the details of c. 3, though it does not suit the details of c. 2, which are likewise inconsistent with each other. The second chapter appears either to be spurious or out of its proper place: it would come better between the account of Drakon's constitution and of Solon's, *i.e.* between cc. 4 and 5. It might owe its present form and place to the same hand that compiled the table of contents in c. 41. In any case the contents of c. 2 are highly suspicious in the position it occupies at present, all the more as it stands practically at the beginning of the mutilated text of the existing MS. The summary in c. 41 implies of course a previous description of the constitution of Ion, which would have been closed consistently with the author's plan of composition, as will presently appear, by an account of a *στάσις*. But it is certainly surprising to find *τὴν ἐπὶ Θησέως τάξιν* described in c. 3 after the account of the Kylonian *coup d'état* (c. 1), and after the account of the *στάσις* which precedes the Reforms of Drakon, may rather, the Reforms of Solon. It may also be observed that the opening words of c. 5 are quite inconsistent with the description of the Drakontic constitution in c. 4, which is in no sense an oligarchy, but as described in c. 4 bears the semblance of a timocratic and moderate republic. This chapter itself is indeed replete with difficulties which render it suspicious. *Inter alia* the Solonian classes (*τιμήματα*) appear in it before the legislation of Solon (p. 13, lines 1, 2), and yet the property qualifications for various officials in the constitution are not based on the classification, but upon another scale (pp. 10, 11). To other possible anachronisms and *aporias* in this chapter reference must be made later in another connexion (pp. 27, 33 *infra*). Enough has here been said to show that

the text of the first four chapters of this treatise as it now stands is in a somewhat disorganised condition. Had the MS. extended no further, it might have suggested the hypothesis that we had on the papyrus only some excerpts or disconnected jottings, belonging perhaps to one and the same work, but not preserved in their proper places or order. Such an hypothesis was, it may be remembered, proposed in respect to the celebrated Berlin Fragments, and it may here be added *en passant* that the new text confirms the order of these fragments as adopted by Blass and Diels.¹ The disorder here visible may be due to interpolations, and the curious and corrupt text, p. 105, lines 1 ff., may betray some traces of the interpolator's handiwork, or of an attempt to 'harmonize' the inconsequences of cc. 2—4. If these considerations are deserving of weight, suspicion may extend to the second chief passage above referred to, from the omission of a clear reference to the Periklean legislation and the Periklean régime in the Table of Contents, c. 41, as compared with cc. 26, 27 of the treatise. This is all the more remarkable as c. 26 concludes with a notice of the law of Perikles restricting the franchise to those *ἐξ ἀμφοῖν ἀστοῖν γεγενηότες*, which anticipates the fundamental law of the constitution in the writer's own day as specified in c. 42, *ad init.* The contents of c. 27 and the manner in which they are displayed, as well as its relation to its context on both sides, taken in conjunction with what has been already said, constitute grounds for impeaching its authenticity. Three points must here suffice: (1) the inconsequence of the opening words, *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, κ.τ.λ.*, (2) the afterthought by which Perikles is included among the opponents of the Areopagitæ, (3) and the notice, at the close of the chapter, of the introduction of bribery and corruption by Anytos *μετὰ ταῦτα*. The trial referred to would belong to the year 409 B.C. Are these 'afterthoughts' of the original author, or of a later head and hand? It is obvious that c. 27 might be expunged from the text, with some gain to its continuity, and without doing any appreciable violence to the passage in c. 41 which summarizes cc. 24—28. While upon the problem of interpolations in this first part of the work, it is permissible to say at least that cc. 30, 31, upon the oligarchic constitutions of 411 B.C. call for some medicine. The editor's note on c. 30, p. 83, draws attention to one statement in direct contradiction to an assertion in c. 32. As though this were not enough, c. 30 seems to contradict itself in two particulars: (1) the Archons, in common with the other officials who are to be members of the Council, are to be elected (*αἰρεῖσθαι*) *ἐκ προκρίτων*, pp. 83, 84. The Archons are to be taken by lot, p. 85. The explanation is possibly that the term *αἰρεῖσθαι*, p. 84, line 5, is used inaccurately. (2) The Hellenotamiae are to be, and are not to be members of the Council, p. 84. A reconciliation of these two last statements has been suggested by Prof. L. Campbell, *Classical Review*, March, 1891, p. 119, but the passage is at least obscure. These two chapters 30, 31, are in striking contrast and in partial contradiction to the corresponding account of the

¹ Cp. Diels, H. *Über die Berliner Fragmente des Aristoteles*. Berlin, 1885.

Revolution of the Four Hundred in Thucydides. Whether one or other is interpolated, at least to a greater or less extent, is a problem deserving consideration. C. 30 indeed contains the account of a mere paper constitution which, on the writer's own showing, never came into existence. If all the text had disappeared from c. 30, line 5, *κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν* down to c. 31, line 3, *τῆνδε*, and we read *ἐξήνεγκαν τάδε. βουλευεῖν μὲν τετρακοσίους, κ.τ.λ.*—who would ever have been the wiser?

But however the case in regard to interpolations may stand, it is plain that the first part of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* contained a history of the inner and constitutional history of Athens presented on a carefully thought out plan. The table of contents in c. 41 corresponds with considerable accuracy to the cardinal points in the historical review. The successive stages by which 'the present constitution' had been evolved, through constructive and destructive moments, were presented indeed in strictly chronological sequence, but something like a logical or literary idea lifts the chronicle towards the plane of philosophic history. From first to last there have been eleven great political conversions—there have been, first and last, twelve epochs of constitutional construction. Six of these lie before the Persian war; six constitutional moments are distinguishable between that war and the writer's own day. It were not too fanciful to suppose that the author conceived at least the first six 'Polities,' or successive constitutions, to have been separated, or connected, severally by a party struggle, *στάσις*. But this idea is apparently modified in the last six stages. In them, so far as the developments or revolutions are traced to causal antecedents, those antecedents are sought in the warfare of the time, first the Persian, then the Peloponnesian, rather than in economic or social conditions in Athens itself. With these brief indications the following analysis may be submitted as presenting the literary structure of the first part of the work. In it the lines suggested by the table in c. 41 are followed out and emphasized, and the result is to show that, whether the text has suffered interpolation or not, the author had a firm and clear scheme and outline of the history of the Athenian constitution, and that the literary sketch as a whole is the work of one mind.

THE XII. *πολιτεία* OF ATHENS.

- I. *ἡ κατάστασις τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἴωνος καὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ συνοικισάντων*, i.e. the settlement of Ion: described no doubt in the lost beginning of the treatise (cp. c. 3, p. 5). It might perhaps be inferred that the author ascribed the first synoecism of Attica to Ion, not to Theseus (as Thucydides, ii. 15). The passage in Plutarch, *Theseus*, c. 24, is at least partly based on Thucydides. Plutarch did not hesitate to dissent from what he believed to be the authority of Aristotle upon occasion. Cp. *Lycurg.* c. 28. But it will be safer to take *συνοικισάντων* here as implying no more than *ξυνοίκισαν*, Thucydides i. 24. It was a *Synoecism* IN not OF Attica. Compare Herodotus, I, 57. 2, 51. *σύνοικοι ἐγένοντο Ἀθηναίοισι* (sc. *Ἡελασγοί*).

τάξις ἡ ἐπὶ Θησέως γενομένη. This must provisionally be identified II with ἡ ἀρχαία πολιτεία of c. 3, ἡ πρώτη πολιτεία of c. 4. It exhibits a slight deviation from royalty, according to c. 41. The expression here is not so strong as in Plutarch, *Theseus*, c. 25, *πρῶτος ἀπέκλινε πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον, ὡς Ἀριστοτέλης φησί, καὶ ἀφῆκε τὸ μοναρχεῖν*. It might appear as though the author laid little or no stress on the Theseian synoecism, and regarded as the two chief institutions of Theseus, the threefold division of the Athenians into Eupatridae, *Agroikoi*,¹ Demiurgi, and the first beginnings of democracy; religion, law, and government being, however, left to the Eupatrids (Plutarch, *op. c.*). To the speculative historians of the fourth century B.C. a modification of royal power was tantamount to an institution of democracy.

As the text now stands c. 3 appears to contain some account of this constitution; c. 1 (and possibly c. 2) some account of the *στάσις* which led to its abolition.

ἡ ἐπὶ Δράκοντος. This constitution is set forth in c. 4. It is difficult to III understand how any one could regard this chapter as a solid contribution to the actual history of the Athenian constitution. It contains statements which it is hardly rash to characterize as anachronisms and as mutually destructive. One of these difficulties has been specified above (p. 24). It may be added here that the feature which seems so extraordinary to the editor, viz. that the property qualification of a Strategus is 100 minae while that for the Archons is only 10 minae, will be no puzzle to any one who recognizes that this chapter is a product of the ideas of a period when the Strategi had long taken the place of the Archons as the leading officers of the State. The constitution here ascribed to Drakon looks uncommonly like an ideal constitution, projected at one of those crises in which, as in 412 B.C. or 404 B.C., 'Restorations' of the *πατρία πολιτεία* were demanded, and some persons, to whom the admittedly popular constitutions of Kleisthenes and Solon were not satisfactory, may have found an eponym for their programme in the author of the earliest written laws at Athens. As the information conveyed in this chapter, whether true or not, is absolutely new, we are presented with the dilemma that either the text of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* used by Plutarch did not contain this passage, or that Plutarch considered it bad history: otherwise surely we should have found traces of it in the Life of Solon. But this supposed Drakontic constitution, with its Ecclesia of Hoplites, with its high property qualification for office, with its Strategi, Hipparchi, its Archons and Tamiae, all elected, and its lesser officials appointed by lot; with its limit of age, its limits on re-election, its fines for neglect of duties; with its Council of 401, and its Areopagus as general censor and guardian of the Constitution:—what is it but afterthought taking the place of history?

A passage on the inevitable *στάσις* (c. 5 and perhaps c. 2) introduces the IV fourth constitution—that of Solon. The person and work of Solon are treated at great length (cc. 6–12), but it is not necessary for the present purpose to

¹ It is to be regretted that the reading c. 13, note is virtually decisive for the *matter*, p. 34, last line, is doubtful: but the editor's

- review the details. C. 13 records the renewed and augmented party struggles V. which issue in *ἡ ἐπὶ Πεισιστράτου τυραννίς*, which may be taken to include the government of his sons, and covers the passage cc. 14–19. The next chapter (20) records the *στάσις* between Isagoras and Kleisthenes, and makes VI. way for the description of the Reforms of Kleisthenes (c. 21). With Kleisthenes it might appear as though, in the author's conception, the period of revolutions and reforms gave way for a time to a period of warfare and development. Instead of a *στάσις* we have in c. 22 a record on the working of ostrakism (an excellent substitute!), and of the influence of war, which VII. introduces the seventh stage, *ἡ μετὰ τὰ Μηδικὰ*, the government or supremacy of the Areopagus (c. 23). This condition melts by degrees into the restored VIII. and developed Democracy, *ἦν Ἀριστείδης μὲν ὑπέδειξεν, Ἐφιάλτης δ' ἐτέλεσεν, κ.τ.λ.*, though for Ephialtes we might expect Perikles, and must take this title to cover the whole passage from c. 24 to c. 28 inclusive. IX. The ninth stage, *ἡ τῶν τετρακοσίων κατάστασις*, is connected in the text with the disaster in Sicily, and is described, with some anomalies noticed above, in the passage cc. 29–32. The table of contents in c. 41 passes over the constitution of the Five Thousand, described in c. 33, and reaches the X. tenth stage with the Restored Democracy (c. 34) where the text omits to connect the restoration with the victories in the Hellespont in 410 B.C. XI. The despotic governments, first of the Thirty and then of the Ten are conceived as a single chapter (*ἡ τῶν τριάκοντα καὶ ἡ τῶν δέκα τυραννίς*), and XII. this title corresponds to the text cc. 35–40. Finally we reach the twelfth stage, *ἡ νῦν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας*, the restored and extreme Democracy; with which stage historical narrative gives way to descriptive analysis, and we pass to the second part of the treatise.

II. Beside the argument in favour of a unity of authorship based upon the literary structure of the first part (as of the second part) of the work, a second, though palpably weaker, argument arises from a consideration of those passages, which appear to show that an elaborate chronology underlies the historical account of the Athenian constitution. It may be observed that, passing over the legendary Akastos (c. 3, p. 6), whose name is not cited for a chronological purpose, the Archon Aristaechmes (c. 4, p. 9), whose name serves to date the legislation of Drakon, and for the sake of convenience omitting Xenaenetos (c. 40, p. 104), there are between Solon and Eukleides, between c. 5 and c. 39, the names of twenty-five Archons given, and the names are given, with three exceptions to be specified, for strictly chronological purposes. Solon's name is not used as a date in c. 5, p. 13, but it is so used in c. 13, p. 33. The name of Damasias, c. 13, is not used primarily as a date. Mnesitheides, c. 26, p. 73, is not used primarily as a date; the same remark applies to the name Mnesilochus, c. 33, p. 90. The remaining twenty-two names of Archons, from Solon to Euclid inclusive, are used for strictly chronological purposes, generally under the formula *ἐπὶ (τοῦ δεινός) ἄρχοντος*. Adding Xenaenetos, c. 40, we get twenty-three. It may be said that twenty-three such dates are not a list when spread over nearly two centuries; and it must be admitted that facts of

considerable importance are mentioned without the archontic date. But will any one venture to say that the twenty-three names used for chronological purposes do not imply the pre-existence and employment of chronological tables, such as the one still preserved on the *Marmor Parium*? The hypothesis of course presents itself that these three and twenty chronological names may have been inserted in the text by a second or third hand. There is indeed scarcely a single case where the Archon's name might not be deleted from the text without creating a visible scandal; and, conversely, nothing would be simpler than to insert the appropriate Archon's name in cases where it does not appear in the text—given, that is, the requisite materials. But the removal of all or any number of the twenty-three chronological Archons, whose names occur in the first part of this treatise, would not get rid of the exact and comparatively full chronological scheme which underlies the account of Athenian constitutional development; for, with the exception of the two excellently attested names, Pythodorus, c. 35, p. 93, Eukleides, c. 39, p. 100, *the Archon's name never occurs in the text as the sole chronological indication for the event recorded*. In other words, all events dated by the Archons' names are also dated by the intervals separating them from other recorded events. This dating by intervals, or casual chronology, is so constant a concomitant of the Archontic chronology as to suggest a doubt whether the two could originally have been independent. To expunge all the casual or empirical chronology from the text would be to do very great violence to probabilities. Though some of the chronological intervals or periods were probably traditional, as for example the Hundred years, c. 32, p. 88 (cp. Thuc. viii. 68), the constancy of these dates by intervals implies a systematic chronology, constructed with or without regard to the list of Archons. The fact that some of the intervals may be inaccurate (*e.g.* the *fifth* year, c. 22, p. 57, the *seventh* year, c. 34, p. 91) does not disprove the presence of an exact or systematic chronology; we all err by rule. Nor is it necessary for the present argument to discuss the desperate passage, c. 13, p. 33, where three *Penteterides* are gobbled up in four lines with unblushing assurance. Provisionally it may here be assumed that a quasi-scientific chronology underlies the first part of the treatise, and that the chronological data have not, to any damming extent, been foisted into the text by later hands; that being admitted, this systematic and preconceived chronology becomes a fresh argument in favour of the unity of authorship, the unity of date, for the great bulk of the treatise.

We pass naturally from these last considerations to the consideration of *the probable date of the composition*, a topic which has an immediate bearing upon the question of the real authorship, and a more remote bearing upon the question of the authority, of this new historical source. Something has been added, and something may still be added, to the editor's arguments under this head. It is urged that the treatise must have been composed after the year 329 B.C., for the Archon of that year (Kephisophon) is named in c. 54. The name occurs in a sentence 'hopelessly mutilated,' but is apparently indisputable. If, however, the sentence 'is clearly an incidental note which

might have been added after the main bulk of the work was written' (editor's note), it might have been added ever so long after: it was probably, if added at all, added some time after: or it may not be an addition; *prima facie* it is a part of the primitive text of the second part of the treatise: in short, it makes very little for the Aristotelian authorship of the treatise; it is rather a difficulty to be explained away on that hypothesis: we are to suppose in fact that Aristotle was writing, or revising, this treatise within seven years of his death!

Mr. Cecil Torr (*Athenacum*, 3302, p. 185) has accentuated and further defined the date of composition by an argument based upon the mention of Quadriremes and the omission of Quinqueremes in c. 46—a chronological indication overlooked by the editor. On the basis of this passage Mr. Torr fixes the composition to the years 428—425 B.C. This argument is conclusive as far as the upper date is concerned, assuming that the words ἡ τετρήρεις κ.τ.λ. are part of the primitive text, and it certainly would be rather harsh to bracket all the words from ἡ to χειροτονήση (c. 46 ll. 3, 4), even though the scribe was blundering and the corrector nodding over this passage (cf. editor's note on καινὰς τριήρεις, p. 118). In regard, however, to the lower date, 425 B.C., after which, Mr. Torr argues, a writer would have mentioned Quinqueremes as well as Triremes and Quadriremes, can we feel sure that the author of the tract would certainly have recorded the building of Quinqueremes, of which there were apparently in the year 425 B.C. only three in the Attic docks? (Boeckh, *Staatsh.* I.³ p. 338, *Urkunden*, p. 76.) How far is it possible to follow the fortunes of the Athenian Quinqueremes? Were they ever built or used in large numbers? Does any ancient author mention them in the Athenian fleet? If not, their omission in c. 46 of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία will not seem quite conclusive as to the lowest date to be assigned to the treatise.

In regard to this lower date the editor argues that the treatise must have been composed before 307 B.C., seeing that the author, in speaking of 'the present constitution,' assumes and implies that there are ten and only ten tribes (φυλαί), 'which number was increased to twelve in the year just mentioned' (p. xvii.). This is, indeed, a very strong argument, all the more because the increase of the *Phylae* involved changes in the institutions based upon the phylie system, and no reference to those changes appears in the text. There is, indeed, a passage in the first part of the treatise which might remotely suggest a possible reference to the later duodecimal system: c. 21, p. 54, l. 7, for a certain good reason οὐκ εἰς δώδεκα φυλάς συνέταξεν, sc. ὁ Κλεισθένης. But this may be a mere accident: certainly the whole description of the institutions of Athens appears to apply naturally to the period before the Demetrios and Antigonos. And as the external evidences for the existence of the treatise may be said to begin, though in a very indirect fashion,¹ about the middle of the third century B.C., our conclusion must be

¹ Timaeus, *testibus Polybio et Athenaeo*, referred to the Πολιτεία, or at least to the Constitution of the Locri, and referred to it as

Aristotle's work. See V. Rose, *Aristotelis Fragmenta*, 1886, ed. Teubner, No. 547. Ed. maj. 1863. *Arist. Pseudepigraphus*, No. 499. Ed.

that the work before us, assuming its unity granted, was composed between 330 B.C. and 320 B.C., probably before the occupation of Athens by the Macedonians,¹ and rather before than after 325 B.C. As Aristotle died in the year 322 B.C., this treatise on the Athenian constitution, which formed the first of 158 similar tracts, would appear to have been composed, or revised, within three or four years of the death of its reputed author. That the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* stood first in the list of the collected *Politics* does not of course prove that the other 157 were all composed after it; but it is not likely that it was composed last, or among the last. In any case the narrow margin of time for its composition, 'or revision,' must tell against the assumption of strict Aristotelian authorship.

To any one who accepts the above dates for the actual composition, it will hardly be worth while to observe that the systematic chronology by means of the Archons, assuming these data authentic, might contribute to determine the general or approximate date of the work in question. For when were the lists of Attic Archons compiled and first used for historical purposes? The new text must now take rank before the *Marmor Parium* as the first document, or monument, extant in which the Attic Archons are systematically used for chronological purposes. If it be assumed that the Archontic data in this tract are genuine, it would seem to follow that the author had a fairly complete and accurate list of the Archons before him, and that it was sufficiently in fashion to be of use: were it known for certain who first compiled such a list, with the leading events in column, after the manner of the *Parian Chronicle*, we might have a fresh argument for the date of this treatise. As the case stands, the use made of the Archons scarcely serves to push the date of this chronological device back much beyond Philochorus and Androtion, who probably used the Archons as dates. It may be just worth while to observe that though lists of *Ἰολυμπιονίκαί*, of *Πυθιονίκαί*, and of *νίκαί Διονυσιακαί* appear among the *pseudepigrapha Aristotelis*, no one seems to have ascribed to him the compilation of the Archontic List. It is also observable that the chronology in the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* makes little attempt to relate the chronology of the constitution to the general chronology or course of Hellenic history, such as is found, with some startling omissions, in the *Parian Chronicle*. We have, in fact, in the case before us a purely Athenian record, apparently derived from purely Athenian sources.

Before opening the question of the *sources* from which the history in this tract is derived it will be well to determine provisionally the question of the author's intellectual position and sympathies, and of the interest in which the tract was composed. And here it will be recognised at once that, on the face of things, the primary interest and purpose of the author must have been the historical or scientific interest, the justification of a proper curiosity. His paramount purpose is neither to praise nor to disparage Athenian institutions

Berl. 1870, No. 501. This carries a fair inference as to the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*. If the *Loerion* was the work of Aristotle, *a fortiori* therefore was the Athenian. The reference to *Eth. Nic.*

X. ix. 23 (1181 b) is inconclusive.

¹ 20th Boedromion 322 B.C. Plutarch: *Phokion*, 28.

but simply to describe and to explain. The author proceeds, for the most part, *sine ira et studio*, with a 'detachment,' which must surprise us, if we think of him as an Athenian, and a contemporary of Demosthenes. The mere conception of treating institutions and their history apart from external politics, and no less apart from the ideal *Polity*, is a conception not unworthy of Aristotle. It might well be the fruit of his teaching. To speak in a figure: the second part of this treatise supplies the statics (ὄστι) of the constitution of Athens, the first part the dynamics (διόστι). Nor is it true to say that all general points of view, all philosophic insight are banished. The passage in c. 9 on the character of Solon's *polity* shows a speculative turn worthy at least of Isokrates if not of Aristotle himself.¹ Again passages in c. 28—a chapter, certainly, a trifle suspicious—and notably the generalizations on p. 79 and the formula on p. 80 have an Aristotelian flavour in them. The penultimate line of the chapter contains indeed a description of ἀγαθοῦ πολίτου ἔργον sufficiently Aristotelian to have been written in the light of the *Politics* (III. iv. 1276 B). But the formula is an old one: the sophisticated πολίτης ἀγαθός exists already in Thucydides (vi. 14), and one has not to wait for the formula of the ἔργον till Aristotle appears. Another passage with some philosophic point about it may be found c. 41, p. 106.² Unfortunately two of these passages are not, perhaps, above suspicion. But even if these passages were given up it would remain true that the very structure of the treatise itself, as a whole, and the strictly *positive*, or *positivist* interest implied throughout, betokens a certain mental enlightenment. Not but what the author betrays partialities, or preferences, and relates his story with some signs of feeling. The second part of the treatise may be almost colourless, but the first part is tinged here and there with a warmer hue. Strangely enough these passages are not all dyed the same shade. The two last referred to are commendatory of democracy, and to them may be added the expression in c. 22 p. 59 descriptive of the Athenians and their non-enforcement of ostrakism, χρώμενοι τῇ εἰθυσίᾳ τοῦ δήμου πραότητι. This passage is not ironical.³ In other passages the point of view seems changed. The brief notice of the trial of the Strategi after Arginusae (c. 34, p. 91) is, as the editor remarks, 'certainly inaccurate' (note *ad locum*): the inaccuracy appears explicable as due to political bias: the author in this passage is either unfair or uncritical. In other passages a moderate or intermediate position is implied. The praise of Nikias, Thucydides (son of Melesias) and Theramenes in c. 28, and the apology for Theramenes already referred to, serve to define the writer's partialities. Not less remarkable is the verdict upon the *polity* of the Five Thousand, c. 33, p. 90, which shows a material agreement with the well-known judgment in Thucyd. viii. 97. Not less remarkable is the

¹ With the reflection κύριος γὰρ ὢν ὁ δῆμος τῆς ψήφου κύριος γίνεται τῆς πολιτείας contrast Arist. *Pol.* IV. x. 5 (1329 a. 11) οἱ γὰρ τῶν ὅπλων κύριοι καὶ μένειν ἢ μὴ μένειν κύριοι τὴν πολιτείαν. The two passages are not contradictories.

² With the generalization εὐδιαφορώτεροι γὰρ

ὄλιγοι τῶν πολλῶν εἰσὶν καὶ κέρδει καὶ χάρισιν cp. Arist. *Pol.* VIII. vi. 10 (1306 a. 9) ὁμοιοῦσα δὲ ὀλιγαρχία οὐκ εὐδιάφορος ἐξ αὐτῆς.

³ Cp. Isokrates, 7, 153, on the ἐπιείκεια τοῦ δήμου. See also Plato, *Rep.* viii. 558 A.

express approval of the régime of the Areopagus after the Persian wars (c. 23, p. 65) καὶ ἐπολιτεύθησαν Ἀθηναῖοι καλῶς καὶ <εὖ>? κατὰ τούτους τοὺς καιρούς. There is here no qualification as in the case of the Five Thousand (c. 33, πολέμου καθεστῶτος); the Areopagite supremacy is the nearest approach to the ideal suggested by the author. But this position is not obtained by the depression of democracy: the general point of view has a remarkable resemblance to the positions in the *Areopagiticus* of Isokrates. Solon and Kleisthenes are the truly popular heroes, as with the orator. Aristeides preserves his reputation for justice (c. 23) though his policy (c. 24), as the editor observes, 'is what one would rather have expected to have come from Themistocles.' Themistokles is indeed somewhat discredited, whereof more anon. Perikles (c. 28) belongs to the better type, and contrasts favourably with the later demagogues. In all this there is a remarkable resemblance also to the views expressed in the *Politics* II. xii. (1273 B). If that passage in the *Politics* is not from Aristotle's hand,¹ is it any the more likely that our treatise is genuine Aristotle? The chapter on the Drakontic constitution remains, indeed, a crux in this, as in every other connexion (c. 4). It deprives Solon of the credit of being the first legislator to dethrone the oligarchy. Drakon's constitution has most of the good points elsewhere approved of, and ascribed to Solon: the Hoplite franchise (c. 4 p. 9 compared with c. 33, p. 90); election of the greater officials, under restrictions of birth and property (by all citizens instead of by the Areopagus alone? Such might be the result of a combination of c. 3, p. 3, last three lines, with c. 4, pp. 10, 11 and c. 8, pp. 22, 23, if it were worth while to smooth away the inconsequence of the Drakontic record in c. 4); appointment of lesser officials by the Lot c. 4, p. 11. A popular Council of 401, with compulsory attendance at the sessions: above all the nomophylactic Areiopagus to observe the officials and to check illegality. But if this passage somewhat blurs the historical perspective it does not seriously obliterate the main points in the author's political views. In fine, the writer is no partisan. Though the treatise shows now and then political sympathies, the bias is not so strong as to lead us to expect wilful distortion of fact. In the worst cases the blame may have to be rolled back upon the author's sources.² If the history is unsound its unsoundness or shortcomings may be due, rather to the imperfection of his sources, or to the defects of his own methods, than to *malu fides*. The position thus reached leads directly to an examination of the sources from which the matters of fact in the treatise have been drawn.

In examining the *sources* we may dismiss for the time being the problems of the second part with the remark that, except for the historical

¹ Cp. W. L. Newman, *The Politics of Aristotle*, Vol. II. p. 373.

² One of these sources seems to have been strongly anti-Themistoclean. See c. 23, the *causality* of the battle of Salamis ascribed to the Areiopagus: there is here a *suppressio veri*. In c. 25 we have the *suggestio falsi*, and more. Plutarch's qualified admission of the first anec-

dote and complete rejection of the second is much to his credit. With c. 23, γενέσθαι τῆς περὶ Σαλαμίνα ναυμαχίας αἰτία (ἢ ἐν Ἀρείῳ πάγῳ βουλή), cp. Arist. *Pol.* VIII. iv. 8, 1304, a. 22, ὁ ναυτικός ὄχλος γενόμενος αἰτίος τῆς περὶ Σαλαμίνα νίκης. The passages are not strictly contradictory. See also Thucyd. I. 74, 1.

asides in this part, the matter might seem to have been almost all collected by simple observation on the spot, or by notorious hearsay, at worst. It is entirely consonant with this supposition, and with the general methods of composition in antiquity, that no parade is made, little or no indication of the *sources* is given, in this part. Returning to the first part we find the case very different. To determine with approximate certitude the sources from which the historical review of the Athenian constitution (cc. 1-40) was derived two methods must be employed in conjunction with each other. The first will seek to detect, from a collection of the obvious inner indications afforded by the text itself, the sources from which it is derived, and the principles upon which they are used: the second would aim at a comparison of the text with other extant or more or less recoverable authorities for the same period or subjects, and a resultant solution of the problems whether, and to what extent, the author of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* made use of those authorities. But the second task is an immense one, and must for the present be here passed over. In what follows the task is restricted to an examination of the more obvious points in regard to the sources used by the author, and a consideration of the reconstructive method followed by him, or found ready by him to his hand in those sources, when real evidence failed him and them, so far as may be gathered from the internal evidence.

Ach, die Quellen! —Once upon this tack there is an end for the while to all mutual confidence between master and disciple, between author and reader: we cease to be amused, and become actively critical; we destroy the work of art, in order to see how it was put together. In the case of epos or drama this may be the Philistine's method (*ἄγροικὸς τις σοφία*); but in regard to histories, which profess to deal with the external order and to record the actual succession of events, it becomes a mortal necessity. In the present case to close every doubtful point with an appeal to 'the great authority of Aristotle' is but a sop to our indolence. In justice to the editor it must be said that in his notes he occasionally admits that 'Aristotle' may be mistaken or misled; but it does not appear to be unfair to say that a very high value is set upon 'the narrative of Aristotle,' 'the testimony of Aristotle,' without any discussion of the prior questions, whence the materials of this 'narrative' were obtained, and how far in this 'testimony' the statements of matters of fact rest upon autopsy, upon hearsay, upon written tradition, more or less authentic, and how far mere inference, in all its subtle forms, takes the place of genuine testimony and tradition. From the nature of the case it stands to reason that neither Aristotle nor any other resident in later Athens can be so good an authority for the events and institutions of the days of Perikles or Themistokles, of Solon and of Drakon, as he is for the institutions and events of his own day, and of the generation or two immediately antecedent. Whether a later author is to be preferred to earlier authorities dealing with events and institutions of their own day, or of times less remote from them, when he comes into conflict with their testimony, must depend upon the opinion we form of the alternative sources open to him,

and of the way he uses them. Neither literary planning nor chronological system is a substitute for sight and speech of men and things. *Prima facie* Thucydides should be a better authority for the lives and actions of Themistokles and Perikles than any author in the last quarter of the fourth century could be. At least the question must be raised as to the title the latter may have to preference.

In respect to the institutions described in the second part of the treatise, the new authority may pass unchallenged into the first rank. In respect to the events and institutions described or narrated in the first part, the new authority cannot possibly be taken to disprove 'assumptions' (*i.e.* conclusions) 'made on the strength of the previously existing evidence' (*Introduction*, p. xix.) unless the ordinary canons of historical criticism are to be upset. Or why should a rather late authority, whose evidence is based partly upon the witnesses he is called upon to disprove, and partly upon materials peradventure inferior to them, be allowed to take the court by storm? Why should a late writer, undertaking to cover the events of Attic history from the days of Ion and Erechtheus to the Archonship of Euclid, be assumed an uniformly strong authority? That indeed were an assumption which could only be justified by a most searching criticism of his sources and methods throughout.

There follows a brief capitulation of the author's *sources*, so far as clearly indicated by the internal evidence, or to be gathered from an analysis of the text. Four main heads may be conveniently distinguished in the sources from which the narrative is derived.

I. The bulk of the history seems to be based upon a general tradition and consensus of authorities, or upon the uncontradicted version of some antecedent authority. Mere oral tradition is not referred to expressly, for the terms *φασί*, *λέγουσι*, *passim*, or even such a term as *ὁ λεγόμενος λόγος*, c. 18, p. 48, cannot be taken to imply strict word of mouth. This basis in general or in uncontradicted tradition becomes more obvious when it is traversed or corrected by special traditions, special versions. The author thus distinguishes the common or general from the particular, cc. 3, p. 6, c. 7, p. 16, *ib.* p. 19, c. 16, p. 44, c. 17, pp. 45, 46, c. 18, pp. 48, 49, c. 28, p. 80, and elsewhere. All these references are to anonymous sources; once and once only does the author name a prose writer, viz. Herodotus, c. 14, p. 41, by reason apparently of a discrepancy between the versions of Herodotus and other traditions; but it is tolerably obvious, from the account of the Peisistratidae and of Kleisthenes given in the text, that even if the author had not happened to name Herodotus we should be justified in concluding that he had made use of 'the father of history.' A similar conclusion is to be arrived at by comparison of the text with the texts of Thucydides and Xenophon. Widely as this author departs from Thucydides in regard to the story of the Peisistratids, in regard to Athens in the days of Themistokles and Perikles, in regard, above all, to the revolutions in 412—11 B.C. it is perfectly obvious that he had the work of Thucydides before him. Time and tide wait for no man, and space is limited: it is impossible here now to exhibit the evidence for this conclusion, and for the corresponding conclusion

in regard to Xenophon's *Hellenics* (I. II.). But a *prima facie* case may be established by a reference to the parallels between 'Αθ. πολ. c. 33 and Thucyd. viii. 97. In respect to Xenophon a similar case may be established by a comparison between 'Αθ. πολ. 36 and *Hell.* II. iii. 18—19, where the verbal agreement is startling, and is not seriously weakened by the quasi-Aristotelian paraphrase: *ὡς ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πλήθει τῆς ἀρετῆς ὠρισμένης* for Xenophon's *ὥσπερ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τούτου ἔχοντά τινα ἀνάγκην καλοῦς κἀγαθοῦς εἶναι*. As this passage reproduces a speech by Theramenes it might be argued that Xenophon and the author are independent, and rely on a common source: but the argument is not a strong one, if the date and relation of Xenophon to the subject be considered. But the evidence for believing that the author was acquainted with the works of Thucydides and Xenophon, startling as his dissent from their records is, and strange as all omission of their names may be, is not by any means limited to the items here indicated. Here however upon this point it can only be further observed that the author of the 'Αθ. πολ. evidently had not that supreme reverence for the authority of Thucydides, and that lesser but still lofty reverence for the authority of Xenophon, which is nowadays in order. He does not scruple to traverse their versions, and to gainsay, by implication, their histories. That he does not name them is in accordance with his own attitude to the nearer and the more remote passages in Athenian history. The deliberate references to any authorities, especially to personal authorities, are much fewer for the last six than for the earlier stages in the constitution. Especially for the period of the Peloponnesian war the author plainly considers himself an authority: the unconscious indications for his sources in that period are to some extent favourable to that consideration, as will appear below; and in some particulars, notably in regard to the two *Decemvirates* in the year 403 B.C. the new text makes a valuable addition to our resources. In regard to the earlier periods the author himself betrays a critical uneasiness by the more numerous reference to the sources and their discrepancies, and in two notable particulars he exhibits a sound sense of the comparative merits of various literary sources, viz. in the copious citations from the poems of Solon in support or in refutation of tradition, cc. 5, 12; and in the use made of the *Skolia*, c. 19, p. 50, c. 20, p. 53, though the latter is not to be regarded as beyond criticism. Even in respect to Solon's poems, the author had not, perhaps, realised that the poems themselves might be the source of the traditions which they are cited to confirm. But in any case they are evidence of the highest order, and are so used by the author. In respect to the List or Table of Archons, which is presupposed in the chronology of the piece, it may have existed in manuscript, or upon stone; but in either case was a private document, not an official record, though largely based upon official sources, such as the *ληξιαρχικὰ γραμματεῖα*, or other lists, and any inscriptions with the Archon in the superscription. (Cp. c. 53, pp. 131, 132, and epigraphic texts, even for the fifth century, *passim*.) It is evident, anyway, that the author has some sense of the relative values of various historical sources.

II. A second class of evidences which he employed may be found in the passages where official or quasi-official records or materials have been used in constructing the text. The most notable of these are (1) the Articles of concord in 403 B.C., the *συνθήκαι ἐπ' Ἐυκλείδου* c. 39, a very valuable complement and corrective to Xen. *Hell.* II. iv. 38; (2) and the psephisms of Drakontides c. 34, p. 93, of Pythodoros c. 29, p. 81,¹ and we may venture to add of Themistokles c. 22, p. 64, and of Aristion c. 14, p. 38, with perhaps others. Was the *συναγωγὴ ψηφισμάτων* of Krateros not the earliest collection of its kind? Was any such collection made, or utilised, by the author of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*? Or are the psephisms used in the text casual reminiscences or mere accidental intruders? This suggestion appears unnecessarily harsh. These sources, so far as appears, are most prominent in the period for which the author considers himself a good authority.

III. A third class of evidences deliberately employed by the author, though not to the extent which we moderns might desire, is archaeological. To this or to the preceding head might be referred the citation of the *κύρβεις* in c. 7, p. 17, with which should be compared the reference to laws (*νόμοι*) of Solon's no longer in use c. 8, p. 24. A general reference to this class of evidence, and a particular use of it, occurs in c. 7, p. 20, but not primarily on the author's own part. The remark on the *præ-Solonian* coinage c. 10, p. 27, may or may not be based on autopsy. In any case the total amount of evidence under this head is disappointing. The Persian War and later troubles damaged the archaeological evidences in Athens and Attica for earlier times, and what the enemy spared the native builders or restorers destroyed.

IV. But failing general tradition or agreement (*πάντες σχεδόν, οἱ πλείους et sim.*); failing special traditions and criticisms (*ἔνιοι, οἱ δημοτικοί, τινές, et sim.*); failing individual authorities—Solon, Herodotus, and anonymous; failing skolia, psephisms, and archaeological evidences, the author has a source of knowledge, or rather a method of reconstruction, to take the place of direct testimony, tradition, or evidence. This method consists in a process of inference from the present to the past, from existing circumstances to their presumable antecedents, from a given state of institutions to a former condition of the same. This is a method for the recovery of the past which, if employed with due precautions and in proper conditions, may work wonders; but if used illegitimately is a mere form of rationalism, deducing a past which was never present, as surely as an allegorising or a euhemeristic interpretation of legend. The method here under review is in vogue with anthropologists to-day. It proceeds upon certain assumptions and analogies: as of the organic continuity of the historic process, the *survival* in later stages of relics material and

¹ In respect to the psephism of Pythodoros the editor makes a remark, that (as Pythodoros is spoken of as the author of the psephism) 'the rider proposed by Kleitophon' was apparently rejected: on the contrary, the highly technical language in which the proposal of Kleitophon is

introduced would support the inference that the author is following an epigraphic or at least an official text, in which the proposal of Kleitophon would scarcely have been included unless it had been passed. Of course the main psephism bore the name of the original mover.

objective of earlier stages, relies which carry us back further than mere reminiscence or memorial tradition can do; carry us back not merely beyond the recorded memory of man, but almost beyond the sphere of self-consciousness itself. If such a method be not critically and carefully applied, and tested by positive evidences and historic traditions so far as recoverable; if it be employed without a full realisation of the differences between the *results* of evolution and the *revivals*, or survivals, of earlier stages, between the inference to objective facts in the past (institutions, circumstances, events) and the inference to subjective facts in the past (designs, purposes, intuitions, ideals, &c. of legislators, statesmen, kings and priests); then the results of the application of this method is a presentation of logical fictions, not a representation of historical facts.

In justice to the author of the 'Αθ. πολ. who largely employs this method, it must be observed that he is more or less aware of the distinction just drawn: we find, as it were, the formula, or a part of the formula for the critical application of this method in c. 9, p. 27, οὐ γὰρ δίκαιον ἐκ τῶν νῦν γινομένων ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἄλλης πολιτείας θεωρεῖν τὴν ἐκείνου βούλησιν. But this anticipation of the formula is little or nothing. Many employ correct methods in reasoning without expressing the formulae for their methods; and many formulate the right methods, only to depart in practice from their ideal standards. An examination of the passages in which this method is employed in the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία points to the conclusion that the author himself, and his authorities, often make it do duty for direct evidences or testimony, and present results, which are really inferences of one kind or another, and sometimes illegitimate inferences from the present to the past, as though they were genuine memories, traditions, bequests from the past to the present. It is impossible here fully to set forth the illustrations for this critique. The following instances may, however, serve provisionally. In two cases the author mentions the employment of this method by others and apparently endorses the method: (1) c. 3, p. 6, the oath of the Nine Archons, (2) c. 7, p. 19, the property qualifications of the second class (ἰππεῖς). In the second case, notwithstanding the additional archaeological argument, he dissents from the result, apparently on the ground that the conclusion to which the method points in this case disturbs the analogy of the classification (cp. c. 9, *ad fin.*). In the two cases following the author uses this method himself, or accepts its use, and the argument is legitimate, though the results may not be certain: (1) c. 3, p. 7, the sacral marriage of the βασιλιννα, (2) c. 8, pp. 21, 22, the Solonian method of appointing officials. In other cases the method is employed under very suspicious circumstances, and with highly questionable results: *e.g.* (1) c. 26, p. 74, the supposed institution of οἱ κατὰ δῆμους δικασταὶ by Peisistratos, (2) c. 22, p. 59, the supposed motive for the institution of ostrakism by Kleisthenes, a case where the author seems to come very near violating his own admirable canon, c. 9, *ad fin.* Without attempting here further to multiply examples or to discuss details, it may be added that the signals of this method of inferring the fact from the reason are the innocent γὰρ (c. 2.

p. 3, c. 2, p. 5. *et al.*) the more elaborate ὄθεν, or ὄθεν καὶ (c. 3, p. 5, c. 8, p. 22), the suspicious διὰ, διὰ καὶ (c. 3, p. 6, p. 9, c. 8, p. 24) and above all the term *σημείον*. Wherever these signals occur the critical reader will beware of danger ahead. It may not be necessary in every case to reject the supposed evidence and inference; but it will always be expedient carefully to examine before admitting them. In fine, a critical examination of the system followed in the reconstruction of the past and primitive stages of Athenian history shows us that this authority is by no means free of the fallacy which substitutes inference from the present or remembered past to the unknown and forgotten to do duty for historical evidences, to a greater or less extent. In this process Reason takes the place of Memory, Imagination represents Tradition, Fiction is with more or less good faith substituted for Fact. In all this, it must be admitted, there is nothing un-Aristotelian. The account given in *Politics*, I, of the genesis of the πόλις is an eminent illustration of the application of this method, notwithstanding the excellent profession of faith with which the second chapter starts. The origin of the πόλις is there deduced from the existing constitution of society, and the supposed nature of man; and the result is not much more historical than the Social Contract theory of Hobbes itself. But this coincidence in method is no argument for the Aristotelian authorship of the Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία, for the method is common to most of the Greek writers, to a greater or less extent, and is by no means confined to them.

Illusions bred of this illusory method may be fairly expected in greater numbers the more and more remote the past with which the author deals. And such in fact appears to be the case in the present instance. The Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία is a very high authority for the institutions of the fourth century, but not so good an authority for the institutions and events prior to the archonship of Euclid. It is, *prima facie*, a better authority for the last six stages of the constitution, than for the first six: a better authority, where contemporary historical evidences are still forthcoming, than when inferences of the author, or in his sources, lead to a speculative reconstruction. It is endlessly to be regretted that the beginning of the treatise, dealing with the constitutions of Ion, and of Theseus, has not yet been recovered: it would probably have afforded indisputable illustrations of the mischief worked by an *à priori* method in historical research, and have facilitated the recognition of its presence, in more or less diminishing force, in the later stages. But enough remains to put us on our guard against accepting the new authority as equally valid and valuable in each section, and in every sub-division, and to convince the critical historian that each particular statement in this new text, and especially in the retrospective portions of it, must be tested and scrutinised before the full franchise is conferred upon it. The author's *methods* are not unquestionable, his *sources* not exhaustive, the *points of view* not always unprejudiced, the *text* not all genuine. Even if the argument for ascribing the work to Aristotle himself were stronger than it is, would the result be to enhance the authority of the treatise on the one hand, or of the philosopher on the other? In any case

the historical value of the work can only be fully appreciated by an exhaustive consideration of its details.

To undertake such a scrutiny of particular statements lies beyond the purpose of this Essay, the main object of which has been to lay more stress on some of the considerations preliminary to an historical appreciation of the text than has so far been laid, whether in the Introduction and Notes, by the editor, or in the comments of the learned press.

REGINALD W. MACAN.

OXFORD, 11 *March*, 1891


ARCHAIC RELIEFS AT DHIMITZANA.

[PLATE XI.]

AT Easter-tide last year, while returning through the Peloponnesus from Olympia to Megalopolis, I passed through the picturesque mountain town of Dhimitzana and had the opportunity of paying a short visit to its Museum. This collection is attached to the Hellenic or second-grade school, the successor of a famous institution, which did much to keep alive the Greek language and literature in the darkest days of Turkish rule, and has been almost entirely formed through the archaeological learning and intelligent energy of the Archimandrite Hieronymos Bogiatsés, who has himself conducted excavations in the neighbourhood and whose interest in the antiquities of his country is as keen as it is exceptional. The Arcadian objects preserved in the Museum are of less importance; but a connection with Sparta, where many natives of Dhimitzana are resident, has attracted to it presents of Laconian antiquities from patriotic townsmen. Among these are the two supplementary Spartan stelai, those of Timokles and Aristokles, published by Milchhoefer in his 'Antikenbericht aus Peloponnesus' in the Athenian *Mittheilungen*; and the three archaic bone plaques, which are now published at Father Hieronymos' request (see Pl. XI.) are part of a similar gift. Unfortunately the details of their provenance cannot be satisfactorily ascertained, as they are not the fruit of any regular excavation but only of an accidental tomb-find. They were presented to the Museum about four years ago by Mr. John Kazákos, director of the telegraph-office at Sparta, and had been shortly before found by a Mr. Chronópoulos in a tomb in the neighbourhood, on the left bank of the Eurotas, at a spot called the 'Bath of Helen' (τῆς Ἑλένης τὸ λουῦτρον). This tomb, according to the report, contained also pieces of mirrors, coins, broken ornaments, and some curious cone-shaped objects of gilded metal, two of which if placed together resemble an egg and were to all appearances thus originally attached. All these objects are now at Dhimitzana, but during my short stay I had no time to examine them; the coins however need no attention, whatever their date may be, as the archaic character of the reliefs makes it almost impossible that they can be contemporary. We have before us probably older objects, which found their way into a later grave.

The question arises, what purpose they served. Were they votive, or part of the decoration of some kind of cista or box? Both theories are possible. It is not necessary to adduce examples of 'anathemata' found in

graves, as that is common enough; and in the immediate neighbourhood of Sparta the juxtaposition of two warriors and a lady suggests Helen and the Dioscuri. It is likely in that case that these reliefs are similar to the many votive figures in lead and clay first found by Ross in the Menelaion at Therapne, which has recently been completely excavated by Mr. Kastroménos, ephor of antiquities, the sanctuary where Menelaus and Helen were worshipped (Paus. iii. 19, 9). The published specimens of these figures (*Arch. Zeit.* 1854 pl. lxv.) bear no resemblance in detail, but belong to the same primitive period of art. It is possible then that these male figures may be duplicates of Menelaus: but there was also a temple of the Dioscuri near Therapne (Paus. iii. 20, 1) and the cult of both was popular in Sparta. Each of these three specimens has or had two holes for attachment by nails at opposite corners: this however does not prove either view to be correct. It is equally possible



(1) Polished.



(2) Unpolished.

that they were decorative panels of a box or casket which was perhaps of wood, and if so the figures are typical ones applied to decorative purposes. Two bone plaques, here engraved, of the same size and shape with female figures in low relief were found in the Acropolis at Athens and are now in the bronze-room of the Museum. These have the same attachment-holes and are doubtless to be classed with the numerous votive figures of terra-cotta. The latter are certainly not intended in the majority of cases to represent the goddess Athena, but the offering to her of a female figure, in whatever material, was appropriate enough. While then it may be fairly held that these small reliefs are 'anathemata' to the mythic heroized personages of Spartan cult, they need not be supposed to be representations of them.

The reliefs are reproduced as nearly as possible full-size. The dimensions

are only '03 mètre by '08, and in the case of the female figure '027 by '084. There is absolutely no trace of colour or gilding, such as is to be seen on the Etruscan ivories figured in Micali, *Ant. Mon.* xli. 10-11. The latter plaque has a raised ledge at top and bottom: it shows a female to right clad in a long chiton and a short himation drawn over the head and utilized as a veil. She is obviously supposed to have both hands uplifted and placed together, though the artist has only known how to represent one. The pattern of the flounce, consisting of two raised lines separated by a row of dots, is repeated horizontally across the dress somewhat higher, while below it is curved. The pattern and shape of the dress reminds somewhat of the Mycenaean-gem with the female figure seated under a tree, and still more of the strange terra-cotta female idol in thin gold relief.¹ The eye is a circle separated from the surface of the face by an incision, with a dot in the centre and depressions marked at either corner, just like the male eye on black-figured vases. The surfaces are very flat and the technique is that of an inexpert wood-carver; the hand for instance is divided into fingers by three straight notches. The figure has many parallels in early black-figured vases. In the archaic kylix of Xenokles² (who must surely be an earlier artist than the 'Kleinmeister' painter of that name) representing the three goddesses and Hermes, the central figure, which seems to be differentiated from the others as Athena, is very similar in the rendering of the uplifted hand, the veiled head, the bars of pattern across the dress, and the protruding profile. The two warriors of the other plaques are very remarkable and are in essentials alike. Both are represented as marching to the right with the left leg advanced, and wear helmets with bushy crests, corselets with a raised lower rim but without 'mitra' or *πτερύγια*, and greaves, holding in the right hand a spear with very stout shaft. Neither has the short chiton of the later Aristion-type of warrior, and both present an extremely rude and barbarous appearance from their short and squat proportions, thick limbs, and the absence of anything in the shape of clothes as distinct from armour. Both have long hair, treated in one case as that of the Diskos-bearer in rolls, in the other almost like a cluster of grapes. They have beards but not moustaches. In the two cases the helmets are slightly different. One has cheek-pieces and a flap over the nose, the other seems to have a chin covering. One carries a round shield on his left arm, the other has the left arm bent and the hand seems to be also grasping the spear. The eye in both cases is a mere circle divided from the flat face by an incision; the nose is very prominent, the small mouth is set back and has an upward curl, and the chin projects. Under the cuirass are indicated the outlines of the chest. The treatment of the eye, the pattern round the bottom of the cuirass, and the notch arrangement of the crest show the wood-carving technique again. The rudeness of these figures with their stout thighs, bare feet and absence of *πτερύγια* shows the extremely

¹ Schuchardt; *Schlicmann's Ausgrabungen*, Nos. 281. 182.

² Raoul Rochette, *Mon. Inéd.* pl. 49

primitive time of the work. The proportion of head to body is the same as in the bronze warrior from Dodona (*Arch. Zeit.* 1882, Pl. I.), which has a more slender anatomy and consequently a less clumsy appearance: in both cases the head is almost a fifth of the total height of the body (·014 to ·068 and ·02 to ·107).

A mere comparison with the Spartan stelai would suffice to show that these are genuine specimens of early Spartan art. The famous Chrysapha stele with the notchlike treatment of the side-curls and the flatness of its surfaces shows the influence of wood technique. But two undoubted specimens of Spartan art can be brought into comparison, which show a most remarkable resemblance to these reliefs. The first is a small inscribed bronze, ·067 high, found at Kosmas, the ancient Selinus, on the heights of Parnon, 30 kilometres from Sparta, Chrysapha being on the direct line between the two; it is now in the Museum of the Archaeological Society at Athens, and was published (though the reproduction is extremely poor) by Dr. L. Julius in the Athenian *Mittheilungen* for 1878 (Plate I. 2). A warrior of very short proportions (the head being a fourth of the body), armed with helmet, corselet, and greaves, is stepping forward with his left foot advanced. He has no moustache but is bearded and wears long hair. In the slightly raised right hand he held a lowered spear, and the left arm is bent at the elbow, as if he were carrying a shield. There is no indication of there ever having been a shield soldered on, but it is quite possible, though Julius thinks otherwise, for such signs of attachment entirely to disappear. The resemblance to the shieldless figure on the bone plaque is strikingly close. The only real variations are that in the bronze a semi-floral pattern is added on the corselet and that the lance is not held upright. The crest is treated in the same way but raised on a rod in the round, which was impossible owing to want of space in the flat. The difference of material causes slight variations in the rendering of details: in bone the eye and the pattern on the bottom of the cuirass were raised, in bronze they are given by sunk holes.¹ It is not too much to say that these two works, the bronze figures and the bone relief, must have come from the same hand or at any rate the same school and time. The bone plaque suggests a somewhat earlier date than that conjectured by Julius, arguing from the inscription.

The other work is a fragment of terra-cotta relief, which seems to have been part of a vase, bought by Lebas in the village of Magoula close to Sparta (Lebas vol. iv. pl. 105) and last seen at a dealer's shop in Paris (Couze *Annali* 1870 p. 279), representing the fight over a fallen warrior, perhaps a scene from the Trojan war. Two bearded and long-haired warriors wearing helmets with tall crests, corselets, greaves and swords suspended by belts are fighting with spears, one bearing a Boeotian shield decorated with two four-point stars and the other a round one. The warrior below has fallen on his

¹ A bronze-warrior in Berlin (2164), found in Italy, bears a general resemblance but approximates more to the Aristion-types, both in

dimensions and in the possession of corselet-flaps.

face to right, also having Boeotian shield, helmet and corselet. On the left an archer is stretching his bow and from the right approaches a warrior with sheathed sword. These warriors are not so short and clumsy, but in their equipment, the profile of the faces (cf. also the vase of Aristonophos) and the same cluster-like treatment of the hair, there is a strong likeness between them and the Dhimitzana reliefs.

In these three materials the same type is represented—the Spartan warrior of the 7th or early 6th century with his long hair and his military equipment lacking both chiton and corselet-flaps. The female figures on the Acropolis plaques are obviously later and may be compared rather for technique and subject than for style; the surfaces are not so flat but more rounded and the difficulties of the material are better overcome. The eye for instance is still in relief but quite of an almond shape, the side-locks and the ears are shown, the veil is being drawn aside with quite a different attitude, and a rude attempt is made to express the feet. Etruscan art is not without its parallels. Mr. A. H. Smith has kindly pointed out to me some ivory plaques found in a tomb at Corneto-Tarquiniæ, which have the same attachment holes and bear a general resemblance to these reliefs though in feeling and subjects they are thoroughly Etruscan (*Mon.* vi. 46). A similar warrior type is also to be found in relief on the handles of ‘bucchero nero’ vases of Chiusi (cf. e.g. Micali, *Ant. Mon.* li. 3): this class, which is probably both anterior to and contemporary with the earliest importation of Greek vases into Etruria, shows similar figures with wedge-shaped beards, crested helmets, stout spears, and cuirass fitting to the outline of the body. It would however be unsafe to draw any conclusions as to connection of art-types therefrom: the primitive warrior type is *primâ facie* likely to be similar in different localities. It may then be regarded as certain that in these reliefs we have specimens of early native Laconian art, which it is interesting to compare with the Spartan stelai, and see the type of Dorian warrior and lady of a very early period reproduced as faithfully as the limited artistic power of the local artist allowed.

G. C. RICHARDS.

SCULPTURE IN SICILIAN MUSEUMS.

ON travelling through Sicily in the spring of last year, I studied as carefully as my time allowed the classical remains in the museums of Palermo, Girgenti, Catania and Syracuse, and in the lack of any general catalogue of those antiquities and of any accessible information concerning them, the following notices accompanied by a few sketches from photographs I was able to take may be of slight service. I only wish to speak of the more important objects that, as far as I know, have not yet been at all or sufficiently published. Valuable as these objects are, I have been greatly surprised at the paucity of literary reference to them. The coin-collections and the architecture of the island have been carefully studied and written on: but an Englishman might seek in vain for much enlightenment in the archaeological publications of Sicily itself concerning its other antiquities. The art-journal entitled *La Sicilia artistica ed archeologica* refers almost entirely to mediæval and modern paintings; and has published nothing classical except the Venus of Syracuse with two or three other statues of the goddess. Possibly the *Buletino della commissione di Antichità e belle arti di Sicilia* may have contributed much to classical archaeology, but unfortunately nothing of this publication is to be found in England except an isolated number of the year 1864 in the British Museum Library. There may be some important notices in such works as Politi's *Viaggiatore in Girgenti*, or Bartel's *Briefe über Calabrien*, or Parthey's *Wanderungen durch Sicilien*, but I have not been able to find these books in any of our libraries. Serradifalco's *Antichità di Sicilia* is mainly architectural, with a few valueless references to works of sculpture. The metopes of Selinus and the Venus of Syracuse are the best known objects of these museums, and these have been frequently and carefully published; and the Hippolytus-sarcophagus in the Cathedral of Girgenti has been sufficiently described. The few scattered references in archaeological journals of Germany, France or Italy to the Sicilian museums will be mentioned in the course of this paper: the most important is the description of the vases of Palermo by Heydemann, in the *Archæologische Zeitung* of 1870, who visited the museum in 1869 when it was scarcely put into order. The inscriptions of the island have been collected in the *Inscriptiones Græcæ Siciliae et Italiae* recently edited by Kaibel.

Among the works of sculpture in the Museo Nazionale of Palermo there is little that belongs to the archaic period besides the metopes of Selinus. These are too well-known to need description, and the recently discovered

metope was found after I had left the island. Certain terra-cotta male and female heads are worth noticing, that were found at Girgenti, and have not yet been published so far as I am aware: they are of the middle archaic style and some of them show the 'Doric' or 'Peloponnesian' treatment of forms, but one or two the softer 'Ionic' or Eastern manner that is illustrated also by another head in the museum—a terra-cotta female head from Selinus with earrings in the ears. We may suppose that at Acragas, as again in Cyprus and Rhodes, the two styles were simultaneously in vogue, and the just mentioned head from Selinus contrasts with some other heads apparently of



FIG. 1.

the same origin in the room of the metopes, that show a Peloponnesian style and expression and belong to the archaic and transitional periods.

Of fifth century sculpture, the museum possesses three works of considerable beauty and interest, placed along the right wall of the large court:

(a) A statue restored as Hermes, somewhat under life-size, holding a purse in his uplifted right hand: but the body has nothing to do with the head, being of different and much later work and of different marble. The hair is compressed by a very close-fitting pileus, and the whole countenance with its sombre expression and Peloponnesian forms reminds us immediately of the Doryphorus type.

We are struck with the severely drawn lines of the cheek-bone, the great breadth of cheek and head and the largeness of the chin. The line of the eyebrows is well marked but scarcely curved; the ear is free of the surrounding hair. Approximately one might assign the head to the earlier decades of the last half of the fifth century.

(*b*) A votive relief showing the nude figure of an Attic ephebos, who holds in his right hand a cloth and oil-flask—the signs of the palaestra; the left arm is enveloped in a chlamys, and his left hand rests on his hip (Fig. 1). The surface of the centre of the body and of the right arm from the middle of the forearm downwards has been broken away and restored, the restoration being certain because the objects which his right hand held are still preserved on the relief. The representation may be illustrated from other grave reliefs; but this possesses a special interest because of the remarkable resemblance of the figure to the well-known Hermes on the Ephesian column. The outline of the figures would be exactly the same if the head of the ephebos were looking up instead of down, if his left foot were placed more freely and lightly on the ground, and if he held the *κηρυκεῖον* instead of the oil-flask and cloth; the congruity of the two prove the wide prevalence of a certain type. But the Palermo relief is of higher beauty; the torso shows, though in a subdued degree, the grand manner of the Parthenon sculpture, and the surface, with the exception of the part about the juncture of the right arm and the right breast, is very warmly wrought. The upward spring of the lips and the curve of the eyebrows remind us of the features of the Eros of the Parthenon. The nose and the upper part of the skull are modern, but enough of the countenance is preserved to display the moving grace of the Attic expression.

(*c*) A relief-slab, sixteen inches high and twenty broad, uninscribed, and containing a rather doubtful representation: a tall female figure in a Doric diploidion, and with such an arrangement of drapery as to recall the works of the earlier Pheidian period, is pouring a libation to a man on the right, who wears a chiton and cuirass and bears a shield on his left arm but whose head is missing: above her is a Victory flying towards him. On the left of the scene are smaller figures—a woman, and a man clad in a himation that leaves most of his breast bare, and holding up his right hand. I am not sure of the ‘provenance’ of the relief; if it comes from Athens it would be natural to interpret the taller personage, who is certainly a goddess, as Athene, though she has no other appropriate attributes but the maidenly costume: and it is probably no divinity or hero whom she is greeting with the wine but a successful general on his return, a Pericles or Cimon. It would be scarcely antedating the relief to refer it to the time of Cimon’s victories, for the style of the transitional period appears in Athene’s face, in the great breadth of her cheek, and the faulty rendering of the profile of the eye. If some such explanation as this that I have suggested is correct, the occasion must have been a great one that was thus commemorated. Among the interesting group of votive or commemorative reliefs published by Schöne there is none that offers a close parallel to this scene, although its spirit is quite in accord with many

of those in which Athene appears in various intimate and friendly relations with her citizens. In many of them the winged Victory is with the goddess and stretching forth her hand or a garland to a victor, only never flying above the head of the goddess as in the Palermo relief but poised above her hand as in the chryselephantine work of Pheidias, from which the type of the goddess in that series of works is usually derived.

Near to this relief is another tablet, said to have been brought from Athens and containing an inscription and relief, that in all probability commemorates like the last some victory: the inscription is a decree in honour of Leochares, son of Chares from Apollonia, and the style of writing belongs to the fourth century. Above the inscription on the left a female figure is represented who appears to be decking a trophy or perhaps writing on a monument. On the right is a seated male figure, probably Demos.¹

The museum possesses four striking works of Alexandrine sculpture:—

(1) A marble figure of Hypnos that deserves to be better known through proper publication (Fig. 2). The statue stands nearly by the centre of the right wing of the first court, and there can be little doubt as to its right designation, for the head is crowned with a chaplet of poppies, half concealed in the hair and not very visible from below. By a correct instinct the restorer has placed the head upon a body that may have belonged to a statue of Hypnos, for part of the torch is ancient, and the whole pose is very like that of the Pio-Clementino statue given in Clarac (*Musée de Sculpture*, pl. 762, No. 1860). But the body of the Palermo statue has nothing to do with the head, which is of quite different marble, and perhaps three centuries older, and of exquisite Greek work, while the treatment of the body is hard and cold. The face is dreamily serious, the head is slightly drooping sideways and the eyes half closed: the lips are rather full and broad; the whole surface is very warm, and some of the forms, for instance the right ear, are rendered with the rarest delicacy. These qualities of the sculpture and the large oval contour lead me to assign the head to the early Alexandrine era: and to consider it the earliest surviving representation of Hypnos in sculpture—earlier than the bronze head of the British Museum, of which the forms are sharper and thinner, and in which the idea is more vividly and less profoundly expressed. The sculptor of the Palermo Hypnos has dispensed with wings, and in rendering the character of Sleep has relied upon the poppy crown, the subdued expression, and the pose of the head. The features are well preserved, but the lower part of the nose is modern: the length of the head is about $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches.

(2) A grave-relief from Athens, containing the form of a young boy, who holds a curiously shaped toy in his left hand, and in his right holds out a bird to his dog, a shaggy terrier. The smiling face shows the softest Attic grace and expression, and the body which is naked is excellently modulated without any trace of hardness except in the rendering of the feet. The style belongs to the early Alexandrine period, and the work deserves reputation as one of the earliest that has dealt successfully with the forms of childhood.

¹ This inscription is strangely omitted by Kaibel in his *Inscriptiones Græcæ Siciliae et Italiæ*. I cannot find any publication of it.

(3) With this may be compared another work in the museum, a broken torso, perhaps of the child Eros, another specimen of excellent Alexandrine work.

(4) A bronze of Heracles with the Kerynean stag, of very vigorous and robust forms, but not very finished workmanship: the face is skilfully modulated.




FIG. 2.

Of the sculptures of the Roman period some may be singled out as possessing a special interest through their more or less near relation to Pergamene style or motives. Such are:—

(1) A relief-representation of a combat between the Gauls and the Greeks, which, as far as I can find, has not yet been published, and which is not

mentioned by M. Reinach in his series of articles on *Les Gaulois dans l'Art Antique*.¹ It is unfortunately set so high on the wall that I was unable to obtain a successful photograph of it: but the following is a brief description of the groups. At the right and left extremity of the whole scene are two male figures erect and wearing the Gallic tunic, possibly captives, or rather, as their hands do not appear to be bound, personifications of the conquered country; next to each of these and also taking no part in the action is a woman, the one on the left in the customary attitude of mourning, bringing her left arm across her breast and raising her right hand to her face as she looks down and away from the scene, the other on the right with her hands folded in front of her and her head raised and turned towards the battle which she watches without any particular show of emotion. These two figures resemble each other on the whole though their drapery is rather differently arranged, the woman on the right being draped more in the later Pheidonian fashion. Her whole form and expression remind us of the 'Thusnelda' of Florence,² except that her feet are not crossed; and the pensive attitude had become typical for the woman of the conquered barbarian land as in the statue described by Aldrovandi³: *ha i capelli lunghi e il capo appoggiato su la man manca, mostrando mestitia*. By the side of the women are pitchers turned over on the ground. We have then a *mêlée* of Greek horsemen and Gallic warriors who carry the spear and the oval Gallic shield, of whom some are erect, some struggling on their knees, and two recumbent under the horses. The work may be of the first century A.D., but there is nothing Roman in the details; and older motives that belong to the Pergamene age have survived in the representation: one of the kneeling figures resembles the kneeling Gaul of Venice, and another reminds us of a wounded Gallic warrior on the sarcophagus of Amendola⁴; the recumbent bodies appear more or less as they are found on the sarcophagus of the Campo Santo of Pisa, and in looking at the warrior threatening the horseman on the right one may remember the giant on the Pergamene frieze who is withstanding Zeus; but no form on the Palermo relief has preserved so much of the Pergamene style and expression as the central barbarian whose left knee is on the ground, and whose shield is raised over his head to defend himself from the horseman's blow: his eyes are deep-set and his brows knit, and the wild hair and the wrathful features are like those of the giant's head from Trebizond in the British Museum.

(2) An oval medallion about three feet high representing in relief a barbarian with wild hair and expression, looking up as though at some enemy above him; his body is preserved as far as the beginning of the thighs; he wears a cloak buckled over his shoulder and he carries two spears. His face, partly covered with moustache and whiskers, is of a more than usually ferocious type; his eyes are very deep and the bone and flesh of the forehead projects over them, and the mouth is wide open.

¹ *Revue Archéologique*, 1889 and 1890.

² Banmeister, No. 235.

³ *Revue Archéologique*, 1888, p. 19.

⁴ The central figure kneeling beneath a horseman, *vide* Pl. xxii, xxiii. in *Revue Archéologique*, 1888.

(3) A monument of greater interest than these, and standing in a closer relation to the Pergamene school, a statue representing a youthful companion of Odysseus in the clutches of one of the dogs of Scylla (Fig. 3). The interpretation is proved—if at first it might seem doubtful—by traces of the fins that must have spread themselves from Scylla's waist and appear on the neck of her hound. At first sight of the Palermo work, I was reminded of the 'Milo' in the Torlonia Museum, and felt sure that the name of this latter statue and the tree in which one of his hands is caught are due to the folly of the restorer. And I have afterwards found that this very close affinity of the Palermo and Torlonia statues had been already established by Schöne in the *Archaeologische Zeitung* 1870, S. 57, who publishes an engraving of the latter and a slight sketch of the former (Taf. 34).¹ He has also noticed another head in the Palermo Museum which almost exactly corresponds to a head in



FIG. 3.

the Villa Albani, both belonging to the same representation of Scylla and the companions of Odysseus.² A few remarks may be added to his notice and criticism. From the literary notices that Schöne collects, and from the surviving fragments of various representations of the same subject, we may conclude that there was an archetype group of some celebrity. And there can be little doubt as to the main forms of it: we must imagine the upper body of Scylla towering above the hounds and their prey, as the centre of the whole

¹ When Schöne saw the Roman work in 1869 it was in the Villa Albani, and was neither designated nor restored as Milo; it was then transferred to the Villa Torlonia, and defaced by the evil genius of restoration that has presided over that collection. The absurdity has

since been exposed by Schreiber, *Arch. Zeit.* 1879, p. 63.

² Cf. also the head at Hannover, sketched in *Mith. d. deutsch. Inst.* 1889, p. 163, recognised by G. Treu as belonging to the representation of the same subject.

the figures of the Palermo and Torlonia collections must have been on the right extremity of the group; the left being perhaps occupied by the bearded



FIG. 4.



FIG. 5.

man whom Scylla has clutched by the hair, the figure of which the heads at Palermo and Hanover showing the hand of Scylla are fragments. This re-

construction is guaranteed partly by the necessities of the case, but chiefly by the important marble in the University Galleries of Oxford, which has been accurately described by Michaelis (*Ancient Marbles*, p. 549), and of which engravings are here given (Figs. 4, 5): and with this we may also compare the representation of Scylla in *Mon. dell' Inst.* iii. 53, and in *Mith. d. deut. Inst.* 1889, p. 162. The original we must suppose then to be a large group of free sculpture with picturesque episodes, and with something of the same general character as the group of the Farnese Bull. The small Oxford copy was evidently intended to decorate a fountain, and the subject is an appropriate one for the purpose, but that this was also the purpose of the archetype we have no sufficient reason for saying, as the passages in ancient writers that refer to well-known representations of this theme contain no such allusion. But we have reason for believing that the original work—whatever was its destination—was an achievement of the Rhodian-Pergamene school. In the first place, the youthful figures of Palermo and the Villa Torlonia—as a glance at the accompanying figure will show—forcibly remind us of the pose and motive of Laocoon: in the next place, the well-known style of that school appears in the head and body of the Palermo statue, in the large surfaces of the pectinal muscles, in the treatment of the wavy hair, in the violently wrought features and the vehement expression. The other head in this museum, closely akin to that in the Villa Albani which used to be called Thersites, has been with some probability attached by Schöne to this group; the expression is yet more violent and approaches the barbaric, but still shows a general resemblance to that of the Laocoon. Both the Palermo fragments are of the Roman period, but the Torlonia statue is still later and of worse execution, showing however the same dramatic and pathetic qualities of sculpture. And we cannot trace the subject far back into the older periods of Greek art: for we cannot say that the Scylla of Nicomachus was a representation that included the companions of Odysseus. Again, we have certain *a priori* reasons—whatever the weight of such reasons are—for attributing the subject to the above mentioned school, as one, if not invented by them, at least congenial to them: we have other instances of their skill in dealing with the personifications of the sea, as for instance the Triton of the Vatican; and the subject in question admits of that vehement expression of mere physical pathos which they loved.¹ We find a Scylla with hounds around her waist and serpent legs on a vase from Pergamon now at Berlin.² Thus it may be more than a mere coincidence that the same representation on an Etruscan cinerary urn³ has a formal resemblance in outline to the group of Laocoon, and in details to some of the groups in the Pergamene gigantomachy.

(4) A small relief containing the figure of a youthful giant with both

¹ The description of the bronze statue of Scylla in the epigram Anth. Pal. ix., τὸσσον ἐπισσεῖται, τὸσσον κότον ἀντία φαίνει, would apply to such a work as we might expect from the Pergamene school.

² No. 2894, *Beschreibung der Vasensammlung im Antiquarium.*

³ Vide *Mon. dell. Inst.* iii. 53, and *Bau-meister*, No. 1762.

hands uplifted and serving as an architectural support: he has serpent legs, and the style of the Pergamene school, though much debased, appears still in the torso and the face.

(5) A small statue of Heracles wearing the lion's skin as a helmet, and holding the apples of the Hesperides; many parts of it and especially the arms have been restored. The rendering of the face shows a faint impress of the style of this school.

(6) A mosaic containing a very striking bust of Poseidon with his trident: he has the wild hair and expression proper to the later type: also a head of Helios crowned with rays. The countenance is full of passion and shows a development of the type seen on coins of Rhodes.

Of the later Roman period and of general affinity with Alexandrine themes, the following are noticeable: (a) a youthful satyr pouring a libation, a copy of an early and much imitated work; (b) a relief of comparatively good style showing the sleeping Ariadne in the pose of the Vatican and Torlonia statues, attended by a boy Eros, revealing her to Bacchus who must be supposed to be coming from the left, while a fawn is looking towards the approaching god, and a maenad is shaking her crotalos over Ariadne; (c) the Zeus-statue of Tyndaris, described by Abeken and Overbeck¹ and over-rated by both; there is a certain simple grandeur in the arrangement of the drapery, but the rendering of the body is very coarse and dull. It is Greek marble worked from a good original but in the Roman period.

The vases in the Palermo Museum have been described by Heydemann in three papers of the *Archæologische Zeitung* (years 1871 and 1872). I will only mention a few important representations which do not occur in his list, and which perhaps have been added since his visit to the collection: (a) A black-figured vase on which Heracles is represented carrying the Cercopes on a pole over his shoulder, while Athene behind is holding out her aegis and encouraging him. (b) A black-figured amphora showing Heracles with the dead boar which he holds in the usual fashion over Eurystheus who has retired into the well. (c) A red-figured crater, of fine fifth century style, containing a group of Dionysos and his maenads with Eros: it is one of those vases that as regards the treatment of the drapery and features might illustrate the style of Polygnotus. The figure and countenance of Eros are very striking: he stands with one foot raised as if he were buckling his sandal; there is an unusually profound expression in his face.

Of the sculpture and vases at Girgenti nothing as far as I can learn has been published except the well-known sarcophagus of the Hippolytos-representation that stands in the Cathedral. The small museum contains some vases, and one important work of sculpture: of the former I can only mention a black-figured crater with white marking of the flesh on which the struggle of Peleus and Thetis is represented, and a red-figured vase with the finely drawn figures of Dionysos and Hephaestus, the wine-god leading him on the ass back

¹ Vide *Annali dell' Inst.* 1839, p. 63, and Overbeck, *Kunst.-Mythologie*, Bd. i. p. 132 (with sketch).

to Olympus. The work of sculpture deserves to be known, and I regret that I could not obtain a photograph of it. It is the statue of a boy in the style of the transitional period, closely resembling the bronze boy in the Louvre.¹ The right leg is advanced and the right arm extended, but otherwise the pose is stiff and constrained; for the hips are parallel and the weight falls equally on both feet. There is only a faint indication of the diaphragm and the ribs but the rendering of the large surfaces of the breast and of the muscles about the hips is excellent. The hair is bound in a fillet and shows the imitation of bronze work as it falls in parallel vertical spirals over the forehead, leaving both ears free. The head is somewhat four-square: the centre of the face a long oval: the cheeks are very broad and the chin large: the line of the lips is straight and the lower lip slightly flattened outwards: the eyes are very narrow and long and the lids not very prominent.

The collection of the Catania Museum has little of value compared with those of Palermo and Syracuse. Among the vases a fine red-figured oinochoe is of interest, showing the representation of the pursuit of Ganymede by Zeus. The god bears a sceptre and wears a fillet and chlamys: a slight touch of archaism survives in some of the details, as for instance in the beard of Zeus, but the drawing and the articulation of the flesh show the power and freedom of the best fifth century style. There are few works of sculpture of importance. I observed some terra-cotta heads of the archaic period, and the sensuous 'Ionic' style, and a good bronze figure of fifth century work, a goddess with an arrangement of drapery that resembles that of the Guistiniani Vesta. The Polyphemos relief, described in the *Archaeologische Zeitung*,² is of late and coarse style: the faces of Odysseus' companions, as well as the face of Polyphemos, show something of the wild 'gigantesque' character in the forms and expression. Worthy of notice also is a fragment about four inches high of a head of Heracles with the lion's muzzle on the top. It has some resemblance to the head of the Glyconic statue, and the great breadth between the eyes, its corrugated forehead and hollow temples are forms common in works of the Pergamene sculpture.

The Museum of Syracuse is perhaps richer than that of Palermo in classical remains, but there has been even less record of it. Among its most interesting acquisitions in recent times are some fragments of sculpture brought from Africa—when or from what site I was unable to discover:—

(1) A very archaic head of a goddess wearing the polos, with hair arranged over the forehead in a row of small circles and falling down over the shoulders in two knotted plaits: the expression of the fleshy face with its staring eyes is like that of the archaic head from Ephesos in the British Museum.

(2) Near this a colossal veiled head—perhaps of Demeter—but so defaced that I could not decide upon its age, though I was led to think it archaic: it is adorned with a stephane and anthemion, and shows traces of

¹ Given in Overbeck, *Geschichte des Griech. Plastik*, vol. i. p. 179.

² 1871, p. 126.

red paint: the centre of the face is very flat, and rather falls in, the chin is long and the sockets of the eyes very large: some recognisable Demeter-faces of the fourth century B.C. display such forms.

(3) A large female head about 12 inches high and 16 deep, a fragment of a colossal statue of Athene, as the helmet is visible, below which a mass of hair appears marked in faint rippling lines and almost hiding the ears. The face is a broad full oval outline, and the treatment of the flesh shows the soft Asia Minor style of the Alexandrine period; and the type seen in some heads from the Mausoleum is shadowed in the forms of its mouth and chin and in the parts about the eyes. The head is turned to one side with a slightly sentimental effect.

(4) A head of Zeus-Ammon, that might be of the fourth century, and if it were not so injured would take a high rank among the representations of the god, for this subject is exceedingly rare among the marbles of a good Greek period: the depth of the head is almost as great as the height (the proportion being about 13 inches to 14); the forehead and the eyes conform to the type of the Zeus heads of the fourth century; and apart from the horns one cannot detect much of the character of the ram-god: the mouth is partly open, but the teeth scarcely appear, nor is there any of that sensual or bizarre expression apparent which marks the later Ammon-heads. There is some power of thought in the face, and on the whole the rendering shows an Attic hand.

Of the other works in the museum I can say nothing about the 'provenance.' The archaic period is represented by some terra-cotta figures showing for the most part the stiff, sharp forms of the 'Peloponnesian' style: a large female head wearing the stephane with purple-coloured hair drawn in zig-zag lines is a conspicuous instance of this manner, the forms of the face resembling those of the 'Apollo' of Tenea. There is also an archaic marble statuette of a priestess in the same pose as the greater number of the statues found recently on the Acropolis. Nothing is to be found in the museum except among the coins that belongs to the Pheidian period, but there are a fair number of good Greek works of later schools, of which the following is an account:

(1) A torso of about 16 inches, a part of a male figure wearing a himation that passes round the middle of the body and is gathered in under the left shoulder: I seemed to discern traces of a staff here, and the body inclines to the right; it may then be an Asclepios or an Athenian citizen in the attitude seen on many reliefs and in the Parthenon frieze. The rendering of the flesh is very warm and soft, and shows good fourth century style.

(2) A charming Greek head in limestone, about 3½ inches high, bound with a laurel crown, of high oval contour and very pure expression, perhaps a head of Artemis.

(3) A statuette of a maiden, unfortunately headless, but with great beauty of drapery: her left hand is placed on her hip: she wears a long high-girdled chiton with himation, and the drapery is almost transparent, as is the fashion in early third century work, but the older style appears in the columnar folds of the left side.

(4) A striking terra-cotta figure of Eros, about five inches high, in an attitude that probably reproduces a work of great sculpture: he is shooting upwards into the air towards his left, as though Zeus were his mark: the red or pink-coloured chlamys over his left shoulder recalls the lyrical passage of Sappho, the forms of his breast and torso are almost feminine and the hair is a luxuriant mass.

(5) The Aphrodite of Syracuse, the only well-known work of the museum, upon which a few words may be allowed here: the workmanship of the very warm and soft surface is entirely Greek, and the articulation of the lower part of the torso is skilful: the marble has been polished, but does not seem to have been worked over by a later chisel. As regards the motive, the idea of the Cnidian original has in the main been preserved with some alterations; it would seem that the right hand was lifting a strip of the drapery across her breast, as certain signs may be interpreted as traces of the drapery between the breasts and of the fingers that touched the left breast.

Of the Roman period there are two very noticeable works that it would be a gain to publish well:

(1) A head of Poseidon of great power and expression and of wholly Greek treatment of the forms, though the surface does not show the warmth of pure Greek work; the long and flowing hair rises up over the forehead and falls in partially severed masses, as though matted with the seawater: there is an immense protuberance of bone in the centre of the forehead and the eye-sockets are very deep, as in the Pergamene type of the water-gods: the depth of the head is great and the skull is almost concealed by the hair, only that the outline of it is indicated by the pressure of a fillet: the expression is wildly excited.

(2) A small archaistic relief of good Roman work, representing the Indian Dionysos, with stiff Oriental curls and a touch of Oriental form; the lower lip is strangely protruding and the forehead is prominently barred; the effect of the head is partly un-Hellenic, and the expression rather sensual.

L. R. FARNELL.

EXCAVATIONS IN CYPRUS, 1890.

THIRD SEASON'S WORK. SALAMIS.

[PLATES IV. —X.]

A FEW words will suffice to introduce the following report on the work of the Cyprus Exploration Fund at Salamis. It was intended to prefix a brief sketch of the history of the city, but it was found that to be of value the sketch would outgrow the limits defined by the occasion, and the present account is already too long. That history is often difficult and obscure, and I hope to handle it in another place, but the main outlines are sufficiently familiar, for which it is enough to refer the reader to the material accumulated by Engel in his monograph 'Kypros,' a book which, although published half a century ago and by no means free from errors, still remains the standard authority on the subject. The site has been described by many travellers from Pococke and Drummond to the latest account by Mr. Hogarth in his 'Devia Cypria.' Our plans and Mr. Tubbs' narrative are a sufficient supplement to their notices.

Excavation at Salamis is no new project. General di Cesnola 'spent large sums of money at this place on three different occasions, but with no result in any way satisfactory.' His brother Major Alexander di Cesnola for some time kept a band of diggers at work among the tombs between the monastery of S. Barnabas and the village of Eneomi. His extraordinary topographical remarks show that he had little or no personal acquaintance with the site. After the British occupation Sir Charles Newton took up the project on behalf of the British Museum, and through Mr. C. D. Cobham, the Commissioner of Larnaca, employed the well-known archaeologist M. O. Richter to conduct an excavation on the site of Salamis. Part of a Roman house, including a bath and small mosaic, was discovered, and is marked on our plan. Beyond a few remarks in the *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 1886, vol. ix. p. 204, I am not aware that any account of this excavation has been published. Herr Richter has also worked on the necropolis of Salamis, of which he has given some description in the *Mittheilungen des Instituts in Athen* 1881, vi. p. 191 and p. 244. Readers of this *Journal* will remember his account of the prehistoric 'Tomb of S. Catherine' in the fourth volume. Among the most important of Herr Richter's many services to Cypriote archaeology may be reckoned the accidental discovery of two marble capitals

under the sand near the Forest Guard's house, which occurred while he was employed in the Forest Department, and subsequently gave us a clue to one of our sites.

The excavation of Salamis was an idea early entertained by the Committee of the Exploration Fund. The idea was ambitious, and one felt as soon as one saw the site that the sum at command was ludicrously small for the undertaking, for buildings worth excavating had first to be laboriously sought. It is, however, satisfactory to have made a start, and we may hope that the past season's work is only preliminary to larger operations. Considering its tentative character the excavation has met with a fair measure of success. Interest will naturally be directed chiefly on the one hand to the topographical and architectural results—especially the plans of the Agora and of the temple court in the sand, and the great Bull's head capital—and on the other to the finds from the Sand site, the Cistern, and *Τοῦμπα*, and among these more particularly to the important fragments of painted terracotta statues. Mr. Tubbs has written the sections on the Excavations and Inscriptions, I have contributed the description of the Finds. We have worked quite independently, and are each of us solely responsible for our respective shares in the following account. It is perhaps inevitable that in so large and often difficult a subject there should be occasional differences of opinion, but the division of matter is sufficiently distinct to save us from the necessity of discussing them, and we have striven rather to set the facts before the reader than to develop views about them.

The season's work did not end with the excavations at Salamis. A small additional sum was procured for the purpose of continuing the previous year's operations at Polis tes Chrysochou, on what promised and proved to be more trustworthy and profitable sites than those before explored. The results of this further work will, it is hoped, be published in a succeeding number of this Journal.

There remains the grateful duty of thanking the many friends in Cyprus whose kindness contributed so much to render our sojourn there a pleasant one. Some are old friends, some were new, but in their kindness there was no distinction. It is impossible to name all, and invidious to make a selection, but we cannot omit to mention the hospitality which we enjoyed from His Excellency Sir Henry Bulwer, Captain and Lady Evelyn Young, Mr. C. D. Cobham, Mr. Justice Smith, Mr. H. Thompson, and from Mr. Williamson. The rest will understand that they are not forgotten.

J. ARTHUR R. MUNRO.

OXFORD, *February* 1891.

[Mr. Tubbs having left England early this year to take a post in Australia, the task of seeing his work through the press has devolved on others: for many reasons this task was a difficult one, and as his sections stand they probably contain blemishes which the author, by a revision in print, might have removed.—ED.]

I.—THE EXCAVATIONS.¹

THOUGH the one of us came from the South and the other from the North, both J. A. R. Munro and myself reached Larnaca the same day, Jan. 8. It was a Wednesday. On the Friday, having spent the interval in getting together various stores and necessaries, we were again *en route*; and, after riding seven hours through a Cypriote deluge, evening found us in the bar of the Royal Oak, Varósia, vainly trying by help of a charcoal brazier to exhaust from clothes, baggage, servants, and selves some of the superabundant moisture. Next day the remaining six miles to Salamis were laid behind, and our tent pitched for the time in the adjoining village of Ai Sergyi. There, until Captain Young, the Commissioner of Famagósta, could arrive, and fix boundaries to the sites it was proposed to excavate, we found plenty to do in verifying old inscriptions or hunting for new, in wandering again and again over the ruins of the ancient city, in enrolling labourers or hearing such antiquarian gossip as Ai Sergyi and Éncomi could furbish up, and, finally, in transferring bag and baggage to more convenient quarters in a house built originally for the local forest-guard, which, standing all but upon one of the sites to be excavated, not only conduced to our comfort but proved of material assistance to the better prosecution of our work. Alas! next season's excavation will necessitate the removal of our six months' home.

In anticipation of Captain Young's arrival, three sites had been chosen where first to tempt fortune. Salamis as it exists to-day is a waste, rather more than a mile long and six furlongs broad—a waste covered with stones great and small, squared or rough, with here and there yet standing remnants of walls, floors of houses, and drums of columns. Spring transforms the desert into a miniature forest of thousands of tall fennel bushes, under whose shade grow innumerable mushrooms. The ground takes the form of a low plateau, bounded on the east, north, west, and south, respectively, by the sea, by a sand tract interrupted by salt marshes, by the main road from Famagósta to Trícómo, and by the valley of the Pediaeus. The surface of this plateau is broken by numerous alternating hills and depressions, in the main natural, but due, partly, to accumulations of *débris*: the greatest height may be 50 to 60 ft. above sea-level. Westward, behind the town as one looks from the sea, stretches a broad tract of perfectly flat country, the rich corn-land of the Mesaoría, gradually contracting in the distance between the embracing arms of two mountain-ranges, one of which runs from the nose of the Carpass westwards forming the backbone of the island, while the other is the higher group of Troödos, capped through the spring months by a

¹ The writer wishes to express his gratitude to Mr. A. H. Smith for the pains he has taken in overseeing the preparation of plates and woodcuts, and to Mr. R. W. Schultz for many

valuable suggestions, and for his assistance in re-drawing and arranging the plans of the sites.

glistening hood of snow whence a keen Tramontana blows down upon the eastern coast. Nearer at hand the level line is varied by modern villages and ancient ruins. Bulking large against the horizon rises the monastery of Ai Varnáva, occupying the traditional scene of the martyrdom of St. Barnabas. Below, and standing out white in the sunlight against the monastery's darker mass, lies the strange old tomb which the natives assign to St. Catherine, but which, half-built, half-hewn in the rock beneath, has the massiveness and simple grandeur of an age before history was written on parchment. To the right stretches the long trail of a great aqueduct which supplied Constantia with water, probably from Kythréa. Many of its pointed arches are still upstanding, more grand in their solitude than when once they formed only a few links in a chain.

Resting the gaze now on that which lies closer at hand, three landmarks at once catch the eye—the wall of the later city, the strangely massive ruins of a 'church,' and the so-called Loutrón. A line drawn from one to other of the two latter and slightly prolonged will nearly cut the three sites which we had marked out for our first essay. Pococke, in his *Description of the East* (II. p. 216), writes: 'On the north of the new city, just within the gate, there are several grey granite pillars lying on the ground, two or three Corinthian capitals of grey marble cut in a very beautiful and particular manner.' Pococke here describes the first of our sites, but the Corinthian capitals of which he speaks have either disappeared in the last century or are a mistake for the limestone capitals of our last site (II) which lies close at hand. Mr. Hogarth visited Salamis in the summer of 1888, and, though it was no part of his plan to deal with well-known ground, he left a valuable note of his observations in *Devia Cypria*, p. 61. I quote the passage in full: 'There are two places in this wilderness where I longed to set a few diggers to work; the one is near the south-western corner of the site, just within the walls, where a fluted shaft of white marble, evidently deeply buried, is peeping out of the ground; the other is at the north-western angle beyond the Λουτρόν, where, in a well-defined oblong depression, much choked with sand, lie half-buried a number of glistening granite shafts of very large diameter—quite half as large again as any on the site of New Paphos; the sand here is strewn with fragments of a white marble pavement. That this is a temple-site I have little doubt.' The first site here mentioned we failed altogether to find, and can only assume that the fluted shaft is identical with one which according to the villagers—whose accounts, however, were somewhat confused—had been conveyed away quite recently by stone-stealers, a class of thieves from whom Salamis has suffered enormously in past years. The second site is that on which we dug first, but Mr. Hogarth has erred slightly in connecting with it either a deposit of sand or fragments of a marble pavement. Mr. Hogarth had also noticed, though he does not especially refer to it, the long rectangular depression which runs southwards from the Loutrón, and supplied our third site. The remaining site, of the three chosen, is not described by previous travellers, but was seen by Mr. Hogarth. It lies close to the Forester's House, and had been accidentally

discovered in digging for water to supply the needs of a plantation which the English Government had a year or two after the occupation commenced along the sand dunes in the eastward half of the town.

On Wednesday, January 15th, just a week after we landed in Cyprus, Captain Young who had been absent in the Carpass, came over from Famagósta, saw our sites and fixed their boundaries. The greater part of Salamis belongs to Government; but here and there are patches of ground, which, having been cleared and tilled before the land was declared public, have remained in private possession. As the terms under which excavation can be carried on vary somewhat according to the owner of the property, it was necessary first to determine whether any of the ground selected was claimed by private persons. Fortunately this was not the case.

SITE *A*¹ OR 'THE COLUMNS.' (PLATE VI).

Close to the northern wall of the new city and about halfway along its irregular course from west to east is a slight depression bounded by a double line of rising ground which gives it, roughly, the form of a rectangle, some 150 × 190 feet. The surface is covered by large fusts of granite, which lie in a certain rude order, and, though mainly crowded together towards the south-west corner, suggest to a hasty glance the ruins of a four-sided colonnade. Of capitals or entablature, much less of walls, there is no trace above ground; nor, so far as concerns the two former, was any discovered below.² The columns were indeed of granite, plain, and Roman; but they lay on the surface. There was hope then of a rich underlayer, and here accordingly, on January 16th, the first sod of the season 1889-90 was cut.³

The site being rectangular two trenches were dug N.—S., and E.—W., intersecting near the centre [*AA* and *BB* on accompanying plan, Pl. VI. Site *A*]. Two more were afterwards added [*CD*], and some enlargement of the former pair took place. Subsequently also probing shafts—none running to great depth—were tried at various points [*a*, *b*, &c.]: but the results attained were no great inducement to further work. In trench *AA* a depth of 13-14 feet was frequently reached, under column 1 as much as 15'6"-16'; elsewhere digging was less deep and in some of the probes was carried down only two or three feet from the surface.⁴ Throughout, the earth showed signs of frequent disturbance; *debris* was plentiful, actual objects few. A first layer of from 5 to

¹ As it was necessary to distinguish the different sites, I first lettered them consecutively, and then replaced the letters where possible by a title to which excavation showed the particular site to have a claim.

² Unless the fragments mentioned below are such.

³ For the sake of brevity and clearness I have added at the close of this section a short ab-

stract of dates, and of numbers of workpeople employed.

⁴ The difference of level between the centre and south end of the site is 6", and between the centre and north end, 2' 9".

Measurements of depth, where given, are calculated from the ground directly above, and are not adjusted to a uniform level.

8 feet was full of faults: drains made of stone or terra-cotta, wretched late tombs, fragments of building without meaning or connection were inextricably mixed together. Below this line there seemed to have been less disturbance, and masonry grew more regular and coherent. The soil as a whole was remarkably dense, and at some points as firm as though it had been purposely rammed and packed. Labour was proportionally hard and slow; it was equally ill repaid. Of the various classes of finds sculpture had no representative, unless part of a face in bronze-slag may be excepted; of inscriptions, only two or three chips;¹ pottery, mainly broken pieces, not numerous, from late Roman to black-glaze, and so called 'primitive' Cypriote;² a bare half-dozen bronze coins,³ with some miscellaneous fragments such as a head in terra-cotta, a bronze horse-shoe (?), some enamelled glass, a portion of Turkish window-grating [5 feet], and animal bones [4 feet] complete the tale.

More coherency was observed at a few points on the site. Thus 5' 6" south of the intersection appeared a cement floor in which was sunk a cistern. At the S.E. corner of the floor were two steps, the upper of which is 6' 9" down from the surface. Southwards from the steps and running slightly across the trench was a wall, whose head lay at a distance of 28' 6" from column 2.⁴ By its northern end a pit for water with roughly built walls of stone, was opened in the side of the trench. Northwards from the intersection a stone tunnel for water—or perhaps oil—was found 8 inches below the surface. It rested on a bed of rubble and cement, and, as was proved later, was part of an octagon. In the centre of the space so described and level with the substructure of the channel was a cement floor of two layers, 7 inches thick in all, which, being hewn through, disclosed under some loose earth containing charred remains, a mass of large stones loosely piled together to form a foundation, and bounded on east and south⁵ by regular walls. The blocks of stone were in general worked and, while most were squared, there were fragments also of columns of blue-grey marble and pieces of moulding and entablature.⁶ These blocks being of considerable size and weight are not likely to have been brought from any considerable distance, but there was no indication of a building to which they might have belonged. To the N.E. of the site, and just outside the limits of the accompanying plan there are surface remains of a small building, also apparently octagonal in shape but of quite uncertain purpose.

In trench *AA* near the northern end of column 2, and at a depth of 7 feet, was a wall of remarkably solid construction, its top stone alone measuring 3' 2" in length (so far as uncovered), 5' 6" broad, and 3' 5½" deep.

¹ These were:

Fragment marble 3¼" × 3¾" × 1" (*a*).

" " 3¼" × 2¼" × 1¼" (*b*).

² Perhaps worthy of mention are fragments of an amphora, &c., black-glazed, with white ivy-tendrils painted on ware like that of Campania.

³ One, a Ptolemy, was 6 feet down. The figures in brackets denote depth of find.

⁴ For convenience of measurement I used those of the columns which lay on the lines of the trenches. When not otherwise stated measurements are always of the shortest interval.

⁵ Doubtless two sides of a square.

⁶ Debased work, with a general resemblance in scheme to the lacunaria from the Regia in the Forum Romanum.

The total height of the wall was 8ft., and it consisted of six courses; its direction was 259° or 11° south of west. A second portion of the same wall seems to have been that found in prober *a*, though existing at a level 9" lower. If the wall on which the granite columns rested is to be found anywhere on this site it must be represented by these two fragments: to the north I could not satisfy myself that either of two portions of walls corresponded adequately with those on the south. Of greater interest and promise of better things, was the discovery in the westward trench, not far in from the intersection [14'9" to 21'], of three Ionic fusts of fine limestone¹ together with a base, a capital, and a portion of entablature, all in excellent preservation. (On Pl. VIII. Fig. 14 we reproduce the mouldings.) As these were removed a foundation appeared, running north and south across the trench, with a cross wall extending westwards a short distance. Above in the side of the trench was a slanting layer of ash and refuse. In prober *a* were splinters from a corresponding column: and a line drawn between the two find-spots would harmonize with the direction of the wall and may represent that of a colonnade. But just where these remains were found the earth was at its hardest, needing to be hewn like concrete, so that under the circumstances it was thought advisable to leave to better filled purses the task of further exploration. I will only here add that south of column 2 a mass of painted wall-plaster (Roman) was turned up²; and that close under the surface eastward from this point were unearthened many fragments moulded in low relief, from a dead-window, apparently that of a church. Almost all fitted together.

Altogether, just over a week was spent on 'The Columns,' by the end of which time the men, 40 in number at first, had increased to 58, with 26 women to assist. A few hands were, however, kept employed here till February 2, and to them are mainly due the results, such as they are, recorded above. For any general or satisfactory conclusion as to the site, materials are wanting: there are, however, several points worthy of consideration. The columns³ lie entirely on the surface—with one partial exception no drum was found beneath the soil. It is as though they had been overthrown yesterday: only the weather-scars consort ill with such an impression. The column-wall, if it is such, lies on the other hand 7ft. down. The site, too, seems almost unnaturally deep in refuse earth. Late burials, such as may have been made during the Arab inroads, are some feet below the surface: in fact, the first fathom of soil in most parts of the site may be considered of later date than the columns themselves. It is not impossible that the granite fusts on this site were brought thither from some other part of Salamis: one has grappling-

¹ On the largest, remains of fine marble stucco (*opus albarium*).

² The design was arranged in panels, painted black on orange-red, with an inner ground of white on which were birds and foliage in blue and green.

³ No column is certainly complete: the largest fragment is 17' 9" long and probably represents very nearly an entire column, its

lower end only wants the base-fillet. By piecing together existing fragments it would be possible to construct monolith columns of about 18' to 19', with an upper diameter (inclusive of fillet) of 2' 5½", and corresponding base-section of 2' 9" (fillet included). The mouldings are quite simple in form and need not be reproduced here.

holes for removal, other similar fusts seem to have been dropped in transit at the S.E. of the town, where they now lie; others may be some of the numerous granite columns in Famagósta.

SITE B.

Although, as has been mentioned, some work was still in hand on this site up till February 2, a move had already, on January 22, been made to the second site [*B*] which lies close under the western wall of the Forester's House. The latter stands on a natural rise increased in height by *débris* of former buildings, but having no great deposit of sand except on its flanks where alternating sea and land winds have piled up deep drifts. In the westward drift the head of site *B* plunged. Running back and falling rapidly away from the house is an undulating plain of low sand-hills in which a slight and moderately even depression marked, though somewhat vaguely, the limits of the space to be excavated. At two points, east and west of one another, the villagers had, in digging for water, brought to light a couple of bluish-white marble capitals in Roman-Corinthian style together with a base and two *ἀγάλματα* of limestone. In laying foundations for the house other remains, here of masonry and wall, had been found; while further towards the sea inscribed marble blocks had rewarded the pains of a previous seeker after antiquities. These indications pointed to a temple such as, for example, comparing the position with that of the famous Aphroditium at Cnidus, would have suited well with the title of Venus Prospiciens, to whom, as Ovid [*Metam.* IV. 760] states, an important shrine was dedicated at Salamis. Whether this suggestion was afterwards justified will appear later.

In the centre of the depression there were not more than five to five and a half feet of sand, but towards each side the drift grew deeper, reaching 10 and 12 feet on the west and double as much eastwards by the house. North and south the difference was less marked, but still perceptible. The character of the ground in the vicinity will be apparent from the general plan of the city. From the house there is a rapid fall to the sea-shore, and a sharp, though short, drop southwards. The building on site *B*, whatever its character, though looking out over the sea must always have had its lower position hidden by the rise on which the Forester's House stands.

Work in the sand was easy and rapid. A single day sufficed to confirm the indications which the villagers' finds had furnished. Column after column was uncovered till the line of the western wall, with its bases almost all in position, was fairly cleared. But the weather was unpropitious. Strong dry north-easterly winds prevailed, raising storms of dust, in face of which the men could not work. Accordingly site *B* was temporarily left on one side, and the bulk of the hands drafted off to the third site. As in this account I follow roughly the order of events, and as site *B* was the one important excavation which the close of the season found still unfinished, and indeed just opening out into wider developments, it will be more convenient to deal first with *C* (or the Agora), and then pursue the course of the work in other fields returning finally to discuss the results from the sand.

SITE C.—THE AGORA. (PLATE VII.)

From the new city wall near its south-west angle a long depression extends, nearly north and south, at right angles and is closed at the further end by a hillock. This depression, when first seen, presented an appearance of great regularity. Along each side stretched a fairly continuous line of limestone drums which seemed to lie much as they had fallen. So weather-eaten were these blocks, long ago deprived of the protective stucco, that it was quite possible at a short distance to doubt whether a given mass was part of architrave or column; but a closer examination showed that amid all the vast accumulation of *debris*—and the ground was like the moraine of an Alpine glacier—there was scarcely a single piece of moulded or even of squared stone on the surface. Of capitals there were a few fragments from which it was clear that a long arcade of the Corinthian order had occupied the site.

Excavation began by the cutting of two trenches at the southern end, one running across the depression from (presumed) wall to wall, the other, at right angles to the first, cutting up the hillock slope with a view to lay bare the southern line of front. On the surface and especially on and about the hillock were numerous fragments, some of large size, from squared blocks of blue marble, such as were most in favour under the Ptolemies and the Empire for bases of statues and dedicatory inscriptions. A preliminary search revealed three inscribed fragments from as many dedications, one of which was of some length and recorded the erection of a statue in honour of an Emperor [*v. inf.* No. III. 1 in section on inscriptions.] Another was a small piece from a large pedestal which had carried a portrait of a Ptolemy [Philometor?], the remaining portions of the one half of which were discovered some weeks later. Although no one inscription named the locality it was clear that the site had been one, such as the Agora, which was suited to the erection of monumental records. A few hands were set aside to search for further spoil of the like kind; and a day or two later a rectangular floor,¹ as of an olive press, was discovered, formed of large marble blocks in which a channel had been cut when they were adapted to new uses. On turning these blocks over five were found to bear inscriptions, all practically complete, and with excellently preserved surface.² Already the fine bull's-head capital had been unearthened; and the work of clearing the site was now prosecuted with none the less vigour for this successful commencement. In appearance the task was certainly not difficult. It resolved itself into the laying bare of a long colonnade on either side and the investigation of the northern and southern ends. The first trench having merely tapped the two column-walls, the line of one or other had first to be determined by further

¹ 12 feet N. and S. by 11' 5" E. and W. It lies somewhat to the west of the south-western end of the Agora (*v.* accompanying plan of Site C on Pl. VII.). East of the floor is a small drain-pipe (6½"-7" diam.) of terra-cotta, which

from its direction would seem to have been in connection with the floor.

² *v. inf.* Nos. III. 4-8 in section on inscriptions.

experiment. To this end a crosswise trench was run striking the eastern colonnade some eight intercolumniations further northwards. Having thus obtained the orientation I set to work to completely clear both lines of columns, east and west, following this up by laying bare the south-eastern and south-western angles and the walls which ran back thence to the outside of the colonnade. The hillock was then cut into and various cross-trenches opened up sections of the outer walls of the colonnade. The hillock proved to be a problem of greater complexity than had been anticipated; while an attempt in the meantime to find the column mentioned by Mr. Hogarth [*v. sup.* p. 62] had led to the discovery east of the hillock of a marble base in position on its supporting wall. Both these points required and received further elucidation; especially was it necessary to establish the lines of the building hidden under the hillock. The opening of the main arcade in its full length raised a further question. The walls were not complete but were cut off by the fortification of the new city. Thus it became requisite to extend operations across the city-wall in the narrow space intervening between it and the Loutrón; and, finally, to ascertain whether, and in what way, the building last named was connected with the Agora. Lastly, something had to be done towards fixing the character of the space intervening between the arcades.

Though long, the work here summarized was not difficult. One circumstance was especially favourable; there was nowhere any great depth of earth. The layer in the centre was not more than a foot, and often much less, on to a rough pavement. Almost equally light, 1 ft. 6 in. to 3 ft., was the deposit on the column walls. Only in cutting up the northern and southern slopes and in attempting to strike the outer arcade walls was it necessary to excavate any considerable depth. Otherwise the task would have been heavy: even to clear two spaces of 700 × 12 ft. to the depth of nearly a yard means a large expenditure of labour, and our toil was doubled by the accumulation of stone and *délbris* which everywhere along the lines of building encumbered the surface. Virgin soil was seldom reached. It was found near the bull's-head capital¹ at a level of 13' 6", and by the south-west outer angle at 12' 6".

There is no need to enter further into details of the actual work of excavation, which was on the whole straightforward, and I will content myself with a statement of results. As will be seen from the plan (Pl. VII.) the Agora consisted of a double colonnade enclosing an open space. Its east and west walls have, as existing, a length of respectively 701' 9" and 701' [Eng.], the measurement in either case being from the back of the southern corner half-base to the city-wall.² These two walls exist throughout at, practically, the same level, that of the emplacement of the bases.³ Their height at this

¹ B on the plan on Pl. VII.

² The two angles S.-E. and S.-W. being determined, the divergence here observable, so far as it exists in reality—and something must be allowed for the impossibility of an absolutely accurate measurement—must be produced by

the city-wall which cuts across the northern end.

³ There are two unimportant exceptions:—

(a) At the north end of the east wall the top courses have been cut away between columns 44–46 in order to adapt the space to later building.

level is 3' 3" on to a lower stepped course which itself continues about another foot. Their breadth is 5 ft., or 6 on the lower course.¹ The central space has a width between walls of 110 ft. ;² and the span of the arcade is 31' 2" ; so that the total width reckoning in the walls is 192' 6" [Eng.], or, approximately,



CAPITAL OF COLUMN.

200 Roman feet. The order is Corinthian, and a sketch of the capital is given here. Its columns, of limestone with moulded fluting in stucco, had a height of 26' 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ " (exclusive of base, but inclusive of capital).³ Of entablature there were but few remains. On Pl. VIII., Figs. 1, 2, 3, and in the annexed cuts, are collected such moulded stones as may with some certainty be identified. Of all others I have made and preserved drawings, but have thought it advisable not to publish them here. The intervals between the columns are not regular. From the south-east corner to centre of base 4 is a span of 62' 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ", allowing an intercolumniation of, as nearly as possible,

(b) A small section of the west wall—also towards the north end—was left unexcavated owing to the number of heavy fusts lying on the ground, to move which was difficult with our strictly limited resources in the matter of tools: we had two good ropes which friendly shipwrecks had furnished.

¹ Only here and there was the wall uncovered to its full depth in the process of excavation. The measurements are not quite uniform.

² 109' 8" and 110' 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " measured, the differ-

ence being mainly due to the varying preservation of the walls.

³ One column—45 on the east wall—is fortunately preserved entire: it has only lost part of its stucco. The base has however been recut.


On the plan I have indicated all bases still existing, and have distinguished between those which are broken and those which are practically sound. The emplacement, wherever clearly discernible, is shown by a rectangle.

15' 6"; whereas between columns 14—16 the intercolumniation falls to 14' 6", is about 12' 9" between columns 19—21, and at the northern end rises again to 15 ft. Similarly in the western colonnade, although data are for the most part wanting, while the interval towards the northern end is nearly regular at about 14' 6", the southern end seems to start with a wide arch of just upon 17 ft.

The outer walls were not opened throughout their length (*v. plan*), and in general are badly preserved as compared with those on which the columns rest. Being encumbered by no bases they presented an easier quarry to the



CONCRETE BLOCK, plastered. Agora, W. Wall [5].



CONCRETE BLOCK, faced with white plaster; triglyph as existing, 15 $\frac{1}{8}$ " high, 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " wide, 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " deep; Square at right side. Agora, W. Wall [7].

inevitable stone-stealer. In some instances only their lower course has remained, in others they have been so broken up and intermixed with later masonry that their outlines are scarcely recognizable; but here and there are still comparatively sound portions, even among the few laid bare in excavating, and these show a width of 5 to 6 ft. In the eastern wall close to the southern corner there seemed to have been¹ a narrow door having an inner

¹ At present built up.

breadth of 7' 1½" and posts 5' 3" high (as existing), whose upper edge is 2' 11" above the level of the E. column-wall and agrees with the higher course of the south-east return. At and about the south-east corner are several cross-walls running eastwards, which we did not as a rule open beyond the few feet comprised in the trench along the main wall (see also below). The centre of the Agora, so far as it was excavated, was composed of an uneven floor of rough, square blocks, less irregularly placed than, *e.g.*, the paving of the Via Sacra at Rome, but of sufficiently poor workmanship. This flooring is about 3 ft. below the east column-wall. Beneath it at the northern end some remains of walls were disclosed, but were not found to lead to any development of importance. At the southern end a flight of marble steps climbs the slope of the hillock. The flight is 70' 6" wide. Three courses remain in greater or less completeness, and there is perhaps trace of a fourth. The steps are not regular in tread or rise: the latter is generally 1 ft., the former varying from 1' to 1' 4¾". There is some indication that the facing course has been lost. In the centre the flight has apparently been interrupted where a width of 13' 6" probably represents the true stairway. Higher up the slope, 13' 8½" beyond and 4' 2" above the middle lower step, are the presumed remains of an additional step. If such they were it will be necessary to assume that the flight between these two points was, as is common in Roman work, interrupted by a ramp; for the gradient of the lower steps does not agree with the difference of level between them and this supposed higher step. The surface of the middle step is practically on a level with the rough flooring of the centre of the Agora; flooring and stair therefore are hardly contemporary.

The eastern arcade, as will be apparent from the plan, is far better preserved than is the corresponding western. It is here, therefore, by preference that we must look for such further details of structure or plan as still survive. On both sides of the east column-wall have been found portions of a tessellated marble pavement which joins directly on to the wall itself about a foot below the emplacement of the columns, and extends thence 8 ft. eastwards and 10 westwards.¹ It is clear from the finding of remains of this pavement at so

¹ This is in each case the greatest distance opened by our excavation, but does not represent the original width. That the pavement ever extended right across the Agora is doubtful; at least it cannot have maintained the same level. The present difference of level between the centre and sides is probably original: the site has in this respect been but slightly interfered with. One fragment of similar pavement was found in the centre [*v. plan*]; but is of poorer quality and probably belongs to later building, of which there are here some remains. Between columns 6-7 E. wall the ground has been more fully opened up inwards, and here there are few traces, beyond some few tesserae, of the pavement. Instead, several stone courses,

as though foundations for steps, project from the column wall.

They measure (downwards):—

(a)	1' 2" rise,	1' 2" tread.
(b)	1' "	1' 2½" "
(c)	8" "	1' 2½" "
(d)	1' "	2' 7" "
(e)	10½" "	1' 1" "

Of these (d) is already at a lower level than the flooring of the centre. The fragment of marble pavement in the centre is 6"-9" above the rough flooring. By the southern nave wall of the church (*v. inf.*) is also a piece of this tessellated pavement, whither it has probably been removed from the Agora.

many different points that it must have extended the whole length of the colonnade.¹ Near the western wall scarcely any indications of a corresponding pavement are to be found: but it must be understood that digging here has not been carried, with trifling exceptions, more than a foot or two on either side. Some few tesserae I picked up lying loose on the surface, and, as these in more than one instance were united by the original cement, they may perhaps be evidence in point. More traces remain of a flagging course which is interposed between the pavement proper and the wall; but marble has here been freely replaced by tiles, which, towards the northern end, have served apparently as a water-channel in connection perhaps with a lime-kiln constructed in the column-wall between columns 44-45. There may also have been a channel at the southern end by columns 2-3.

Contrasting with the general character of the western walls, the frequent overbuilding and reconstruction for later purposes, is the discovery towards the southern end of a long strip, in excellent preservation, of fine mosaic work, with patterns—for the most part Chinese bridges with macander borders—in slate-blue, red, pink-white, and white marble. The tesserae are of medium size. They are set in cement, and the entire floor is supported on a cement underlayer. After running 93 ft. with a width of 16' 3"² it breaks off suddenly, the under cement continuing a few inches farther. At this point we cut down to a depth of 5 ft., passing through several layers of cement; 5 ft. farther north was a cross-wall. At one point a late wall crossed the mosaic diagonally and was removed; at another [56' 3" from S. end] a base of bluish marble³ of the customary late form lies resting on the mosaic as it was found. Attempts were made to discover a corresponding mosaic on the eastern side of the Agora, but without success. Several fragments of mosaic flooring were indeed found; but, instead of lying outside the colonnade altogether, these were invariably between the column and outer-walls, were plain, and of poorer quality. The largest⁴ fragment lies behind column 4 near the outer wall, along whose inner edge are several patches, at considerable intervals, of a long strip which seems to have continued up to the end of the trenching on this side the wall [opp. column 9]. Throughout this section moulded limestone

¹ Thus in the E. colonnade:

43-42 West. Yellow marble slabbing, 5' 4" length [prob. later work].

42 W. Piece of tessellated pavement, 9' 4" x 4' 9" [as excavated].

42-37. Remains on W. side: yellow flagging course on E.

35-34 W. Yellow flagging.

32-31 W. " "

30 on E. " "

29-27. Tessellated pavement, 3' 6" wide [as excavated].

29 on W. Tessellated pavement joining on to flagging course; width 5' 6" [as excavated].

17. In cross-trench eastwards, tessellated

pavement giving a parallelogram of 8' x 13' 6".

16-14. Numerous fragments, loose, on W. side, some on E. also.

12. In cross-trench, giving a parallelogram 10' x 18' 6".

12-10. Cement bed for pavement in W. side.

Colours used are orange, blue-white, and dark blue; designs geometrical.

² This width is perhaps original, as the mosaic ends westward, against remains of a wall.

³ Opposite it the mosaic has a different pattern—a polychrome wheel. The floor has here sunk so that an adjoining portion projects in the corner of the next cutting at an 8" higher level.

⁴ It has a width of 8' 6" as uncovered.

blocks [square] are set against the outer wall at nearly regular intervals of about 15 ft., as though part of some architectural ornamentation. Without further clearance their purpose cannot be determined; they can scarcely however, have had anything to do with the Agora itself. This south-east corner has been considerably rebuilt, or adapted to later erections. A not dissimilar block, in better preservation, is set in the east column-wall at its northern end, where also the wall has been cut away and altered to suit the exigencies of a later house, whose marble-flagged floor still remains between columns 46 and 45.

Here may best be placed details of the more important of such additional walls or buildings as either have a possible connection with the Agora, or have at a later time been constructed on or against it. At the south-east inner corner of the eastern colonnade there is some adventitious masonry, both westwards and southwards of the angle, which itself is well defined. From it a canting has been carried 4' 8" west, 2' south, while neatly joined on to it and coincident with the last 22" westward is a wall running southwards. Of better character is a piece of masonry 3' broad which continues the line of the column-wall for 14' 9" at 2' 2" lower level. It is, however, interrupted at 6' 4"—11' 6" by a marble plaque floor, and beyond it is later limestone masonry for another 2'. Resting against the outer face of the southern end of the arcade are fragments of two walls, small, and in appearance late and unimportant. For a distance of 67 ft. northwards from the outer S. E. angle of the colonnade there are numerous cross-walks, six in all, of which only one seems of importance; the others were not followed up.¹ This one is part of a three-sided rectangular building of good construction, at least the lower stepped course of which seems homogeneous with the masonry of the Agora.² Its northern, eastern, and southern sides measure respectively 36' 3", 19' 6", and 23', with a thickness of 3' 7", 2' 8", and 2' 9". The shortness of the southern sides leaves an interval of ground unbuilt over, perhaps to correspond with the (presumed) doorway which, as already mentioned, exists in the outer colonnade wall at this point. The inner wall surfaces are all plastered, and in the S. E. angle is a small oblong pit, also plastered, measuring 4' 2" × 2' 6", with a depth of 2 ft. (from the top of the adjoining wall). Though, perhaps, rebuilt in later times, this erection seems to have originally been included in the Agora and its annexes. There may have been at the S. E. corner a row of offices or shops.³

¹ After the first of these walls the outer Agora wall is plastered. All the walls excepting that of which details are here given may belong together: conjecture is useless where merely a few feet have been disclosed. The fourth wall is carried on into the Agora-wall, and has been opened for some distance up to its junction with a N. and S. wall which runs parallel with the Agora. Beside it was found an inscription of the Ptolemaic period [*v. inf.* No. III. 16], as also part of a marble head [female] of large size

and Greek work.

² The northern wall is also of the same width as the southern end wall of the Agora colonnade. The other two walls are narrower. From its northern side a wall starts off which seems continuous to that to which the fourth cross-wall is attached [*v. plan*].

³ It may be worth while to note the character of the objects found thereabouts. These include:—

In *marble*: object like mason's mallet split

Another noteworthy building is the church which was found planted against the east colonnade, whose outer wall it utilizes. It is a true basilica of the type of which the subterranean church of S. Clemente in Rome is a well-known example, and is peculiar only in that its southern aisle is somewhat narrower than the northern. The dimensions are 56 feet to spring of apse (from eastern face outer colonnade wall, which is utilized to form the rear wall of the basilica), 58' 6" width over all. The apse of the nave has a chord of 22' 3", and a radius of 7' 4"—7' 6".¹ Within the apse is a mass of *débris* which belonged presumably to the altar.² The floor of the basilica is 2' 6" below the (existing) top of the apse wall;³ and still lower are further remains of masonry and drain pipes, and a thin layer of cement and pottery. At the head of the southern aisle, where the apse wall breaks off suddenly, a shaft was sunk to a considerable depth, but failed to show evidence of an under-layer; the earth was indeed remarkably free from foreign substances. Beyond the apse a cutting 3' 9" deep was made for a distance of 25 feet up the slope in a line of the basilica, but the earth here also was nearly virgin. Near the surface, against the southern nave wall, a small Lusignan coin was found, and by the same wall a portion of tessellated marble pavement,⁴ like that of the Agora, and several architectural fragments,⁵ including a small marble stele and a capital. On the western side of the outer Agora wall is a flight of stone steps leading northwards, which may probably be assigned to the basilica.

From this point on there is little to remark in the eastern colonnade. Many remains of walls and other masonry were disclosed in cutting cross-trenches, but none was opened for more than a few feet, and none needs description here. In several places the column-wall has been used for later requirements, and this has caused a certain amount of re-cutting and re-plastering. Along the northern slope a trench was run in the earlier days of the excavation, with a view to determine the northern front. This opened some remains of masonry and a deep well full of potsherds, shells, and other refuse, which were cleared out until at 22 feet the rising water prevented further progress. In the centre below the slope, two trenches disclosed a plastered wall running parallel with the main direction of the Agora; two others more to the south contained only rough paving, like that

in two; round object; ribbed slab like foot-scraper; ear of bowl; inscribed slab [to Hadrian, *v. inf.*]; fragment of bowl [red marble]; part stele, with vase in relief.

Bronze: coins; hook; small wheel; chain, with brass weight.

Iron: Fragments of lock; curved fragment [sickle?].

Lead: large weight.

Stone: weight; knee of statue [limestone].

Terra-cotta: Roman lamp with Eros; ditto plain.

Ivory: fragment like serviette-ring.

¹ These are inner measurements, not inclusive of walls.

² The apse, with its heap of *débris*, is exactly paralleled by a small ruin on the right of the Sacra Via at Rome, as one passes from the Arch of Titus to the Meta Sudans.

³ Which in its turn is 1' 9" above the level of the east wall of the Agora.

⁴ The portion opened is about 18 feet long by 3 broad.

⁵ The few objects here found belong rather to private dwellings: fragments of window and other panelling in thin marble; tesserae from one of the brilliant glass mosaics which were used to decorate house-walls; a lion's head gargoyles, &c.

at the southern end—a cement, floor and beneath it a mass of stones, mostly architectural, thrown in apparently as a foundation.


A curious circumstance was the finding, built into the new city-wall, two marble bases, which with their podia were monolithic [*c.* Pl. VIII. Fig. 4]. A ragged peasant of Sergyi, who had not seldom served us as guide, reported that a number of marble columns had been disinterred from the city wall. Others, he said, still remained. It was, indeed, quite possible to trace certain bays in the wall, such as might well have been built round a column or similar round mass; but such a mode of construction seemed little adapted to strengthen what had clearly been a wall of fortification. On cutting down, however, two marble bases were in fact found, while the bay in which a third had stood was well defined. Moreover, these bays have a certain regularity,¹ as though base and column had stood in position before the wall was built; but the one base which was thoroughly exposed proved to rest on cement, not on a masonry course. Part of a marble Corinthian capital was turned up in an adjoining shaft sunk against the south-western pier of the Loutrón, but I seem to have taken no note of its measurements, and cannot say therefore whether it had any connection with the bases.

There is even less to note in the western colonnade. At the north-west the new city-wall is carried on to the column wall of the Agora to a height of four courses and for a distance southwards of 6' 9". The courses below are stepped. The inter-columniation 45-46 is marked by the superimposing of a narrow late wall, level with the top of the bases of the colonnade: it continues a short distance northwards of 46. A little north of the centre of the arcade the column-wall is for several feet stepped on its eastern face. The step is 1' 3" down and has a width of 1' 5½": it may probably be a vestige of the supporting course for attachment of the marble tessellated pavement, which no doubt extended inwards from the western as from the eastern colonnade [*v. sup.* p. 71]. The most noteworthy feature was, however, the series of drains which underlie the arcade, and generally pierce the column-wall at a slight depth from its existing surface. They are all of similar type, built of rough stone, once probably faced, and are nearly equal in size, varying in width from 1' 3" to 1' 10", with heights of from 2' 3" to 4'. Only one, the most southerly, could be traced to its termination—a plain wall, which may however have been interposed,—in the others progress was stopped, sooner or later, by an accumulation of earth which in so confined a space there was no means of removing. A rather larger drain is that which crosses the column-wall at its northern end, and then bending round northwards runs under the Loutrón, and is no doubt identical with one found at the N. W. corner of the latter building. The drains afterwards supplied a run for two litters of foxes: and the vixen repaid our kindness by carrying off a fine turkey-hen the night before it was destined to replenish our larder.

¹ This regularity is not fully maintained in the actual measurements, which give 12 feet between first bay and first marble base then

18 feet to a probable second bay, and 20 feet again to the second base excavated.

The upper course of the column-wall shows in its existing state much evidence of later interference. Many architectural fragments have been hastily built in; and among these one, a pilaster capital in low relief, is of some interest, and is represented in the annexed cut. Other pieces are probably from the entablature of the colonnade itself, but are unfortunately few and small. Somewhat south of the arcade's central point there is on the west a rectangular depression at present under tillage. It was at one time intended to make trial of this patch of ground, on which an *annexe* to the Agora might well have stood. Two preliminary trenches were carried from the outer wall down to the edge of the plot, but as they failed to disclose anything of importance, and as the ground, being in private possession, would have had to be bought up, or at least the standing crop and owner's rights paid for, the idea of excavating it this season was abandoned. Inside the Agora, and somewhat further south, two walls, separated only by a couple of feet, were found running parallel with the colonnade and only a short distance away from the column-wall. They were, however, not followed up. At the S. W. angle were several



remains of building. They seemed to be for the most part of a late period. Among them are some architectural members including a marble base and a small stele. From the outer angle of the arcade a wall runs westward for some 34 ft. It shows on the surface of the ground and has not been excavated. Another wall, parallel with this, also exists further north, and extends 15 ft. from the outer arcade wall, against the lower course of which and between the two cross-walls there was some remain of a cement floor.

The excavation of the Agora was completed by that of the hillock at its southern end. Here were found thick walls forming a double rectangle. There can be little doubt that these are the *stoa* and *cella* walls of a temple, which forms a natural finish to the Agora. The peristyle has an extreme length of 96 feet, and breadth of 72, a proportion of 4:3; the *cella* is practically square, being 52' \times 50'.¹ The eastern wall of the *cella* was not

¹ The measurement is conjectural, based on the interval between the *cella* and outer walls on the west side. It would be natural to ex-

pect rather a square: the divergence may be accounted for by the differing thicknesses of the four *cella*-walls.

found, though the space it should have occupied was excavated to a considerable depth. The general width of the walls is 6 feet.¹ Two narrow walls connect the peristyle with the marble steps. No vestige of base or podium was found, with possible exception of the middle of the western peristyle wall just opposite some fallen drums. The latter are indeed plentiful, especially on the southern slope, where a great mass of limestone fusts may be seen. The diameters of the drums vary considerably from 4' 8" to 3' 0½", so that they must be representative of at least two orders.² The existing surface of the walls is remarkably even and in part flagged with large flat stones. Their level³ is 1' 10" above the S.E. corner base, or 3' 6" above the column-wall of the Agora. The north cella-wall breaks off short at its eastern end, where it has a depth of 4' 8" masonry, supported on a compo-bed 1' 6" thick. Here 7' 10" below the top of the wall, or 11' 6" below the surface soil is a floor of small squared pieces of tile set orderly in a matrix of cement 2 feet thick.⁴ Cutting through this floor, of whose presence at this point I have no explanation to offer, a mass of heavy masonry was disclosed heaped together with no pretence to regularity. On removing the upper blocks however, masonry in course appeared at an additional depth of several feet; this seemed to be the remains of walls running skantwise to the line of the later temple. Further work proved to be impossible without greatly enlarging the shaft; water too was beginning to appear, and at a depth of 13' 9" below the cella-wall excavation was abandoned. The sole object found in the shaft was a colossal limestone hand similar to those afterwards turned up on another site (Toumpa *v. inf.*). This underlayer was only discovered after the Agora had been abandoned when the season was already well advanced, and I did not at first realize its full importance. Some valuable time was lost accordingly before I could set on a few hands to excavate to a lower level at other points of the temple. When this was done, however, masonry in course, and apparently agreeing in direction with that already mentioned, was found also at the N.W. angle of the cella, and at the S.E. of the peristyle.⁵ It was then too late to do more, the shafts sunk could not be extended underground, and there was not time to attempt a thorough clearance of the hillock. That task must be left until the excavations are resumed. The hillock is a mass of *débris* and loose earth, which must be removed bodily.⁶

¹ It is 6' 8" on the N. cella wall, 5' 11" on the peristyle at the S.E., and with this narrower measure the other walls agree rather than with the wider dimension.

² Many drums owing to their imperfect preservation it was impossible to measure. I subjoin the diameters of the others:—4' 8" [drum at S.E. peristyle angle], 3' 6½" [W. peristyle wall, opposite supposed emplacement], 4' 1" [second drum, *ibid.*], 3' 11¼" [N. peristyle wall], 3' 5½" [S.E.], 3' 4½", 3' 9", 3' 0½", 3' 3" [all on S.]. There is a large, much-broken drum standing on the Agora floor, which even in its present state measures 4' 6".

³ *i.e.* the level of the N. cella-wall; the

peristyle wall on the south is somewhat lower.

⁴ As open, the floor is 12' 6" wide E. and W. and 14' 6" long N. and S. On the E. side of the cutting there are in the earth-wall of the trench traces of two cement layers 2" to 3" thick at a height of 5' and 6' 9" respectively above the floor.

⁵ The space was too confined to render measurement possible, and my compass was unfortunately broken.

⁶ On the crest of the hillock, just about the centre of the cella, a shaft was sunk to a depth of about 18 feet without encountering anything but loose soil.

The site is certainly an important one and the temple, whose walls now occupy it, is almost as certainly a rebuilding of an older shrine whose ruins exist beneath.

On the surface and still more in trenching, numerous fragments of inscriptions were discovered. The majority of these were from the pedestals of honorary statues, and belonged partly to the Ptolemaic epoch, partly to that of the early Empire. Almost all came from the north slope of the hillock, in and about the line of the cella wall; but no one was deeply buried, nor were the earlier necessarily at a lower level than the later. On the surface before excavation, some splinters of fluted columns of blue marble, and corresponding Corinthian capitals were picked up; and at the N.W. a short way into the soil were various small fragments of a white marble cornice, as also a piece of wall-plaster with device in colours. From the eastern trench which occupies the line of the lost cella-wall, came a fragment of a marble trophy (?):¹ near the southern cella-wall, a phallus in terra-cotta, pierced for suspension. There were too some remains of surface building; a patch of marble plaque flooring on the crest of the rise, and a wall parallel with, but at a higher level than, the northern cella-front. Nothing was discovered which could account for the bull's head capital. This huge block, though discovered lying beneath the hillock, we had supposed to have fallen from a higher position; but nothing like a base or pedestal was unearthed.² Its own mass, immovable without better gear than the expedition possessed, prevented excavation of the ground immediately beneath it; but on its western side a shaft was carried down without encountering any masonry, or indeed remains of any description until at 13' 6" *καίας*³ was reached.

The inscriptions do not afford a certain clue as to the dedication of the temple. Three fragments of an important document which seem to relate to the lands of the temple are unfortunately fragments only, and can with difficulty be restored. One mentions probably a Zeus Olympios—the five concluding letters of the second word are alone preserved. The inscribed blocks from the olive-press [*v. sup.* p. 71] were doubtless removed thither from the hillock; and one of these, the pedestal of a statue in honour of Livia Augusta, is dedicated to Zeus Olympios. Until further evidence of a more conclusive nature can be obtained these indications may serve to give a name to the temple. But important as the site is, lying as it does at the

¹ It is a fragment only, part of the trunk itself; but the remains of other parts attaching to it are scarcely reconcilable with the supposition that it is the ordinary tree-support of a statue.

² Its lower diameter is 3' 1"; the side of the upper cushion-square 4' 6".

As will be seen from the photograph in another section, this fine marble has been chiselled away, the corresponding volute (bull's head) being lost, and a considerable portion of the wings. It was probably intended to use it

as a font in the Byzantine church which adjoins the eastern colonnade.

I cannot see that among the various architectural remains discovered there is any one that can be connected with this capital, which must originally, it would appear, have surmounted a monumental column.

³ This is the native word to designate everything that is not *χῶμα*, or loose worked earth: *καίας* accordingly includes every form of virgin soil and native rock. The term is a convenient one and may be kept with advantage.

very heart of the city's life, there is no reason as yet to identify the presumptive Zeus Olympios with the chief deity of Salamis, Zeus Salaminios. It is remarkable how Zeus meets one at every turn in ancient Salamis, here, at Toumpa tou Michaili, on the sand-site, and on *D*. The temple on the hillock is from its form Roman. Its rebuilding may therefore be contemporary with that of the Agora. The marble steps are of poorer workmanship, but they, as connected with the peristyle, may on the whole be assigned to the same date, so that Agora, stairway, and temple will be parts of a single plan.

Before adding a final word on the Agora some experimental excavations outside its limits but having more or less relation to the main work fall to be mentioned here. I have already referred to the olive-press (?), whose floor furnished the inscribed blocks. At no great distance a second cast was made on a spot which seemed to promise similar results; but fortune was unkind. Shafts were then sunk on the westward rising ground, which intervenes between the Agora and the high road to Famagosta.¹ Here plastered walls, as of a house, were laid bare and by them several small objects were found.² Further northwards along the slope a probe struck the mouth of a concealed well, the water in which 26 feet below the surface was warm and brackish. Eastward nearer the Agora other walls appeared under the surface; but neither in the one case nor the other was there enough to tempt us to spend more time or trouble. A fresh trial was then made between this rising ground and the olive-press, at a point nearer the latter than the former. Again a house-wall (N.—S.) was disclosed and beside it a piece of mosaic; but as before there was no sufficient inducement to carry on the experiment. Lastly, a probe of more importance had been worked on the east side of the hillock, where the column mentioned by Mr. Hogarth was supposed to have stood. Here a column-wall was found and traced for a length of 94 feet, at which measure its apparent limits were fixed. Four of its bases were in position. They were of marble and their moulding was of the usual late type. The wall had been largely overbuilt by a later house (or houses): beneath one of whose floors was quite a number of bronze coins, the pilfered treasure of some long dead slave.³ The ruins of the house made excavation very difficult: the spade was useless and the space had to be cleared entirely with pick and rope. The limits of the wall itself having been to all appearance determined, there seemed no sufficient reason, in view of more important matter, to turn what had from the first been an experiment into a serious excavation. Further digging was accordingly abandoned, not however until it had disclosed at the northern end quite a little network of drains.

¹ This ground rises about 15' 6" above the Agora wall.

² Including a small marble Nike, fragments of alabaster [statuettes ?], terra-cottas, ivory needles and bodkins, pottery of Cypriote type, lamps and glass. The northern shaft produced a little bronze figure (mirror handle).

³ To this house must also be referred some fragments of wall-plaster, with part of an inscription painted in pink-red, apparently an artist's signature:—

ατ(ε κ
ἐπι)οησεν
λ'ετ

I have spoken throughout of the Agora by that name without offering any justification for it. It is indeed almost sufficient to refer as ample evidence to the plan of the building. Such a colonnade of such dimensions could not well have been in a Greek or Roman town anything but the Agora. There is, however, some additional reason for the name. According to village report an English archaeologist some years previously had dug up a stone close by the western colonnade, an inscription on which, so he had told them, described the site as the Agora of Salamis.¹ In the course of this season's excavation some portions of a huge block of blue marble were found, to which a bronze inscription had been affixed. From the soldering holes and marks on the stone, the letters, which are from 4 to 6 inches high, can be read as . . .

G. PRO. PR.

FOR.

and the reference seems to be to a restoration of the Forum by a propraetorial governor. The imperial officers in Cyprus however bore after 22 B.C. the brevet rank of pro-consuls. In Le Bas and Waddington is a second inscription which records a (partial?) restoration by the ἀγορανόμοι Pasikrates (?) son of Empylos, and Karpion [*Voyage Archéol.* No. 2758]: while a third published in the same work proves that a Karpion, perhaps the same man, held the position of government architect [*ibid.* No. 2797]. An inscribed pedestal [*v. inf.* 'Inscriptions' III. 44] found this year is from the base of a statue in honour of 'Empylos the son of Empylos the son of Charias,' erected in 'the year nine.' If the era referred to is that of the reconstitution of the province the year indicated will be 14 B.C. Combining the two inscriptions referring to Empylos, and assuming for the moment that the same individual is the subject of both records there would seem to be evidence for a restoration of the Agora, soon after the battle of Actium. Such a date would agree with the 'propraetore' of the inscription already mentioned as found this year on the site. But on the other hand the architectural remains point rather to the first century A.D., or as late perhaps as the reign of Trajan or Hadrian. Dr. Dörpfeld saw the site before excavation had begun, and judging from the surface remains was inclined to place the structure in the 'first century' of the Empire. The question is one for an architect and I prefer to leave it open.² There is probably nothing to exclude the hypothesis of two restorations, one perhaps partial, the other more complete. To the former the inscriptions just quoted will refer, though the evidence they furnish is inconclusive: the latter will be established by the character of the remains themselves, if, as is probable, these are proved to be later in date. With the latter hypothesis should perhaps be connected an inscription in honour of

¹ This inscription may conceivably be identical with that published by Sakellarios, *Τὰ Κυπριακά*, p. 171, and republished by Lebas and Waddington, *Voy. Arch.*, Vol. III. No. 2758.

The fragment from an inscription in large characters on a moulded stone [*v. inf.* p. 14] cannot be restored with sufficient certainty, but may be quoted as lending a tittle of collateral

evidence, as it was found by the Loutron.

² If the restoration is placed in the 1st century A.D., or the beginning of the 2nd, it must be in all probability connected with a partial destruction of Salamis by the Jews in Trajan's reign. This will determine the date as falling within the first twenty or thirty years of the 2nd century A.D.


Hadrian [*inj.* No. III. 16]: the evidence of which cannot however be pressed, since, though the slab was found at the S.E. corner of the Agora, it was lying loose in the soil against a wall which is outside the limits of the colonnade, and had evidently—for its surface was covered with mortar—been used as building-stone.

C (*continued*). THE LOUTRON. (PLATE VII.)

The excavation of the Agora was completed by March 18:¹ but for several days previously only a portion of our staff of workpeople could be profitably employed upon it. By Feb. 27 we were already experimenting for a new site to the westward [*v. sup.* p. 79], and even earlier had commenced work against the Loutron. The problem which offered itself for solution was to determine the manner in which the northern end of the Agora was rounded off. The colonnade-walls are continuous up to the wall of the new city, which is laid over and across them. Beyond it a space of rather more than twenty feet is occupied by higher ground up to the Loutron wall, into which columns seemed to have been built, so as at least to suggest the theory that here an older colonnade had been swallowed up. In approaching the difficult question of the northern end of the Agora the levels of the various portions of masonry are data of value: I have added accordingly a section exhibiting the relative position in this respect of all the buildings from the temple to the Loutron inclusive. It will be seen from this plan that the Agora columns and the Loutron piers stand approximately on the same level: there is a difference of a few inches only, such as may have crept in by error into an extended calculation. The agreement however, if actual, must not lend colour to the idea that the Loutron piers preserve any portion of the Agora.

The building known as the Loutrón or Vourta is one of the few still standing ruins on the site of Salamis. The accompanying view, which I owe to the kindness of Captain A. H. Young, Commissioner of Famagosta, exhibits the Loutron as it was previous to our excavations. It will be noticed that the interior does not contain a very deep deposit of earth; but it was otherwise with the exterior, where the soil is 8 to 10 ft. above that inside. Hence, while the details of the inner structure were for the most part visible, those of the outside were wholly hidden; though it was possible even there to trace the imprint of columns in the walls. The work accomplished this season consisted accordingly in laying bare the piers of the southern front, in establishing the form of the northern and western sides, and in determining the intermediate vaulting of the interior [*v. plan*]. The eastern end was not touched so far, that is, as the outer face of the wall is concerned; but as the S.E. corner was completely, that at the N.E. partially, turned, there seemed less reason for dealing with it, more especially

¹ With exception of some additional work on the temple at the southern end, and more particularly on the older layer beneath it.



SECTION FROM TEMPLE TO LOUVAIN.

as the accumulation of soil is here much less, the ground falling away so sharply that any important peculiarity must have left traces of itself on the wall above. No more work was done than barely sufficed to complete the plan; but without an expenditure of labour disproportionate to the main purpose of the expedition nothing more could be done, with the exception of one or two small tasks whose completion was prevented only by the approaching end of the season and the failure of funds.

The Loutron as excavated proves to be a structure of great strength and considerable irregularity. The walls are faced with big blocks of squared stone, the core being of large stones, and here and there fragments of marble concreted with white cement. The total length (inclusive) is 194' 6", the width 70' at the western, 72' at the eastern, end.¹ The main course of the walls is 8' thick on the southern side, 7' 3" to 8' 6" on the west,² varies from 12' to 8' 3" on the north, and is 14' on the east. The north wall is especially irregular, but part of this irregularity may be more apparent than real, since excavation on this side was not carried down to any considerable depth. At the eighth arch, counting from the west, the wall bends outwards, and though I cut down several feet on the inside and for some distance along from the beginning of the deflection, I could find no apparent reason for it. The remaining arches, however, from this point to the N.E. corner are different in character, resting on real corbels which have a greater projection; those toward the western end spring almost directly from the wall. Corresponding to the irregularity in thickness of walls, there is a difference in structure. Against the south side rest huge pier-buttresses, whose corners are ornamented with engaged columns.³ The buttresses, like everything else in this curious building, are irregular; for, though similar in design, they are

¹ Drummond, travelling in the latter half of the 18th century, gives almost exactly these dimensions—192' × 72'; yet presumably he only paced the distances. The remainder of the passage from his letter is curious. 'The walls are 4' thick, besides cloisters for the priests their apparatus and attendants, which run the whole length of the temple on the south side, and are in breadth 21' within walls, with an entry different from that of the temple [he identifies the Loutron with the 'temple of Zeus Salamine']. Nothing is now to be seen but the vaults below, which supported the temple, and some parts of the walls above; the vaults are uncovered, and it appears that twelve rows of arches have run from side to side, and four from one end to the other. . . . Part of the pedestal that supported the statue (of Zeus) remains in the east end: the grand court is 660' × 390', and hath included other buildings besides the temple, but of what kind I will not presume to say.'—Drummond, *Travels through Different Cities, &c.*, 1754, Letter XIII., p. 274.


It is much to be regretted that Drummond

did not make a sketch, even of the roughest kind, of 'the cloisters.'

² These measurements are of an upper and lower course.

³ These are not however true columns. I give a plan of the western side of the central pier, which will show the method of construction. The long stones continued into the square mass of the buttress, and are arranged alternately, the upper being at right angles to the lower. There are no drums. Thus the buttress is not weakened at its angles, as it must have been had the columns been true columns built in.

That this method of construction holds for all the angle columns I have little doubt, although it is only visible (in the present state of the excavations) in the central pier, the fourth pier, N.W. column of S.W. pier, S.E. pier [only column open]. Such columns cannot therefore represent a pre-existing colonnade incorporated with the Loutron: buttress and column are of a piece. How far the buttresses themselves were originally part of the Loutron is a different question.



THE LOUSTRON.

unevenly spaced.¹ The second buttress (from the east end) has no columns existing: there may be trace of them at a lower level, but the buttress which moreover is of smaller dimensions, is surrounded on one side by solid cement-work, and on the other by soil of such density that further excavation had to be abandoned. The measurements of each pier-buttress it is scarcely necessary to give; the centre one, as the most complete, may serve as typical. This has a width of 7' 7", a length of 6' 3" (unfortunately not capable of being calculated exactly), and is 12' 8" high on to the upper line of moulding at its base. Its columns are 3' 7" to 3' 9" in diameter at the top, and have a height of 16 ft. (base included), or 16' 6½" measuring to the under surface of the podium of their base [*v.* also Pl. VIII. Fig. 6]. Base like column is made in sections; and in the one instance where the former is satisfactorily preserved and exposed (S.W. buttress), its sections do not correspond with those of the column. Against each buttress additional walls have been laid. Thus from the S.E. buttress a wall starts southwards, and another west; the eastern edge of the second is hemmed in with solid cement-work; from the columns of the central buttress walls are carried east and west, and that they are additions is proved by the fact that the columns and their moulded bases continue into the masonry; a similar wall runs eastward from the fourth, and is perhaps one with that which starts to meet it from the centre buttress; and, lastly, from the S.W. a wall runs southwards and may be continuous with that from which further west spring the corbels of a vault. By the eastern side of the fourth buttress is an additional wall 3' broad, which at present exists only at a lower level than the top of the pier, itself incomplete, but from the remains of mortar seems to have extended once to the same height as to the pier. Similarly against the centre pier was found masonry laid roughly in course, but not built up as a wall. It will be noticed that on the plan the south wall of the Loutron is not hatched throughout. The portion left plain represents a course found only by the process of excavation; and possibly adventitious; for the columns of the centre buttress with their base moulding continue into it. There is, too, a difference in the mortar used. White cement of great purity and fine grain is here employed as a binding, while on the column are remains of a grey mortar mixed with ash. The N.W. and S.W. columns of this buttress seem to have been repaired: their bases have, I think, been re-dressed, and part of the moulding has been filled in with a mortar mixed with brick-dust.² On the other hand, there is a white (marble) cement between the base and its podium.

¹ From W. edge S.E. pier-buttress to E. edge fourth pier, 38' 8", or an interval of 23' 8"; from E. edge fourth pier-buttress to W. edge central, 38' 8", or an interval of 38' 8"; from W. edge central pier-buttress to E. edge second pier, 38' 3", or an interval of 23' 3"; from E. edge second pier-buttress to W. ditto (?) S.W. buttress, 35' 3", or an interval of 35' 3".

(The fourth and second piers are imperfect) Though unequal, there is a certain correspond-

ence in the intervals.

² The moulding is more upright than on the S.W. pier; and the column's edge is square with the top of the base, whereas on the S.W. pier it recedes an inch or two. Below the facing mortar the stone is weatherworn. The bottom member of the moulding does not project sufficiently, and where continued into the wall appears to be fuller.

The western end is very differently treated. Here a strong wall 7'6" broad, 16' high, and at a distance of 11' covers the front of the main building, a prolongation of whose northern wall it joins at the N.W. corner.¹ Towards the northern end a tie-wall has been inserted coincident with the upper 6ft. of masonry of the outer western wall. It is 2'6" broad. Near the southern end traces of a vault were found in a shaft sunk some feet down, just north of the S.W. corner.

Yet another mode of building is shown on the northern side. Less excavation was done on this flank of the Loutron; but the edge of the masonry hidden under the soil was traced throughout its length. The projecting spurs which characterise this wall were laid bare to the extent indicated on the plan, and an accumulation of stonework, including one wall of considerable length, was disclosed at the N.E. corner. Of the 'spurs' here mentioned—they are masses of plain masonry irregularly spaced, and of varying width²—one only was opened to its further end; the others I assume to be of similar character. What the structure at the N.E. may have been, there are no data to show: further excavation is required throughout.

On the east front the spade was not employed, but the great thickness of the wall seems to preclude the idea of any buttress or other form of added strength. Three holes have been knocked through the wall at a later time³: otherwise this, like the other three sides of the Loutron, is solid-built.

The interior was a large pillared hall, its width formed by four aisles, its length by thirteen bays. The vaulting springs from corbels,⁴ and rests in the centre on solid square piers⁵ which measure 3'9" to 3'10" either way. These do not always present a straight line, nor are the corbels of the north and south walls always directly opposite one another; and while at the western end the arch is planted on similar square piers placed against the wall, at the eastern it springs directly from a continuous corbel course running the whole length of the side. The corners of the rectangle are cut off obliquely, and the corner-pieces serve also as buttresses for the arch spring.⁶ There is an inter-pace of 9'7" to 9'9", and this dimension is fairly regular, except that the span between the northern wall and the first line of piers is less by about two

¹ The wall is of the same height in its present condition as that of the main building, reaching down to the same depth. Below it is a drain whose floor is 17' 6" from the surface. The wall, like those of the main building, is constructed of large squared stones facing a concrete core. It is only at the N.W. corner that it has been opened to its full depth, elsewhere, on the surface, or a few feet below.

² From 6 to 8 feet.

³ The holes are nearly shapeless, yet there is some trace of an inner square frame which might be original. There is another opening in the

S. wall between the first and second corbels. At the N.W. and S.E. the walls have been broken away to admit of entrance to the ruin, which, before our excavations disturbed the ground, was largely used as a sheep-fold.


⁴ In the western half of the northern wall, the arch is keyed directly to the perpendicular masonry.

⁵ Of these, enough were opened to make the plan of the vaulting clear.

⁶ Even these corner-pieces are irregular, the length of the hypotenuse varying from 7' 6" to 10'.

fect for two-thirds the length of the building than it is for the remaining third, or at any point along the southern wall. In the present condition of the Loutron the pillars of the interior are just hidden beneath the surface of the earth and *débris* which fill the interior. When Drummond visited Salamis, they must have been still above ground. Some 9ft. lower, 14'3" below the cushion of the arch, is the floor, a solid mass of the hardest cement, through which it took one of the men nearly three days to cut a distance of 2'6", and even then he failed to reach the soil below, and had to abandon the attempt.¹ All the interior masonry has been protected by stucco. The highest portions of wall still standing are at the east end; the best preserved surface is on the south wall (inner face).

To the S.W. of the Loutron are remains of buildings whose relation to the main structure I am not in a position to decide. There exists at this point, above ground, the upper part of a vault, which as it afforded shelter to the hands in rainy weather, and served as an, if rude, yet not uncomfortable,



INNER WALL OF LOUTRON.

salle à manger, went by the name of the *καφενέιον*.² Its southern side is incorporated with the new city wall. The *καφενέιον* was not excavated, but the ground immediately to the east of it was. Here were found the buttresses and springs of a second arch, with part of a floor (?) of large marble

¹ From the plan of comparative levels, it will be seen that the southern floor is (virtually) on a level with the bottom of the base of the

column in the buttresses of the S. side.

² Marked 'Vault' on plan.

slabs.¹ The north arch-buttress rests against a wall running eastwards, and possibly continuous with one which starts to meet it from near the S.W. pier of the Loutron (*v.* plan). The arch will have been at right angles to the axis of that of which, as previously mentioned, some trace was found north of the S.W. corner of the main building. The existence of these vaults explains the mention of 'cloisters' in the passage previously quoted from Drummond. It is much to be regretted that that passage is not more explicit, as it is obvious that far more was above ground in Drummond's time, and much that is now obscure was then no doubt plain.

The amount of earth and *débris* in and about the Loutron contrasts strongly with the shallowness of the layer which hid the Agora from view. Inside, a multifarious deposit was found. There were numerous fragments of marble of a late epoch, pieces of Turkish window-grating, of small blue-veined columns, bases and capitals, a slab—as though from a balustrade—surmounted by a plain cone, portions of a window, tesserae from a polychrome pavement and mosaics, and plaster mouldings and panels. At the N.W. corner, between the inner and outer western walls, scores of tesserae from a marble pavement were disinterred; and from the same shaft came a small alabaster box. A large sandstone block, cut pentwise on one side, bore the mason's mark OKIQ , roughly incised. From this shaft comes also a large-moulded fragment of marble bearing a mutilated inscription, which, though it may refer to the

CHCTHCATP)

ANCYNT
TUKPH

Agora, has, so far as concerns its discovery, nothing to do with the Loutron. The same holds good of another fragmentary inscription, a small piece of a marble slab found at the S.W. loose in the earth near the mantling wall.²

It remains to say a few words of the Loutron as a whole. Irregularities in the structure have been remarked at every turn; but, while irregularity is common in architecture from the Temple at Ephesus to the Duomo of Fiesole or S. Maria Novella, there is one feature in the Loutron which can hardly be original to the first plan—I mean the deflection of the north wall. Moreover, this deflection corresponds, as has been seen, with a difference in the springing of the vaults—a difference which divides the building into two parts, of which the one is represented by the westward two-thirds of the north wall together with perhaps the western end, the other by the remainder

¹ One slab extends from buttress to buttress of arch, a distance of 4', and continues under them. West of the southern buttress is a marble block moulded; and in the angle between this and the slab first mentioned, is a second marble slab. The two vaults are parallel and presumably continuous. The greater span of the *καφερέιον* is apparent only, its inner casing

having given way.

² There is not much material for restoring this inscription. The first line—there was a line above it—looks like the formula $\phi\kappa\omicron\delta\acute{\omicron}\mu\eta\sigma\]\alpha\nu$ $\sigma\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \tau\phi\ \theta\epsilon\phi$, but no letter follows the τ , and the stone seems to end here. The second line contains part of $\tau\phi\ \text{Κρη}[\tau\iota\kappa\phi]$ perhaps. There was another line below.

of the building. We seem to have here the work of two periods, and yet a third stage in the structure may be exhibited in the added walls of the southern side. The latter, perhaps, are of the same date as the vaults at the S.W., a date which is not improbably that of the construction of the new city wall, when the Loutron was already fallen into disuse, or when at least its walls could be turned to account in connection with the new fortifications. The vault at the S.W. is certainly of poorer workmanship than the Loutron, agreeing better with the city wall into which it is joined.¹ The ugly irregularities of the north wall may indicate that this portion of the Loutron was either partially below ground,² or was mantled and hidden by some other adjoining structure; while, on the other hand, the ornamental character of the southern side shows that this was once open to the view. That the pier-buttresses are strictly part of the Loutron is perhaps more than doubtful; yet again I could see nothing to suggest that they are not contemporary with it, or were not intended to serve some purpose strictly germane to that of the main building. But the whole problem is one for an architect, and mindful of the proverb, I prefer to leave open a question to which I have given much thought without arriving at a satisfactory conclusion.

There is less cause for hesitation in pronouncing upon the purpose, and, with some reserve, upon the date of the Loutron. That the local name of the ruin may contain a genuine tradition as to its use need not be doubted; but instead of the structure serving as a bath, for which its internal arrangement is ill-fitted, it is in all probability one of the very few existing specimens of a *castellum*³ for the cooling and filtration of the town's supply of water. With this view the solid cement floor, the massive walls, the pillared vaulting are alike in agreement. A similar reservoir once existed in connection with the Thermae of Diocletian; another is the "Hundred and One Columns" of Constantinople. The pillars which seem misplaced in a building where room is all-important may have been of use, as facilitating a more rapid deposit of the solid matter held in suspense by the incoming water. The Loutron is later than the Agora, earlier than the adjoining wall of the new city. Between these limits its date cannot be determined with accuracy; but judging from the style of the work it may well belong to the second century, A.D. A *castellum*, however, is only the terminus of an aqueduct, and for the latter we have not far to seek. The general map of ancient Salamis,

¹ An alternative view, to which I held at first, would see in these vaults part of the aqueduct which supplied the Loutron. This would agree very well with the probable line of this aqueduct, and would explain the vaulting; but there is a trace of a vault on the western wall, and it seems scarcely probable that the water was made to double a right angle.

² The earth however for some distance below the top of the 'spurs,' which in their present condition are somewhat higher than the corbels

on the inner side of the wall, is $\chi\omega\mu\alpha$, and contains a sparse admixture of small objects.

³ It serves as a *castellum*, but has the form rather of a *piscina*, (using the latter term in its Roman, not in its ecclesiastical sense), and is accordingly, as a building, nearly unique. It will not be long, I hope, before it is laid bare in its completeness. Even as it stands it is not only one of the most complete, but, architecturally, one of the most interesting ancient buildings in Cyprus.

published with this report, will show two aqueducts¹ which cross the plain from the west, and, approaching each other at an acute angle, enter the city nearly at the same point, after which the one is lost to view. Either from its position would serve as feeder to the Loutron; but one, the later in character, on entering the city turns sharply away N.N.E., skirting the line of the new city wall, and occupying in all probability that of the wall of the older town. It is the other and older aqueduct which supplied the Loutron, and this is sufficiently proved by the ruins of a smaller *piscina* near the so-called *ἁγιασμὸς τοῦ Βαρνάβα*,² a *piscina* whose construction exactly resembles that of the Loutron. In plan it is more nearly square, measuring 31' 6" × 34' 6" outer to outer; but the masonry is exactly similar; it is similarly vaulted, and the corbels of its arches have the same width, 3' 9". The aqueduct itself is lost sight of near the monastery, behind which, however, are some small runnels which may have served as feeders to it. That the water was not brought from a distance seems indicated by the presence of the small *piscina*, which in all probability was used to collect it in such fashion that a continuous service, of volume adequate for the needs of the Loutron, could be maintained. From the point where the aqueduct, at its eastern end, crossed the Famagosta road it is again lost to view; but one line of masonry runs southward, crossing the road obliquely, and then pursuing its eastern edge till near a small mound of earth it strikes up the rise towards the Agora. Opposite the head of the aqueduct, across the road, is a mass of masonry nearly hidden underground, which may represent the continuation towards the Loutron; the mass is of greater width than might have been expected. Two-thirds of the distance between this ruin and the new city wall is again masonry, here suggesting rather a N.—S. wall. The fragment is, however, composed of two pieces, each of which has perhaps belonged to a different structure, for each seems to employ a different mortar. In the one case, a fine white binding of nearly pure lime is to be seen, closely resembling that already remarked in the wall adjoining the centre pier-buttress of the Loutron. It is not impossible that the aqueduct was divided about this point, and while one arm ran N. and N.E. close under the new city wall, which there is some reason to think used its ruins as a buttress, the other turned southwards, and then again E. to the Loutron. The disappearance of this arm may probably be accounted for on the supposition that it followed the same line as the new city wall, which was afterwards constructed on its ruins. On reaching the Loutron it would have slightly diverged from the line, and was, I would suggest, carried alongside the reservoir on the

¹ Of the later one, that from Kythrea, considerable remains are still standing. Two of its arches, just abreast of the village of Ai Sergyi, are entire. It is from this aqueduct that the inscriptions published in Le Bas and Waddington are derived. The other is a street of ruins, running in a practically straight line to within a stone's throw of the monastery of Ai Varnáva.

² According to Florio Bustron: 'Detto Barnaba

fu martirizzato da Igemone podestà de Salamina: et dopo morto, fu tratto fuori della città et sepolto in una grotta chiamata Tis Igias.' St. Barnabas' tomb would then be underneath the Byzantine church of the *ἁγιασμὸς τοῦ Βαρνάβα*, a well below which is still used *τῆς ὑγιείας ἐνεκα*, when the natives are attacked by malarial fever.

pier-buttresses of the southern side,¹ whose presence it is otherwise difficult to explain, thence discharging itself by shoots into the interior of the reservoir. Between the first and second corbels of the south wall of the Loutron is a hole, the side-stones of which appear worn as though by the passage of water; but though I was at first inclined to call this a shoot, I am now more than doubtful. The hole seems placed too low, and it has no counter-part in the rest of the wall.

From this the older aqueduct, must be clearly distinguished the, as far as concerns its remains, far more imposing later aqueduct, which brought an abundant supply of water to Constantia from the hills near Kythréa. Of the date of this aqueduct I shall have to speak when dealing with the inscriptions from it; here I will merely describe its course. From the point where it crosses the road it turns sharply N.N.E., and continuing in a straight line, clearly marked by the bases of its arches, buries itself in the sand just where it is traversed by the fence which surrounds the government plantation. Thence it seems—or perhaps only one arm of it—after, as is indicated by the character of the ground, continuing for some distance in the same direction, to have turned seawards, and, passing just north of the ruins which Pococke styles a church, to have crossed the path which now leads up from the village to the forester's house, and thence again to lose itself in the sand. Where this path is in its turn traversed by the government fence which here turns southwards at a right angle to its previous westerly direction, there seem to be distinct traces of the masonry of the aqueduct (see map); and it is worth, perhaps, considering whether Pococke's church, with its four abnormally thick walls,² standing as it does on nearly the highest ground hereabouts, may not rather be another castellum. In any case the course of this later aqueduct ought certainly to be followed up when the excavation of Salamis is resumed. That a building so important as the town reservoir, if it was such, that the main aqueduct, and that a principal building like that which occupies our second site [B] should lie wholly outside the ring-wall of the later city, and at a distance from it, equal at this point to the entire width of the city itself, may make us hesitate before we identify the later city with Constantia, with whose magnitude the narrow dimensions of its circuit seem ill-assorted.³

SITE D.—THE DAEMONOSTASIUM AND CISTERN.

The excavation of the Agora being nearly completed, and site B not offering room at this time for more than a limited number of hands, the series of experiments was extended. I have already briefly noticed a trial which was made of the ground westward of the Agora. On March 12th work

¹ Whence the southern Loutron wall, in its second plan, was jointed on to them.

² They have in their present condition a width of from 12' 6" to (apparently) 20 feet, as contrasted with a length of 66'.

³ Cf. the language of Polybius, Bishop of

Rhinocoroura, in describing the restitution of S. Epiphanius' body to the town in which he had lived and worked. Constantia is there spoken of as *πολιανδρος*, a 'great metropolis.' [The passage is quoted by Meursius, 'Cyprus' cap. xxi. *ad fin.*]

began on the S. E. quarter of the ancient city, where a few men were despatched to test the abrupt hill which forms the end of the plateau of Salamis towards the river. The very name of the hill, 'Daemonostasium,' was alluring, and it was said that 'a large marble statue having a band across its breast like a soldier' had been found in the neighbourhood. *Débris* of buildings was plentiful here as everywhere. Below the hill-slope at the S. W. were numberless fragments, mostly of small size, of blue marble columns and capitals, while on the rise itself various walls cropped up above the soil. Further westwards, between the Daemonostasium and the southern end of the Agora, were many fusts of large blue marble columns, and I was anxious also to try the eastward slopes towards the sea where remains of black-glazed pottery were littered about the surface, which was moreover almost free from *débris* of late buildings. It was not intended to do more than experiment on this long and varied tract of ground, unless important finds should supply cause for more extended operations. Probers were sunk first on the crest of the hill, whence we gradually made our way with successive trial-shafts seawards along the slopes of the plateau. Two short trenches were also cut on the site marked by the blue marble fusts just mentioned, and resulted in the discovery of two portions of a probably continuous N.—S. wall forming presumably the eastern side of a large rectangular building whose date may be indicated by a fragment of stamped Aretine ware found in the trench.¹ It was not possible, however, at this stage of the season's work to undertake a fresh site of such dimensions as this promised to be; so that we contented ourselves with having ascertained its existence. On the summit of the hill part of a late (Turkish) house was first opened, then various portions of walls; and the further seawards the probers extended the older became the layer of finds they revealed. We soon found that we were meeting with ground of a very different character from any hitherto encountered. Roman and Ptolemaic remains had been left behind, and Cypriote and Greek of a good period took their place. The last slope before the sand-hills commence produced strange results. Here the *καίτας* had been cut and quarried in ancient times, so that a narrow line of *χώμα* ran athwart the incline in a direction somewhat north of east. The ground had clearly been turned over more than once, as the spade brought to light pottery and terra-cottas of all ages and styles mixed together in hopeless confusion. Numerous pits or well-shafts had been sunk; one of which is simply cut in the *καίτας*, a second is walled round with rough stone, a third plastered. In the flat ground at the floor of the slope, a well of brackish water still exists; a second, smaller in form but much deeper, may be seen on the rise westwards towards the Daemonostasium. But the number of such pits brought to light in excavating is certainly noteworthy, nor does there seem anything to account for the fact that the hillside

¹ It is stamped



has been, as it were, ploughed from west to east with a single broad and deep furrow. Mining for water can scarcely have been the sole cause; but there is no indication of, what the finds might otherwise suggest, a necropolis. I can only suppose that old disused wells were filled with rubbish, that this then became a general refuse-heap, the ground perhaps being even excavated for the purpose; and that afterwards, in comparatively late Roman times, when the surface had again become level, fresh shafts were sunk for water, resulting in a general disturbance of the older layer. In keeping with this view it may be noted that one prober, and to a certain extent a second, revealed, not fragments of terra-cotta or pottery, but a dense mass, unmixed with earth, of shells of the whelk, evidently a table delicacy:¹ also that, while the objects found were of all periods without distinction of find-spot, yet on the whole the older layer was nearer the surface, the more recent deeper into the soil, and both occupied mainly the upper stratum of *χωμα*. From the character of these objects it seems probable that they were the refuse from a neighbouring temple, of which however no trace was discovered on the spot.² The shafts ran down to a considerable depth: we followed them for a distance of from 17 to 24 ft. until water stopped further progress.³ No remains of buildings were disclosed, but here and there were portions of walling of rough construction, clearly intended to train and buttress the *καίλας* which has at this point rather more consistency than hardened clay and breaks off with some freeness. In two adjoining shafts this walling had the same direction northwards up the slope, and was no doubt continuous. It consisted of two courses, one stepped above the other.

Altogether about thirty shafts were sunk on this site within a confined area;⁴ not seldom two of them were afterwards merged into one. A trial too was made of the flat ground below the slope, a broad expanse which sweeps

¹ Similar masses of shells representing bushels of fish were found on the adjoining site *E*, and again on *F*.

² Some fragments of pottery afford special evidence of such a temple and may even supply its name.

(a) Three portions of the neck and rim of a black-glazed vase bear the words scratched in large firm characters

Δίδης Σωτήρος

(b) Fragment, plain coarse vase (milk-bowl) with doubled-handle spout, on whose rim, done with the nail in the wet clay, is

ΕΕΥΧΗΝ

ε εὐχὴν

(c) Bottom of a black-glazed vase

ΣΩΤ

Σωτ[ή]ρος

(d) Fragment of brownish-black pottery with Ψ ΕΟΥ in relief. θεοῦ (?)

The evidence of these four fragmentary inscriptions may be completed by reading them as

though they formed a sentence

θεοῦ Δίδης Σωτήρος· εὐχὴν

³ The varying depth corresponds to the position of the shaft, which reached the water-level sooner or later according as it was sunk lower down or higher up on the slope.

⁴ I subjoin measurements of a few as samples:

(a) Plastered cistern; 13' 3" deep; 6' 6" diameter; 8' 3" extent of plaster from surface.

(b) Round cistern; 18' deep; 3' 4" diameter; roughly walled with stone.

(c) *F*; shaft; 17' 4" deep; 4' 9" wide; 7' 3" long; at bottom walling in two courses 12' and 15' 4" respectively from surface; direction about 20° W. of N.

(d) *C*; shaft; 11' 6" ; walling continuous with that in preceding shaft.

(e) *B*; shaft; 14' × 4' 6" × 9'.

(f) Round cistern; 21' 4" deep; diameter at top 3', then increasing and again contracting to original dimensions.

In all cases whether 'shaft' or 'cistern' we have simply reworked ancient pits.

from the plateau to the river channel, and, with its sandy waste broken here and there by small hillocks, has the appearance of having been once under water. Indeed it might well have been supposed, as Pococke seems to have thought, that here had been the harbour of Salamis, and that the river-mouth had opened out into a natural haven. On cutting down however through a layer of sand about 5 ft. thick, remains of masonry were found, and this clue would have been followed up, but for a most untoward accident which happened on March 21, and resulted in the death of one of the workmen—a deaf-mute from Encomi.

The finding of masonry at this point under the sand¹ is important in reference to a reported destruction of part of the city by an earthquake which altered the level of the Pediaeus. There seems to be some exaggeration. As far as existing indications show there has been little or no change of level or formation either in the river valley or on the sea-line. For a considerable distance inland the Pediaeus cannot fall more than a foot or two in the mile; on the sea-shore are still unbroken many pieces of the ancient slips and harbour walls; and the masonry discovered in the sand is not more than a few feet higher than the present sea-level. Ancient geographers speak of two harbours of Salamis and of 'islands' against which incoming ships must be on their guard. These two harbours as well as the islands probably exist to-day and have not, as Pococke supposed, been turned into part of the mainland. The one harbour is the *κλειστός χειμερινός* of Scylax [*Periplus*, § 103] and lies to the north of the point; it is 'locked' by the line of reef which runs nearly parallel with the shore—a distance nowhere exceeding one hundred yards;² further north shore and reef all but meet. Several of the slips still remain and can be traced for a considerable distance under water. The other harbour was probably south of the point, and is the natural haven formed by the meeting of river and sea. This also is partially sheltered by the reef which here trends out from the point and then returns forming a sickle, at the end of which it disappears below the surface of the water. The 'islands' I take to be some isolated broken fragments in which the reef ends;³ they are somewhat small to justify the title perhaps, but *νήσος* does not in strictness mean more than 'floating land.' Nor can the level or channel of the Pediaeus have greatly altered; the remains of one, and perhaps of a second, older causeway are visible crossing its present bed, and their level hardly varies from that of the one in use to-day, which was probably first constructed when Famagosta rose into importance. The older remains lie between the latter and the sea. No doubt the bed of the river has risen slightly and the harbours have, like

¹ The shaft is sunk in a low hillock, not on the flat.

² So far as I could measure between wading and swimming. The masonry below the water is not shown on the accompanying map except by a general, and not quite accurate, reference. I have preserved memoranda of the existing masonry, which extends at intervals from the first to the second point: north of the latter

there are no certain vestiges. It is not necessary here to insert measurements, which were unavoidably approximate only. The harbour fully justifies Scylax' epithets; the violent N.E. winds which are often experienced here in January and February cannot disturb the calm of its shallow sheltered waters.

³ Cf. what is said of Ammochostos in the *Periplus Cypri*, § 304.

that of Famagosta, silted up;¹ but in the tideless Mediterranean the sea neither recedes nor advances,² and while I have often observed an easterly wind carry the waves another ten yards inland and wash away the sand from rock or masonry which generally is covered from view, a day or two of calm weather, with the equable motion of such slight tide as there is, soon restores every part to its accustomed smoothness. There is masonry here along the shore-line which, though covered with only two or three inches of sand, is never washed clean.

B. THE CAMPANOPETRA. (PLATE VII. A.)

Having failed thus far to find any traces of a building which might account for the pottery and terra-cottas unearthed in such profusion on the slopes of site *B*, the higher ground immediately above was next essayed. Attention was more especially directed to the site known to the villagers as the Campanópetra, a name given by some wandering Florentine to the tall moulded block of limestone which rises straight and square from the ground like Giotto's Campanile.³ Probings were also made on the edge of the plateau and along its crest westwards, disclosing objects for the most part similar to those discovered on the slope below, but not including the earliest varieties. One shaft ran down beside a wall of considerable length.

An experimental shaft was tried at a spot farther to the east, but resulted merely in the finding, close under the surface, of some Roman *μνήματα*,⁴ shallow tombs lined with gypsum slabs and tiles. There was nothing in them but human dust and a few fragments of bone which were given back to their interrupted slumbers. The experiment, however, had thus much value that it proved, as had been already inferred from the character of the vegetation, that the low hills which bound the coast are not deeply covered with sand, a fact of some importance in view of the early resumption of excavation. It is not indeed to be expected that the sand can anywhere lie to a great depth, except where, as on site *B*, it has drifted—the margin of shore is very narrow, and there is no long expanse over which the sea-wind sweeping coastwards may gather a dusty harvest: nor does the area of sand extend far inland. The Government fence marked on the map indicates very fairly its limits up to the point where it turns eastwards to the sea.

With exception of one prober to the N.E. of the Campanópetra no other

¹ The northern λιμὴν χειμερινός barely exceeds five feet in depth, and the greater part is only 1' 6" to 3' 6" or 4'.

² The preservation of the ancient slips precludes the idea of any considerable alteration by the earthquakes from which Salamis suffered.


³ Since I wrote this report I have learnt that the name Campanopetra is open to some doubt. It is certainly the name used to me by several of the villagers, but J. A. R. Munro obtained from

others the form Campanópissa.

⁴ *μνήματα* in Cypriote means a built tomb intended to hold a single body. The term is a convenient one.

The present tombs had covers of gypsum, sides of plastered stone, and floor of tiles. They measured 6' × 2' 3" × 2' 3", dimensions which are almost invariable for *μνήματα* and for niches of big tombs of the Roman period in Cyprus.

outlying experiment was undertaken, and the work was confined to site *E*. This, like most of those excavated, is a rectangular patch of ground with a surface slightly concave. Beside the large upright block which properly speaking has alone a title to the name Campanópetra, other smaller pieces of limestone similarly moulded were scattered about. Like the Campanópetra itself, which still stands erect 9' 7½" high, they are parts of the jambs of a door. The section of the stone is given here. The moulding is also shown in Pl. VIII, Fig. 11. The principal block rests on a wall 2' 8" wide whose course so far as laid bare may be traced on the accompanying plan of site *E*, Pl. VII, *A*. With it the angle of wall at the S.W. is probably continuous, though there is a divergence of line amounting to a few inches between the one and the other.¹ At the N.E. is again a portion of wall running nearly at right angles to that on the west, but exhibiting a depth of 10' 3" (inclusive of rubble bed). Further east was found a large fragment of late flooring, and by it was a pit filled with whelk-shells. Similar deposits of shells were found also in a shaft on the south side where again were



portions of walls, which in this instance however did not extend far from the surface.² At the N.W. was a piece of late marble flooring and under it a small drain. These different remains of building do not appear to belong entirely to one plan or to one period; but it would be idle to speculate on their character or purpose until further excavation has supplied further premisses.

In the centre of the plot³ near where, as I afterwards learnt, the first shaft was sunk, a fortunate rustic was reported to have chanced upon the

¹ The wall beneath the Campanopetra has a depth of 5'; that at the S.W., where the ground is somewhat higher, of 6' 6".

² One wall is merely a single course of stone on a rubble and cement bed, 2' 6" high (inclusive) the other of even less height. Partly under the latter but deeper down is the bed of shells. Remains of masonry other than those mentioned

are unimportant.

³ As the plan will scarcely convey a sufficient idea of general dimensions it may be stated that the artificial square constructed for measuring purposes, one arm of which is coincident with the W. wall and extends from a few feet N. of it to the S.W. angle, measured 109' W. × 100' S. × 116' E. × 102½' N.

proverbial pot of gold, containing in this case pieces of Constantine, who having been made a saint is the one Emperor with whose name the village savants are familiar. We found no gold Constantines, but a layer of pottery, rather less broken than that near the wells of site *D*, consisting mainly of Cypriote ware of the earlier sort (vith-vth centuries B.C.), such as has been sometimes classed with 'Mycenaean'. Other shafts produced, partly similar ware, partly plain black-glazed pottery and one or two fragments of red-figure of good style. But the six or seven holes, some of them reaching a depth of 10, 11 and 12½ feet, failed to supply evidence of any more permanent remains than had been found on the southward slope below. The pottery was met with at no great depth, 3' to 5' in the centre and 7' or more at the sides of the plot where the *χῶμα* was deeper.

Site *E* has not been excavated; it has been the subject of an experiment only.² When the work at Salamis is resumed a further attempt must certainly be made to solve the problem presented by the finds of early pottery in and about this part of the ancient city; and the plot of corn-land intervening between *E* and *D* might be first tried [*v. plan*]. Here at any rate is the one quarter of the city³ where in the course of a season's excavation a really archaic layer of remains has been found. It is true that the Rhodian, early black-figure, and red-figure vases which were discovered are fragments only; but they are fragments of good work and of undeniably early character, and that they should exist in such crowded mass as a refuse-heap only, without there being any neighbouring building or necropolis whence the refuse had come, is scarcely credible. So important a clue must be followed up, even if the money expended should not be recovered in the form of a valuable collection of pottery. There are many problems in the early history of vase painting, and especially in that of the Rhodian and Asiatic schools, which no site promises better to solve than does Salamis.

G⁴: OR TOUMPA.

At this period of the season quite a number of excavations, mainly of an experimental character, were being carried on simultaneously. Of these the Campanópetra had occupied a few hands from March 19 to April 3; *D* had been abandoned on March 26, and the day before, having concluded a bargain with the proprietor, I had started some of the men on a new outlying site which, from the nature of the ground, is known to the villagers as Toumpa [*i.e.* 'The Hill, or Mound']. Between the two rivers where the line of causeway which carries the Famagosta road across them is for a short distance

¹ Excepting of course the portions of wall already mentioned.

² Accordingly it has not been thought worth while to burden this description of it with detailed measurements.

³ The following site Toumpa, as outside the limits of this city proper, is only a partial

exception.

⁴ According to chronological order this should have been *F*: but that letter had long before been pressed into the service of the general map to denominate a point of high ground close to which excavation was subsequently commenced.

interrupted, and opposite the road which turns aside from the highway to feed the villages of Encomi and Ai Sergyi, there is a small rocky hill rising abruptly out of the surrounding marshy plain. Fronting the road the rock has been so cut and quarried as to present an appearance of steps and seats; behind and to the north a gentler slope leads down to the second Famagosta road, used in summer only. Here also the villagers had done some digging¹ and made, as usual, report of marble statues. Apart however from villagers' gossip, there was little possibility of mistaking the character of the site. The position, a shelf of earth nestling under a shoulder of rock, the cutting of the rock itself, the fragments of terra-cotta on the surface, all told their tale. There could be little doubt that here had been a Cypriote shrine, and probably a shrine of repute; for it was placed on the main road to Ammochostos with two causeways converging upon it, a solitary spot of solid land between the crossing of two rivers, where the traveller in either direction could give thanks for having passed the one peril and bespeak a safe journey over the other, paying here his oetroi to the religious authorities of Salamis.

The site divides itself naturally into two portions, hill-crest and slope. The westward side, that towards the main road, was ploughed land and here preliminary shafts were sunk, though I was anxious to come as soon as possible to where the line of rock cropped up above the soil on the hillock's brow. The slope, as anticipated, produced nothing, though it had been necessary to first test its character. Accordingly starting away from the face of the rock, a deep trench was carried along the front, and, objects soon coming to light there, the remainder of the excavation consisted simply in pushing the trench farther back down the slope until the limit of finds was reached. In the end the trench was 28'-30' wide, with a depth of 12' from the rock level. Outside this trench finds were made only at the S.W. corner of the rock in what was, but for the intervention of a small portion of unworked ground, merely a continuation of it. Many other shafts were tried further out in the field near the S.W. corner but with little or no result: at the N.W. the rock had been cut straight down forming a blank wall, but this though investigated led to nothing. Supplementary digging was also carried out on the crest of the hill, and on its northern and eastern slopes: the shafts however, which generally did not reach more than from four to eight feet, opened nothing but *débris* of late masonry—of which, indeed, there was here a considerable amount on the surface—and a few fragments of pottery and limestone figures similar to those found in the main trench. Among the pottery fragments were one or two pieces of 'Klein-meister' ware. Almost all therefore of the very interesting and important find from Toumpa comes

¹ Encomi, to a native of which village Toumpa belongs, was in Turkish times a headquarters of illicit digging. Encomi occupies one end of a ridge of *kafas* which stretches thence northwards to the monastery of Ai Varnava; and parallel with this ridge eastwards is a second, shorter, line of *kafas*.

The two ridges form the necropoleis of Salamis and have done so evidently from prehistoric days as they contain also sepulchres like Ai Katharina. It is this city of the dead which Alexander Cesnola intends by the name 'Salamis': that any remains of the town itself existed he seems scarcely to realize.

from the main trench just under the brow of the rock. Toumpa, in fact, has little place in this section, it belongs almost entirely to that on 'Objects Found.' No plan of the site is given: the general map of Salamis suffices. There was, in fact nothing to plan. Beyond some *debris* on the crest and northward slope all the masonry discovered is comprised in a piece of poor walling low down in the S.W. corner by the road.¹ In this there is nothing to cause surprise: Cypriote shrines were far more of the nature of groves than of temples.²

Toumpa being private property the excavation was no sooner ended than it became necessary to remove all trace of it. The ground had to be restored to its former level, and left in such a condition as was not incompatible with tillage. It may be to the point therefore to notice here the character of the subsoil. At the foot of the slope close by the road water was reached at a level of 7'3" and was brackish. About half-way up the slope a trench opened ground which evidently had long been undisturbed. There were three distinct layers. First came 5ft. of loose sand and sandy earth, then 4ft. of comparatively firm earth only partially mixed with sand. This layer trended upwards at an inclination of 15° from the horizontal line: and below it was again loose sand, free from admixture of any foreign substance. These deposits of sand on ground raised above the prevailing level deserve to be noted. If they were formed by indrift from the sea-shore the present coast-line must be considerably in advance of the ancient; for the limit of drifted sand falls in modern times far short of Toumpa. Close under the rock the soil had been completely disturbed: its upper layer was a mixture of sand and soil, and below at 5' to 6' was a stratum of black earth full of charred matter and of fragments of bone. The presence of such earth on the site of a Cypriote shrine does not require explanation.

F.—THE ATRIUM. (PLATE VII. *A.*)

While Toumpa was being worked out, two other experimental sites were undertaken, one on the high ground a short distance north of the Dhaemonostasion hill, the other within the circuit of the later city. *F* on the map accompanying this report marks about the summit of the plateau of Salamis which thence runs S.E., at nearly the same level to its termination in the Dhaemonostasion. Just eastward of *F* is a hollow filled with large blocks of stone, among which are several limestone drums. Two of the latter, which stood upright, had the air of resting still in position. Gregori, the foreman, was anxious to follow up this clue, and as there were at the moment several workmen to spare, he was given a free hand. An extended excavation was not, however, contemplated: how much or how little was accomplished will be best seen from the accompanying plan *F*. The two

¹ 4' long × 1' 18" deep × 3' 5" broad, two courses, lower projecting: direction N.N.W.

Limniti during the previous season, *J. H. S.* vol. x. (1890).

² Cf., generally, report of excavations at

upright drums proved to be, as had been expected, in place. Their base, whose moulding is eccentric [*v.* Pl. VIII. Fig. 9], has an upper diameter of 2' 11 $\frac{3}{4}$ "', the side of its podium being 3' 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ "'; base and column have a united height in existing state of 4' 8". The wall on which they stand is 4' wide, but consists of only a single course 1 ft. thick. By it was found a Roman portrait-head in marble [section on 'Finds']. The wall ends westward with a short flight of steps, set at right angles to it, which again lead on to a fragment of plain mosaic floor.¹ Eastwards near the first column are also two small fragments of mosaic just showing in the side of the trench and curiously enough, lying one a few inches above the other. Above them is a narrow layer of charred matter which extends, at a slightly lower level, throughout this trench. Between the columns, and extending just beyond (westward of) the second, a narrow (later) wall has been placed upon that which supports the columns. Eastwards and westwards of this, the main wall, were others at no great distance having directions not quite coincident with it. That to the east has at present a length of 38', and is 2' 6" wide; it finishes towards the west in a cross-wall,² on to whose western edge join other portions of wall, though in slightly different line. In the N.W. angle of the trench opening this wall is a pit, much-choked, whose roughly circular wall is formed of loosely-placed masonry. To the west are two deep walls separated only by a narrow interval, the northern of which seems to bear an impress of greater age.³ Neither is directly in line with the column-wall. Northward from the steps already mentioned, and beyond the patch of mosaic, was another deposit of whelk-shells, such as has been noted on preceding sites. In the side of the trench the cement-bed for the mosaic continues, and below is a second layer of cement, above and beneath which is blackened soil containing charred fragments. South of the steps was part of a cement floor (or bed for mosaic), beyond which rough masonry, not unlike that with which the Agora is paved, was found. This being removed, a shaft was sunk till at 17' it reached *καίλας*. Here, as at other points,⁴ an older layer was opened, consisting mainly of broken pottery, plain, black-glazed, and Cypriote. A trench south from the eastern column produced nothing but loose earth, with very sparse fragments of older pottery, and struck *καίλας* apparently at a depth of 10' 6". Other shafts revealed only rough masonry of a similar character to that just mentioned, or pieces of wall, mostly of a late period. One trench, however, at the N.E. was carried along the side of a wall of better character. This wall was opened for a distance of 20 ft., and proved to extend 7' from the surface, at which depth was a step course projecting

¹ Coloured tesserae, small; without pattern: 4' 3" N. to S.

² It has a width of 5' 5" and runs N. 1' 4" and S. 7' 9" from a point equal to axis of column-wall. Its western edge slopes westward of south, so that the adjoining wall placed at right angles to this edge does not square with the longer wall eastwards.

The more southerly of the two has an

angle-return at its eastern end: both portions being 6' 6" deep and extending from the surface. The northern wall only exists at a lower level 9' beneath the southern, and thence continues to the bottom of the trench, or 13' to 13' 6" from the surface: there is an angle-return at the western end.

⁴ Indicated on plan.

about 18", and apparently intended to support a floor of which some traces remain. At the S.E. corner of the trench part of an open water-channel. Possibly continuous with this wall are some portions of masonry which protrudes above the surface further southwards. Of surface remains there are indeed a goodly number; they are distinguished on the plan.

The site did not yield much portable spoil. In addition to the portrait-head already mentioned, there were the greater part of a small marble statuette of Aphrodite, several more or less complete terra-cottas, of which some retained their colouring, and various fragments of pottery. What other finds there were consisted of architectural members: a couple of small marble columns with diameters of $10\frac{1}{2}$ " and 15", two small white marble bases, and a blue marble drum which had been hollowed out to serve as the mouth of a well. The villagers reported that many similar columns had been carried off from the site in previous years. There can be little doubt that the spade had chanced upon part of a large Roman mansion, and in view of more important work the experiment was abandoned.

II.—THE DRUMS. (PLATE VII. A.)

'The grand court (of the temple of Zeus Salaminius) is 650 feet by 390,' writes Drummond; 'and has included other buildings beside the temple, of what kind I will not presume to say. One part on the north of the square I take to have been a circus; great numbers of broken fusts are scattered about, some being $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet in diameter, so that they must have been very high; they lie near the temple among some foundations which probably belonged to the palace, as one person was both king and high-priest.' It is not quite clear to what ruins Drummond alludes. If the Loutron, his 'temple of Zeus,' stood inside the 'great court,' the latter can hardly be identified with the Agora, though this is the only large rectangular space in its neighbourhood. If the court is not the Agora, then the 'large fusts' north of it may perhaps be identified with the last site *H*, excavated this season. As, pursuing the path which leads from the Loutron to 'The Columns,' one tops a slight rise, *H* lies to the right, a depression roughly rectangular in outline, covered with fragments of huge limestone drums and capitals. It was not of inviting appearance or of great promise; but it was of considerable size, and the building which had stood upon it must have been, judging from the remains of its order, though late, yet important. There was more than sufficient reason for making a further experiment. Accordingly, a few hands commenced work here on Mar. 28, and were employed up till Ap. 19. Just at the close of the season a little additional work was done. The main lines of the building were thus ascertained, but not enough was effected to render the plan complete [*v.* plan *H*, Pl. VII. A].

The western end is occupied by a wall running about N.N.W. with an ascertained length of 116' 6"; it would, however, if fully excavated undoubtedly prove to be considerably larger. The wall has a width of 3' 6" to 3' 9", and a height of 4' 2" on to a projecting course which continues

another 2' 6".¹ From it at least four parallel walls start eastwards; the one most fully excavated has a present length of 181' 6" and is still incomplete. These walls form two pairs, an inner and an outer. The former, separated from each other by an interval of 32 ft., are just over 4' 6" wide, and carried large Corinthian columns not differing greatly in form from those of the Agora, but perhaps of larger dimensions.² Though several bases remain in position they are much mutilated, none retaining more than a trace of its original moulding.³ The intercolumniation is not quite regular, but seems to have been about 12 ft., considerably shorter therefore than that of the Agora. The last span westward is rather larger, instead of being, as might have been expected, smaller. The outer pair of walls are of less dimensions, and have carried apparently an order of three half-column pilasters; but so little of them has been opened that their connection cannot be regarded as absolutely certain. There seems to be an irregularity in their level, the southern wall being rather lower than the northern at the line of emplacement of its columns; the best proof of their connection with the building is afforded by the similarity of the bases of their columns, their direction parallel with, and their equi-distance⁴ from, the inner column-walls [see cut of moulding and plan of these bases, Pl. VIII. Fig. 8]. The walls are about 2' 6" wide, and seem to have been increased under the columns the better to support their weight. These walls with their pilaster order would appear to have formed the sides of the building, but the western end wall certainly continues beyond them. Traces of flooring were found at various points. Thus there is a vestige of a cement layer level with the top of the southern outer wall, and 3' 8" lower—depth of the cutting—there seems to have been a second. Another fragment 3' 3" wide adjoins, on its northern side, the first base of the southern inner column-wall; there may have been again cement flooring resting on the outer stepped course of the western wall; and there is a thin layer of crumbling cement north of the centre portion of the southern inner column-wall, and below it a layer of black earth so fine as to resemble sand. The face of the wall here is stuccoed. There is a goodly array of other walls on the site, which have little or no apparent connection with the main building. Though all are inserted in the plan, it is not necessary to give a description of each one. On the south has been opened part of a wall whose direction is very nearly, but, so far as with a lack of instruments I could determine, not exactly parallel with the axis of the colonnade. It exists also to a higher level than the main

¹ Two mutilated blocks standing on this wall are just conceivably the remnants of bases.

² The side of the base square is 4' 6½"; and of the drums scattered about one has an apparent diameter of 3' 6", another of 3' 2½", a third of about 3' 2". A drum resting on the outer southern wall has a diameter of about 2' 11½".

³ By combining together the vestiges of moulding on various bases it was possible to re-

construct a base having a general resemblance to that of the order of the Agora; but the reconstruction is too tentative to be reproduced here. The lowest moulding seems to have been more than a foot high, and the entire base quite two feet.

⁴ The interval is about 27' (29' 2" and 29' 9" measured over all from nearest face of inner column-wall; and allow 2' 6" for width of outer wall).

walls, but like them seems to have carried columns or pilasters, for which however there is no further evidence than its outline [*c.* plan]. Nearly parallel with this is a portion of wall in the trench furthest to the S.E., by which are remains of a tessellated marble floor, and a blue marble Corinthian capital. At the eastern end of the northern inner column-wall are two cross-walls, but neither is sufficiently marked as the eastern front-wall of the building. The column-wall too continues beyond them. On the one are some tiny marble bases placed on a later wall which occupies the eastern half of the cross-wall. At the extreme N.W. is a bewildering medley of walls, which may in part have belonged to a house. Portions of wall-plaster were at any rate found there, and vestiges of cement flooring; the ground above which is very firm and dense, while below, after a thin layer of burnt earth, it is equally loose and mixed with all sorts of *débris*. The easternmost portion of the southern inner column-wall also shows a medley of masonry, and in the next trench westwards are considerable fragments of plaque-flooring [*πλακομένη*]. The other walls placed on the plan reach generally to the surface, and are in most cases of slight character; some masonry which appears in a trench occupying just the centre of the building may be excepted, but is much mutilated, and is at best a fragment.

As a whole the building was probably of a late period, and the ground has been extensively used again at a still later time. Interesting was the discovery of a large drain which runs under the southern slope nearly in the direction of the Loutron. I traced it for some 120 ft., but could get no further as the earth had fallen in and choked the passage. The form is as usual square, but the drain is larger than those in the Agora, and receives a number of smaller affluents. The site, like *A*, had also been freely used as a burial ground. Several *μνήματα* roughly constructed of stones, some of which had been architectural members, were chanced upon and lay at a fair depth. One yielded a well-preserved skull. Turkish glazed pottery was occasionally met with, but finds were extremely rare and comprised merely fragments of terracottas—a poor little Roman amber Cupid [?], and three pieces of inscribed blocks, two having merely a few letters. The excavation was too incomplete to supply satisfactory material for any conclusion of value as to the character of the building which had occupied this site.


J.—TOMBS, AND *Τούμπα τοῦ Μιχάηλι*.

To complete our series of experiments we resolved towards the close of the season to open some of the tombs of Salamis. For this purpose two patches of ground in the necropoleis, west of the town, were acquired.¹ The one of these plots lies at the foot of a great mound of earth, itself probably a sepulchre, and not far from *Δι* Katharina [see map]. It is a polygonal field of poor soil, poor both for the growing of corn and the pro-

¹ The general position of the tomb-district has been indicated above. See also, in part, the map, which however only covers a portion of the ground.

ducing of antiquities. Commencing on April 29th some six or eight shafts were sunk, and sufficiently showed that tombs had indeed existed here, but had been long rifled and destroyed. Scarcely a single complete object, and not one of value, was found. In one shaft the workmen came upon masonry close under the surface which Gregori decided was the prelude to a tomb of the Pera type. For once however his instinct was, unfortunately for us, at fault; and though with the thermometer at 92'' in the shade he sadly distressed himself by furious onslaughts with pick and shovel, the masonry still refused to yield a treasure it had never possessed.


A large tomb near the monastery, whose *δρόμος* had fallen in, was next attacked. It belonged, or rather the ground in which it was sunk belonged to a good lady of Éncomi, whose relatives and friends had for many months intended to rob it, but had found their courage slip away whenever they were on the point of carrying out their plan. So the tomb was left for us, and



the Encomites contented their love of plunder—by proxy. It was a fine Roman sepulchre in excellent preservation, and had three semi-chambers, in which were sarcophagi of terra-cotta placed on couches of natural rock. In the earth of the tomb were a number of small clay vessels, and of glass cups and tear-bottles. The sarcophagi yielded some gold earrings and plated beads, and with a few objects in bronze the list of contents is at an end. The chief interest of the tomb was architectural, as will appear from the annexed plan.

The second site Toumpa tou Michaili, lies on the southern end of the eastern ridge of *κατάς*, and consists of two plots, one belonging to the head man of Encomi, the other to a brother of the unfortunate deaf-mute Petros, from whose father it takes its name of 'Michael's Hill.' The two plots are divided from one another by a road running to the village. Behind them is a long strip of land covered with rushes, which in the wet season becomes a

marsh.¹ Michaili's patch proved a great surprise. It had little that savoured of tombs, but the surface was strewn with fragments of inscriptions of all kinds and periods. A goodly number of shafts were sunk both here and in an adjoining patch of vetches, but failed to open anything of the nature of tombs. Two ended in rough holes which, cut in firm rocky *καΐας*, had preserved their original shape; wells they were not, but they may possibly have been pits to hold water, such as are still used in the neighbourhood by the villagers, and afford, for some days after rainfall, a scanty draught for flocks of sheep and goats. The earth is shallow, and is not very full of ancient remains. The majority of the inscribed fragments were on the surface, and



PLAN OF TOMBS : PANAGY'S FIELD

besides these the finds included two or three small pieces of marble from statues, a marble flower-ornament, a piece of limestone grating, and several fragments of pottery from a good period. No sign, however, was found of any building whence the inscriptions might have come, and it is possible that it lay either to the N. where in a neighbouring field we obtained a large blue marble pedestal with a complete inscription [*inf.* No. 44], or else to the east

¹ Hidden by the rushes at its southern end is a huge block of limestone which, utterly ruined by wind and weather, bears now but the faintest resemblance to a lion, of which animal it is said

to have been still a passable portrait a few years back. It measures 7' 2" long × 3' high × 4' 6" thick and is all but shapeless, though very probably the reli of a funeral monument.

where another blue marble block on being dug up proved to be moulded and to have been cut to receive a statue. It is probable, however, that there was no great building in this neighbourhood, but that the Circus had stood near at hand, perhaps on the flat ground now traversed by the high road in and about which are several remains of foundations. The neighbourhood of the circus will account for these numerous fragments of inscriptions: the pedestal mentioned is from a statue in honour of a gymnasiarch.

Quite different was the find on the N. side of the road. This plot of ground proved to be as crowded with tombs as the other was empty. All however had been rifled long before, the greater number doubtless in ancient times. One little group was interesting architecturally [*cf.* plan annexed]. Each chamber was hewn out of the rock in the form of a large sarcophagus with pent-house roof. The stone stair leading down to the principal sepulchre was also complete, and had been used as a means of rifling the adjoining tombs. In all, about fifteen tombs were opened, and all fifteen were empty.

Taken as a whole this experiment was a decided failure so far as concerns its main object: but the find of inscriptions, though these were for the most part very fragmentary, and the suggestion they supply as to the locality of the circus, are a result of some importance. That many untouched tombs still remain is certain; the subsidence of earth above is continually revealing fresh ones. But it is rather on the western ridge that they must be sought, not on the eastern, of which Toumpa tou Michaili forms part. That many have been plundered both in ancient and modern times goes without saying, but our experiment was on too small and partial a scale to be the basis of a general inference. Only the close of the season and failure of funds prevented a more extended trial. It was necessary to concentrate our remaining time and energy on the sand-site in order to bring the work there not indeed to a termination—that was beyond our power and must be the legacy of a second season—but that we might at least reach a certain stage in it at which the task could be conveniently taken up by our successors. To the interrupted story of this important site I must now return.

B. TEMENOS OF ZEUS (?) IN THE SAND NEAR THE FORESTER'S HOUSE.

(PLATE VI.)

Of site *B*, or the 'Sand Site,' which was in work almost throughout the entire season, I have already given a general description: it remains to tell the story of the excavation and its results. Assuming that the capitals and bases discovered by the villagers had, lying as they did nearly due E. and W. of one another, marked either the two ends of the building or one of its side walls, a trench was first run from one find-spot to the other, and to this a second was added, cutting across the western end of the first. Two others were subsequently commenced, one at the eastern, one at the western end, and the first two extended in both directions. The western column-wall was then ascertained for its entire length, and from its northern angle a new

trench was drawn along the line of the northern wall. Further trenching was becoming difficult and unprofitable in this deep layer of loose sand, and the weather being unfavourable, work was interrupted until a supply of barrows ordered from Limassol could arrive and render possible its resumption. When these were at length received the clearance of the site was taken up in earnest, but it required a fortnight's hard work for all the sand previously excavated to be removed to a distance. The western end and N.W. inner angle were excavated to a considerable depth, well down into virgin soil; the northern wall cleared together with a broad strip on its inner side; and then, as there proved to be more sand than had been expected, and as the season was already well advanced, attention was concentrated on the eastern end. Here the drift was extraordinarily deep, reaching more than 20 feet as the work advanced up the slope. A considerable space was however cleared, completely opening the eastern wall and the ground for some distance adjacent. On the plan of the site I have marked in continuous character the limit of excavation, so far as this reached down to the level of earth, or of masonry resting on the earth: a much wider area has in fact been partially cleared, or, in loose sand, the work actually done would have been impossible. Thus the labour still necessary to entirely clear the building is less great than it might seem; the large, almost untouched tract in the centre consists of a much shallower layer (6-8 feet) and can easily be removed by working from its inner edge. Female labour will at most points be found relatively to cost much the more effective.

An unfinished excavation in the sand places many difficulties in the way of a satisfactory statement of its results. While the work is in progress there are no landmarks; the aspect of the site changes insensibly, and as the wall of sand recedes the eye fails to appreciate relative distances; what was apparent yesterday will be hidden again to-morrow. Thus plan and measurements have to be left to the very last, till the work is at an end in fact, when a chance wind may again obscure everything and there are no workpeople to clear away the intruding layer of dust. Once the site is laid thoroughly open difficulties will have vanished: at present many things must be taken *eum grano arenæ*.


The building of which the greater part was excavated this season was apparently a four-sided colonnade, of a late period, and, at least as concerns its western end, very unevenly constructed. In length it is 168' (Eng.), and 125' broad,¹ thus giving, with allowance of a few inches for the impossibility of exact measurement of weatherworn limestone, a proportion of just 4:3. The column-walls are remarkably slight in construction, the western which alone is uncovered to its foundation having a width of 2' 9" and a depth of 1' 8" for

¹ The measures here are, *length* from centre N.W. corner pedestal to further edge N.E. corner=middle of eastern wall; *width* from centre N.W. corner pedestal to centre S.W. corner pedestal.

The 'allowance' spoken of in the text is not

therefore necessary for the older building whose length deducting 1' 4" for half the cornering will be 166' 8" which is to 125' exactly as 4:3. The restored structure has varied the length slightly in order to harmonize with the eastern front which (*v. inf.*) is of a different character.

the first course, and 3' 7" width by 10½" depth for the second course, below which is a layer varying in thickness from 2' 6" to 3' 6", of loose rubble, and this in its turn rests on *καίλας*. The first and second courses are not square with one another, the upper being set slightly aslant the lower. The lower course in reality is part of a much older building, dating perhaps from the ivth century B.C., of which the existing structure is a restoration in late Imperial times. Of this older building there are also other remains:—to it belong the four corner pieces, a base on the north wall used as a substructure, two bases inverted on the east wall, and some finely moulded jambs which were found on the western wall. The material used was a hard limestone of very fine grain, almost like marble, which, sheltered in the sand, has generally weathered admirably. Some idea of the character of the structure may be gathered from the cut of the S.W. corner-piece given here, and the mouldings of the bases and jambs on Pl. VIII. Nos. 5, 10, 13. As it has occupied the



ELEVATION OF PIER, S.W. ANGLE, INNER WALL, SITE B.

same space so it has been in all probability of the same character, architecturally, as the restoration, a four-sided colonnade.¹ It was of more substantial construction than its successor, but was not heavily built, as the subsoil is sand.

The character of the existing structure and its state of preservation will be best understood from the views reproduced on Pl. IV. from negatives taken by J. A. R. Munro. The colonnade is composed of plain pillars, bearing Corinthian capitals, and the material is marble, varying in hue from a blue-veined white Asiatic kind to the common blue. The columns are of uneven length to equalize which their bases are raised on pedestals of proportionate height or placed directly on the upper courses of the wall.² An average height is 13' 6," an average diameter 2' at the base

¹ But see later as to a probable modification of this statement.

² Annexed to plan B is a section of the west wall showing the relative heights of the bases.

By an oversight I omitted to take an exact measurement of the difference of level between the N.W. corner and the adjoining base. It is inserted from a photograph, approximately.

[inclusive of fillet], 1' 7" at the head. To these dimensions correspond a base of 1' x 2' and a capital slightly over 2 feet high¹. The intercolumniation is also irregular, but does not vary more than a few inches on either side of 9' *Roman*,² except at the corners where it increases to 11' English. There are 14 such intercolumniations on the western end, that is to say 13 columns exclusive of the doubled half-columns at the corners, only the bases of which, belonging to the older building, remain. All the bases, two only excepted, remain in position: their columns and capitals, generally entire, lie as they fell at right angles to the wall, and, as a rule, on its inner side. Details of the order are given by Pl. VIII. Figs. 12, 15. On the north wall only two bases remain, one of which is probably not in position and is not shown on the plan; the other close to the N.W. corner was in place and rested on a base from the older building, to obtain whose measurements and moulding it had to be removed. A third was lying displaced on the wall. It was necessary for convenience of excavation to leave the sand lying between the northern walls, so that the columns and capitals were not, with few exceptions, exposed to view. On the south wall, so far as it has been opened, all bases are in position; their columns only the ends of which have as a rule been cleared, lie adjacent and seem to be entire. Beyond the column-wall on these three sides, and at a distance of 18 to 19 feet,³ is an outer wall, courses of which remain in places several feet above the level of emplacement of the columns. It is of fairly good construction 2' 1" wide, and is of limestone. At the S.W. it is united to the column-wall by masonry; and its western portion continues beyond the angle, but has been opened only a very short distance.

The peristyle probably enclosed an open court; but the greater part or the space it occupied has not been excavated. A slight wall⁴ runs inwards from about the centre of the northern column-wall, and is almost certainly continuous with that opened by a trench in the middle of the court from which another wall of similar character strikes off eastwards at right angles. No certain trace of flooring appeared in the strips of ground excavated along the western and northern walls, with a possible exception in favour of a small patch adjacent to the intersection of the two original trenches (*v. plan*); the *χωμα*, with which fragments and foreign substances were but sparsely intermingled, seemed rather like that of a patch of open soil, a Cypriote *αὐλή*. In the S.W. corner was found a small, covered-in drain or water-channel, which seemed to connect with a rectangular shaft, roughly built of stone, a few

¹ The measurements of column 10 are sub-joined as a sample; those of the others need not be inserted here.

Shaft, length 14' 3": base diameter 2' 0½" (inclusive of fillet): head 1' 7½".

Base, side of square 2' 10": diameter (upper) 2' 3": height 1' 2".

Capital, flower to flower 2' 9½": diameter (lower) 1' 8¾": height 2' 2".

The lengths of the columns beginning from the northern end are 12' 10¾"; 13' 7"; 14' 3½";

14' 6½"; not measurable; not measurable; 14' 5"; 11' 5½"; 14' 4"; 14' 3"; 11' 8"; 14' 3¾".

² On the S. wall the intercolumniation is a fraction under 9' English and therefore slightly greater. The corner interval is as before 11'.

³ 19' 5", 18' 7", 19' 3" on the S., W. and N. respectively.

⁴ It has a width of 1' 6", extends 11' 3" as open, and starts from the lower course of the N. wall.

feet west of the southern end of the column-wall.¹ A similar pit of still smaller dimensions² exists 13 feet further east than the slight wall just previously mentioned. In the N.E. angle is much *délris* of late constructions, one wall of which has for angle-pieces two fragments of limestone columns.³ The corresponding S.E. corner also preserved similar remains; and from a portion of stuccoed wall adjoining the second column came part of an inscription and a statue of Athena wearing the aegis. Both had been mortared in. Between the outer and inner walls of the western end, near the 9th base [from N.W.], is some rough masonry forming a rude semi-circle. Against the 1st base of the north wall, partly cut away for the purpose, a wall⁴ has been laid extending 4' 10½" to a rough floor of large square stones. Enclosed between these and the N.W. angle was an irregular quadrilateral slabbed with gypsum with an under-bed of cement, cutting through which we found evidence of an older layer in a small terracotta head of pseudo-Egyptian style.

The eastern end of the rectangle is of a different character. Here a broad wall replaces the narrow masonry of the western front, and has supported fluted columns of fine white marble 22 ft. high,⁵ carrying Corinthian capitals of a slender calathus shape with design in low relief. Half of one column still stands erect on its base. The bases of which seven remain in position are level, and the intercolumniation sufficiently regular at 11' 2" to 11' 8". At its southern end the eastern wall continues beyond the corner,⁶ and the same is probably true of its northern end, where, however, the ground is insufficiently cleared, and owing to a great accumulation of *délris*, certainty cannot as yet be had. The northern and southern column-walls fit into the eastern, their ends being coterminous with the line of its centre; and the limestone corner half-base is constructed to carry not two pilasters but one [*cf.* plan of S. E. corner: the corresponding N. E. corner is at present obscured by later over-building, but has almost certainly been of the same character]. Moreover, the last interval on the eastern wall is only 5' 3", which might almost be indicative of a pycnostyle front, as the intercolumniation is 11' 2" to 11' 8"; but, taken in conjunction with the facts just mentioned, confirms the hypothesis that the eastern front is not the true front of the colonnade, but belongs to another structure to which the colonnade has been attached as an *annexe*, a hypothesis which even apart from this evidence

¹ 5' 6": 7' from S.W. angle. The pit in existing state is 1' below the S.W. angle and has a depth of 5' 6", but is partly choked.

² Inner diagonal 22".

³ Probably forming part of a square building. Just outside the angle were similar remains; part of a thin wall of flag-stones and a gypsum floor, both now destroyed. Against the wall was found a thin marble slab moulded—perhaps a door-jamb—on which was an excoriated inscription.

⁴ The wall is 2' 1" wide and rests on the lower course of the column-wall into which it projects 5½".

⁵ Length of shaft: 21' 9"; top diameter 2' 4¾"; base diameter 2' 11¼" inclusive; square of base 3' 9¾"; upper diameter of base 2' 11½".


Capital: height 2' 7¾" with cushion 2½" more; diameter (lower) 1' 11½"; side of cushion 2' 3½"

The capitals have suffered greatly, most of their tracery being lost. I regret that I have no drawing of these capitals. One however is shown on a small scale on the photographic plate of this eastern wall.

⁶ For a distance, so far as it has been opened, of five feet beyond a point equal with the middle line of the southern column-wall.

would be almost sufficiently proved by the character of the eastern column-wall itself. The older building has followed similar lines, as the plan of its S. E. corner shows. At this corner too there are, lying on the adjoining portion of the southern wall, three continuous drums of limestone as though fallen from the corner-base. One at least has probably a square underside but they have not been moved and cannot be measured satisfactorily in their present position.¹

Within and without the outer wall, at a level 3 ft. below the top of its basis, is a pavement of coloured marbles,² arranged in various patterns, which do not however fit orderly into one another, but follow haphazard. The designs are in many cases similar to those in the pavement discovered on the



Agora. At the N. E. inside the wall westward the pavement has been destroyed to make room for late buildings, remains of whose masonry are shown in yellow on the plan. Towards its southern end the pavement has given way over a drain which runs hence 55' northwards parallel with, and at a short distance from, the eastern wall; at 22' 6" it is joined by a smaller affluent from the east. Westwards the pavement has only been cleared for a few feet; eastwards it continues 34' to the edge of a wall marked *a* on plan, but this breadth is not opened throughout. North and south it continues beyond the corners, and at the south rises in a short flight of steps of unequal

¹ They have an inclusive length of 9' 10", and the lowest drum has a diameter of about 2' 5", no allowance being made for its original stucco face. Another—entire—drum lying a short distance away has a diameter (exclusive of

allowance for stucco) of 2' 4". Lying on the steps (see below) is part of a large plastered limestone capital (Corinthian).

² Mainly various tints of blue, alternating with white.

breadth,¹ similarly clad with coloured marble tesserae, whence it again descends to a limit not as yet ascertained. At the north traces were found of a corresponding step or flight of steps, but by a workman's mistake were partly covered in, partly destroyed before measurements could be taken. Several loose tesserae from a not dissimilar pavement were also turned up in the end of our first trench outside the western outer wall of the peristyle. Of an outer wall no vestige was found² at the eastern end, though, as a glance at the plan will show, the pavement has been opened far beyond the point at which an outer wall if homogeneous with that on the other three sides of the rectangle should have made its appearance. This circumstance, added to the reasons already stated and others which are implied in the existence and dimensions of the marble floor, is, at the present stage of the excavations, conclusive in favour of the hypothesis that the eastern colonnade is *sui generis* and a part of a structure the remainder of which continues under the sand further towards the sea.

From this point anything like certainty as to the eastern end of the site leaves us. There is indeed sufficient evidence for one architectural member, a coffered limestone cornice, but its connection is not clear. A very considerable portion remains, in all thirty blocks, equivalent to a length of 50 ft.: but each block is isolated, many are in bad condition,³ and only the fact that they were all found lying close to the eastern wall, inside and outside, throughout its length, furnishes any evidence as to their destination.

The whole of the eastern end, and especially the N.E. corner, is cumbered with great masses of *débris*, in this presenting a marked contrast to the rest of the site. Very few of the stones had any pretension to be in place. They formed a disorderly heap with which, as the season was closing and workmen were few, there was some difficulty in coping.⁴ There are, however, three

¹ 1st step 4" rise : 1' 4" tread : 9' long so far as excavated.

2nd step : 7" rise : 2' 8½" tread.

3rd step : 9" rise : 3' 5" tread.

Beyond the 3rd step is a high descending step, leading apparently on to another portion of flooring. But this was opened at the last moment, and while being cleared for measurement the sand fell in and I was unable to get its dimensions.


² The mass of masonry, of rough stones roughly joined together, which may be seen on the plan running southwards from the N.E. corner on top of the pavement, is an exception.

³ The stone has weathered badly, since it lost its stucco, a fact which deserves noting, since most of the moulding under the sand has been well preserved. As no one block was quite complete it was difficult to obtain their facia, but by piecing them together I was able to construct the moulding with some certainty. Though doubtful at first I am inclined to think now that, as stated above, all the blocks are of

a single series. Their original width would then be 20", and height 16": the length varies according to that of the unmoulded portion. One block was found at the S.E. which exhibited a different type, and near it one piece of dentils, of the poorest late work. There was however, one other large block from a cornice (?), which was removed from the N.E. *débris*. It is of a different type, is well preserved, and retains some of its stucco.

⁴ Some idea of the amount of this *débris* may be gathered from the fact that with one half of it we built shelter-walls all along the northern, for a considerable distance on the southern side, and both within and without the eastern column wall. These walls, which make a prominent feature in the photographs of the site, must not be confounded with the outer colonnade walls, which hardly appear at all. It is hoped that when the site is again taken up these shelter-walls will prove to have done good service in keeping out the sand.

blocks of rude masonry which have more coherence. One of these extends from opposite the N.E. corner of the colonnade, some twenty-five feet southwards, and is quite characterless. It can scarcely be called masonry. A second, almost equally rude and formless in its present condition, lies to the north of the same corner and consisted in part of architectural stones, among which were two half-drums of limestone. It is incompletely cleared, and may hide the finish of the northern outer colonnade wall. Eastwards is a third mass of masonry showing much more certainty of line. A curved wall (?) is partly exposed, as though there had been a church at this point, and was to some extent hidden under some upper masonry, a portion of which—it was quite rough—has been removed.¹ At its western end stands



MASONS' MARKS.

upright a small marble stele, erect against which was found the lower half of a colossal figure of a goddess (?) in white marble, the remainder of the statue minus the head and the greater part of the arms being discovered some weeks later a short distance southwards. Close against this stele is a row of four and a half fusts placed upright and so as to touch one another²; whether

¹ It consisted mainly of a straight upper course 2' 9" broad, which caused the entire mass to present, in plan, the appearance of a single concave lens seen in profile.

² Taking them in order, from south to north,

we have: (1) marble stele, 1' 3 1/2" diameter, inclusive of a plain fillet; (2) limestone drum, 2' 3" diam.; (3) limestone drum, 1' 10 1/2" diam.; (4) granite, 2' 4 1/2" diameter, inclusive of fillet; (5) limestone, 2' 3"; (6) limestone half-drum.

they stand on anything but loose soil has not been ascertained. Among the stones which lay entirely loose and without connection are several which need to be noted. Beside various pieces from the cornice already mentioned, there is firstly a series of building stones, all of about the same size,¹ on one and sometimes on both sides of which are grooved mason's marks: one similar stone is built into the northern column-wall. The greater number are drawn on the annexed cut. Another larger block has also a mason's mark, but of a different character.² Secondly fall to be mentioned vestiges of vaulting. Two large flat stones, and a third in fragmentary condition, were found to retain the curvature of an arch: another stone of finer material discovered at the S.E. can scarcely be other than a keystone. A third series is formed by members from different orders—capitals, drums, and bases. These



CAPITAL OF COLUMN

include a large capital of unusual shape [figure annexed], a sort of simplified Ionic, in which the volutes have been reduced to half-curves³: it is incomplete, and a second large block close by may be its remaining portion. The

¹ 2' 6" × 20" × 12" may be taken as an average measure. The marks extend right across the stone, and consist of grooves about 1" × 1".

² In this case composed of the letters **JB** two or three inches high. The stone is of a different shape from those of the series.

³ A merely blocked out volute is found in very late Roman work, but is there combined with foliage. Such a design is simply the rude

form of a composite capital, showing the point of transition between debased Roman and mediæval. There is a large capital of this kind lying at the end of the Colosseum.

The capital here figured measures 2' in height; 1' 2" in height to top of volute; 4' 6" string from middle to middle of ends of two adjacent volutes (only two remaining); 4' 6" (approximately) diameter inclusive of ear-pieces.

material is a coarse yellow limestone, with a biscuit-like texture. Similarity of stone may serve to connect with these capitals a large base at the south-east [moulding, Pl. VIII. No. 15], also eccentric in form, a companion to which in point of moulding is the re-cut base of an engaged half-column, now lying on the northern wall near its N.E. corner.¹ For the like reason two huge squared stones at the S.E., as yet imperfectly exposed to view, and some moulded fragments, one of which is perhaps part of a door-jamb, may be placed in the same category; and the series of blocks from the cornice should at least be compared. Of uncertain provenience are the limestone fusts, up-ended, which stand in a row beyond the N.E. angle of the colonnade; but the granite drum which stands with them cheek by jowl is matched by a second, also found erect, near the eastern end of the southern column-wall. The two very nearly agree in measurement with the drums on site A, but seem to be a fraction smaller.² They have probably been brought from some other site. A short column of blue marble with spiral fluting lies on the pavement eastwards of the main wall: it has no doubt been used as a pedestal.³ The end of a second exactly similar column appears in the sand-wall of the cutting not far distant; but has not been fully opened. Placed just against the eastern wall in front of its centre base is a small base of marble, with a diameter of 1' 9"; upon it the fluted column may possibly have stood, as the diameter of its lower end is 1' 7½", and the two were found only a few feet away from one another. A few drums were also discovered at points of the site other than the eastern end; three of limestone, sadly worn, were laid bare by the first cross-trench in the early days of the excavation, and have diameters of 2' 3", 2' 2¼", and 2' 2", respectively.⁴ Another, which retains its stucco fluting, projects from the side of the cutting on the north: it has a diameter of 2' 1", and its fluting resembles that of the marble columns of the eastern end. The interest of these limestone drums lies in the possibility or impossibility of connecting them with the older colonnade, one of the bases from which has an upper diameter at the channel-line of 2' 2½", or 2' 4½" extreme measure.

As regards finds there was on site B, taken as a whole, a remarkable dearth of small objects and of inscriptions. At the western end, where alone excavation was carried down to the level of *καίτας*, little of an older layer was discovered. At and near the intersection of the first two trenches fragments of bronze-slag and of glass blackened, but not fused, by exposure to fire were turned up at a depth of one to three feet into the soil [= six to nine feet from the surface of the sand]. Somewhat lower pieces of Cypriote ware appeared, and one fragment of a red-figure vase. From a shaft sunk by the villagers for water at the time when the plantation was begun, had come some limestone statuettes. Further east we found the bases of similar statuettes in working

¹ A second half-column here is lying loose further eastwards.

² That at the S.E. has a diameter of 2' 4¾" inclusive of fillet: for that at N.E. v. l.s.c. Contrast measurements of fusts on site A.

³ It is 4' 8¾" long: and has diameters of 1' 7½" lower, 1' 6" upper inclusive.

⁴ These measurements do not allow for stucco: but do so for imperfectness of curvature, where existent.

down below the spot where, just at the junction of sand and soil, a small marble Eros-torso had been brought to light. In the same hole was a row of large plain amphorae placed upside down, and the soil beneath them and for some distance east and west was full of fragments of Cypriote ware of the usual geometric variety.¹ Similar pottery, always in fragments, appeared throughout the north-west corner of the rectangle and along the northern wall. Beside the Eros-torso only one other piece of marble statuary, a recumbent figure of the Pediaeus [?], was discovered, though several chips and small fragments of marble statues came to light. It was not, in fact, till the east end began to be cleared that finds became numerous. Here, however, statuary was so plentiful that at one time the workmen were turning out a statue a day.² All were found at one level, that of the junction between drift-sand and soil, a level slightly lower than the existing surface of the column-walls. The marble was generally in good preservation, but each statue had suffered the loss of head and arms. One ideal female head was recovered; its surface is excellently preserved, and only the tip of the nose and back hair have suffered injury. The fate of many limestone statues is made too clear by the discovery near the north-east angle of a dense mass of shavings of tooled stone prepared evidently for the kiln.

As will be seen from the plan the marbles lay both within and without the column-wall, but the greater number were on its eastern side: in fact the further seawards the excavations advanced the greater was its interest and the better its results. Here a miniature precipice, more than a score of feet high, discloses, as the sand slides downwards, fragments of masonry perched at various altitudes, threatening to fall and destroy all beneath them. All this unsupported masonry has to be broken up and removed. Measurement is impossible. It is true that the remains high up in the sand are presumptively late, as they are certainly of poorer character: yet it goes sadly against the grain to destroy even them without a record, especially as with them doubtless belong much of the *débris* of tooled stones accumulated on the marble pavement.³ At the south-east there is less difficulty. Here excavation has been for the moment stopped by a blank wall nine feet high, the bottom course of which is five feet above the bases of the eastern colonnade. This wall, which is marked γ on the plan, is poorly built, but remains solid, at least for the present: before another season commences it may not improbably have fallen. Its southern end is marked by an engaged quarter column, which starts from 2' 8" below the apparent lowest course of the wall and extends to a height of 6' 6". The middle portion presents the appearance,⁴ probably

¹ Ornamentation in brown-black on a grey-white slip. Level of find from 2' 6" to 5' into the soil. At about the same level was found the pseudo-Egyptian terracotta head mentioned above.

² The find-spots are indicated, approximately, on the plan.

³ Among the stones there described, those

composed of yellow biscuit-limestone are probably to be connected more particularly with the remains here spoken of.

⁴ An appearance heightened, if not accounted for, by the insertion of some moulded blocks. The corner column may have been filched from the older colonnades: *cf.* a block built into the western outer wall near the S.W. angle.

delusive, of a blocked-up window,¹ of which the lowest course of the wall would then have formed the sill.

It was at the N.E. opposite the first base on the eastern wall that excavation was carried furthest towards the sea. Here there is a wall resting upon the soil at the level of the marble pavement which itself ends somewhat abruptly at this point. It was followed up for 6' 3" when it appeared to turn southwards at right angles. Several courses remain and give it a total height of about six feet. Having come to the end of the marble pavement, and there being no possibility of an extended excavation at this point, it was decided, as the last days of the last week of the season were upon us, to see what lay under the pavement. Cutting down at its edge we came at once upon the older layer, which probably exists under the whole eastern end, but which could not be dealt with without destroying the later building. A wall² of limestone blocks, remarkably neat and even in construction, here appeared running parallel with the eastern colonnade. In the two days of work still left it was only possible to open the wall for a distance of 7' 9" and a depth of 6' 6", at which level it has a projecting course. At 8"—3' 4" from its southern end the stones protrude three inches so as to give its wall greater breadth and strength. There is a neat finish and exactness of jointing about the masonry of this wall which mark it off from anything else on the site and prove it to belong to a good period. The material, a hard fine-grained limestone, seems to resemble that of which the ornamental members of the older colonnade were composed. It is curious that several feet above this wall, but occupying nearly the same direction, there was, and still in part is, one of those pieces of hanging masonry of which mention has already been made in characterizing this quarter of the site.

So much for the work done. I must now briefly state the general results. Five periods of building are to be distinguished on the site, and these again fall into two main groups, an earlier and a later. As representatives of older work we have the eastern limestone wall, and the remains of a limestone colonnade. The second group comprises the eastern column-wall, the marble colonnade, and the unimportant late structures, such as encumber the N.E. angle, or form the hanging masonry of the eastern sand-cliff. Having first sub-divided into five periods, it is quite possible that we must re-arrange the division, and distinguish only three, or at most four. The eastern limestone wall and the limestone colonnade may conceivably be of the same period, though this, in the present position of the site, is not a probable hypothesis; and similarly the eastern column-wall and the marble colonnade may be of the same period. But until more work has been done it is as well to keep the five groups distinct; or, putting the division into the form of a consecutive story, there was first a building, of limestone, date, form, and purpose unknown, against, or at least close to, which a three-sided peristyle, also in

¹ Marked *a* on plan.

² *b* on plan. When the little that remains has been done, and the Eastern front completely cleared, the pavement can be removed and the

existence or absence of older remains below satisfactorily ascertained. Our work has been preparatory.

limestone, was constructed as an *annex*. Then the first-mentioned structure was restored in marble or replaced by a marble erection of different form, and to this was, later, annexed a restoration in marble of the limestone peristyle. Finally, the whole having fallen into ruins, part of its material was used to construct upon the site houses or other buildings. This, I think, will be a reasonable description of the results so far as the present excavation has gone; obviously it is merely temporary, and will have to be revised when excavation is resumed and extended. Next follows the question as to the date and destination of these different structures. Here the field is at once narrowed. For the eastern limestone wall and the building of which it formed part there is no evidence on which to base a judgment; it can merely be said that the character of the masonry, and the level at which it was discovered, prove them to be of a comparatively early period. Not much more can be determined, in the second place, as to the limestone colonnade. The evidence here is such as only an architect can weigh and pronounce upon; it consists of the form taken by the mouldings and the style of masonry. I will therefore merely repeat an opinion expressed by Dr. Dorpfeld, who, visiting the site in the early part of the season, declared that this portion of the ruins might be as old as the ivth century B.C. The finding of pottery from this or even an earlier period tends to confirm this date, but is not conclusive. There is, thirdly, the eastern column-wall which is probably the western wall of a building the remainder of which is still buried under the sand. Here a *terminus a quo* is supplied by the discovery, built into the wall, of a blue marble pedestal which has been thrice used and contains three inscriptions,¹ each one of which has been more or less completely chiselled away. The latest of these inscriptions mentions Augustus as *θεός*, and dates, therefore, not later than shortly after 14 A.D.² The *terminus ante quem* must rest upon architectural evidence, and I would merely suggest, therefore, that the workmanship suits rather with the first than the second century A.D., or perhaps with the period covered by the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian. The collateral evidence of the statuary found adjacent to the wall is not convincing: while some examples may well belong to the first century, others are more probably later, and in any case statuary by itself can only prove that a building was in use during a certain period and does no more than suggest that it was neither erected much earlier nor destroyed much later than the dates corresponding to the extremes of such a period. For the fourth division, which consists of the marble peristyle, there is the same *terminus a quo* as for the eastern column-wall. Personally I think the limit can with safety be placed considerably lower, the contrast of architectural style sufficing to give the irregular structure a date at least well on into the second century. So far as concerns its architectural features, the peristyle might be considerably later still, but a *terminus ante quem* seems to

¹ Nos. 52, 53, 54 *infra*.

² But in the eastern provinces Augustus was already a god, and had his high priests long before his death.

The other two inscriptions are of the Ptolemaic epoch, but cannot be regarded as affording evidence whereby to date any of the existing older remains.

be furnished by a fragmentary inscription which had been built into a later wall at the S.E. This wall had, when standing, been part of the buildings of the fifth period, which cannot have coexisted with the peristyle. The inscription, which is not, I think, of a later time than 300 A.D., and may be even of the second century, is not necessarily, but probably, to be connected with the marble peristyle.¹ It mentions the worship of Zeus, and this raises a further question. Is it conceivable that the restoration of the peristyle should have been carried out after 333 A.D., when Salamis was rebuilt under Constantine and christened Constantia? The answer, having regard to the nature of the building as well as to this inscription, must surely be in the negative, otherwise it can only be supposed that a profane site was exorcised, and in that case a church or at least a sacred building should have replaced a heathen *τέμενος*. Finally, the fifth period for which there is evidence on this site cannot commence earlier than the founding of Constantia, and extends to an indeterminate date. It is possible, indeed, that a lower limit might be approximately established were there means of accurately gauging the rate of accumulation of drift-sand. After the buildings had been overthrown, perhaps by the iconoclastic zeal of Christian Constantia, the materials were suffered to lie undisturbed, soon to be hidden from sight by indrifting sand. The western end is untouched, its columns and capitals lie as they fell, and they fell not on sand, but on the soil. It is otherwise with the eastern wall. Here one column remained erect, and guided the thieves who attempted to carry off material, perhaps for the embellishment of Famagosta, just then rising into foremost rank among the cities of Cyprus. It is to the account of this attempt that we may with some reason attribute the fact of the columns being found lying in the sand some 3 to 4 ft. above the level of the wall on which they originally stood.² Now in cutting our first trench there appeared, especially in its northern side, a clearly-marked line of marble splinters forming a narrow layer from 2' 6" to 3' or 3' 6" down in the sand, which here had a depth of 5' to 6'. The same layer is found elsewhere, and is particularly thick at the eastern end. Throughout it is to be seen at the same level.³ Assuming the sand to have accumulated in the centre of the depression at a regular and unvarying rate, it would be possible to fix this attempt to remove material at a date corresponding to one-half the interval 350--1890, or in the latter part of the 11th century, A.D. This would then be the epoch at

¹ For the inscription see below, No. III. 48 in section on inscriptions. It is written on a fragment of thin marble slab 5½" × 3¾" × ¾" thick. The very insignificance of such a fragment renders it altogether unlikely that it should have been brought from any distance. A blue marble pedestal, such as that mentioned on p. 28, offers sufficient reason for the trouble of removal, and may have stood, under the Ptolemies, in a quarter of Salamis very different from that in which it was last used to support a statue, and in which it lay ready to the builder's hand.

² There is ample evidence for the attempt at

removal. Not only are the columns in many cases badly broken, but they are sometimes split lengthwise, or have clamp-holes for hoisting. The attempt was abandoned, and the number of splinters and the awkward fractures of the columns show that it was ill set about.

³ Not, of course, at the same distance from the surface, for the depth of drift varies. The northern column-wall has also been interfered with, and here a capital was found four feet down in the sand—*i.e.* at about the same level, the drift being deeper towards the sides of the depression.

which Famagosta was becoming a town capable of containing large and splendid buildings. Still later will be some of the 'hanging masonry' at the eastern end of our site, which lies well above the layer of splintered marble. Thus the site of Constantia will have been inhabited for some time after Famagosta became the only large city in this district.

Lastly, the question has to be faced—What were the peristyle and the adjoining structure? I shall answer it in very few words. Trusting to the inscription already spoken of, and to the character of the buildings, I will call it a *Temenos* of Zeus. The temple is probably still hidden under the sand, but its western wall may be that which has been spoken of hitherto as the eastern column-wall. Beneath it the eastern limestone-wall may be the remnant of an older temple. The peristyle would then be an annexe, comparable in some respects to the *Atrium Vestae* in the Roman Forum. The frequency with which female portrait statues occurred perhaps unduly accentuates the general resemblance between these two buildings. The other marbles found do not afford much more help; for if the principal among them is a seated Hades with Cerberus, there are also an Eros, a river-god, an Athena, and a goddess with a snake, while a nude male figure seems to have had one of the attributes of Dionysos. *Ἀγάλματα*, which might at once have set the matter at rest, were not brought to light.

The story of the excavations of 1890 ends here. Its results are three-fold. Towards the final restoration of ancient Salamis a contribution has been made which is large, even if regarded solely from the point of view of so many cubic yards of earth removed. But more has been done than merely to displace a quantum of soil. The topography has been placed on a firm basis; the centre of the ancient city disclosed: the sites of two of its temples recovered: a large tract of unexcavated ground tested. Everything is thus ready for a resumption of the work. For those, secondly, who ask a more solid return, a plentiful spoil has been won from 'Time's remorseless tooth.' Lastly, to the archaeologist and the historian new material is offered for the rewriting of the tale of ancient life. In fact, the Cyprus Exploration Fund has set its hand to a task of as great promise and profit as of importance. No other ancient site offers such advantages as Salamis. A whole city lies buried, and no modern village or town cumber its ruins. The foremost state of Cyprus, a state which from its infancy fell almost completely under the sway of Greek culture, waits to be given back to the world. It offers material of every sort: its ruins already disinterred cover a period of at least 1,000 years, from 600 B.C. to 400 A.D., and others still standing carry these limits yet further back. All cultures are here represented, all forms of classic civilization have met and intermingled. Egyptian, Assyrian, Phœnician and Greek, Cypriote and Roman, each nation has tarried to grave its character on the monuments of Salamis. Drifting sea-sand has shown itself as able to

shelter and preserve as the lava-stream. A great work has been successfully begun. Italy has her Heracleum and Pompeii; why should not Cyprus, and through Cyprus England, give to the world a *Salamis rediscovered*!

H. A. T.

DIARY OF THE SEASON.

DATES.	SITES.	HANDS EMPLOYED.
Jan. 16—22	<i>A</i> .	49 men, increasing to 58 men, 26 women.
Jan. 22—Feb. 1	<i>A</i> and <i>B</i> . — <i>A</i> abandoned Feb. 1. <i>C</i> begun Jan. 30.	58 men, 26 women.
Feb. 3—15	<i>C</i> .—Work several times interrupted by rain. Occasional work also on <i>B</i> .	71 men, 27 women.
Feb. 17—Mar. 1	<i>C</i> .—Feb. 19. Extended to Loutron. Feb. 27. Extended to W. field. <i>B</i> .—Only clearing away of sand previously excavated. Rain interfered at times.	115 men, 35 women.
Mar. 3—8	<i>B</i> and <i>C</i> [including Loutron]: Mar. 5. Extended to 2nd W. field. Mar. 8. Both W. sites abandoned.	108 men, 50 women.
Mar. 10—15	<i>B</i> , <i>C</i> [with Loutron], <i>D</i> : Mar. 12. <i>D</i> begun.	100 men, 50 women.
Mar. 17—22	<i>B</i> , <i>C</i> [with Loutron], <i>D</i> , <i>E</i> , <i>F</i> : Mar. 18. <i>C</i> finished except some piece-work. Mar. 19. <i>E</i> begun. Mar. 22. Loutron finished.	110 men, 63 women.
Mar. 24—29	<i>B</i> , <i>D</i> , <i>E</i> , <i>F</i> , Toumpa, <i>H</i> : Mar. 25. Began Toumpa. Mar. 26. Closed <i>D</i> . Mar. 28. Began <i>H</i> .	110 men, 60 women.
Mar. 31—Apr. 5	<i>B</i> , <i>E</i> , <i>F</i> , Toumpa, <i>H</i> : Apr. 3. <i>E</i> and <i>F</i> closed.	117 men, 59 women.
Apr. 7—10	<i>B</i> , Toumpa, <i>H</i> .	98 men, 39 women.
Apr. 11—15	Works closed during Greek Easter festival.	
Apr. 16—19	<i>B</i> , Toumpa, <i>H</i> .—Only a few hands on <i>H</i> , which was closed Apr. 19. Additional work on <i>C</i> [hillock].	83 men, 50 women.
Apr. 21—26	<i>B</i> , Toumpa.—Piece-work on <i>C</i> and Loutron. Apr. 25. Closed Toumpa.	103 men, 63 women.
Apr. 28—May 3	<i>B</i> , Tombs.—Apr. 29. First tomb-site begun. May 3. Tombs closed. Barley harvest begins: scarcity of workpeople.	65 men, 35 women.
May 6—10	<i>B</i> .—Toumpa tou Michaili [begun May 7]. May 8. Additional work on <i>H</i> . Barley harvest.	53 men, 42 women.
May 12—17	<i>B</i> .—Toumpa tou Michaili. Latter closed May 15. Barley harvest nearly ended: more hands available.	85 men, 70 women.
May 19—24	<i>B</i> .—Little work could be done owing to failure of funds. Clearing up and finishing off.	26 men, 23 women.
May 26—June 4	Division of finds, completion of plans, packing and shipment of antiquities.	

In all there were 102½ days of full work; on three and a-half rain prevented all labour. From April 11–15, inclusive, the Greek Easter, and on May 5th, St. George's Day, no workmen were to be had. During the greater part of the season from 150 to 180 hands were employed: a higher number would have outstripped the staff of managers and overlookers. As the men were hired nominally for the day but virtually for the week, and as in excavating the sphere of labour shrinks or expands in a manner which cannot be exactly estimated in advance, those who were from time to time set free by the exhaustion of a part of a site were employed to make experiments on other portions of the ancient city. This serves to explain the comparatively large number of trial excavations.

H. A. T.

II. THE FINDS.¹

A. Site of the Granite Column.

The great majority of the objects found on this site are of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. In the lowest stratum, just above the red virgin soil, were fragments of Cypriote pottery and of rude terracottas, presumably of early date, but not numerous. Nothing seems to deserve more than passing mention. The following is the list:—

A. Twenty-four bronze coins.

B. Pottery (mostly fragments) of various styles.

(*a*) Plain, light or red, including several of the little bottles of late shape with slender neck and foot and swelling middle.

(*b*) Six Roman lamps, three of them with moulded devices—(a soldier and another figure—side-boss in form of a lion's head—two winged draped figures (angels?) kissing, standing on rosettes, on the spout a torch).

(*c*) Black-glazed, plain or with impressed patterns, one fragment with white ivy branch.

(*d*) A fragment of a cup, black throughout, the body decorated with patterns in relief—rosettes over a pattern of leaves arranged scalewise—matt black surface.

(*e*) A small fragment of fine thin smooth pottery with red concentric circles, resembling Mycenae ware.

(*f*) Cypriote pottery, mostly from the lowest stratum, light surface, dark concentric circles, dark and red bands, chequers.

C. Terracottas.

¹ I have to thank Mr. A. S. Murray for the kindness with which he was always ready to interrupt his own work and conduct me to inspect one or another of the antiquities here described, after their arrival at the British Museum, also Mr. Warwick Wroth for looking

through the coins, Mr. A. H. Smith for the trouble he has taken in superintending the execution of the illustrations, and Mr. Herbert Read, R.I.B.A. for drawing out the plan of Salamis in a form suitable for reproduction.

(1) Grotesque head from a brazier, cf. Conze, *Jahrbuch*, v. p. 126, type iii. A.

(2) Fragment of little terracotta group, pair of lovers, pretty style.

The following from the lowest strata—

(3) Small horse's head of archaic type (cf. others found on the Cistern and Τοῦμπα sites), the head-harness and breast-trappings resembling the Assyrian.

(4) Small female head from statuette, in high head dress, details indistinct, rude work.

(5) Two or three very crude little animal heads.

D. Miscellaneous objects mostly of no importance, including—

(1) Fragment of a decorative frieze, white marble, 10 inches × 6, with remnant of a griffin. Late Roman work.

(2) A number of fragments of wall plaster, from near the great south wall, white ground, with a yellow border brushed over with red, and blue birds, with black legs and markings, among green foliage.

(3) Fragment of the crown of a head (?) with a row of bosses or curls—material uncertain—(3 inches × 4).

(4) Fragments of an enamelled glass alabastron, blue and yellow, and of an amber-coloured glass cup.

B. Sand Site.

The objects found on this site lay mainly in two groups, either near the western row of columns, especially at its northern extremity and in a 'nest' a few yards east of the centre, or along the whole length of the eastern line of columns. Elsewhere objects were only occasional and sporadic, and none of them were large or important. It is, however, necessary to bear in mind that much of the site, especially in the centre and along the south side, remains unexcavated. As regards levels there is little to be said. The whole site was covered with an accumulation of sand varying in depth from about six feet towards the west, to five and twenty or more at the east end. The objects found lay upon, or but a few feet embedded in, a stratum of earth immediately below the sand. Deeper probings revealed more sand beneath the soil, but no antiquities save broken Cypriote pottery—this, however, in great abundance. For the rest neither was pottery at all prominent among the finds, nor terracottas. Sculpture was the staple, and bronze objects were fairly plentiful, but of little importance. The sculptures are divisible by material and by style or period. The division by material corresponds to the division by date, and there is a similar division by date and material in the building. The earlier sculptures, like the earlier building, are of limestone. They are in an archaic style which cannot be later than the fifth century B.C. The later sculptures are of marble, and their style points to the Ptolemaic and Roman period. The columns of the later building are also of marble, but although the columns themselves may be contemporaneous with the sculptures, their architectural combination can hardly be so early. The finds may be grouped as follows—

A. About 150 *bronze coins*.

B. *Sculptures*, most of them more or less mutilated.

(a) *Limestone*. All very fragmentary. Almost all from the nest near the western colonnade.

(1) Base of statue, with feet and remnant of legs (1 ft. 4 in. high), about life size, in bad condition. Was draped down to the feet. One sandal distinguishable. The length of the toes is noteworthy and marks the archaic style.

(2) Similar base (11 inches \times 10 \times 4). Only the forepart of the toes preserved. No sandals. Not bad work. Traces of red colour. There is a large round hollow underneath the plinth, and a smaller hole right through between the feet.

(3) Life-size right hand, half closed, grasping something between the thumb and forefinger, the palm against something. Perhaps from a female figure holding an object against her breast.

(4) Similar right hand, about half the size.

(5) A number of small fragments, including two with what seem to be locks of hair (or one of them a necklace ?) treated in archaic fashion in beads, and several fragments of drapery, one of them carefully worked in deep regular folds, with a fringed border, and traces of red colour.

(6) Fragment of torso from small female figure (8 inches \times 12). The right arm is broken off at the elbow, the left a little below it. The back, and the front from the left breast to the right arm are split away. The upper arms are held close to the sides, the left is slightly bent at the elbow. The figure is draped in an under-garment with sleeves reaching to the elbow, and an upper-garment (?) passed round the waist below the arms. The latter is coloured red, and there is a red border to the sleeves, and a red stripe down them on the outer side. Three notched tails of hair fall down the breast on each side. Careful and delicate work.

(7) Torso of little draped figure (about 3 inches \times 4), holding an object in front of her with the right hand. Traces of red colour. Rough work. Flat behind.

(8) Fragment of similar figure (about 4 inches \times 5), holding in the right hand a long object below her breast. Half sleeves. A double string of beads about the neck.

The above described fragments are best explained as belonging to a series of female figures of various sizes, analogous to the series of marble figures which is to follow.

(b) *Marble*. These works seemed to have suffered intentional mutilation. All the heads are knocked off, and of the few found none can be fitted to any of the statues. Perhaps when the site is completely cleared some may be recovered. A possible clue to the meaning of the mutilation is given by a purposely obliterated inscription, at each end of which a cross has been cut. Further damage has been done by the fall of the building, one figure was discovered under one of the eastern columns, shivered almost to chips.

The first two figures were found at the west end of the site, the rest, with the exception of a few small fragments, at the east. Two or three of the better works may date from Ptolemaic times, the majority seem to be of the Roman period. The isolated fragments are very numerous, only the larger and more interesting are here enumerated.

(1) Nude torso of small boy (1 ft. 2½ in. high), the arms broken away at the shoulder, the legs through the thighs. The remains of wings on the back mark the figure as Eros. He rested on his right leg with the left slightly bent. Neither arm can have been raised. The work is fairly good and not without freshness. Found in the 'nest.'

(2) Small reclining figure of a River-God (2 ft. 2¾ in. long). The head, right shoulder and arm, both feet, and the left hand, are lacking. The God reclines on his left side, his left elbow propped on a water-jar, which is bored for the insertion of a pipe. His mantle is wrapped about his legs and carried round behind his back, so that the end falls over his left arm. His right hand holds a little dolphin against his thigh, and he carries a cornucopie in the bend of his left arm. Inferior Roman work.

(3) Sarapis seated on a throne with Cerberus by his side (Fig. 1). Size about two-thirds of life. Broken away are the head, both arms from just above the elbow, both feet and the front of the legs from the knees downward, and the three faces of the dog. The material is blue marble, with white marble inserted for the flesh where shown. The forepart of a sandalled right foot cut away square at the instep and evidently intended for insertion under drapery, which was found seven weeks later, almost certainly belongs to the figure, with which its scale is in complete harmony. The breast of the figure is rather full, but there can be no doubt that Sarapis is intended. He is seated on a high-backed throne, his left arm is raised, and was probably supported on a sceptre, his right lowered, perhaps to hold a patera. He is clad in a thin *chiton* which clings close to the body, and his lower limbs are enveloped in an *himation* which is carried behind the back and over the left arm. Cerberus, a dog of rather shaggy bulldog type, squats on his haunches against the right arm of the chair. About his neck is twined a serpent. In front of Sarapis projects a footboard with rabbeted edges, narrowing forwards, and not set square to the chair. I cannot satisfactorily explain this object. Round the plinth of the statue runs a hollow moulding. The workmanship is careful and finished, the folds of drapery are studied and not unpleasing. One would naturally assign the work to the time of Hadrian, but it may quite well be rather earlier. The type goes back to the great statue at Alexandria. With the difficult questions of the origin and authorship of that statue we need not here concern ourselves, they are discussed by Professor Michaelis in connection with 'Sarapis standing on a Xanthian marble in the British Museum' in the sixth volume of this *Journal*, where full references to the literature on the subject will be found. But two points may be noticed in which our figure recalls descriptions of the Alexandrian statue. There seems to be a weak reminiscence in the three heads of Cerberus, mutilated as they are, of the prototype described

by Macrobius (*Saturn.* I. xx. 13-15). The middle head is larger and broader than the others, and so more leonine in type, and the head next to Sarapis is a little raised above its fellow and laid caressingly against its master's knee. The second point is the colour of the marble. The use of coloured marble for drapery and accessories is of course common enough in Roman Imperial times, and this dark blue marble is extremely common in Cyprus, whereas white marble had to be imported, but it is perhaps more than a coincidence that the only statue of this material which has, so far as I know, been found in the island should be a Sarapis, for (quoting Athenodorus son of



FIG. 1

Sandon) Clement of Alexandria,¹ after describing the materials out of which the artist Bryaxis, whoever he was, fashioned Sarapis, proceeds *λεάνας οὖν τὰ πάντα καὶ ἀναμίξας ἔχρωσε κύνῳ, οὗ δὲ χάριν μελάντερον τὸ χρώμα τοῦ ἀγάλματος, κ.τ.λ.*, 'having, then, ground all these ingredients to powder and mixed them together he added a colouring of cyanus, which is the explanation of the colour of the statue being so dark.' Professor Michaelis (who seems

¹ *Cohort.* iv. p. 146. A and B. ed. Migne.

by the way to conceive of the statue as *quinted*) adopts Kroker's opinion that the work described was Egyptian, and conjectures that it was an Osiris placed in the ancient sanctuary of Apis in the Rhakotis. But Clement at least does not seem to distinguish two statues, and, whether he accepts the explanation of the fact or not, *does* seem to imply that the Sarapis of his day was of dark bluish colour, which would exactly match the Sahunian figure.¹ It is of course possible that there was an earlier Egyptian statue, of which the Greek one was a modified rendering, and that the colour was a characteristic retained in the latter. But if so, we are certainly committed to *sen-hapi* as the true explanation of the traditional Sinope. There is another point on which I venture to differ from Professor Michaelis. Ptolemy Soter seems to me to have a stronger claim than Philadelphus or Euergetes to have established or re-established the worship of Sarapis, for Macrobius quotes the answer of the God to Nicocreon 'king of the Cypriotes' who had inquired of him 'quis deorum haberetur.' Now Nicocreon was king of Salamis from 331 to 310 B.C., and (if we are to press the *Cypriorum rege*) vassal king of Cyprus under Ptolemy from 312 to 310. It is not unlikely that the inquiry was preliminary to the introduction of his suzerain's new deity into Cyprus. In any case the story is plausible enough, and represents Sarapis as already established in Egypt, although not yet known in Cyprus, before the year 310 B.C., that is to say long before the death of Ptolemy Soter. It is of interest not only for the history of the type in general, but also for the artistic pedigree of the statue before us. Is it possible that the building may have been connected with a sanctuary of Sarapis?

(4) Perhaps related to the Sarapis is a female statue considerably above² the size of life (Fig. 2). The head, the greater part of the right arm, and the left wrist and hand are lacking. The surface has here and there suffered from the weather. The left arm is bent, the wrist and hand were separately made and somehow attached by the large vertical socket under the stump of the forearm. The figure stands firmly but not stiffly upright, resting on the right leg with the left knee slightly advanced. A long tunic descends to her sandalled feet, and is gathered under the breast by a narrow band. Her mantle is girt about her hips and falls over her left arm. Serpentine locks of hair flow down each shoulder. The style is large and simple, and the general effect good. The work on the back is but slight. The statue was found in several pieces, and together with the upper part was a much damaged right hand grasping a fragmentary snake, which probably belongs to the figure. The scale matches well enough, and the prop that projects from the snake may be plausibly connected with the rough boss on the right side of the figure. A female figure holding a snake would naturally be interpreted as Hygieia, but the action of the right hand has yet to be determined. It seems probable from the attitude, and the position, shape, and size of the socket, that the left hand carried

¹ The dark blue marble is always known in Cyprus as *μαύρα πέτρα*; the epithet may be compared with *μελάντερον* above.
² Close on 7 ft. high without the head

some upright attribute of considerable size, and I am inclined, as the merest of conjectures, to assign to this figure a cornucopiae of suitable scale, of which the top was found some distance further south. Isis is the natural associate of Sarapis, but just as Sarapis approximated to Asclepius on the one hand and Pluto or Agathos Daimon on the other, so Isis was assimilated to Hygieia and to Tyche. The mythological combination therefore would not be surprising, and the attributes are actually combined *e.g.* on the figures in Clarac



FIG. 2.

pl. 557. 1186 A. and C., which Stephani would name not Hygieia but Ge (*Compte Rendu* 1860, p. 102). But until some material connection is established between the cornucopiae and the figure, the question need not be raised.

(5) A series of draped female statues, from rather over to rather under life size. Of these five are fairly complete, except for the heads and most of the forearms, but there are fragments of several more. Some are better executed than others, but none rise much above the average style of Roman

work. All wear the same garments, a *chiton* reaching to the feet, and a mantle thrown round the person over it. Two wear the mantle over both arms, the right hand raised to the breast or face respectively, and one of them holds in her left hand under her right elbow a bobbin of wool. Two others wear their *himatia* passed in a roll across the breast from under the right arm to the left shoulder. Their right forearms and left hands are gone. The fifth is closely draped in a similar manner, but the fold of the upper-garment supports the right arm, which is raised from the elbow and held away from the body. The left hand catches up the drapery by her side. She turns towards the right hand, a posture which displays to advantage the contours of her figure and the studied folds of her dress. The work is careful and not unpleasing, but without special excellence. None of the backs are highly finished. The statues are not characterized by any divine attributes, their dress is that of ordinary life, and the bobbin of wool is simply the mark of a good housewife. We have probably to recognize in them individual portraits, perhaps a series of priestesses.

(6) Fragment of female head. Life size. There is practically no face left, the fragment is from the back, crown, and left side of the head. The hair is parted on the top, gathered up in a thick ridge along the face, and collected in a mass behind. One lock hangs down behind the ear. The treatment is in shallow lines. Poor work.

(7) Athena, standing, rather under life size. Lacking are the head, arms, left lower leg, and right shoulder. The head has been broken off and fixed on again, for although the edges of the break are ragged there is a socket for the insertion of a bolt or spike. The Goddess stands on her right leg, with her left knee a little advanced. Her left arm was raised from the shoulder, and probably rested on a spear. The stump of a prop on the right hip seems to show that her right hand was well lowered, possibly it held a shield. She is clad in a long *chiton* with *diplois*, and a narrow snake-fringed *agyis* which passes over the right shoulder and under the left arm. The Gorgoneion is small and unusually placed under the left breast. The figure is of ordinary style of the Roman period. The back imperfectly worked out.

(8) Small nude female torso, broken off through the hips. The upper part of the left arm is preserved, and from its position and the curve of the body it is evident that the figure sat on the ground propped on her left hand. Under the right armpit is the hand of another figure, probably supporting her from behind. There is a plain armlet round the left arm.

(9) Another female figure, which must also have belonged to a group. The legs are broken off just above the knee. The head is gone, and the greater part of both arms. The right leg is advanced in rapid motion. The dress is a shortened (?) *chiton* with *διπλοῖς*, girded in at the waist, with cross bands over the breast. The movement of the figure is helped by the action of the drapery between the legs. The size is considerably under life. Many small isolated fragments may be connected with the group or groups to which these figures belonged.

(10) (Fig. 3) Female portrait head ($7\frac{1}{2}$ inches high). The end of the nose

and the left ear are gone, the surface on the top and back of the head damaged. Otherwise the head is in perfect preservation. The hair is parted transversely across the middle of the crown. The back half of it is plaited and twisted into a flat mass behind, from under which two plaits are carried forward, forming a head-band. Over this band falls the front hair in a formal fringe, which gives a *frons tenuis*. The fringe is treated in a schematic tooth-like manner, as so often on Roman heads. The face is of a regular oval form. The curve of the eyebrows is broad and low. The eyes are not fully open, but the upper lid, the projection of which gives an expressive touch of shade, droops a little, and the under is gently drawn up across the eye. The



FIG. 3.

ears are small, the nose is delicate and finely cut. The cheeks are carefully modelled, with perhaps just a trifle too much downward tendency about the corners of the nose and mouth. The small slightly flattened chin has an air of decision, but passes into a rounded jaw overshadowing a neck softened by the tender ripple of a little fold. But the most successful feature is the dainty mouth with thin lips parted and showing a glimpse of the teeth. The lips are the most mobile and living part of the face, and upon them seems to hover the echo of a smile. The whole expression, while not without a certain chastened severity, is that of maiden meditation, pleasant dreams. If not seen, however, in quite the right light, the face looks cold and dead. The execution is careful and finished, the whole effect laboriously built up by

attention to the several parts, rather than impressed at once on the stone by a master hand. The sculptor seems to have striven after an idealism rarely attempted in his time, but one still exclaims not 'what a masterpiece of art!' but 'what a charming model!'

(11) Passing over an unimportant fragment, we have two other female heads, a small head with drapery carried over it like a veil, and a small mask with curved back, doubtless intended for insertion in drapery. The latter is in very poor condition, and both are of extremely degraded style.

(12) The greater part of a more than life size nude male figure, gradually recovered in many fragments and still far from complete. Preserved are the torso, left arm down to the wrist, right leg down to the ankle, and the greater part of the tree stump beside it. Doubtless further excavation at the south-east corner of the building will reveal more fragments. The type approximates in general to that of the Hermes of Andros: the right hip is arched, the left arm bent, and a *chlamys* is wound about the forearm, the end falling over the left shoulder, where it is adorned with a round brooch. A hand of about the same scale, and found in the same spot, may belong to the left arm, but the connecting wrist is not discovered. The hand, of which the surface is badly weathered, held a staff or similar object. Long hair, attested by a serpentine curl on each shoulder, is a deviation from the Hermes type, but a raw boss on the right hip indicating the position of the right hand is in harmony with it. The left wrist was of a separate piece. The style is good, although not early. The forms are largely rendered, with considerable softness and life, and without exaggeration. There is more of Praxitelean inspiration in the work than in many perhaps earlier renderings of the type. The statue may well represent a deity, and no identification seems more appropriate than Dionysus.

(13) Among the many small fragments which cannot be fitted to any of the larger works, it will be sufficient to mention one which has a significance of its own and beyond itself—a headless eagle on a stump, no doubt the support of a statue. It is a good deal damaged. Below is what looks at first sight like a snake's head, but may be only a twining branch.

(c) *Bronze*.—With the possible exception of a little piece of a fold of drapery, no bronze works were discovered, but their former existence is rendered probable by the bronze slag frequently met with, which sometimes preserved the form of the bottom of the melting pot.

C. Pottery.—Scarce except in the lower stratum, very fragmentary, and of little interest.

(a) *Cypriote*. Apparently the only pottery of the lower stratum, which was full of it, but also found in the upper stratum in stray fragments. The fragments are too small to give much idea of the shapes, but most of them seem to belong to large jars, jugs, and open cups of the commonest types. The pottery is of the ordinary kind with light surface and dark decoration in concentric circles, bands, and the usual patterns, occasional red bands being introduced.

(b) Plain, e.g. a series of coarse brown jars arranged in a row in the nest

before mentioned, Roman lamps, lamps of the pinched saucer or 'cocked-hat' type, minute jugs, &c.

(*c*) Black glazed ware (scarce), both plain and with little impressed patterns.

(*d*) One small chip of red-figured pottery, with drapery and the fingers of a hand, rough careless style and presumably late date.

D. Miscellaneous.

(*a*) A few terracottas, namely:—

Fragments of female face, about 1½ inches long, with white coating. Fairly good style and type.

Crude little terracotta beast, apparently meant for a bull, painted with red and black bands.

Terracotta head from statuette, about three inches high, female, flat behind. The head resembles many found in Cyprus, we may refer particularly to the analogous heads found on the *Τοῦμπα* site described below. The hair which is treated in fine parallel lines, is parted across above the forehead, and falls in a heavy fringe close over the eyebrows. Tassel-like dependent ornaments cover the ears. The features are indistinct in detail, but the eyes are large and prominent, the face flat with a projecting mouth and chin, and the line of the cheeks clearly marked at and below the corners of the mouth. The head was found near the north-west corner of the building at no great depth into the soil. It may belong to the lower stratum, and have been thrown up in digging the foundation of the colonnade wall, but in any case is probably at least as early as the fifth century B.C.

(*b*) Bronze objects.

Two small bells, one of them with an iron clapper.

A signet ring (the seal lacking).

Three hooks hanging from a fourth.

A small wheel or pierced disk suspended from a hook.

A dart-head, buckle, pin, needles, &c.

(*c*) Various odds and ends:—

Glass vessels, a variegated glass button, a little stone bird, a stone lid of a vessel, a bone handle, a light-blue porcelain bead, fragments of wall plaster with red and black colour (one with a red bird's head), a piece of large lead pipe, &c.

C. The Agora.

As the Sand site was pre-eminently the site of sculptures, so the Agora is the site of inscriptions. But a considerable number of fragments of statues and statuettes were also found there. The quantity of bronze coins turned up was a special characteristic of the site. Pottery and terracotta figurines were rare, and not for the most part of any particular interest. They were most abundant in the exploratory trenches dug in the large field behind the northern half of the great west colonnade. A large number of small miscellaneous objects came to light, most of them of bronze.

A. About 550 *bronze coins*.

Also five lead seals or tokens.

B. *Sculpture*. The most important works were found at the southern end of the site in the neighbourhood of the hillock, all the following are from within the limits of the Agora proper unless it is otherwise stated.

(a) *Limestone*.—Fragments, mostly in poor condition and of rude style, but not therefore archaic.

(1) Stray pieces, which may well have belonged to statues over life size of the usual Cypriote type, such for instance as those found at Dali and Bouni—a left hand against drapery, a knee, a portion of a draped figure, a large hand found among the foundations under the hillock.

(2) A small female torso, about half life size (from the marble bases beyond the south end of the east colonnade). The surface is much damaged, the left hip gone. The figure is draped in a short-sleeved *chiton* girded under the breast. The back is very rough, possibly the hair fell in a mass behind. A band over the right shoulder carries what seems to be a quiver. The figure is therefore probably intended for Artemis.

(3) Draped torso, with the upper part of the arms and legs, of an extremely rude figure, whether male or female can hardly be determined. (11¾ inches high. From the west field.) The left arm is closer to the side than the right, the left leg is a little advanced, but without bending the knee apparently. The build looks archaic, especially the long waist. The surface is much gone, and the work of the very rudest.

(4) Three fragments of statuettes from the west field—a left arm, with a bracelet on the wrist, holding a large torch (?)—an ugly little male head of the vilest style—and a fragment of a ram with the mark of a broken something on the head.

(b) *Marble*.

(1) The first place must be taken by the great Bull's head capital (Fig. 4). Its architectural significance is not here in point, we are concerned with it only as a piece of sculpture. The design is no doubt oriental. The two bulls back to back with their heads projecting to either side are found for example on the capitals from the Palace of Darius at Persepolis, where they were doubtless copied from older models in the art of Chaldaea and Assyria.⁵ But one cannot but feel how much the design has been improved upon in the work before us. The curtailment of the bulls to heads and shoulders gets rid of much of the grotesque awkwardness of the earlier composition, and gives greater relative prominence to the heads. The addition of wings springing from the shoulders and curling forwards like volutes is a happy, although perhaps not original, touch. On the other hand the wings must have looked rather small and cramped, and the unity of the design is spoilt, for the artist has now to find something to fill the centre face of the capital between the wings. He does it with a female figure in Caryatid posture, with a sort of *modius* upon her head, who passes below the

⁵ Cf. also the gilt pin from Paphos, *J. H. S.* ix. Pl. XI.

waist into a curious floral ornament. The filling is well adapted to the space, and the contrast between the simple broad outer surfaces and the broken complicated play of light and shade in the middle section is not unpleasing. But the effect is none the less inartistic. Wholeness is sacrificed. The contrast between the big bulls and the little woman is too emphatic, and the centre has too much the appearance of a decorative patch on a bold sculpturesque design. The figure may be mythologically connected with the bulls, may be for instance associated with the oriental Goddess whose emblem is the horned moon, and who underlies the Greek legends of Artemis, Io, and Europa. But a mythological connection is not an artistic one, and to stick in the principal thus baldly between her monsters is unpardonable. Nor does



FIG. 4.

it mend the design to say that the combination is merely eclectic, and the figure has long since degenerated from a Goddess or Priestess into a purely architectural Caryatid.

The capital has suffered a good deal, only two sides are preserved, and roots of both the wings of the extant bull have been deliberately chiselled away. The horns and ears are broken off, and the face of the Caryatid is half obliterated.

The bull's head projects boldly and effectively. In looking at the neck, it must be remembered that the capital is intended to be seen from below, the ridge of the neck, which looks awkward in a level view, would not be seen. The upper part of the head is for the same reason tilted well forward.

The wings are treated in broad parallel curves without any attempt at feathering. The rough hair, on the other hand, of the forehead and front face is carefully rendered, and the folds of hide on the neck are not forgotten. The modelling above the nostrils, and the expression of the small truculent eye, are well done. The female figure is dressed in a simple sleeveless *chiton* gathered in by a band round the waist. The work displays considerable skill in the rendering of the form, and some feeling for the difference of texture between the drapery and flesh. Both arms are raised as though supporting the abacus.

On the whole the workmanship, if a little dry, is good and effective. Yet the capital must be of comparatively late date. The material, the style, and the taste displayed in the Caryatid and the ornament out of which she grows, all prevent our assigning it to an earlier period than the Ptolemaic, even if it be no later, as well it may. The design is extremely interesting as showing how oriental motives persisted in the art of Cyprus after the final establishment of Hellenic culture.

(2) Fragment from the thighs of a draped figure, under life size, probably female. The right knee is slightly advanced. The drapery clings closely round the limbs except at the left side where it falls in parallel folds. The back is only roughly worked. Perhaps archaistic work. Much damaged.

(3) Fragment of colossal statue. Part of the calf of a leg, in a high buskin which reaches half way up it, against a palm stump. Found on the hillock.

(4) Fragment of female face, over life size. The upper part, including the eyes (except the inner corners) and half of the left cheek, is lacking. The face is full and rounded, of a broad type, without sharp lines or features. The iris of the eyes is incised, the glands in the corners are rendered. The nose is broad, with a wide bridge. The full lips are parted but not sufficiently to show the teeth. The corners of the mouth are soft, and the chin and jaw rounded. The lips are rimmed with an incised line as in bronze work. The execution is fairly good, and may be of Hellenistic date, but is perhaps more probably an archaistic product of Roman imperial times.

(5) Torso and thighs of a male statuette (9 inches high). Nude, but with drapery hanging against the left leg. Of no special merit or interest.

(6) Winged female statuette of slender proportions, headless, armless, and footless (6½ inches high). Draped in a long *chiton* with *διπλόις*. Mark of something (right hand?) on the breast. The figure is probably Nike. Very poor work. From the west field.

(7) Head and other small chips of a little statuette. The hair is long and tied in a bow on the top of the head. The type is about equally suited to an Aphrodite or a young Apollo. The execution is facile, and the marks of a fine-toothed chisel are clearly visible. The effect is singularly fresh and happy. Style not too late, probably Hellenistic.

(8) Fragment of a sepulchral stele with a small jug in relief.

There may be added—

(9) A fragment of gypsum slab with half of a large bulbous fish in relief. Probably very late.

C. Pottery.

Within the limits of the Agora proper nothing was found but plain pottery, jugs, pinched saucer lamps, Roman lamps, etc., with here and there a small piece of black-glazed ware. On the west field, however, the black-glazed ware was more plentiful, and fragments of Cypriote pottery of the usual kinds, with light or red ground and dark bands and concentric circles, were fairly abundant. Three fragmentary vessels may be mentioned.

(1) Fragments from a large full-bellied jar with small rim and handles. The clay is reddish with white surface, the decoration in matt red. The latter consists of bands, especially one broad between two narrow, an arcade pattern, and floral sprays below the shoulder. The shape and patterns seem to be early.

(2) A broken little ovoid lecythus of fine thin ware with smooth yellowish surface, decorated with three dark glazed bands on each of which are painted three red lines. Certainly of early Greek fabric.

(3) Fragments of a small vase. Light red ground with a dark pattern of leaves and spirals surrounded by dots. Careless execution.

D. Miscellaneous objects in stone, terracotta, bronze, etc.

(a) Terracotta.

From the Agora proper there are only two fragments to record, the torso of a crude little beast, and part of a female head, being the left side of the face (fragment $5\frac{1}{4}$ inches \times $3\frac{1}{2}$). The latter is adorned with a disk earring with a little boss in the centre, and surmounted by a lofty crown with a row of rosettes. It seems to be of good Greek style.

The following came from the west field—

A fragment, three inches high, which looks like the leg of a Siren with a bird's claw, on an ornamental base.

A little head in a pointed cap or hood. The details are indistinct, but the forehead is retreating, the nose is prominent, and the eyes are large and flat.

A fragment of female torso, the right hand slung in the upper garment, the left holding an object. Hasty work without finish.

Several heads and other fragments of female statuettes wearing a high crown and generally resembling the female figures so common on the Cistern site described below. The crown is usually decorated with a row of rosettes, sometimes with elaborate palmettes. Disk-and-pendant earrings are generally worn. The style is developed but severe, and not without traces of archaism here and there, the eyes, for instance, of one head are large and flat, of elongated almond shape, and bordered by a distinct *rim*. The other fragments are most of them mere draperies, one however represents a deer or kid grasped by the left hand of a draped figure, a motive to which we shall find parallels hereafter.

(b) Bronze.

Small objects of bronze were plentiful—dart and arrow-heads, little chisels, borers, weights either square or of pendant form, a large hook, a buckle, a fork, a key on a ring, a finger-ring, a little wheel or disk with pierced openings, a small bell, a shield-shaped pendant, etc. A curious little object about two inches long, shaped like a double-headed axe with small blunt blades, may be a hammer-head. A small paw may have been the foot of a candelabrum. From behind the south end of the west colonnade came a bronze vase or bottle seven inches high, and from the west field a handle of a mirror in the form of a young boy (including the base about three inches high), who lays his left hand on his chest, his right on his hip. None of these objects need be earlier than the Roman period.

(c) Odds and ends, including iron implements, an iron lock, an ivory object resembling a napkin ring, a blue porcelain bead, a crystal pendant, a silver finger-ring, bone pins, dice, a small lead circle with a cross in it, lead weights (one or them as large as a big orange, with a bronze ring to it), a sling-bullet, a glass saucer, a stone hammer-head or pestle, a marble mortar, pieces of several marble basins, an oblong marble plate ribbed like a door scraper, two cubical stones with depressions on each side (possibly drill-heads), etc.

D.—The Daemonostasium.

During the very slight operations on this site two objects were found which deserve notice. The one is part of a dark stone mould on which is incised something resembling a fluted pilaster surmounted by a lotus flower. The other is a small limestone head, about two inches high, of archaic style. The hair is dressed in Egyptian fashion, carried straight across the forehead, behind the ears, and falls in a mass down to the shoulders. The ears are large and high set, the eyes protruding and elongated at the outer corners. Nose and mouth are damaged. A necklace encircles the throat.

D.—The Cistern.

The objects found on this site consist almost entirely of fragments of terracotta or limestone statuettes, and of broken pottery. The site is on an open hill-side unencumbered by the *débris* of buildings, part of the southern slope which runs eastward from the Daemonostasium to the sea and divides the upper city from the harbour quarter. Wherever in the slope over the hollow marked by a dilapidated *cistern* a trench is dug, remnants of pottery, etc., are sure to be turned up, but the part productive of really interesting fragments is confined within very narrow limits; five and twenty paces in the one direction and fifteen in the other would more than cover it. On this small patch a confusion of fragments of all Greek periods was found. No stratification according to age was observable, and the oldest fragments were often nearest the surface. The following classification gives little idea of their number:—

A. Terra-cotta and limestone figurines.

(a) *Crude little hand-shaped human and animal figures.* There are a score or more of little figures, all of them apparently male, and almost all with pointed beards. Most of these figures wear a pointed head-dress, which in the better worked out specimens develops into the regular Cypriote cap with flaps. Many of them are of columnar form with a head and arms. Two or three little round shields indicate that some were warriors (*cf.* Perrot and Chipiez, *Hist. of Art in Phoenicia and Cyprus*, Vol. II. pl. II.), others simply lay their hands on their chests or paunches. Others again were probably charioteers, for terracotta chariot wheels were also found, and many pieces of horses. The better horses are equipped with harness and trappings; the fringes or tassels on the chests of some of them are quite in the Assyrian manner. Horsemen too are not infrequent. Two or three animals seem to be beasts of burden carrying panniers. Others are more like dogs than anything, and several are probably meant for oxen. About the birds there can be no doubt. The figures are often painted, the caps of the men for example and the tassels of the horses are often red, and red and black stripes are a favourite decoration for man and beast alike.

(b) *Archaic and later Animals.*—Animals of better style were not uncommon. Half-a-dozen more or less broken bulls' heads may be mentioned. Most of them are of mask form, between two and three inches high, with holes here and there round the edges for affixment. One has pierced eyes, and another is bored through the nose as though it had been a spout of some sort.

Of genuine archaic style are five or six horses' heads of bony angular type with button-like eyes laid on. Two of them retain a fragment of body and seem to have carried panniers (?). There are other fragments of horses which show muscular modelling and freer style.

Among the birds two or three doves may be recognized, and a headless limestone hawk of conventional style not unlike the Egyptian.

Of later appearance are several dogs, two of them wearing collars. Two bristly fragments may be referred to pig-rattles (*cf.* one from tomb 4). A monkey, and two rude animal-headed men give the transition to humanity.

(c) *Archaic heads.*—A number of heads, from about one to two and a half inches high, were found which exhibit archaic style, neither crude and helpless nor facile and free. Several seem to have belonged to warriors or charioteers in pointed head-dresses. The eyes are usually large, flat, and long, the mouth prominent, and the beard sharply defined. Best of the warriors is a little bearded head, of the type familiar in porcelain and Corinthian pottery, in a helmet with cheek-flaps. The front of the helmet is decorated with an incised device, a winged wheel or circle with a star in it. The eyes are high-set, large, and pointed at both ends. The face has been painted red, the helmet yellow. Two small bearded heads exactly reproduce the type of which so many examples were found on the *Τοῦμπα* site (*c. infra*), one of them indeed seems to have come from the same mould as some of the heads found there. The hair is black and the lips are red. A little limestone head

with short beard and a flat round cap wears hair in the Egyptian style in a heavy mass behind the neck. It is difficult to decide whether some of the beardless heads are male or female. Many of them are extremely ugly, *e.g.* one with high-set almond eyes and a prominent snub nose, another with pierced eyeballs and large high-set ears, or a third of limestone with rimmed eyes, unevenly placed, and on the one side almost level with the forehead, on the other cut deep into the cheek. Certainly feminine is a grotesque head, wearing necklace and ear-pieces, whose great semicircular eyes occupy half of her cheeks. Another resembles the archaic head from the Sand site and many from *Τοῦμπα*.

(*d*) *Female heads of severe Greek style (cf. Agora).*—One constant type includes almost all, a face with regular Greek features and dignified severe expression, or lack of expression, surmounted by a high crown or head-tire, sometimes as high as the whole head. Besides fragments we found forty fairly complete specimens, ranging in height of face from one and a quarter to three and a half inches. The type is no doubt an early one, and was no doubt long retained. The heads are not much touched up after leaving the mould. The back is left plain in all cases. The crown is sometimes plain, but more usually adorned with at least one row of bosses, disks, or rosettes. The upper part is often decorated with crenellations in relief, elaborate palmettes, a row of Sphinxes, or other ornaments. The hair is sometimes gathered to an apex over the centre of the forehead. The back of the head is usually covered by a veil. A lock of hair often falls on each side of the neck. Disk- and -pendant earrings and (apparently) necklaces are regularly worn. There are traces of blue colour on the crown of one of the best examples. The type in all its varieties may be readily paralleled from Cyprus in the first case of the terracotta room at the British Museum.

(*e*) *Heads of developed and freer style, various.*—It is not easy to classify the remaining heads, but two or three groups or specimens may be mentioned. There are several little comic masks and masked heads, some of them of good workmanship and not without character. With them may be noticed a bearded head, not unlike a truculent philosopher, and another of excellent type and execution, carefully modelled and delicately finished. A youthful head wears a high cap and earrings. It is perhaps rather heavy and lifeless than severe in style. Among the female heads is one over which a mantle is carried, similar to many found in the tombs at Polis tes Chrysochon. Others are of very free and graceful style, some of them bearing traces of white overcoat and colour.

(*f*) *The very numerous fragments of figures* are for the most part too small and shattered to be of much interest, but certain main types may be discerned and brought into connection with the leading varieties of heads. Corresponding to the bearded heads of the *Τοῦμπα* type are stiff, flat, heavily draped figures, with the left arm to the side, and the right slung in the upper garment, the edge of which passes from the right knee over the left shoulder, and is sometimes ornamented with a raised or painted border. A series of rude columnar female statuettes, some holding their arms at right

angles to their bodies, others bearing a lyre against the left side, may answer to the cruder female heads. There are, however, also fragments of lyre-players of better type. Without doubt the female heads of the crowned type belong to a set of larger figures of which a great quantity of fragments were found. They seem to have been standing figures holding fruits, flowers, or animals. The scale, the style, the moulding and flat backs, all agree with the heads. Many pieces show red colouring. The drapery, if sometimes a little heavy, is in good Greek style. Bracelets and ornate necklaces are generally worn. The offerings, or whatever be the objects held, are as a rule carried against the breast, but in the case of larger animals under the arm or standing upright against the leg. Of the animals the dove and the young deer are the commonest, but a swan or goose also occurs. The several varieties may be paralleled in the case at the British Museum above mentioned. Of another type, smaller, and mostly of freer style, are the seated female figures. The surface is frequently whitened and painted. Sometimes an object is held on the lap, *e.g.* open tablets, a dog (?), a dove (?). The arms of the chair of one figure are apparently formed by a pair of Sphinxes. Standing 'Mantle-figures' are also common, and exhibit great variety in attitude and drapery. Many are whitened and coloured, and recall in general the Tanagra figurines. One of the best preserved is the lower part of a figure from the elbow downwards, eight inches high, wearing a pinky red *chiton* and a green *himation* with deep red border and lining. The male figures are equally various. There are numerous youthful figures, nude or wearing a *chitonys*, sometimes leaning on a pedestal. One of them rested his arm on a forked staff, and holds a rabbit. Another seems to have been a Moschophoros or Kriophoros. Others ride on horseback. Two little bearded figures are seated on high-backed chairs and wear rams' skins over their shoulders, the horns covering their ears (Ammon?). There are boys playing with birds or dogs, and one (Heracles?) holding a snake in each hand. Pretty is a little goat-legged Satyr carrying an Eros on his shoulder. The flesh of the Satyr has been ruddy, the wings of Eros blue. Other figures are grotesquely ugly, of Dionysiac character or caricatures. There are several *genre* subjects, such as a baker in a sleeveless tunic kneading bread. Finally two small fragments may be mentioned, which probably came from the drapery of large painted terracotta figures, such as were afterwards found in great quantity at Γούμπα.

B. Pottery.

The pottery on this site was very abundant and very miscellaneous in character, but consisted almost entirely of small fragments an inch or two square. It may be roughly classified as follows:—

(a) Plain.

(1) Rough light or red, of various shades, both thick and thin. Occasionally reddish with a light surface. Shapes are seldom distinguishable owing to the smallness of the pieces, but there were lamps of the pinched saucer or 'cocked hat' type, saucers, jugs small and large with pinched lips, minute jugs, pitchers and cups, bell-shaped lids (or strainers) with two small

holes near the knob on the top, double and twisted handles, large flat basins or plates, big-eared diotae, amphorae, etc. The inscribed handles of amphorae read $\Delta I \Sigma K O$ preceded by a combined upright and diagonal cross, $\Delta A M O$, ΔA , and $M I \Delta$.

(2) Fine smooth clay, usually of a light red colour. Platters and fragments, presumably early, a small amphora. Also deep lamps with covered spout, and ordinary Roman lamps. With them may be noticed a fragment of lamp of open form with horizontal rim and a series of spouts, which bears incised with a blunt tool along the rim the fragmentary inscription... $\epsilon \epsilon \chi \eta \nu$ in very late letters, and two small pieces of reddish glazed lamp with... $\lambda \epsilon \omicron \upsilon \varsigma$ in relief, equally late.

(b) Without patterns or glaze, but washed over with simple matt colour. Mostly little red lecythi with a bulge or step in the neck, of the early type found in great plenty at *Τοῦμπα*.

(c) Unpainted vases of animal form, light clay. The only example at all complete is a legless ox standing on knobs. The head forms the spout, and there is an ordinary vase-mouth at the end of the handle, which springs from the back of the neck. Several heads from similar vessels were found, including a ram's. With these may be mentioned a fragment of a vase of the *Poli* type with the pitcher-bearing woman. She is seated and supports the pitcher with her left hand. A rude example, with traces of red colour.

(d) Cypriote painted pottery.

The fragments seem to be from great jars, jugs, flat basins, bowls, etc., of the ordinary kinds. Four varieties may be distinguished, but the first two at least seem to pass into one another by insensible gradations; the surface, for instance, may be white and red in different parts of the same fragment.

- (1) Light reddish clay, light surface, dark and red decoration.
- (2) Light reddish clay, natural surface, dark and red decoration.
- (3) Light yellowish clay, light surface, dark and red decoration.
- (4) Light clay, deep brown-red surface, dark decoration.

Of the fourth variety, which has a very smooth surface, only two fragments were found, adorned with very small concentric circles. For the rest the decoration is, as usual, in bands, concentric circles, hatched squares or lozenges, etc. There are one or two fragments of the small bowls that approximate most closely to the *Dipylon* system of ornament.

With the exception of the vases of animal form, the above-described varieties were commonest on the outskirts of the site, whereas in the centre the terracotta figurines and Greek imported pottery were predominant.

(e) Early Greek painted pottery, mostly of the oriental style as found at *Camirus* and *Naucratis*, *e.g.*

(1) Five fragments from a large bowl with horizontal rim (Fig. 5). Red clay with white engobe. On the rim a black meander. Inside the neck a red painted line between two white. Round the shoulder, close under the neck, a band of black strokes or dashes. Then a large beast, black to red, brilliant crimson neck, white line dividing shoulder and neck, head and foot in outline, no incised lines. In the field in front a rosette.

(2) Two fragments of pinax. White engobe, red decoration. Lotus pattern, buds, groups of strokes and dots, macander.

(3) Fragment of vase. White engobe, reddish brown to black ibex of the usual conventional type, purple horn and shoulder, outlined head, no incised lines.

(4) Fragment of similar vase, with goose and macander, incised lines.

(5) Two fragments of finer ware, creamy white with black to brown decoration. Spotted deer feeding, outlined heads, ornaments in field. Underneath a finely drawn lotus pattern.

(6) Fragment of pinax. Creamy white, with black outlined pattern



FIG. 5.

of leaves (?) with purple centres. Back, natural red, with concentric rings.

(7) Two fragments from a vase. Black, white, and purple godroons, scale pattern black to red, with white dots, incised lines.

(8) Several fragments of vases with yellow ground, natural or artificial, black birds and beasts, rosettes, etc., purple scarcely occurs, incised lines. These fragments resemble the elder Corinthian rather than the more eastern varieties.

(9) Fragment of aryballos, Corinthian type, the black decoration almost entirely gone.

These specimens do not stand alone, but are accompanied by a number of small fragments of similar vessels. Especially common are those with the white ground and patterns characteristic of the oriental style, radiating spikes, straight or curved, guilloches, bands of black dashes, etc., and thin red or purple lines between white on black ground. Other pieces are without the white engobe, but the patterns are closely related. Others affect patterns of wavy lines or 'arcading.' One curious little bit stands by itself; on the grey natural ground is roughly but freely drawn a flower and trefoil leaf on a stalk.

(f) Numerous fragments of small bowls or cups of the shapes and decoration of those figured in *Naukratis* I., plate X. The rims often ornamented with groups of vertical strokes and rosettes of dots.

(g) Black-figured vessels.

(1) Broken cylix, stemless, with horizontal rim decorated with black dots, round the foot radiating strokes. Band of Sirens and winged Sphinxes,




FIG. 6.

very rudely drawn. Purple touches, incised lines freely used, rosettes in the field. Poor black glaze often passing into red.

(2) Small fragment of 'Kleinmeister' cylix (Fig. 6). Female head. Below the rim ΣΤ. The fragment is exactly similar to the cylix in the British Museum, figured in the *Annali* 1857, tav. A., which bears the inscription Στροϊβος καλός. There can be no doubt that the ΣΤ on our fragment are the first letters of the same words, and that the two vases are by the same artist. The black-figured cylix in Gerhard, *Auscrl. Vas.* III., 190, 191, 3. 4. bears the same inscription, and from its similarity to the Glaukytes cylices in Munich and the British Museum (Gerhard, *ibid.* 235, 236, *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, 1889, taf. II.) has been ascribed to Glaukytes. The other British Museum cylix and the new fragment from Salamis may therefore also be ascribed to that same artist.

(3) Fragment of similar cylix, with two beasts face to face.

(4) Fragment of similar cylix, with an inscription of ten letters, out of which nothing intelligible can be made.

(5) Fragment of stem and centre of a cylix with inner picture. A nude male figure holding a spear, and the arms of another figure facing him and holding a wreath. Minutely painted.

(6) Small fragment of a vase, with remnants of a winged Sphinx (?). Masterly work.

(7) Small fragment, doubtless from an early black-figured cup. Fine black glaze, broad yellow band covered with vertical black strokes, red lines above and beneath.

(8) Bottom of a large thick vessel, doubtless a fine black-figured vase. Black 'spear-head' pattern radiating from base.

Also numerous fragments of black-figure technique, but no special significance, mostly from cylices of the 'Kleinmeister' type.

(h) Red-figured vases.

(1) The most interesting of the fragments is a small piece from the neck of a large crater with a maeander pattern on the outside of the rim, and close under it a band of figures in the best style of the great masters. A battle scene is represented. A warrior in a crested helmet, with raised cheek-pieces, a short *chiton* with scalloped edge, and cuirass with lappets, bends forward to thrust with his spear, which he holds horizontal at the level of his hip. His back is turned to the spectator, his left leg is advanced, his right arm is drawn back to thrust, and his left thrown forward with his round shield, of which only a small part is preserved. Behind appear the shield and spear of another warrior. There is a small round hole above this shield, so the vase was probably mended in antiquity. The execution is admirable and full of freshness, but there are little omissions, *e.g.* the glaze is not carried in under the chin as far as the neck, and does not *quite* touch the upper line of the right arm, while the line of the thigh is not terminated quite at the edge of the *chiton*.

(2) A score of fragments from similar vases, but mostly, so far as can be made out, of much later style. These craters have usually an olive-leaf border round the mouth. The colour of the ground is, in the better fragments, very light. Only here and there can figures be recognized. On one fragment is part of a couch, on which a draped figure reclines; a white pair of legs floating in front indicates the presence of Eros. Several pieces have fragments of horses' heads, etc., from chariot scenes.

(3) Fragment of vase with a corner of drapery, well executed.

(4) Bottom part of a cup, with the feet of two figures, and a palmette. Rough, careless work.

With these red-figured vases may go a fragmentary lamp and a little pot with spout and side-handle of the same technique.

(i) Black-glazed ware without figures, either plain, or bearing little impressed patterns.

Very numerous fragments of vessels of all sorts, but especially saucers and stemless cups. Many bear scratched inscriptions in the Greek or native script. Most of these are merely monograms or the first syllables of names (*e.g.* Τιμ or Ο · να · σα · το ?), but Διδ]ς σωτηρος on the waist of a black cup

is important, as bearing on the question of the origin of the accumulation of fragments on this site, to which the most plausible answer is that it represents the refuse heap of a temple.

Some few fragments bore white painted wreaths and twigs.

C. Miscellaneous objects.

(1) A much-battered fragment of a small limestone lion, like that which stands before the house of Stavris, in the village of Enomi. (*c.* Hogarth, *Dacia Cypria*, p. 62.)

(2) Torso of a little marble statuette, fruit and flowers round the waist. Perhaps Harpocrates. Late work.

(3) A terracotta handle with a rude relief of two figures, identical in design with another found at *Τοῦμπα* (*c.* p. 165).

(4) A little leaden frying-pan, two inches in diameter, with fishes in relief.

(5) A little leaden spoked wheel with raised patterns.

(6) A porcelain 'sacred eye,' two inches long.

(7) Several little limestone statuette-bases or shrine altars of various shapes.

(8) A number of weights, whorls, etc., of stone and terracotta. Also a quantity of little terracotta disks with holes for suspension.

(9) Odds and ends. A glass bottle, alabastra, little objects of bone, bronze, lead, etc. One or two stones with a flat and a convex side (*c.* *J. H. S.* IX., p. 154).

D. A dozen bronze coins, apparently of late date.

Some fragments of wall-plaster, with imitation marbling in black and yellow, may be mentioned just to show that ancient art can be as vulgar as modern.

E.—The Campanopetra.

A little probing work was done on the ruin known as the Campanopetra,¹ which lies just above the Cistern site, and is distinguished by a great standing block of stone. The few objects found were of little interest—Cypriote pottery of the usual kind, but also some few fragments of the 'Geometric' cups. One curious fragment has a raised eye painted black on light ground.² Black-glazed ware, plain and stamped. Several fragments of limestone statuettes, including a small piece of head, with hair very much after the Pergamene manner. A pyramidal terracotta wedge. Six bronze coins.

F.—The Building on the Highest Point in Salamis.

The finds here were not of much importance, but ranged from the latest period to a very early date. A few may be mentioned.

¹ Or Campanopissa, both forms of the name are used.

² Cf. the Naueratite 'eye-bowls.'

(1) A marble portrait head of a bearded man. Life size, style of the Roman imperial period. Realistic work, truculent expression.

(2) Four fragments of a marble statuette. A familiar type of Aphrodite, standing, with draped legs. Ordinary work of the Roman period.

(3) Some interesting fragments of pottery, including—

An excellent specimen of a Cypriote 'Geometric' cup, the decoration chiefly in deep red on the white surface of the clay.

Several fragments of Cypriote ware with lotus and guilloche patterns worked into geometric decoration.

A fragment from the rim of a cup with a red-centred rosette left light in a dark metope field. (cf. fragments from the tombs.)

A fragment from an early Greek vase of the 'oriental' style, with lotus pattern and reversed palmettes in black on the smooth red ground; also purple lines on black.

Some excellent black-glazed fragments.

(4) Terracotta fragments of statuettes. Mostly of free style, from 'mantle-figures,' with white paint and blue or pink colour. Also a pretty little child's head, a couple of crude beasts, and a piece of a small bearded mask, the beard of which is black and executed in precisely the same manner as those of the *Τούμπα* terracotta statues.

VIII. *Τούμπα*.

The antiquities discovered close under the western rocky face of the rise between the two rivers are the most interesting of all the finds at Salamis. The terracotta statues especially are not only in themselves important, but still more for the light they seem to throw on the relation of Greek vase painting to oriental embroidery, and the history of the latter art at Salamis. The numerous little porcelain figures and scarabs, which formed a considerable item in the total of finds, are also of interest from their very close affinity to the similar objects found at Naukratis and Camirus. The site thus makes no small contribution to the study of the early art and culture of those important regions where the rising genius of Greece first came into familiar contact with the older civilizations of the East. Considering the extreme smallness of the productive patch of ground, the find was abundant, but admits of classification under a few well-defined headings. The objects lay thickly strewn close over the sloping surface of the rock which they followed down to a considerable depth. It must be noted that the female statuettes were scarce in the main trench, from which came almost all the other figures and small objects, but fairly plentiful further to the south in trenches near the south-west corner of the hillock, where conversely scarcely anything else was to be found.

A.—Terracotta figures.

(1) Bearded type of draped figures carrying flowers.

An extraordinary number of fragments of figures of this type were found, but few of them can be fitted even one to another. There is great

difference in the size; three leading scales may be distinguished—statuettes from 9 to 15 inches high, middle size figures about 2 feet high, and statues of the size of life or above it. Some of the last must have been very large, for there are fragments which, if the scale was strictly adhered to, would give figures at least fifteen feet in height. From their extremely fragmentary condition the description of the large statues must be mostly a matter of reconstructive imagination, but the reconstruction is certain: for, firstly, the material is very abundant; secondly, the small figures accurately reproduce the type; thirdly, precisely similar terracotta statues, not to speak of limestone, have been found before, for example in Colonel Warren's excavations at Tamassus; and lastly, the type is one of the commonest on the Assyrian and Persian reliefs.

Of the small statuettes about sixty specimens were found, several of which are fairly complete. But the best general idea of the type may be derived from the example of the middle size, which is reproduced on Plate IX. The figure is stiff and flat, and the total lack of form is more noticeable than in the smaller statuettes. The dress consists of a long under garment, which extends from the neck down to the feet, and an upper garment, which covers the right side of the body, and passes from above the knee (or rather the place where the knee ought to be) up over the left shoulder. Round the neck and bottom of the lower vestment, and down the left side, runs a broad red band. A similar band follows the edge of the upper garment, which is further adorned with a fringe of flat tags, slightly raised, and painted alternately red and black. The feet are lacking, but must have projected on each side of the strange triangle with which the figure is terminated. It is hard to explain this triangle as anything but a mere support to the ankles. It recurs, however, on some of the small statuettes. The right arm is slung across the chest in the upper garment, the left depended by the side, and was hung under the hollow shoulder on a pin, the hole for which is visible on the outside. Many such movable arms were found. On the analogy of other examples, both large and small, the right hand simply rested on the breast, the left carried an open flower. Sometimes the flower is moulded with the hand, only the head showing between the thumb and forefinger of the clenched fist; more often a hole is left for its insertion, and several painted flowers were found, of mushroom shape, and evidently intended to be so inserted. The tag or lappet on the left shoulder is a feature which appears on both large and small figures. But the most interesting part of the figure is, of course, the head. It is crowned by a broad band of diadem, which reaches as high as the top in front, and shows only a narrow fringe of hair over the forehead. The hair on the top is punched all over with a small horse-shoe stamp to represent close curly locks, but descends in a heavy mass half way down the neck behind. The beard, on the other hand, is treated in the Assyrian fashion in three tiers, and is vertically divided into locks, which are 'feathered' by diagonal strokes. Eyebrows and moustache are similarly feathered. All the hair is black, and a black border round the eyes represents the lashes. The eyes are large and almost semi-circular in

shape, with staring black pupils. The nose has no special prominence, and is far from the Semitic type. The ears are big and clumsy. They are adorned with earrings of a double twist of spiral, painted yellow. No doubt the gold or gold-plated spirals so often found in Cypriote and other tombs are just such earrings. The rather prominent lips are painted red. The whole impression of the figure, although naturally far from handsome, is not without a certain stiff grotesque dignity.

This figure is typical, but there are a good many small variations on the type. From the statuettes there is indeed little to add. They fall into groups according to the various moulds from which they were turned out. Some are painted, some plain. The flat under-robe of one variety is broken by two raised lines converging from the hips towards the feet; on another the lines diverge towards the lower corners of the drapery. The borders of the cloak are often fringed with zigzag indentations. The beards are long or short, round or pointed, and in one set are divided into four pig-tails. More interesting are the fresh features displayed by the large statues. Many of the fragments may belong to figures with shorter drapery, a jerkin or tunic reaching to the middle of the thighs or to the knees. Such figures were found at Tamassus, and are frequent on the reliefs, and the smaller figures of the next type favour the supposition that something of the kind existed among the larger. Moreover, some of the fragments of legs show that the drapery was not always carried right down to the feet, and the ornamental swallow-tails and tassels in some instances point in the same direction, for they seem to hang below the drapery against the flesh. But as it is impossible to say in most cases which fragments come from long-robed, which from jerkin figures, and the difference between the types does not seem on the large statues to extend farther, all are here described together.

All the large statues apparently were painted. The features reproduce in the main those of the example described. There are, however, two main differences in the heads (cf. Figs. 7, 8). The first is in the treatment of the hair and beard. The hair is sometimes stamped with circular, sometimes with horse-shoe marks; occasionally it is rendered by sweeping incised lines, as though combed. The back hair is now divided in tiers, now in a single ridge. In one or two instances there seems to have been a bristly wave or roll of hair over the forehead. The beards are long or short and close, full and broad or comparatively narrow, stepped in tiers or plain. The vertical ribs are now close and fine, now broad and large, and the ends may or may not be curled. The short close-cut beards, which are in a small minority, are sometimes treated in combed lines, sometimes also simply roughened with incised dashes. Feathering is usual, but by no means universal. The second point of variety is the head-dress. Some heads seem to have had none, those, for example, with the wave of hair above the forehead. Others, we must suppose, wore the broad diadem. But far the commonest head-dress is the familiar high cap, with a point hanging down behind, and check-flaps (*παραγαθίδες*, Strabo 733), like those of the modern 'deer-

stalker,' which are usually raised but sometimes on smaller figures let down on each side of the face. This cap is of the ordinary white surface colour of



FIG. 7.



FIG. 8.

the clay. It is stamped all over with circular punch marks, which, on the analogy of the hair stamps, I take to be a mode of representing wool. The

caps will therefore be of a kind parallel to the Astrachan caps still worn in upper Asia. The pointed end hangs between two red tasselled cords, which doubtless served to tie up the flaps.

Minor details to be noticed on the large figures are the earrings, which were often apparently of metal, or at least separately inserted, the spiral armlets and bracelets in the form of snakes, and the sandals with painted heel-piece and strings. Handles of dummy swords or daggers were frequently found. The blades were separate and inserted into, or fixed on to, the semi-circular end of the hilts, which is realistically studded with sham nail heads. For these daggers we may once more compare the Assyrian reliefs. They are, in fact, *ἀκινάκαι*.

But the most interesting point of all is the decoration of the drapery, which is brilliantly painted to represent oriental embroidery. The ground-work is usually a scale pattern of strong purple-red colour, each scale having an edge of the natural colour of the clay enclosed between a double black line. This field is divided into panels by borders, of which the commonest is the interlacing star, or rather open flower, border.⁸ A series of open flowers of six petals (the middle petals on each side shared with the adjoining flowers) is left of the light surface colour of the clay in a black or dark ground. The flowers have, in many instances, red centres. A simpler border is a dark band with light lines. Others are rather to be taken as edgings to the garments than field borders. Of these the most effective is the lotus pattern, left light in a red ground and outlined with black. Other patterns are the guilloche, the herring-bone, the red triangle with incised hatchings in a square black panel, the rosette, &c. Very common are plastically indicated fringes, with two or three red tails alternating with two or three black. Double indented frills are also frequent, in which each tooth is half red, half black. The raised bands, usually red with black edges, which often occur, seem to be shoulder-belts, no doubt to carry the daggers. The garments seem often to have had pendant tails adorned with fringes and tassels, such as we see on the Assyrian reliefs.

Extremely important is a series of fragments on which figures of men, animals, and winged monsters are worked into the scale pattern of the panels. Most of these are represented on Plates X., which renders minute description unnecessary. There are two lions—one looking back over his shoulder, the other fixing his jaws in a stag—a warrior with drawn sword, and a monstrous figure, Sphinx or man-headed beast, facing a similar creature, with a palm-tree between them. The composition seems to have been on the metope system, as the division into panels determined.

The scale pattern was in several instances replaced by chequers of red and light colour divided by black lines. Plain fields of unpainted drapery without the scale pattern and panels were rarely found among the fragments of full-size figures. Less infrequent were fragments on which a plain red field adjoined a plain black one, divided only by a narrow meandering bor-

⁸ Common in Assyrian work.

der of red with light edges, cut into sections by little light spaces on which are three black strokes. These fragments suggest a jerkin with lappets over a tunic, and possibly point to figures like those classed under the second type.

The backs of the figures seem to have been left unpainted, which indicates that they were intended to stand against a wall or back-ground. Some of the fragments bear symbols incised in the clay while soft.



and

H

occur, the second of which may be read as Cypriote *pa*; possibly the first syllable of *βασιλεύς*, as on the coins.

After the description which has been given of them it is scarcely necessary to point out that these terracotta statues are inspired by the art of Assyria. The type of figure, the attitude, the arms, the flowers carried in the hands, the dress and its decoration, down to the details of the embroidered patterns, all so strongly recall that art that one is at first sight tempted to imagine that the figures have simply walked out of an Assyrian relief. There can, however, be no doubt that they were fashioned, close by where they were found, out of the river clay, which still supplies excellent material to the potters of Varosia. It has already been mentioned that similar terracotta statues, but apparently without the painted draperies, were discovered some years ago in Colonel Warren's excavations near Tamassus. One fairly complete specimen and fragments of many more may be seen at the Commissioner's office in Nicosia. Both the Salamis and the Tamassus figures display the same oriental fashion in dress, but the likeness to Assyrian work is only in externals; the features are very far from Semitic, although equally far from the Greek ideal—are in fact thoroughly Cypriote. The pointed cap with flaps, the so-called *κίδαρις*, whatever its origin, seems to have become the national Cypriote head-dress at a very remote period. There is, I think, no reason to doubt that these figures represent native Cypriotes at a period when dress and manners derived ultimately from Assyria, spreading perhaps from the upper grades of society, had become general among them.

In this connection it is interesting to notice the curious scale pattern. That the ground is really meant to be a textile stuff seems clear from the colours, borders, fringes, and patterns woven into it. But the scale pattern can hardly be derived from anything else than scale armour. It would certainly seem more natural to us that the scales should point downwards instead of upwards, but the upward direction is proved by the monuments to have been the ordinary arrangement in the East. The pattern may have originated from, or even be intended to express, a corselet of mail worn under an embroidered

tunic, both of which are mingled in this conventional combination. Now if, as is probable, Herodotus is at least partly indebted to the picture dedicated by Mandrocles in the Heraeum at Samos for his description of the equipment of the various contingents in Xerxes' army, it is not impossible that there is no lacuna in the sentence (Bk. vii. ch. 61) wherein he describes the body armour of the Persians, *περὶ δὲ τὸ σῶμα κιθῶνας χειριδωτοὺς ποικίλους λεπίδος σιδηρέης ὄψιν ἔχθουσιδέος*, but tunic and corselet were combined in the picture, as they are on the Salaminian figures. Where on the other hand Herodotus is drawing on no monumental source but on oral or written tradition, he expressly distinguishes the scale armour and tunic of Masistius (ix. 22), *ἐντὸς θώρηκα εἶχε χρύσειον λεπιδωτόν, κατύπερθε δὲ τοῦ θώρηκος κιθῶνα φοινίκεον ἐνεδεδύκει*. Both of these passages from Herodotus very strongly suggest the dress of the terracotta statues, and raise the question whether the latter do not represent the Persian period of Assyrian art, and were produced in the last quarter of the sixth century, after Cyprus fell under the dominion of Cambyses. Several considerations may be adduced in support of this view. It might be doubted whether an Assyrian influence so immediate and direct as appears on our figures could have made itself felt in Cyprus at an earlier date. The scaly armour and purple tunic seem to have been regarded by the Greeks as a special characteristic of the Persian and Median dress. Beside the passages from Herodotus may be placed for instance Xenophon, *Cyropædia* VII. i. 2, and Strabo 734. From Strabo 733 (*οἱ Μάγοι*) *τιᾶρας περικείμενοι πιλωτὰς καθεικίας ἐκατέρωθεν μέχρι τοῦ καλύπτειν τὰ χεῖλη τὰς παραγναθίδας*, compared with the words on the following page *τιᾶραι παραπλήσιαι ταῖς τῶν Μάγων*, we may suppose the caps of the Salaminian figures correspond pretty closely with those commonly ascribed to the Persians. The leathern breeches were a garment characteristic of the Persians rather before than after they adopted the dress of the Medes, retained as a military rather than civil dress, and neither these nor their sleeves were likely to be adopted in Cyprus. The *χλανίδιον* of the figures would be quite in keeping. There is another passage from a Greek author which even more strongly recalls the terracotta statues, and at the same time connects them with the Persians. Polyænus (vii. 6, 10), in describing the stratagem whereby Cyrus captured Sardis, says that he set upon long poles *εἶδωλα πώγωνας ἔχοντα καὶ Περσικὴν ἐσθήτα, καὶ φαρέτραν κατὰ νότον, καὶ τόξα μετὰ χεῖρας*. The words *εἶδωλα πώγωνας ἔχοντα καὶ Περσικὴν ἐσθήτα* might be a summary description of the Salaminian figures. The story comes from Ctesias. Neither Polyænus nor Theon (*Progymn.* 11) mention the material of the images. The Epitome of Photius¹ and Tzetzes² call them wooden, but it is not unlikely that the wood of the poles has been extended to the figures upon them. The story is inconsistent with the account of the fall of Sardis given by Herodotus: is it possible that the existence near Sardis of statues like those found at Τούμπα may have given rise to it?

The first and third of the symbols quoted above from the backs of the

¹ *Cod.* LXXII., p. 173. B. ed. Migne.

² *Chil.* I., 89 91.

figures may be read as the Greek σ and η , and held to support the comparatively late date assigned on this theory to the figures.

Nevertheless I would rather place them about a century earlier. The other objects found with the statues, and presently to be described, if not absolutely impossible in Cyprus at the close of the sixth century, are certainly rather to be referred to the seventh or at least the earlier half of the sixth. Scale armour is seen on the Assyrian monuments no less than on the Persian, and Layard found a quantity of bronze scales with helmets and other armour in one of the palaces at Nineveh. The figures have even more affinity to the Assyrian reliefs than to the Persian. Persian civilization stands to Assyrian in much the same relation as Roman to Greek, neither in art nor in literature can the two always be kept distinct. We need not be surprised if Greek writers, who knew little of the relation between them, used the word 'Persian' in too wide a sense, much as they probably used 'Phoenician' in early days. Apart from the scales, our figures recall Herodotus' description of the Assyrian costume (i. 195) as much as the passages noticed above. As to influences on the island there is no reason to suppose that the connection with Persia was at all closer than had been the connection with Assyria nearly two centuries before, for there was no Persian 'occupation' or resident satrap. The Cypriote kings paid homage and tribute to Sargon in B.C. 710,¹ and a statue of Sargon now in the Berlin Museum was found in Cyprus. Their relation to the Assyrian monarchs remained unchanged under Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal. Without drawing, as we might, on the too often invoked intermediation of the Phoenicians, or assuming, what is yet possible, that the Cypriotes passed under Assyrian influence, in or out of Cyprus, before the time of Sargon, it is quite likely that Assyrian dress and manners had made sufficient progress in the island by the middle of the seventh century for the dedication of such figures as those found at *Τοῦμπα*, not only by princes and court dignitaries, but also by the humbler dedicators of the statuettes. Other considerations tending to the same conclusion may be drawn from points to be noticed hereafter. We may, I think, here date the *Τοῦμπα* finds with some confidence between 650 and 550 B.C.

But whatever their date the chief interest of the figures for us remains the same. The painted draperies doubtless represent with vividness and accuracy the famous oriental woven stuffs familiar in literature as Babylonian embroideries.² For this reason alone they would be an important discovery, especially when we remember in connection with their provenance that Cyprus became famous for its textile fabrics, and that Akesas and Helicon of Salamis, the acknowledged masters of the art, whose works were numbered

¹ So Winckler, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons*, p. xl., rather than 709 or 708.

² Mr. A. S. Murray suggests to me that the *ἑσθήτος Βαβυλωνίας τελαμῶνες*, which together with the votive hair of women almost concealed from view the statue of Hygieia seen by Pau-

sanius at Titane (Paus. H. xi. 6), may be explained by the fringes of the draperies. The fringes would certainly be analogous to the hair, but I can suggest no parallel to the use of *τελαμῶνες* to describe them. The word would rather point to some sort of head-band.

among the treasures of Delphi and held a worthy gift from the Rhodian state to Alexander the Great, were reputed to have woven the first *purples* for Athena Polias. However much or little truth there may be in the story, it is interesting to compare for instance the embroidered border on the robe of the Dresden Athena with the panels on the terracotta draperies and the border pattern of triangles with incised hatchings which takes the form of a series of vertically arranged squares.¹³ The figured drapery on *e.g.* the François and Sophilos vases also suggests itself. The main point to be noted, however, is that we have here some indication of the influences under which, or even materials out of which, that craft was developed whereby alone Cyprus can claim to have contributed to the arts of Greece at the time of their highest perfection. The *παραπέτασμα τὸ Κύπριον τὸ ποικίλον* mentioned by Aristophanes may have retained some reflection of the colours and patterns here portrayed. It is also worth while to note that it was Cyprus, the easternmost of Greek settlements, with a population largely infused with eastern elements, that was prominent in this art of weaving in colours in which it is the inmemorial privilege of the oriental peoples to excel.

But there is a still more interesting point about these draperies which must claim our attention. The influence of oriental embroidery on early Greek vase-painting has long been recognized. The painted draperies of our figures suggest at once the vesture of the Assyrian kings as we see it carved on the reliefs of Nineveh, or the raiment of the archers of the Guard emblazoned on the frieze of tiles from Susa, and the patterns and animals that decorate the vases of Naucratis, Camirus, and Corinth. The lotus patterns, rosettes, guilloches, scales, the animals and winged monsters, are common to both. The warrior with the drawn sword is also interesting as showing that the introduction of scenes with human figures in action may not have been an original invention of the Greek genius, but have had parallels in the oriental prototypes, unless indeed it be maintained that the Cypriote painter has improved upon his model.¹⁴ But our fragments do not merely illustrate this connection, they also explain it. In truth we seem to catch in them the missing link in the history of the development, to witness the very process of transition from textile to fictile. They were painted in direct and realistic imitation of the oriental vestments actually worn by the living models. They were painted in a Greek city and on terracotta. What could be more natural than that the potter, who had once learnt to paint these designs in literal realism on the figures, should repeat them as decorative ornament on his vases? And the white ground, the purple, and the black, are they not just the colours that he seeks to reproduce on his pottery?

Many other interesting questions here suggest themselves. We may

¹³ The border of squares with figures in them is of course common enough on the monuments.

¹⁴ The arrangement of animal figures, &c., in bands as a border pattern is not found among

our fragments, but is well known on the monuments, *e.g.* the throne canopy at Persepolis. Rawlinson, *Ac. Mon.* iv. p. 169.

ask whether, if these draperies supply a true link in the history of vase-painting, the important transition may not first have taken place in Cyprus, or if not in Cyprus where else? Was the practice of setting up such figures wide-spread on the eastern coasts of the Mediterranean? Where did it originate? Was it the invention of a community of potters, which grew up by the gradual enlargement of statuettes, and was fostered by the realistic desire to colour them, a desire which led to the preference of clay to stone, or was it a practice native to lands like Mesopotamia where stone is scarcely to be had, and is replaced for most purposes by clay? Are these figures an attempt to imitate in the round the gorgeous enamelled brick friezes of the east, or the resource of the Cypriote artist to whom the marble dear to his pictorially-minded Ionian brethren was denied by nature? Our statues do indeed bear not only on the history of painting, but also on that of sculpture, for the discovery of terracotta works on so large a scale may well stimulate closer inquiry than has hitherto been made into the influence of work in clay on the origin, development, and style of sculpture in stone. Sculpture in stone—but do not these great hollow moulded figures also suggest that the craft of the potter may have been no less influential in the development of the art of casting in bronze?

Into these and similar questions the limits of time and space forbid us to enter here, but what has been said will at least justify our having dwelt at such length on these most interesting figures, to which we may return on a future occasion. Let us now pass on to the other types.

(2) Male figures carrying kids.

This type is usual among the middle-size figures, there is no clear evidence of its occurring among the large statues, and there is only one instance of a rather smaller statuette, which is also exceptional in being long-robed, with the regular cloak and flower. The typical garb is a short tunic, over which is a short-sleeved jerkin or jacket. Another garment worn underneath both is sometimes visible in front, hanging in horse-shoe folds before the thighs. Pendant swallow-tails and tassels to one side are also common, and lappets with macaendering border, like those already described. Both tunic and jerkin are generally painted in red and black, but unpainted examples occur, and some few with elaborate patterns similar to those of the large figures.

In most cases the right hand carries the kid against the breast, either supported on the palm or resting on the forearm and grasped by the forelegs, but sometimes both hands are employed, the one holding the fore and the other the hind pair of legs. The kid is usually painted black. When only the right hand is used the left hangs by the side and holds an open flower. Movable arms seem frequent.

Not one head was found which can be fitted to any of the bodies, but there can be little doubt that most of the heads of medium size belong to this type. The only head of this size that is bearded is that of the figure on Pl. IX., already described; all the rest are beardless and of youthful appearance (cf. Fig. 9). We may presume, therefore, that the type is beardless

at least in the great majority of cases. The heads are painted in the same way as the bearded heads, and the details, treatment of hair, yellow earrings, &c., are much the same. The head-dress, where any is worn, seems always to be the usual cap with flaps. One of the most complete




FIG. 9.



FIG. 10.

of the heads (Fig. 10) wears the flaps let down. The cap is in this case without the ordinary punch-marks, and painted with dark horizontal bands on the white surface of the red clay. The face is long and narrow, the eyes are large out of all proportion, and their upper lids level with the forehead.

the eyebrows being raised instead of the eyes depressed. As is not uncommon on Cypriote heads the one eye is much higher in the face than the other.

One detail which first appears on these smaller figures is interesting. On the breast of a little torso depends from a linked chain a disproportionately large scarab in a swivel setting, the whole of course imitated in clay. Remains of similar appendages appear on one or two other torsos of the middle size. It is, I imagine, not improbable that the numerous scarabs found with the figures on this and other Cypriote temple sites were actually hung round their necks. The earrings, as we have already seen, were sometimes separate and inserted, probably therefore actual earrings of metal. The little round disks with a central boss, which occasionally occur on the breasts of these figures, may also represent metal prototypes. Herodotus (i. 195), in describing the dress of the Assyrians, says, *σφρηγίδα δὲ ἕκαστος ἔχει*. By *σφρηγίδα* we naturally in this connection understand a Babylonian cylinder. The *Τούμπα* figures wear Egyptian scarabs. The point illustrates at once the dependence of the Salaminians on Assyrian fashions and their independence of them. It supports the view already taken of the date of the finds, and the opinion expressed below as to the Egyptian influence beginning to make itself felt at that date.

The type as above described is fairly constant. Now and then it is the *left* hand that holds the animal, and the latter seems once to be not a kid or goat but a ram, and once again to be a deer. The sandals are a regular accompaniment of the type, and the left foot seems always to be slightly advanced.

(3) Miscellaneous male figures and fragments.

Many of these may be connected with the types already described, but a few which present interesting variations may be noticed. There is one curious figure in long drapery and red pointed cap. He is of the smallest size and ridiculously slender proportions. His face is of a broad ugly type. Behind his neck is a rough projection, perhaps to hold him by during manufacture or painting. A broken piece of object on the right hip is explained by a black hoof beside his foot. He stood holding a kid upright beside him with both hands.

Several little bearded heads were not simply moulded with the bodies, but are furnished with stalks for insertion. Another in a plain red cap with flaps is noteworthy for its style, which is better and more naturalistic than that of the rest, indeed this little head might pass for a work of genuine archaic Greek style.

Extraordinarily ugly on the other hand is a grotesque head possibly meant for a caricature. He wears a pointed cap of dark colour very much at the back of his head. There is no forehead, the raised eyebrows occupying its place, but the line of the head retreats in one plane from the tip-tilted nose to the point of the cap. The eyes are lifted, showing the whites, and the ears are simply rough plaques stuck on to the head. Another grotesque little head is of almost negro type.

A fragment moulded in relief with the legs of a little nude male figure in the developed style of Greek art is surely a stray piece. It is quite without parallel from this site.

(4) Female figures.

Corresponding in quantity and in size to the smallest bearded figures are the female statuettes. They were found mostly in trenches in the southern portion of the site and away from the wall of rock. Like the male figures they are stiff, upright, and flat. Several specimens from the same mould are not uncommon. They have as a rule a somewhat ruder appearance than the male figures, and are less distinct in detail, probably from lack of finishing touches after moulding.

There are three main types—

(a) Both hands to the sides.

(b) The left hand to the side, the right on the left breast.

(c) One hand to the side, the other (more often the right than the left) holding a disk, or possibly in some instances a wreath or chaplet, under the breast. The disks are possibly meant for tambourines.

The figures may at first sight be divided into nude and draped. It is, however, difficult to say whether all are not really meant to be draped, for some apparently nude figures seem to wear a clinging garment visible only at the corners near the feet where it detaches itself from the limbs. On the other hand it may be maintained that this supposed drapery is due merely to careless moulding and lack of finish, the clay squeezed out at the edges not being pared away. But at least in a qualified sense we may say that the statuettes of the first type with two exceptions, the one a very small figure, the other of rather exceptional style, are nude; those of the second type are all nude, whereas most of the third are draped. The drapery seems to consist of a sleeved jacket over a long tunic. Necklaces of pendants are usually worn, and a disk with a central boss, hanging between the breasts. Earrings are general, and the pendant tassels over the ears not uncommon. Most of the heads seem to be bare, the hair gathered back from the face and falling behind the ears down the neck. One or two, however, wear a round diadem either plain or adorned with bosses or rosettes. Such statuettes are very common on all old Cypriote sites, and may easily be paralleled from Rhodes, Naucratis, and elsewhere. It is unnecessary to mention particularly any but a few exceptional figures and heads.

One of these is the draped statuette already mentioned. There is a vertical ridge of drapery in front between the legs, and the hair falls in a mass on each shoulder, imparting a peculiarly Egyptian air to the figure. Several heads with flat crowns, massive hair, and ear-tassels show approximation to the same type, and recall the head found near the N.W. corner of the Sand site. Two or three heads of a broad large type, but probably feminine, wear the hair in a sort of turban fashion over the forehead, unless it be not hair but a form of head-dress. There are similar examples from Camirus in the British Museum. A head with a round hole through the top may perhaps have formed the neck of a vase. One figure of the first type is

unique in being moulded on an upright background pierced above the head with a hole for suspension on a nail against a wall. Another, of the third type, holds not a disk but a long object at her breast. Two fragments, a head and a piece of arm with part of the torso below it, show a more nearly Greek style. The latter might well belong to one of the larger female figures found on the Cistern site. The head, although far from beautiful in features or pleasing in expression, exhibits a feeling for form and attempt at modelling, which in spite of stiffness and heaviness is far above the average.

(5) Animals.

The most interesting are the bulls with a row of lamps along their backs. Of these the most complete example is represented in Fig. 11. He measures $10\frac{1}{2}$ inches from the nose to the root of the tail. Between his horns is a four-cornered lamp of the 'cocked-hat' type, and there are vestiges of three more down his back. The style is rude and simple, and the




FIG. 11.

grotesque little figure reminds one of a young puppy. An interesting detail is the rough column of clay left, as though to support him, between his legs. It is quite superfluous to a terracotta figure of this size, and can scarcely be other than a survival from a large sculptured prototype. Other specimens of these bulls were painted black. A bull's head mask was also found, for which we may compare the bull masks from the Cistern patch.

Horses form the bulk of the animals. Most of them bear traces of a yoke behind the neck, and are therefore chariot-horses. With them may be connected the spoked chariot-wheels occasionally met with. Many are adorned with trappings, tiers of tassels or fringes in front of the neck and chest (*προστερυΐδια*), quite after the manner of the Assyrian chariot-horses, and sometimes side-fringes (*παραπλευρΐδια*). The tails were often separate and inserted. Chariot-groups of terracotta are stock products of the older Cypriote shrines, *e.g.* Dali and Tamassus. The Cypriote war-chariots were famous from a very remote date, for the great inscription of Thothmes III. at

Karnak, describing the defeat of 'the miserable king of Kadesh' at Megiddo, mentions the 'gold and silver chariots, which had been made in the land of Asebi' (Brugsch, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, vol. i., p. 372). Their use in war was retained in Cyprus long after it was relinquished in other parts of the Greek world, as we see from Herodotus' description of the defeat of Onesilus. The great plain of the Mesaorea must have favoured their retention.

Connected with the horses is a Centaur of the archaic type—a complete man, with the hind part of a horse tacked on to his back. There may also be mentioned a stag with tassels down his neck, who was evidently intended to run on wheels, for the plinth is bored with horizontal axle-sockets. There are also the head of a sporting hound with a red collar, fragments of a lion, and a curious bristly torso, perhaps meant for an ape's.

(6) Crude figurines, men and animals.

These are of the usual types, and need not be dwelt upon after what has been said of the similar figures from the Cistern site. There are horsemen and horses; there are columnar little figures holding their arms before them (charioteers?), or laying them on their chests or paunches, or bearing a round shield; and there are bearded heads in pointed caps. We may also mention a crude reclining figure, perhaps meant for a nude woman, a couple of sharp-nosed dogs, a pair of apes (?), one of them holding a fruit to his lips and laying his hand approvingly on his belly, and two birds, the one with open wings, the other of concave form like the lid of a vessel.

B. Limestone Figures.

There is more freedom and variety in the limestone figures than the terracotta, no doubt partly because they are emancipated from the mould. Although numerous enough, they are in a small minority as compared with the terracotta images. The same general types of male figures recur. We find, for example, beards from colossal statues, one of them treated in the 'feathered' style, another ribbed and curled at the edge. There are a few large fragments, a piece of shoulder, one or two hands, &c., which may belong to these figures. On the smallest scale there are one or two fairly complete figures of the long-robed type, with the one hand on the chest, the other by the side, and several bearded heads probably to be connected with the same type. Some of the heads wear the cap with cheek-pieces, and in one case the flaps are let down, the tasselled ends hanging on the shoulders. Others are bare, and wear the hair parted over the centre of the forehead. Red colour sometimes appears on the caps and the drapery. One flat formless fragment from the lower half of a figure is curious, because on the left side of the drapery at the level of the thigh is carved a large crab. A somewhat free variety of the type is presented in a fairly complete little figure with the parted hair, who is beardless and clad in a short-sleeved tunic, over which is a small upper garment passing from under the right arm over the left shoulder, leaving both arms free. Flowers do not occur. Still farther removed from the terracotta type are the figures holding animals. One fragment is long-robed, and shows the kid's hind feet resting on the ground. Other specimens hold the kid under the arm, and one carries also a staff.

Quite new is a figure bearing what seems to be a sheep in the 'Kriophoros' attitude, and, stranger still, a nude male statuette (broken away below the knees) holding in the right hand the hind leg, and in the left the tail of what seems to be a lion. The parted hair falls back in a smooth rounded mass down to the shoulders, and is straight cut across the forehead, imparting a distinctly Egyptian air to the figure.

We have accounted for the differences between the limestone and the terracotta statuettes partly by the emancipation of the workman from the traditions of the mould, it is time to notice two other influences which begin here to emerge more clearly. Many of the limestone heads with parted hair which is always treated in smooth rounded surfaces, suggest Egyptian art, and the influence of that art steps clearly to the front in a set of heads mostly of medium size. One of them wears a flat round cap, but all are flat-crowned with straight-cut hair along the forehead, which falls in a thick heavy mass behind the neck. On some there are traces of blue colour. If further evidence of Egyptian influence were wanted, it is furnished by the middle part of a small figure wearing the *shenti* ornamented in front with *uraci*. We may also refer forward to the scarabs, porcelains, and small objects, presently to be described. In all the wealth of terracottas there is scarcely a hint of any influence that can even be plausibly supposed to be Egyptian, only perhaps in a few of the female heads, and the scarabs worn round the necks. It is surprising to find that influence so strong in the limestone statuettes and other finds. The explanation which suggests itself is that, although Egyptian monuments mention Cyprus as early as Thothmes III., and Egyptian influence on the island may have very remote beginnings, yet that influence did not make itself felt in force until the Hellenic peoples attained some footing on the banks of the Nile and began to act as the intermediaries in the transmission of Egyptian culture to Cyprus through the intercourse of trade. We have frequently already been reminded of the finds at Naukratis, and shall again find much to recall them. Here it must be pointed out how strongly our limestone and terracotta figures resemble similar Naukratite statuettes. The nude figure holding the lion is, for instance, exactly parallel to those reproduced Naukratis I., Pl. I, No. 1, and II., Pl. XIV., No. 10; but, indeed, Pl. I. and II. of Naukratis I. and XIV., and XV. of Naukratis II., are full of suggestions of similar figures from Salamis. No less similar are the fragments of pottery and the scarabs, &c. There was probably therefore a close connection between Naukratis and Salamis, and Egyptian influence may well have reached the latter mainly through the former. But that influence was, at least at first (and it must have been comparatively fresh at the probable date of the *Τοῦμπα* remains), confined to sculpture and the importation of small objects, whereas the established traditions of pottery remained for the time unaffected. If this hypothesis is well founded, it would be interesting to inquire whether the same division of the spheres of Assyrian and Egyptian influence does not hold good for the rest of the Greek world. But we must pass on to other matters.

There is more than Egyptian influence visible in the style of the limestone figures. Several of them may well be termed works of archaic Greek art. One or two of the heads, for example, for all their precise formality, show a certain feeling for natural form, still struggling with the conventions of the type, but not without hope and promise of success. The figure already noticed cannot be separated from a large class of early Greek works; the broad shoulders, narrow waist, strongly-developed thighs, and frank nudity are all in keeping with the archaic Greek style. As Mr. E. A. Gardner has remarked of similar Naukratite statuettes, 'from these primitive figures up to the magnificent athletes of perfect Greek art, we can trace an unbroken succession of type.' We seem to see the Greek artistic spirit beginning to stir. Something of Hellenic genius there may have been in the mixed population of Cyprus, although I incline to the view that the Greek element in the island was not derived direct from Greece, but had wandered southwards from the Hellespont, passing under oriental influences on the way through Asia Minor. Something too must be allowed for the conflict of influences already indicated, which would give an opening for the development of native talent by freeing it from the exclusive domination of either. But it is worthy of note that it is just where we have seen reason to assume a stimulating impulse from the Greeks in Egypt, that the distinctively Greek style first shows itself at Salamis. By this second influence the conservative terracotta works appear no more affected than by the first.

Several little limestone works represent what may be called *genre* subjects. One of these is a little (headless) scribe seated on a stool writing on a roll which is spread before him on a table. Another headless figure stands holding a long arched something before him on which he seems to be performing some minute operation. A little head represents a flute-player wearing the *φορβέλα*. We may also mention a rude grotesque little bearded *herma*, only a few inches high.

The female figures of limestone are few and fragmentary—there is not a head amongst them—and diverge totally from the terracotta types. There is a piece of torso of a woman holding her two breasts in the familiar fashion. The edges of tight sleeves round her wrists are the only indication of her being draped, a fact which bears on the question raised before. The other fragments are from figures seated in arm-chairs. All are very small, and it may be doubted whether they are really female at all.

Animals are represented only by two hawks or eagles of the Egyptian type.

The problem of the meaning and interpretation of the figures, limestone and terracotta, is one the like of which has to be faced by every excavator of a temple precinct, yet no one principle of interpretation has hitherto been suggested which will meet all the requirements of the problem. In the present case there is nothing to guide us beyond the figures themselves. We

may assume on the analogy of similar instances that they were dedicated in fulfilment of a vow. Various considerations would affect the form of the dedication—the character of the deity to whom it was made, the sex, status, and age of the dedicator, the social institutions and religious customs of the community, and finally the varying circumstances of the vow, all the difficulties and successes, fears and hopes of humanity. The dress of many of our figures may be thought to be sacerdotal, but it seems rather to be that of civil life, differing perhaps slightly for different classes in its form, and in splendour from the gorgeous robes of a court dignitary to the simple everyday dress of a humble citizen. Perhaps in most cases a man devoted himself or a member of his family to the God, and paid his vow vicariously—originally with a human victim, afterwards with an image of stone or clay. We may conjecture from parallel cases, *e.g.* the figures found at the neighbouring shrine of Apollo at Bouni, that the main type of the figures is some indication of the type of the deity, to which they were assimilated either because the God was the special object of veneration to a certain class and age, and his worshippers bore his emblems in the temple services, or from some religious belief which induced the worshippers in honouring the God to assume his likeness. So, as the Bouni figures dedicated to Apollo are mostly beardless young men crowned with laurel or bearing branches of laurel, we may perhaps assume that the deity worshipped in the open shrine at Γούμπα was a masculine bearded God.

C. Pottery.

Comparatively little in quantity, and in very fragmentary condition.

(a) Plain unpainted ware, mostly yellow or whitish clay, occasionally reddish clay with light surface. Jugs of the 'bottle-jug' type, narrowing upwards. Jugs with a short neck and pinched lip. Minute vessels, many hand-made. Rimmed platters, apparently wheel-made but much distorted in drying, frequent. Bowls or cups of the shape which is often adorned with geometric patters. Lamps of the pinched saucer or 'cocked-hat' type, very frequent, often with two wick-spouts close together. From a trench to the S.W. of the main one and some little distance off, which yielded nothing else, came several little pots of thin greyish clay with two incised lines round the body. With them was a Roman lamp.

(b) A large number of little jugs, two or three inches high, of lecythoid shape with a reduplicated neck, painted with a simple wash of deep matt red (Γούμπα jugs).

(c) Cypriote.

Little hand-made jugs with pinched lips, or little jars. Light ground, black and red bands. Fragments from jugs and open vessels of various shapes and sizes. Clay either light or more commonly red with light surface. The usual decoration in bands and concentric circles. One small fragment may be mentioned here which is worthy of attention as a confirmation of the view advanced above, that patterns on pottery may have been derived from the painted draperies of terracotta figures. A rosette with red centre is left light in a dark ground, and below is part of a lotus flower with alternate red

and light leaves outlined with black. Similar fragments will be noticed from one of the tombs.

(*d*) Greek pottery.

Fragment of vase, brownish clay, pale saffron yellow ground, with the edge of a band and a spiral in black to reddish-brown glaze.

Fragment from the neck of a large vase, similar ware, with a pattern common to Assyrian wall decoration and Rhodian pottery.

Fragment of similar ware, macander, black band with a purple and white stripe on it, and the head and neck of a duck from a band of animals.

Fragment of similar ware, but a more butter-yellow ground and more shiny glaze, which tends to chocolate tones. Hind quarters of a lion, incised lines and purple touches, rosettes in the field.

Fragments of two or three bowls or cylices, one of them black inside with a creamy yellow centre, and outside three red-glazed bands.

Small fragments of a 'Corinthian' vase, figures inside and outside incised lines, purple touches, rosettes in the field. Inside the legs of a band of running figures are distinguishable.

Little *aryballos*, Corinthian type, but red and black glazed.

Fragments of several cylices of the 'Kleinmeister' type; one from the north side of the top of the hill, nearly complete.

Small fragment of a black-figure cylix with part of a rudely-drawn bird, incised lines.

Half of a black-glazed saucer with impressed patterns, and an illegible monogram scratched underneath.

D. Porcelain figurines, etc.

Little figures of Egyptian porcelain were not uncommon. Most of them have their parallels from Naukratis and Camirus. There may be mentioned two little figures of Bes of the usual type; a little white figure with a dark brown nose or beak, wearing the Disk-crown; the upper part of a little bearded figure with his hands to his sides; the upper part of a nude female figure (Fig. 12), white with dark hair, arms extended (exact parallels from Camirus); portions of two similar figures, but with their arms to their sides (*cf.* Naukratis I. pl. II. nos. 10 and 17); part of an animal-headed figure; lower part of flute-player (?); minute yellow eagle; etc. There were also found several porcelain beads, plain or ribbed, a little imitation shell, and two of the little disks with fretted edges.

E. Scarabs and seals.

Some five-and-twenty scarabs were found, some of stone, others of blue paste. The former are mostly of dark hard stone, rudely engraved with animal figures, which include a winged beast, a horned beast, and a mounted archer. A scarabacoid of the same material bears simply a cross hatching of lines. One scarab is of transparent green stone with a representation of a lion and a bull, another is of bright peacock-blue colour, but not engraved. The paste scarabs are most of them imitations of the Egyptian, but the symbols are meaningless. One bears a face on the back, another has a silver

setting. They recall the scarabs found at Naucratis, where they may well have been manufactured.

Besides the scarabs were found several seals. One, which is not engraved, is surmounted by a couchant lion: it is of dark etone. The most interesting is a conical dark stone seal with a hole through the apex, engraved with mysterious characters (below, p. 186). There are several similar seals in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford, where they are roughly classed as Hittite. Curious also are an imitation seal in terracotta (doubtless from a statuette) with an incised symbol resembling the Cypriote α , and a swivel seal, which seems to be of very hard wood, engraved with a rude stag (?).

F. Miscellaneous objects.

Several little limestone bases were discovered, perhaps for bronze statuettes, and two or three limestone shrine-lamps, of the 'cocked-hat' type. There is also a diminutive bronze lamp of the same form.

Other bronze objects are—an Egyptian uræus with pin-holes for



FIG. 12.

affixment; a bronze axle-socket; an object of mushroom shape with nail-holes through the rim, probably some sort of handle; a crude little dog (?) with collar; a three-edged arrow-head; two small rings; and a little fragment coated on one side with gold leaf.

There are several more or less fragmentary terracotta objects, which I am unable to explain, or adequately describe in few words. They are probably connected with the terracotta figures, and some Assyriologist may be able to interpret them. The simplest are four objects resembling spear-heads (? points of dagger sheaths), one of them 'feathered' and painted red, and three little things like blunt arrow-heads with one barb shorter than the other. On the north side of the top of the hill was found a terracotta handle with a design in relief, apparently from the same mould as one found on the Cistern site. A bearded figure lays his left hand on the head, and right on the shoulder, of a smaller figure facing him. Then comes a round hole, below which is a figure riding on a bull (?).

Among various odds and ends may be noticed two fragments from the

lower part of a little green enamelled vase. From a simple base rise brown triangular rays or vandykes to a narrow brown band through their apices. The vessel, although of different material, must have resembled in design that published by Mr. Petrie in this *Journal*, vol. xi, pl. XIV. fig. 9.

Little cowrie and similar shells were very common. They are bored as though for stringing together in a necklace. We may also mention a fragment of ostrich egg, and a little bead of elongated form and red transparent stone. Lastly there are four bronze coins. Three of them were picked up on the surface and are evidently late Roman or Byzantine. The fourth was found in the very thick of the objects in the main trench, six or eight feet from the surface. Strangely enough it proves from its fabric to be of Ptolemaic date and is consequently of no assistance in determining the chronology of the finds. The only other objects which can be suspected of so late an origin are the black-glazed saucer with impressed patterns and the little terracotta legs in relief. This coin is an awful warning against chronological generalizations from isolated instances, even when found among homogeneous and apparently undisturbed surroundings.

IX. *Site of the large limestone drums.*

The work on this site, being mainly directed to the plan of the building, seldom penetrated below the surface rubbish, and yielded few objects of interest. Over twenty coins were found, the latest of which date from the Lusignan kings of Cyprus. Some terracotta fragments of good period were discovered. They recall those found in such abundance on the Cistern site, female figures with high head-dresses bearing animals. With them was broken pottery of good black-glazed fabric, both plain and stamped, and a 'cocked-hat' lamp. Among miscellaneous objects are a little amber figure of a child, a bronze spoon, a marble thumb from a statue, and a bit of marble slab with very late carving representing a bird and foliage.

X. *Tombs.*

The tombs numbered 1, 2, and 3 lay in the field of Lefteris Michaeli close by the large tumulus near 'S. Catherine's tomb.' Tombs they seem to have been, but as we found them they were merely holes, long ago collapsed, and probably robbed before that. Nothing was found in them but broken pottery, plain and Cypriote of the commonest sorts, one little lecythoid vase of the *Τὸδμπα* type, and fragments of crude little terracotta figurines.

Tomb 4, which lies farther to the west towards the church of S. Barnabas, had already been opened and partially worked by the Encomites. Of the three terracotta sarcophagi which it contained they had opened two, in the third we found a bone pin and a pair of little thin gold earrings of horse-shoe shape. The tomb yielded also:—*pottery*—nineteen of the little bottles with swelling waists and slender necks and feet, nine Roman lamps, a minute pot,

three plain light jugs, a hollow pig (probably a rattle), a clay button, and a headless male statuette, wearing a *chlamys* passed behind his back, and holding a dove against his chest with both hands: *glass*—eight bottles, two cups, two beads; *bronze*—a mirror, two *spatulae*, a little disk, a crescent, a leaf-shaped object pointed at each end, a number of little studs, and two Roman coins: *jewellery*—a pair of thin gold wire earrings with beads upon them, and a quantity of diamond-shaped gold leaves¹: four iron strigils: a small dark stone saucer with four ‘ears’: a little thin ivory tablet: and a little square leaden frame with circular aperture, decorated with raised bosses and granulations, precisely similar to one figured in *Salamina*, pl. VI. no. 4.

The few other tombs opened lie further to the south in the field of Panagis Hadji Tophi. They proved to be of much earlier date, and the rock of the low ridge in which they are excavated is firm and compact, so that they were found in admirable preservation. Every one had, however, as it turned out, been systematically robbed. The tombs, small vaulted chambers, lay so thick that the robbers had often no difficulty in breaking through the walls from one to another. The contents were perhaps never very magnificent, but it was little indeed that had been left behind. Plain pottery was the staple, mostly of light yellowish colour. Wide-mouthed jugs and jugs with pinched lips were among the commonest forms, but there were also little amphorae, bowls, ‘cocked-hat’ lamps, etc., and single specimens of the *Τοῦμπα* lecythi, and the ovoid vases already well known in Cyprus.² Fragments of Cypriote pottery of the ordinary style were common, and small pieces of black-glazed ware occasionally to be met with.

Reference has already been made to two interesting fragments from tomb 7. They show the same colours and technical methods as the painted draperies from *Τοῦμπα*. Rosettes left of the natural colour of the clay in a black metope field, lotus flowers outlined with black and partly filled in with red, are designs already familiar to us. The fragments are small and it is not easy to say from what vessels they can have come, but one at least must be from a flat pinax.

Beyond pottery there is little to record. Crude figurines and alabaster were sometimes found. One tomb contained an iron knife, another a stone object resembling a scythe-sharpener. It is to be regretted that so little was found, for the tombs seem to be of excellent period.

XI. *Τοῦμπα τοῦ Μεγαίλη.*

This site, on which we stumbled in our search for tombs, was remarkable for the abundance of chips of inscriptions to be found on it, and for the absence of anything else. The antiquities which it produced are altogether

¹ A crown of similar gold leaves is seen xi. p. 56.

² For the shape, cf. Cesnola, *Cyprus*, p. 405, Fig. 17, and *J.H.S.* v. p. 103.

They are very common in late tombs, cf. *J.H.S.*

insignificant. As was to be expected, statuary takes the first place, but is limited to half a dozen fragments of marble figures and the foot of a rude limestone statuette. The fragments are of the very smallest size, and not one of them, so far as can be distinguished, of any particular merit. Three terracotta fragments recall types already described—a hand with a bracelet on the wrist holding a bird, a female figure holding an object against her breast, and a bird's head. Four bronze coins were found, and a small gold Byzantine coin picked up on the surface by the reapers was purchased.

The tale of our finds is complete. If the enumeration has sometimes been tedious it must be remembered that it is often as important to know what was *not* found on a site as what was found, so that a practically exhaustive treatment may be justified. On the other hand no one can be more conscious than the writer how inadequately several important points have been dealt with.

By way of appendix one little antiquity may be briefly noticed, which was acquired in the village of Hagios Sergios. It is a female head of marble about four inches high. The left side, including the eye, is broken away. The hair, which is bound back from the forehead by a simple head-band, is slightly worked, but well distinguished in texture from the skin. The eyes were rather high set and deep at the inner corners, for the centre of the forehead is prominent. The nose continued the line of the upper face. The lips were full. The chin is rounded, the neck slightly inclined to the right, the face directed a little to the left. The expression is grave and severe. To judge from its type and style this little work may well date from the fourth century B.C.

J. ARTHUR R. MUNRO.

NOTE.—Mr. Warwick Wroth of the British Museum has kindly examined the coins found at Salamis and furnished the following note on them—

I have now looked through the coins discovered during the excavations in Cyprus. You have carefully noted the find-spot of each specimen, and it is much to be regretted that the majority of the coins are in such poor preservation. Mr. Ready, the Museum electrotypist, tells me that he does not consider that they can be cleaned satisfactorily, so that it is impossible to make a detailed report on the finds. So far as I am able to judge, the bulk of the specimens belong to Byzantine and late Roman times. The latest coins found are of Cyprus itself, being silver or billon 'deniers' of Henry II. King of Cyprus struck A.D. 1310–1324. They have the *obverse*

type of a lion; *reverse* Cross, and are in the box marked 'Drums.' The Greek class seems to be little represented. One bronze coin marked 'Τούμπα April 10' is of Ptolemy, and among the large series of coins—chiefly Byzantine—found in the Agora is a Macedonian regal coin of bronze struck B.C. 279—277. It has the obverse type of a Macedonian shield ornamented with the Gorgoneion.

Amongst the Roman coins is a sestertius (brass) of Severus Alexander, found in the Cistern. Site F yielded some late Roman (and Byzantine) pieces as well as a sestertius, apparently of Trajan. The Byzantine coins consist principally of the large copper money bearing the mark of value M on the reverse. Coins of this type were issued from the time of Anastasius to that of Theophilus.

There is one Byzantine coin of gold, a half-solidus (found in the Τούμπα τοῦ Μιχαήλη) of Maurice Tiberius A.D. 582—602. A similar specimen is described in Sabatier's *Monnaies byzantines*, vol. i. p. 239, no. 4: Pl. xxiv. 13.

WARWICK WROTH.

Mr. Wroth subsequently identified bronze coins from—

The Site of the Granite Column:

Severus Alexander.
Arcadius.
Maximinus.
A Ptolemy.

The Sand Site:

One little Greek coin and one Ptolemaic.
Severus Alexander.
Constantine Pogonatus.
The majority Byzantine, some few Roman after Constantine.

The coins referred to in the postscript seemed after cleaning to be Roman Imperial (Tomb 4), and Ptolemy V. Epiphanes (Τούμπα).

(2) Sandstone cippus over house-door of Maria Kakouri at Encomi: about 2' x 1'6". Surface worn. Letters $\frac{3}{4}$ "—1", late fairly regular.

ΔΙΟΓΕΝΩΝΗΓΥΜΝΑΣΙ
ΑΡΧΕΧΡΗΣΤΕΧΑΙΡΕ
ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΧΡΗΣΤΕ
ΧΑΙΡΕ

Διογένη [sic] γυμνασί-
-αρχε χρηστὲ χαίρε
Ἄρτέμων χρηστὲ
χαίρε

(3) Round moulded cippus of limestone in ἀλλή of Constanti Hadji Tophi at Encomi: above, a socket-hole: diameter 1'4", height about 3". Letters poor, slightly cut, 1" and 2" high.

ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ
ΧΡΗΣΤΕΧΑΙΡΕ

Ἄπολλών[ιε
χρηστὲ χαίρε

(4) Fragment of white marble slab, broken all sides, surface good, back stippled, 7" x 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ " x 1". Letters well cut $\frac{3}{8}$ "— $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Found by a villager of Encomi on Toumpa tou Michaili (*v. sup.* 'Excavations' site J): and from him purchased. Now in the British Museum.

ΠΡΩΤΑΡΧΟ
Ο ΣΤΟΥ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ Κ
ΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΒΟΥ ΓΑΙΟΥ
ΝΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ ΣΙΑΤΡΟΥ
ΟΥ ΦΙΛΑΧΟΥ ΛΜΗΑΒ
ΕΩΣ ΤΡΟΥΛΛΑΒ
ΚΛΕΟΥΣ ΟΥΧΙ
ΟΥ ΦΙ

Ἰ Λ δ' Πρωτάρχο[υ
του Φιλίππου
ου φι ἀ β ὀ Λ ρκ Γαίου
Π]υτοκράτους ἰατροῦ
ου φι ἰ ἀ ὀ Λ μῆ.
Ἄρουλλᾶ β'

Σερονίου Σουλπικίου Πα]γκλέους Οὐη[ραμιαροῦ
ἀγων]οθέτ|ου

I have as yet no satisfactory key to the complicated chronology of this fragment.¹

Servius Sulpicius Pancles Verianianus would appear to have been a person of note: already two previously published inscriptions refer to him [Lebas and Waddington, IV. 2759. Hogarth, *Devia Cyprica*, p. 63 no. 15].

5. Blue marble block built into rear wall of house of Ali Hassán at Encomi. Surface much worn, the greater part of the inscription being obliterated. The stone is not complete, and its original dimensions cannot be ascertained: in its present condition it measures about 2' x 10". The letters, which are neat and regular, are 1" high.

ΑΤ Ο ΝΑΡ
 ΔΕΚΤΩΝΥΜ ΟΝΑΠΤΟΣΞΔΕΙΓ
 ΝΤΟΤΕΤΑΡΤΟΝΟΔΗΜΟΣ
 ΑΑΜΙΝΙΩΝΤΟΝΕΑΥΤΟΥΠ////////

[The above is Mr. Munro's reading. The inscription is a fragment in honour of an Emperor, and should be restored

. δη](μ)αρ[χικῆς ἐξουσίας
 τ]ὸ ἕκτ(ο)ν ὕ(π)[ατ]ον ἀπο(δ)εδειγ-
 μένο]ν τὸ τέταρτον ὁ δῆμος
 τῶν Σαλ]αμνίων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ π[ατέρα.

The numerals make it practically certain that the Emperor honoured is Nero, and the date the earlier part of the year 59 A.D., which suits well with the style of the lettering.—ED.]

6. One of the boys engaged on the works brought us a marble fragment which had been for many years in the wall of his brother's house. It was purchased and is now in the British Museum. The stone which measures 17" x 17½" x 23" has borne an inscription of at least sixteen lines of small Greek characters; but the surface has been so thoroughly scoured and worn away that I have failed as yet to make out more than the extremities of some of the lines. These are in part portions of proper names, and do not greatly assist in restoring the inscription, which, until it has been subjected to longer study, I forbear to publish.

¹ [The difficulties in the way of interpreting these signs and numerals as dates seem insuperable, and I would suggest that they represent quotas or subscriptions to a Salaminian festival, a supposition which ἀγωνοθέτου (if rightly read) in the last line supports. I cannot interpret all the numerals, but would compare inscriptions of Paphos (*J. H. S.* 1888, Nos. 15 and 116), in which a sign *Λ*, similar to one used above, appears to stand for *drachmae*. In the case of the Paphian festival (No. 15)

individuals contributed, besides money, one or more δψώνια, and it is conceivable that ὁ in this Salaminian list stands for that word. The combination ΦΙΑ remains unexplained, but on the same analogy would represent 510 of something, whose initial letter is alpha. I would suggest then that the whole is a list of names and quotas, and that in two cases we have recorded contributions of 510 . . . ? 2 ὁ(ψώνια) and 120 drachmae, and of 510 . . . ? 1 ὁ(ψώνιον) and 48 drachmae respectively.—ED.]

7. Lying just in front of the Forester's House were four fragments of a large limestone block which from its form, as well as from the content of an inscription upon it, had evidently been brought from the ruins of the later aqueduct from Kythréa. The frame in which the inscription is enclosed measures about 1' 10" × 1' 2½": letters very coarse, poor, and late, lined in with vermilion.

ἐγ[ενο]υτω σὺν θ[εῶ]
 β ἀδτε [αἰ ἀ] ψῆδες ἐ-
 π(ι) Ἀρκαδίου[υ το]ῦ σ[οφ-
 ωτάτου (ἀρχιεπι-
 σκόπου μ(η)νὶ η' ἰ(ν)δικτιῶνος) α'

The first indiction falls, in the beginning of the viiith century, in the years 613, 628, 643 A.D. The Arcadius here mentioned is the first of that name, a man who enjoyed a high reputation for learning—so the epithet *σοφωτάτου* is not merely *epitheton ornans*—and was known especially as author of a life of S. Simeon Stylites. He belongs to the close of the viith century and commencement of the viiith. Cyrus Bishop of Phasis writes in 626 A.D. that he had sent to Arcadius a copy of a rescript of Fl. Heraclius: and Sergius Archbishop of Salamis and successor to Arcadius refers to him in a letter to Pope Theodore against the Monotheletae which was read before the 2nd Lateran Council of 649. The Plutarchus who is mentioned in inscriptions from the aqueduct published in the *Voyage Archéologique* is probably a metropolitan of minor importance whose term of office intervenes between that of Arcadius and that of Sergius.

8. About 3 feet below the level of the keystone on the interapse of the easternmost of the two arches which still stand complete in the middle of the plain southwards of Ayi Sergyi, built into the structure is a block of limestone which has carried an inscription similar to the preceding, though only the frame and the final + now remain. The surface has all but entirely disappeared owing to the action of the weather. The stone is about 3' × 1' 9."


9. Built into the structure of the next fragment (seawards) of the aqueduct, and occupying a position relative to the arch similar to that of the preceding, is again a limestone block inscribed with square characters like those of Lebas and Waddington, no. 2764. The inscription is set in a frame, and is partially legible. Viewed from below it seems clearly to have contained the same formula as no. 7 supra: but the reading here given is hardly more than conjectural.

ἐγ[ενο]υτ[ω] [σὺν] θ[εῶ]
 ἐφ-ω
 ται ἐπτα

 . . ω

The three inscriptions 7. 8. 9. *taken together* are of interest: for they show what those published by Lebas and Waddington fail to do, that it is to the construction of the still existing arches that each and all refer. These arches are in genuine pointed style, and their period as shown by the inscriptions is the first half of the viith century A.D., an architectural date of importance. The aqueduct was probably the last great work carried out in Constantia. In 648 Mavia and his Saracens committed fearful havoc, and nearly destroyed the city: and the last mention of an archbishop of Constantia is at the vith Synod 678 A.D.

10. Brought in by a villager. The face of this marble has splintered away leaving a portion of the original surface in the centre. Inscribed surface $4\frac{1}{4}'' \times 3\frac{1}{2}''$, with neat lettering $\frac{3}{8}''$ high: much worn by exposure to weather. Broken on all sides. Now in the British Museum.



Θράσυ]λλος Ἀρρυ[βίου
 ος αὐτὸς

11. From Encomi also comes a fragment of a large brown unglazed bowl stamped transversely on its rim.



† Διοφάντου


III. *Inscriptions obtained in excavating.*

A. 'The Columns.' As already mentioned in dealing with the excavations, this site is almost entirely barren of inscribed stones. To the couple of fragments given in the preceding section there is nothing to be added here.

B. *The Agora.*

β₁. Certain inscriptions were found on the surface before excavation began. Of these the most important is (1) a fragmentary blue marble block from the pedestal of a statue in honour of Tiberius. The stone measures $10\frac{3}{4}'' \times 6\frac{3}{4}'' \times 7''$ thick, and, though broken at both ends, is square above and below with exception of the edges which are frayed. Letters vary according to position from $\frac{5}{8}''$ to $1\frac{1}{4}''$, and are cut in Roman style shallow and fanciful.

The surface of the stone is rather worn. Now in the British Museum. Found on the hillock.




[This fragment has been communicated to Prof. Mommsen, who suggests that it may have read originally thus :

[In honorem]
 [Ti. Caesaris divi Aug. f.]
 divi] Iuli nepoti(s) Aug. [pont. max.
 tribunic]iae potestatis [et Iuliae
 Augustae] minorum [nostrorum
 facien]dam curavit ide[m] dedicavit
 C. Lucretio Rufo.

Prof. Mommsen does not express himself satisfied with this restoration, but refuses to admit Sala]minorum in line 3 as Mr. Tubbs suggested. The squeeze does not make it certain that there is an Λ at the beginning of line 3. The date, according to the interpretation given above, must lie between June 27, B.C. 6 and the same day B.C. 5.—ED.]

(2) Part of a large blue marble block [pedestal], square to left and below, broken above and to right: $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 1' 9''$ thick. Letters fairly cut and shallow, 1" high. Left in situ, on southern hillock at foot of which it was found.



A third fragment of similar character to the preceding, also found on the surface, proved to be part of a large pedestal-inscription of which much larger fragments were discovered several weeks later (*inf.* no. 17).

β_2 The progress of the excavations soon brought to light a number of other inscribed stones the texts of which here follow for the most part in the order of discovery. A large number of splinters and fragments bearing only a few letters are not reproduced, but in view of a continuation of work

on the temple under the hillock, impressions and full particulars of all have been preserved.

3. Fragment white marble 5" × 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ " × $\frac{3}{4}$ " broken all sides. Letters $\frac{3}{4}$ "; surface good. From trench on slope of hillock: now in temporary museum of Salamis (Forester's House).

ΟΔΕΔΕΙΓΜΑ

ἀπ]οδεδειγμ[ένον

4. Block of blue marble: broken behind, and partly cut away above: to right re-cut for joint: 2' 6" × 10" × 1' 6" thick. Letters 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ", square and regular. From 'olive press': left in situ.

Η ΠΟΛΙΣ Η ΣΑΛΑΜΙΝΙΩΝ
ΜΟΣΧΟΝ ΜΟΣΧΟΥ ἌΡΞΑΝΤΑ
ΤΟ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ἔΤΟΣ

Ἡ πόλις ἡ Σαλαμινίω[ν
Μόσχον Μόσχου ἄρξαν[τα
τὸ πρῶτον ἔτος

5. Blue marble block (pedestal), re-cut: 2' 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ " × 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " × 2' 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Letters 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ ", fairly regular; inscription between lines. The surface has been redressed to obliterate an older inscription, of which only faint traces remain, including a σ in the left-hand upper corner. Socket on top, channel below.

Found forming part of floor of 'olive-press': left in situ.


ΔΙ' ΟΛΥΜΠΙΩΝ
ΛΙΒΙΑΝ ΤΗΝ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ
ΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΣΑΡΟΣ
ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ

Δι' Ὀλυμπίω
Λιβίαν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ
αὐτοκράτορος καίσαρος
Σ]εβ[α]στοῦ
κ.τ.λ.

The dedication Διὶ Ὀλυμπίῳ has been referred to in a previous section [‘Excav. on site of Agora,’ p. 78].

6. Large blue marble block (pedestal) 1' 11" × 9 × 2' 4½": partially cut away: socket-holes for feet above, channel (of olive-press) below. Letters very neatly cut between lines, ¾" to 1¼": surface quite fresh and clean. Found in ‘olive-press,’ and left in situ.


Bilingual inscription, defective above, to left side, and at lower right-hand corner.



G. JUL]IUM · NIDAM · G. JULIUS · C[HIUS]
 . . . DNIANUS · ET · JULIA · LAMPYRIS · CHII
 U]XOR · ET · LIBERTA · HONORIS · CAUSSA
 Γάιον] Ἰούλιον Νίδαν Γάιος Ἰούλιος Χεῖος
 . . . δμ]ανὸς καὶ Ἰουλία Λαμπυρὶς γυνὴ Χεῖου
 κα]ὶ ἀπελευθέρᾳ τειμῆς χάρι[ν

The inscription from its spelling is probably of the Augustan age. Lampyris is an unusual cognomen: it occurs once in an inscription, and there also of a freed woman [Wilmanns *Exempla* I.L. I. 1360].


7. Blue marble pedestal 2' 11¾" × 9¾" × 2' 10¾". Letters 1⅜", lightly graved. The channel (of the press) passes through the first line of the inscription, of which also the beginning and end have been cut away. Surface fair. Found in ‘olive-press,’ and left in situ.



β]ασ[ιλέα] Πτολεμαῖον Πτολεμαί[ο]ν υἱὸν
 κ]αὶ Βερενίκης θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν
 Πέλοψ Π[έλοπος]

This is Ptolemy Philopator [221-204 B.C.].

8. Blue marble block [pedestal] 1' 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " \times 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ " \times 2' 2". Letters moderate $\frac{5}{8}$ ". Surface good except where deliberately cut away or redressed. Channel (of press) above: upper line wanting, as also beginning and end of second and third lines. Found in 'olive-press,' and left in situ.




[τὸν δέινα]
 ἀϋθύπατον ἢ βουλή ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου
 ἀγμείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης χάρις
 Λιδ'

If the era is reckoned from the constitution of the province in 55 the proconsul referred to will be the governor of Cilicia in 42 B.C.: more probably the date is calculated from the reconstitution of the island under Augustus and will then be 9 B.C.¹

ιδ' is not an absolutely certain reading, owing to the adjacent fracture in the stone: but as the stroke above the letters is complete and the stone retains part of the tooling for an I stroke, there can be little doubt that ιδ' were the original characters.

9. Fragment white marble 9" \times 9" \times 2 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Letters 1"—1 $\frac{1}{4}$ " rather uneven. Surface covered with mortar: broken all sides except above. From southern end of east colonnade. Now in British Museum.



[Prof. Mommsen suggests:


Ploti]n. Augus[tac
 pro felicitate
 matris imp. Hadriani e]onjuge di-
 vi Traiani Caesa]ris Aug. et pa-
 tronae]tensinus

¹ [The latter alternative is much to be preferred. In 42 B.C. Cyprus was in all probability still held by Arsinoe and Ptolemy, to whom Caesar had given it in 47 B.C., and consequently had nothing to do with any proconsular governor. If the numerals are rightly read, this date

is important as proving that the second provincial era is the one commonly used in Cyprus, and is usually denoted by the sign L. In that case the dating of several previously-known inscriptions will need revision.—Ed.]

He adds however that the blunders thus admitted seem, like the lettering, to belong to a later period: though in a Greek province considerable latitude may be allowed.—Ed.]

10. Three fragments, not continuous, of a white marble slab, broken on all sides (*a*) $7'' \times 7\frac{1}{2}'' \times \frac{2}{3}''$ (*b*) $4\frac{3}{4}'' \times 3\frac{1}{4}'' \times \frac{2}{3}''$ (*c*) $2\frac{7}{8}'' \times 2\frac{3}{4}'' \times \frac{2}{3}''$. In (*b*) a longitudinal drill hole as for rivet. Letters, not cut with chisel, but splintered as though with a nail or similar tool: $1\frac{1}{2}''$. Found towards north end of West colonnade close to surface. Now in temporary Museum at Salamis.



[This is too fragmentary for restoration.—Ed.]

11. Fragment marble $4\frac{1}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{4}'' \times 1\frac{3}{4}''$: broken on all sides except perhaps below. Surface sound, mortared. Letters neat $\frac{5}{8}''$. West colonnade, about 35th column. Now in British Museum.



... σαιαν κα[ι
 π]όλιν ἐλε[υθέραν
 Πολύ]βιον ἀρετ[ῆς ἔνεκα

If the second line is rightly restored we have here the fragment of an inscription which if complete would probably be of value for the history of Salamis.

12. Two large blocks (continuous) of blue marble which have carried an inscription in bronze (*a*) $13'' \times 14'' \times 9''$ thick: broken in every direction (*b*) $1' 5''$ wide $\times 12\frac{1}{4}''$ thick: original surface at back, otherwise broken,

Only the socket-holes and imprint of the letters on the stone remain: but the reading is almost certain. Found by the eastern column-wall: left in situ.



. leg. AU]G · PRO · PR[AETORE
SALAMINIURU]M FOR[UM · DILAPSUM
RESTITUIT]

As to the significance of the inscription see above under 'Excavations on site of Agora,' p. 80.


13. Three fragments from a similar block of blue marble, which also have carried bronze letters, were found. Unfortunately only the socket-holes remain: the surface of the stone is uneven, and the imprint of the letters cannot be traced with any approach to certainty. Found in same spot. Left in situ.

14. Fragment blue marble block $5\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5\frac{3}{4}''$: letters $1''$ poor and shallow. Square below, elsewhere broken. Found on surface of Eastern slope. Now in temporary museum at Salamis.



. εὐεργεσίας

15. Marble slab broken to left, top and bottom $21\frac{1}{4}'' \times 10\frac{7}{8}'' \times 2\frac{1}{16}''$. Letters $1\frac{1}{2}''$ — $1\frac{3}{4}''$ in many parts worn. Found by outer (East) colonnade wall near S.E. corner. Has been used as building stone, surface being covered with mortar. Now in British Museum.



Αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι θεοῦ Τραϊανοῦ
Γερμανικοῦ Δακικοῦ Παρθικοῦ υἱῶ
θεοῦ Νεροῦ υἱῶ υἱῶ Τραϊανῶ Ἀδριανῶ
Ἡ πόλις τῶν Σαλαμεινίων ἡ Κύπρου
μητρόπολις? τὸν]σωτήρα.

For the possible connection of this record see above 'Excavations,' p 81.

16. Portion of the blue marble block (pedestal?): 8" × 5". Surface, but little damaged. Roughly recut to left. Other edges broken: but a portion of the original edge remains at the top, allowing room for two more lines than are preserved (or one with a margin). Below, the edge though rough cannot have lost anything of consequence. Letters $\frac{3}{4}$ " neat. Found against 4th cross-wall (E outer wall towards S.E.). Now in temporary museum at Salamis.




τὸν δεῖνα τοῦ δεῖνος τὸν συγγενῆ τοῦ
βασιλέως τὸν στρατηγὸν καὶ
ἀρχιερέα τῶν κατὰ [τὴν νῆσον
.]ρε[κ]

σὺν τοῖς στρα[τιώταις καὶ οἱ
συμπολιτευόμε]νοι ἀρετ[ῆς ἕνεκα εἰς τὸν βασι-
λέα Πτο]λεμαίον θεὸν τὸν δεῖνα
καὶ τῆ]ς εὐερ[γείας ἣν διατελεῖ ἔχων


β₃ Inscriptions found in and about the northern cella-wall of the temple on the hillock. It is to be noted that all inscribed stones were found on this side of the temple, which fronts towards the Agora, and that the fragments lay thickest at the corners N.E. and N.W. of the cella-wall.

17. Six fragments from a large marble pedestal, formed evidently of two blocks, to the one of which alone the fragments, all continuous, belong. One (small) fragment was found Jan. 30 on the surface, others in the earth on Mar. 2, 3, and 4. Placed together they nearly complete the one block, which is broken above but square to left, right and below, and measures 2' 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " \times 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ " \times 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Letters 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ "—1 $\frac{3}{8}$ " well cut. N.E. corner of cella: left in situ.



*βασιλέα Πτολεμαίου τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν δεῖνα υἱὸν βασιλέως
Πτολεμαίου καὶ βασιλίσσης τῆς δέινος θεῶν
αἱ ἐν Κύπρῳ τεταγμέναι πεζικαὶ δυνάμεις
εὐεργεσίας ἕνεκεν τῆς εἰς ἑαυτὰς*

18. Fragment of blue marble block (pedestal): 1' 6" back to front \times 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " high: square to left and below. Inscribed surface poor, 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " \times 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Letters $\frac{3}{4}$ " badly cut. N.E. corner of cella: in temporary museum at Salamis.



τὸν δεῖνα κ.τ.λ.


*ἀρετῆς
ἕνεκεν καὶ εὐνοίας εἰς τὸν βασιλέα Πτολεμαίου
καὶ τὴν πόλιν τῶν Σαλαμινίων*

19. Three continuous fragments of blue marble block (pedestal). Surface 29 $\frac{1}{4}$ " \times 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ " \times 12" back to front. Letters $\frac{3}{4}$ " fairly cut. N.E. corner of cella: left in situ.



ἡ πόλις
Διο|νύσιον Ἀρίσταρχος.


20. Blue marble block in two pieces (half pedestal): surface 2' × 1' × 16½" back to front: square to left, right and below, broken above top left-hand corner worn. Letters 1½"—1¾", firmly cut, but affected in style. Middle line chiselled away. N.W. angle of cella: left in situ.



////N θεοὺς φιλομήτορας το[ὺς ἀδελφοὺς
καὶ βασίλισσαν Βερε]νίκην [τὴν θυγατέρα οἱ ἐν Κύπρῳ τεταγμένοι
Λύκιοι? λει]φθέντες δὲ ἐν τῇ νήσῳ καθ' ὄν καὶ [ἐκείλευσεν vel simile quid].


The preceding lines of the inscription can be easily restored: they contain the names of Ptolemy VIII. Lathyros, known on inscriptions as Philometor, and of his wife. The inscription must have been put up in honour of Ptolemy's daughter Berenice (or Cleopatra) during her short reign, before she was put to death by her husband Alexander after a married life of nineteen days. The erasure of the middle line will then belong to the brief interval between Alexander's murder of his wife and his own death at the hands of the infuriated populace B.C. 80.

21. Broken blue marble block (pedestal): surface 17¼" × 9¼" × 8¾" back to front (back broken away). Letters 1" slightly cut and without true apices as though by a Roman hand. Square to right and below. N.E. angle of cella; left in situ.



. . . ων τοῖς πρώτοις
ἀρχιερευσά]μένου τὰ κατὰ τὴν
νῆσο]ν.

22. White marble plaque fragmentary, and broken in two pieces: 10" × 4 1/2" × 1 1/8": surface 9 1/16" × 4 1/4". Inscription in panel sunk about 1/16". Letters poor 5/8", variable. Surface worn in parts, mortared. Broken all sides: but the panelling shows that there was no additional line below. N.E. angle of cella: now in the British Museum.



[Αὐτοκράτορι Νέρωνι Κλαυδίῳ]
Καίσαρι Σεβ]αστῶ Γε[ρμανικῶ δημαρχικῆς
ἐξουσίας τ]ὸ ζ' αὐτοκράτορι τὸ ζ' ὑπά[τρω τὸ δ'
Κυπρίων ἢ νῆ]σος τῶ ἰδίῳ θεῶ καὶ σωτήρι ἐκ τοῦ [ιδίου.

Erected in the end of 59 or early part of 60 A.D.

23. Fragment of white marble slab: surface 5 1/2" × 5 5/8" × 1 1/8", worn, broken all sides. Letters 1" 6" fair. N.W. angle of cella: now in British Museum.



[Apparently contains the names Proculo and Tibullo.—ED.]


24. Fragment white marble plaque. Surface 7 1/2" × 6": thickness 1 1/4": square to left only; surface flaked away through action of water; mortared. Letters 1", fair. N.E. angle of cella: now in British Museum.



Soda[lis Au
p. pr.
ti

25. Three fragments, not continuous, of a white marble slab (*a*) $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 7\frac{1}{8}'' \times 1\frac{2}{3}''$ (*b*) $6\frac{1}{4}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}'' \times 1\frac{2}{3}''$ (*c*) $2\frac{3}{4}'' \times 2\frac{1}{4}'' \times 1\frac{1}{8}''$.

Surface of all mortared, and slightly disintegrated: each fragment broken on all sides. Letters $\frac{3}{8}''$ blackened, moderate cutting. The edges of (*a*) and (*b*) are rounded away, and do not retain marks of fracture: those of (*c*) are sharper. (*a*) and (*b*) were found together at the N.E. angle of cella: (*c*) three weeks previously near N.W. angle of stoa wall. Now in British Museum.



The connection and meaning of these fragments is too obscure to admit of complete restoration. The following words occur:—

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(<i>a</i>) εἰς τὴν
 τῆς χώρα[s]
 τῷ ἔτει περὶ
 γεγρα]μμένοις πρόστιμο[ν
 σ]ῦκα γεμιέειν ἐπὶ τῷ
 ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς χιλίας
 γεμιέ]ειν σῦκα τὰ γεινόμε]να</p> | <p>(<i>b</i>)
 Ὀλυ]μπίου τὴν

 ἀρ]χοντες</p> |
| | <p>(<i>c</i>) ε
 ἔγραψα τὸ
 </p> |

[In (*a*) l. 1 I read //// <IHM on the impression: l. 4 fin. TOM. It is a great pity that this stone is not more complete: it seems to record a contract for exporting figs.—ED.]

26. C:—*The wall of the new city.*

Fragment of blue marble block found built into the wall of the later city: $5\frac{1}{2}'' \times 2\frac{1}{2}''$. The inscription is too fragmentary to merit an attempt at restoration: but it is interesting from the position in which it was found. It is not earlier than the first century A.D.: and would thus supply a *terminus a quo* for the date of the wall, were such necessary.



C2:—*The Loutrón.*

For the inscriptions found here—nos. 27-30—see above under 'Excavations on site of Loutrón' p. 88. There were also one or two tiny fragments, and one piece of inscribed marble had been built into the southern wall. It only contains however the lower part of three or four letters from a Greek inscription and has no more value than what is implied in the fact of its use in building.

D.E.G.F. From these sites practically nothing in the form of inscriptions was obtained (31). From one of the shafts of D, however comes a fragment of a marble plaque with a few letters engraved in an unusual style; the broad strokes being purely triangular in form. In temporary museum at Salamis.



32. From G. (Tomapa) was secured a conical seal of steatite with a curious inscription in characters which ought to be Cypriote but are not quite regular. It is reproduced here from an impression. Now in the British Museum.



INSCRIBED SEAL

We may read perhaps, starting with the centre character, *kī' r' e' o' lo'* which has a close resemblance to *Κρέον(ν)τος* (for the name cf. inscriptions from Poli no. 6. *J.H.S.* 1890). But the superfluous *e'* would so far as my experience goes be unexampled; and the last sign may rather be *no'* than *lo'*. If the proposed reading could by any possibility stand good, the seal would be of more than usual interest as supplying an instance of Cypriote syllabic characters used as pure consonants. *kī' r'* at the beginning of a word

. . . ς Τάρσιος
 . . . ς Ἀντιοχεύς
 [ὁ δεῖνα] Θε]αγένους Ἐφέσιος
 . . . ς Ἀριστομένους Μαγνής
 [ὁ δεῖνα] Πλουτιάδου Ἵπαιπηνός
 [ὁ δεῖνα] Δι]ονυσίου Ἀντιοχεύς
 . . . ος Εὐβίοτος [Εὐχ]όρου

Perhaps part of a list of mercenaries in the pay of one of the later Ptolemies: or of subscribers to a festival, cf. no. 15 of Inscriptions from Paphos [*J.H.S.* Oct. 1888 p. 231]. [Or of Proxeni. In line 1 Mr. Muuro reads *Ταρσεύς*, which is surely correct.—ED.]

J. *Τοῦμπα του Michaili*. For conditions of find see section on this site under heading 'Excavations.'

35. Fragment white marble slab: surface $3\frac{1}{8}'' \times \frac{7}{8}'' \times 1\frac{7}{8}''$ thick, broken all sides. Letters well cut $\frac{1}{2}''$. Found in shaft close under surface. Now in British Museum.



. . . ἀνο . . .
 τὸ τοῦ] Διὸς ἰ[ερόν ?]
 . . . ς Φιλοκ[ύρου]

Again apparently a reference to the temple of Zeus, cf. sup. nos. III. 5 and 25, inf. nos. 44 and 48, and see also 'Excavations.'

36. Splinter of plaque, white marble: $3\frac{3}{4}'' \times 1\frac{1}{2}'' \times \frac{3}{4}''$. Letters fair $\frac{1}{2}''$. Faint lines to guide mason. Found on surface. Now in British Museum.



37. Fragment of blue marble block: complete above, elsewhere broken: $7\frac{1}{8}'' \times 4\frac{7}{8}'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$ (present thickness, which is not original). Letters moderate. $\frac{7}{8}''$. Found in shaft two or three feet below surface. Now at Salamis.



38. Fragment white marble block: square above, elsewhere broken: $3\frac{3}{8}'' \times 2'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$ (existing thickness which is not original). Letters fair, $\frac{3}{8}''$. Found on surface: now at Salamis (temporary museum).



39. Fragment of white marble plaque: $4\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4'' \times \frac{5}{8}''$. Letters $\frac{1}{2}''$, poor, in late style, between lines. Found on surface: now in British Museum.



*αἱ οἰκία[ι καὶ τὰ ἀμπέλια (vel simile quid)
τ]ὰ ἐν Κώμῃ [τῆς Σαλαμῖνος ὑπάρχ-
-οντά μοι καὶ (τῷ δεῖνι)*

Memorandum of property, chiefly interesting as tending to show that the modern village of Encomi represents an ancient Κώμη τῆς Σαλαμῖνος. Τοῦμπα του Michaili lies between Salamis and Encomi, rather nearer to the latter village.

40. Fragment of white marble plaque: $2\frac{7}{8}'' \times 2\frac{7}{8}'' \times \frac{5}{8}''$. Letters about $\frac{3}{8}''$, so slightly carved as to be almost graffiti. Found on surface: now in British Museum.

////ΣΑΛΑΜΕΙΝΙ////
 ////ΛΠΙΕΣΑ. ΜΙ////
 ////ΗΣΑΛΑΜΕΙ////
 ////ΘΟΝΙΑΩ////
 ////ΚΑΛΑΝΚ////
 ////ΙΑΝ

[Beyond the word Σαλαμεινί[ων in lines 1 and 3 nothing is to be made of this.—ED.]

41. Fragment of blue marble block: square above broken elsewhere: $4\frac{3}{8}'' \times 7'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$ (present thickness which is not original). Letters roughly cut on stippled (perhaps redressed) surface, $\frac{3}{4}''$. Found on surface of ground. Now in the temporary museum Salamis.



Ἀυτοκράτ[ορι Καίσαρι τῷ δεῖνι ὁ δεῖνα
ἀρχιερ[εῖ μεγίστῳ κ.τ.λ.]

42. Fragment of white marble plaque: broken all sides: $4'' \times 2\frac{1}{4}'' \times \frac{3}{4}''$: fairly good surface. Letters $\frac{3}{16}''$, moderate. Found on surface: now in British Museum.



! δια]κόνῳ
ο]ντα καὶ Η . . .

43. Wedge-shaped splinter of limestone: rough surface, $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5\frac{3}{4}'' \times$ about $2\frac{3}{4}''$ (present thickness which is not original). Found on surface. Now in British Museum.



. . . ιαπρο . . .
. . . ιεματα . . .
τὸν] μαντ[ιάρχην
διὰ] βίου

44. From field of Giorgi Charolampou adjoining Toumpa tou Michaili to the North. Large blue marble pedestal: $2\ 7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 14\frac{1}{2}'' \times 19''$: inscribed


surface $27\frac{1}{2}'' \times 7\frac{1}{4}''$. Above socket-holes for feet of statue (bronze). Old crack in the stone, allowed for in cutting the inscriptions. Letters regular. Found lying isolated, just showing above the soil. Now in temporary museum at Salamis.

ΔΥ ΟΛΥΜΠΙΩΙ
ΚΥΠΡΙΩΝ ΤΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΝ ΕΜΠΥΛΟΝ
ΕΜΠΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΧΑΡΙΑ ΓΥΜΝΑΣΙΑΡΧΗ
ΣΑΝΤΑ ΤΟ Θ' ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΙΔΙΟΥ ΠΡΟΙΚΑ

For the significance of this inscription cf. what has been said above in section on 'Excavations' p. 105.

Δύ Ὀλυμπίῳ
Κυπρίων τὸ κοινὸν Ἐμπύλου
Ἐμπύλου τοῦ Χαρία γυμνασιάρχῃ-
-σαντα τὸ Θ' Ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου προῖκα

The 'year 9' may be either the ninth year of the province 47 B.C., or the ninth from the reconstitution of the province by Augustus and its transference to the senate, *i.e.* 14 B.C. Combining with this inscription that published by Lebas and Waddington *Voy. Arch.* no. 2758 the family tree may perhaps be restored thus:



45. From the field of Panagyis, adjoining Toumpa tou Michaili (see map). Portion of blue marble block: space to left and below, elsewhere broken. Surface $7\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{3}{8}''$: thickness, not original, about 7". Letters moderate, $\frac{5}{8}'' - \frac{3}{4}''$. Now in temporary museum at Salamis.


ΔΕΚΤΥ
ΚΡΗΤΩ
ΔΙΑΤΕ
ΒΑΣΙΛ
ΕΥΕ

Δίκτυ[ν τὸν στρατηγὸν τῶν ἐν Κύπρῳ τασσομένων
 Κρήτω[ν ἢ πόλις τῶν Σαλαμινίων ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα ἧς
 διατε[λεῖ ἔχων εἰς τὸν βασιλέα Πτολεμαῖον καὶ τὴν
 βασίλ[ισσαν (τὴν δεῖνα) θεοῦς φιλομήτορας καὶ
 εὐερ[γείας τῆς εἰς ἑαυτήν.

The inscription dates very possibly from the disturbed reign of Ptolemy Philometor 185-147 B.C.

46. Block of undressed limestone, found in reaping a field near the Roman Tomb (see 'Excavations'). Two sides are roughly squared: three are inscribed: on the fourth, though it is broken, the cleavage gives a fairly straight single edge. The stone is about $1' 4\frac{1}{2}'' \times 8'' \times 6''$, and is in extremely rough condition, yet cannot have lost very much since it was cut: from its shape, which is slightly cuneiform, it may have been originally upended in the soil. Four lines of characters appear on two faces, only two are certain on the other where however the stone is broken away partially.

Top and bottom of the stone are probably intended to be square. Characters Cypriote, coarsely cut on an undressed surface, with traces of vermilion colour. Now in British Museum.



It is not quite evident how the inscription is to be read, but arranged according to the face on which they occur the characters run:

<i>pa</i>	<i>e</i>	?		<i>to</i>		<i>ni</i>	<i>si</i>	
<i>ni</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>se</i>		<i>si</i>		<i>ri</i>	<i>se</i>	
<i>se</i>	<i>mi</i>			<i>ke</i>				
<i>si</i>	<i>a</i>			<i>sa</i>				

We may either read each face separately, in which case the writing will be columnwise, or follow each line continuously as though the stone were round. The former alternative is *a priori* improbable, and in view of the combinations which would result (e.o. mi. a *e.g.*) may be dismissed. Against the other method must be set the irregularity of the lines, and their apparent disappearance—for the lower half of the stone—on the third face where the

This is too fragmentary to restore. The following words appear. —

μετὰ τῆν τῶν
 Ἀρισ|τώνακτος εἰς τὸν
 Ὀλυ|μπίον ἱερόδου|ον
 γράφ|ειν τοῦτο διατ|αχθὲν
 ἐν] τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Δι|ός
 δέδωκα
 καλάνδων

 Φιλοξέ|νου
 Γαίου.

[From the squeeze it appears that very little is lost at the end of the lines. The last four are probably complete on the right. The fourth from the end reads, as Mr. Tubbs has represented it, εσο and νο, with marks of contraction after each ο. We have probably here a fragment of a dedication of a slave to the service of Zeus Salaminus, amounting to a deed of enfranchisement.—ED.]

49. 2 Fragments white marble plaque 6" × 6½" × ½" broken all sides. Lettering poor. Found near wall which starts inwards at right angles from the northern colonnade: 2' into soil. Now in temporary museum at Salamis.



ἐπὶ αὐ|τοκράτορος τοῦ δεῖνος
 καὶ ἐλε|υθέραν
 φ . . . ου

50. Fragment white marble plaque picked up by one of the women from among the excavated sand: 6¼" × 4¾" × ¾". Similar in all respects to preceding. Now in the British Museum.



μεγίστ|η
 σεβαστ|ῆ

51. Fragment white marble plaque: found loose in soil by eastward wall (and on plan B): $4\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4\frac{1}{4}'' \times \frac{5}{8}''$. Lettering late, but neat 1'. Now in British Museum.




52, 53, 54. Blue marble pedestal found built into the eastern column wall towards its northern end: $2' 4\frac{1}{2}'' \times 2' 4'' \times 1' 4\frac{1}{4}''$. Three faces are inscribed with as many dedications: and both above and below are socket-holes for the feet of statues. The block has served its office as pedestal, certainly twice, probably three and possibly four times. Two of the inscribed faces have been mutilated, one very deliberately line by line: the third face has an imperfect surface. Left in situ.

52. Inscription defaced, but can be read with practical certainty from the apices, and a few tooled marks which remain. I have not attempted to reproduce the lines as they stand: they could only be done by photography; but have restored them, preserving their style and relative position.

ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΝΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣΥΙΟΝ
 ΤΟΝΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΝ ΚΑΙΝΑΥΑΡΧΟΝ
 ΚΑΙ ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΑ ΚΑΙ ΑΡΧΙΚΥΝΗΓΟΝ
 ΤΟ ΚΟΙΝΟΝ ΤΩΝ ΕΝ ΚΥΠΡΩ
 ΤΑΣΣΟΜΕΝΩΝ ΘΡΑΙΚΩΝ
 ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΣΥΜΠΟΛΙΤΕΥΟΜΕΝΩΝ

*Πτολεμαῖον βασιλέως υἱὸν
 τὸν στρατηγὸν καὶ ναύαρχον
 καὶ ἀρχιερέα καὶ ἀρχικυνηγὸν
 τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἐν Κύπρῳ
 τασσομένων Θρακῶν
 καὶ τῶν συμπολιτευομένων*

53. The inscription here also is defaced, and the mutilator has taken the trouble to block out each character separately, with the fortunate result that they are more easy to read.



Ἡ πόλις
 "Υλλον" Υλλου γυμνασιαρ-
 χήσαντα προίκα Λ^γ καὶ
 ἀρχιερευσάμενον τῆς
 Κύπρου τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ
 Θεοῦ Καίσαρος

The third line is the most difficult to decipher. I have given the result arrived at after several hours study of the stone in various lights, but I cannot feel that the date (more especially) is anything more than a suggestion. Λ γ' reckoning from the reconstitution will give A.D. 11, which is earlier than the death of Augustus: who was however θεός in the East before his decease.

As to the value of the inscription chronologically, see 'Excavations' p. 118.

54. [This inscription is hopeless.—ED.]

IV. *Inscriptions on Vases.*

Vase-fragments with inscribed characters were found almost exclusively in the well-shafts of site D: some specimens I have already given in a note to p. 93 of the section on excavations. The characters are for the most part graffiti, and in many instances are from the Cypriote syllabary. In dealing with the Cypriote graffiti on vases obtained last season from Poli I made some attempt at classification: and content myself here with referring to the report then published (*J.H.S.* 1890). Those found this year include the following examples.

1. >Ξ, on the bottom of a stamped black-glazed saucer.
[cf. *J.H.S.* 1890, p. 80. n. 6.]
2. >Ϛ, σ' on several fragments of black-glazed ware: in one instance the sign is doubled.
3. >Ϟ, κ' on two similar fragments. [*op. cit.* p. 64.]
4. >ϛ, vα: one example.

5. χ *ro*: two examples.
6. $\Lambda \mathcal{N}$: once.
7. χ : cf. *J.H.S.* 1890, p. 80
8. ω
9. ϕ : *l.c.* p. 80, note 5.
10. $\tau \iota \mu$: *ibid.* p. 79.
also \uparrow ; *ti*
11. α : *ibid.* p. 78, note 1.
12. $\rho \nu \eta$ *or ne*
13. $\leq \Sigma$ *po ti*
14. $\kappa \nu \tau \underline{\nu}$ *or na sa to* : possibly Ὀριάσα(ν)το(ς) , a form of genitive of nouns in *-as*, *l.c.* p. 65.

There were also some stamped amphora handles:—


1. $\ast \Delta \iota \Sigma \kappa \rho$

2. $\mu \iota \Delta$

3. $\Delta \phi$
 —

4. $\Delta \alpha$
 $\mu \rho$

Further a fragment of a 'Kleinmeister' cylix with a female head and

 *sc.* Στρούβος. (In British Museum.)

I may be permitted to use the present opportunity of replying to a criticism by Dr. R. Meister on my publication of the Cypriote inscriptions from Poli in last year's report. Dr. Meister's notice appears in the *Berliner Phil. Wochenschrift* for Oct. 25, 1890: and the author very courteously sent me a copy of the number. As regards the Onasagoras inscription, J. A. R. Munro, being at Poli this season, purchased the remainder of the stone which proved to have been, as we had supposed, built into the same stairway lettered side downwards. The reading so obtained my colleague will publish shortly: it does not support Dr. Meister's conjecture, which—I refer to his Postscript—might surely have been omitted had Dr. Meister paid more close attention to the data I gave as to (*a*) the dimensions of the two stones (*b*) the size and especially the idiosyncrasy of lettering on the Onasagoras block. On the inscription from K. 45 Dr. Meister proposes to change my reading into Φιλοπαφος. While admitting the possibility of all that he says as to the form of inflexion, I remain doubtful whether -παφος in Cypriote or in Greek can be the genitive singular of a *feminine* noun (τῆς Ὀνασίλω παιδός). Thirdly the writer objects to my interpretation of vase inscription no. 1 (*J. H. S.* 1890, p. 76). I should be more inclined to accept Dr. Meister's reading could he adduce *proof* that \blacktriangledown , which retains no trace of a second horizontal stroke, can be anything in Cypriote but $\kappa\alpha$. A reference to the original article, or to Dr. Meister's citation of it, will show that I expressed myself doubtful as to the true reading.

H. A. T.

NOTES ON THE ANTIQUITIES OF MYKENAE.

WHEN a new field of view was opened to us some years ago by Schliemann's unearthing of Mykenae, there were no sufficient data already known to enable us to judge of the age of the civilization there presented to us. Since then the discovery of many other pre-Hellenic tombs in Greece, and the unexpected links which I have found in Egypt, afford some basis for an approximate chronology. We will therefore consider here (1) the comparisons between the objects found in the six tombs in the circle at Mykenae, and others found in Egypt, (2) the relation of these to other pre-Hellenic tombs, (3) the artistic and climatic data bearing on the Mykenaeian civilization. I cannot profess these notes to be exhaustive; they are merely what occurs to a bystander who is more familiar with Egyptian archaeology; and many of the facts I am indebted to Mr. Ernest Gardner and Mr. Walter Leaf for pointing out to me, while examining the collections at Athens.

Taking the graves in the order of their numbers (as adopted in the Museum and by Furtwaengler), we find in grave I. a group of glass beads which have been greatly changed by moisture: the original colour is seen where the outer scale is broken away, it was a clear prussian blue, decomposing to white on the surface. This decomposition is continually found in the blue glass of 1500 to 1200 B.C. in Egypt; and the tint of this glass is exactly that of glass rings of Ramessu II. that I have found, 1250-1200 B.C. So these give a date shortly after 1200 B.C. The vases found in the same grave show the close of the purely geometrical style, and the beginning of natural ornament, and would therefore fall between 1200 and 1100 B.C. according to the examples found in Egypt.

In grave II. were some fragments of blue-green glazed ware which is similar to that of 1200 to 1100 B.C.

Grave III. contained red agate pendants of about 1300 B.C.; and beads of about 1300 to 1200. The alabaster dish formed like two hands recalls the taste of Egyptian alabaster work of about 1200 B.C., when we meet with shells, girls holding dishes, ducks hollowed out with movable wings for lids, and such designs, in alabaster. The anchor-like design in the middle of the gold-foil shrines is found on a jar of about 1300 B.C. at Gurob. The most curious piece here is the hollow knob of rock-crystal painted inside with line patterns in red and black. This is only paralleled by a pectoral ornament of a mummy, a little after 1300 B.C., with a rock-crystal cover hollowed like a watch-glass.

and painted with the phoenix and its name, in black line on the inside. Most of these objects had perhaps descended for two or three generations as the vase with palm-leaves in circles seems to belong to the earliest natural designs after the purely geometrical, probably about 1150 B.C.

In grave IV. we find the most important objects for dating. The gold cup (No. 226, see Schuchhardt fig. 241) is of the form of bronze cups about 1300-1200 B.C. The dome-head rivets on the handles of a gold cup are a pattern which came in about 1400, and lasted for two or three centuries. The anchor pattern occurs again, belonging to about 1300. The alabaster knobs from furniture are also about the same age. The ostrich egg fragments show signs of having had a handle attached, as on two ostrich eggs in grave V. I have found similarly an ostrich egg, with a hollow-turned wooden handle ending in an open trumpet mouth, in a burial of about 1400 B.C. at Kahun. But far the most definite date is given by the glazed objects; and moreover it is probable that these porcelain ties were made for the tomb, and did not descend for some generations as other objects may have done. The blue tint of the ties 277, 284 is about 1200 B.C.; the light blue of the ring and the brown bands on it are intermediate between the colours of 1200 and of 1000; the tie 341 points to 1150; while the disk 343 is most like the colouring of the similar rosettes of Ramessu III. about 1100, and the tie 276 shows the same date. The decomposition of the green to olive in 284 is like that on certain tablets as late as 950, but such a change might occur in earlier glazes. From all these it seems reasonable to take 1150 as a medium date, with a possible limit of 50 years either way.

Grave V. contained a cup with dome-head rivets, alabaster knobs, and ostrich eggs with handles, all which we have noted above; these point to 1400 or 1200 B.C., but the objects are so closely connected with those of graves III. and IV. that this is doubtless of the same age as those.

The dates we therefore reach are grave I. 1200-1100; grave II. 1200-1100; grave III. about 1150; grave IV. about 1150. That an earlier date is improbable is also shown by the negative evidence that none of the purely geometrical false-necked vases occur, such as are the general product of 1400 to 1200 B.C. in Egyptian deposits.

That the source of this civilization should be looked for before this date is shown by many points. The beads and crystal knob probably come down from a century or two earlier: the style of the sceptre handle with gold open work enclosing inlay of blue glass and crystal reminds us of the style of the beginning of the xviiith dynasty about 1600 B.C.; the method of the inlaid daggers with gold patterns on a middle strip of black metal is like the daggers of Aah-hotep, before 1600 B.C.; and the lions over the gate are similar in position to a gilt wooden lion (broken from some small decoration) which I found dated to 1450 B.C. In stating the date of these graves as 1150 B.C. therefore we do not at all limit the period of the whole civilization.

Turning now to the other pre-Hellenic tombs, we see that in almost all of those that Tsountas has excavated at Mykenae impressed glass paste ornaments are found, whereas not a fragment of impressed glass is found in

the graves in the circle. This points to a difference of period. Now in some of these tombs this glass is accompanied by ribbed beads, discoid with lines on each side radiating from the hole. We see the same beads accompanying impressed glass from the Nauplia graves. And at Menidi were beads of violet pottery with longitudinal ribbing, along with impressed glass. These styles of ribbed beads are unknown in Egypt before 1100, but are characteristic of the xxii.-xxiii. dynasties, 975 to about 800 B.C. At Spata the impressed glass is found with glass pendants which are like those of about 1200 in Egypt—so it probably began before the age of ribbed beads, but yet certainly after the six graves of 1150 B.C. We may therefore approximately date the impressed glass period from 1100 to 800 B.C.

Before going further we should note that there are evidences of decadence at the graves in the circle, at least in grave IV, which cannot be dissociated from the age of the others. The most obvious case is the extraordinary alabaster vase (242 Schuchhardt) which is so debased and *rococo* in its whole style—the scalloped edge (not shown in the illustration), and the curly grooved handles—that it seems impossible to suppose that its maker could be advancing to finer art. Another instance is the absurd stand with ferns growing out of it, inlaid in gold on the side of a silver cup (239 Schuchhardt). Again the bow-ties made in glazed ware, imitating flexible cords and fringe, are in a decadent taste, such as could hardly belong to a rising art. Each of these instances might be matched in Pompeii but not under Perikles, or in a Georgian drawing-room but not under the Henrys. The use of punch-point ornament, on a gold band in place of embossing, also recalls the debased metal work of Roman times.

Turning now to the Vaphio tomb we find on the contrary finer work than at Mykenae. Is it possible to suppose that after producing the monstrosities just noticed they should leap back into semi-archaic work of a grand style, such as we see on the gold cups? The feeble attempts at effect at Mykenae cannot have led to the vigorous treatment of those bulls and men, instinct with life in even the quiescent scenes, and more resembling the finest archaic Greek coins than anything else. The gems of Vaphio are also finer than those of Mykenae. The dagger found there has an inlaid band along it of simple damascening of gold in silver; if figure subjects were already usual they would hardly be supplanted by a simple ornamentation, but damascening might well be used before figure subjects became the rule. There is also a fragment of an inlaid gold figure which seems to be better proportioned than those at Mykenae. Another consideration is that we have seen that the glass period probably followed closely on that of the circle graves; yet there is no glass at Vaphio, for which there is therefore but a brief possibility after the circle graves. From these details it seems probable that the Vaphio tomb preceded the circle graves. It was not long before them however, for the form of cup handle is exactly like that found in the circle graves; there are gold-sheet dolphins for inlaying like the work of the stand of ferns on the silver cup; and there is pottery later than the pure geometric, and therefore probably as late as 1200 B.C.

The beehive tomb at the Heraion contained a bit of a bowl of Egyptian blue glaze with a lotus on it which seems to indicate 1250 to 1200 B.C.; and no impressed glass was found there, again pointing to its being before rather than after the circle graves.

Again, in the treasury excavated by Madame Schliemann her work did not clear all the floor nor find any side chamber, but was in the earth which had fallen in on the collapse of the top. Yet here were found impressed glass pastes, ribbed beads, and rough chipped agate beads, all of which indicate 1100 to 800 B.C. Hence the tomb must have been already partly ruined shortly after the age of the circle graves.

Another consideration is that the artistic evidences point to Egyptian models of about 1500 or 1600 B.C., as we have noted. If then this civilization was active as early as that, where are the great tombs to correspond with the centuries between 1500 and 1200 B.C.? On the other hand there is hardly time for the erection of all of the beehive tombs between 1150 and the Dorian immigration.

A classification which somewhat obscures the matter is the supposed distinction between 'shaft tombs' and 'beehive tombs.' The only 'shaft tombs' of importance are those in the circle at Mykenae. The private tombs cleared by Tsountas are all of the 'beehive' principle, namely a passage leading horizontally into a rock chamber. Are the 'shaft tombs' then a really distinct class? I doubt it. So far as the evidence goes which we have here considered, it leads to the following series: 1st rock chambers approached by tunnels, and often with side niches as used down to late times, but which were the evident prototypes of, 2nd large beehive tombs approached by tunnels with a side chamber for the body as at Mykenae, 3rd beehive tombs with the grave sunk in the floor as at Vaphio, 4th being afraid of plunderers, when in a decadent state, the richly furnished tombs were dug within the great wall; and as a beehive tomb could not be made there entire, the circle representing it was made of stone slabs, and the graves dug in the floor of the circle, as at Vaphio, which shortly preceded these. The fact of the side chamber having been excavated as a shaft at Orchomenos does not seriously affect this, as the builders evidently wished to decorate it with highly ornamental ceiling, and the easiest way to build such a chamber would be to dig an open pit. Also it should be noted that the term 'shaft graves' is somewhat misleading, as they are only cut down in the rock far enough to be safe from hasty plundering, the depth is not in general more than the width of the grave, and they are not deep shafts as in Egyptian or Cypriote tombs, nor is there any enlargement or side chamber at the bottom. The graves are merely rather deep forms of the simple trench grave found in the Vaphio tomb. That there should have been a continuous falling off in the style of the graves is only what is found as a law in Egypt. The earliest tombs there are the most solidly and largely made, and succeeding ages steadily aimed at cheapness and shams until the series ends in shallow open graves.

Another matter which demands notice is Prof. Ramsay's conclusion that the lion gateway is of as late a date as the eighth century B.C. This result

from assuming it to be derived from the Phrygian lion groups, on the ground of not knowing of any other prototype. As however we now have a wooden lion, in exactly the same attitude, dated to 1450 in Egypt, and at that time the lion was a favourite architectural subject under Amenhotep III. (see the lions seated on either side of the door at El Kab, and the lion head in the round found at Gurob), it seems that the Phrygian designs are not the only source of this motive for Mykenae. As moreover the art of Mykenae is Egyptian in origin in many lines we can hardly refuse the lions an Egyptian pedigree. We cannot prove that they are unique at Mykenae, as we do not know what filled the triangular spaces over the tomb doors, nor what the superstructure of the palace may have been. That the design penetrated to Phrygia is nothing surprising considering the range of Mykenean culture.

The climatic question bears seriously on our estimate of the civilization of the time. Was it an isolated culture? Or was it part of a wide-spread intercourse? Certainly to Egypt a great deal must be attributed, if not indeed all the elements of importance. The main feature of decoration is the spiral pattern, often elaborately evolved. And the very elaborations that we find are exact copies of Egyptian decorations. For instances see the painting on the ceilings of tombs at Thebes (copied by Prisse, republished in Perrot's *Egypt* fig. 544). Here is the crossing twist (No. 3), the interlinking spiral (No. 5), and the flamboyant spiral (7 and 8) giving the peculiar curves found at Tiryns (*Tiryns* Pls. vi., xii). On the Egyptian ceilings are also the rosettes and the keyfret which are so frequent in Greece; and the palmetto is almost identical with a wooden panel bearing a derived lotus pattern of about 1300 B.C. which I found at Gurob. The work of the inlaid daggers has long been recognized as inspired from Egypt; but we must note that it is native work and not merely an imported article. The attitudes of the figures and of the lions, and the form of the cat, are such as no Egyptian would ever have executed. To make such things in Greece implies a far higher culture, and a more intimate intercourse with Egypt, than merely to import them. The same remark applies to the glazed pottery. Much of it might have been made in Egypt, but the style of some is not Egyptian; and especially a tall vase with spiral patterns in slanting bands is clearly a product of the same class as the Mykenean architectural ornament. Here then the Mykenaeans were capable of elaborate technical work; and imitated rather than imported from Egypt. Another analogy with Egyptian work is seen in the grandly embroidered square sails painted on the frescoes at Mykenae (*Epheméris* 1887 Pl. xii.). The horizontal bands of embroidery, the square form and suspension from the mast are all like Egyptian sails of the Ramesside age; but yet these sails are not from Egypt as the decoration is distinctly Mykenean and without any Egyptian influence. The gold rings and Vaphion cups also show what a high state of art had been reached here on a native basis. The familiarity with Egypt is shown by the lotus pattern on the dagger blade, by the cat on the dagger, and the cats on the gold-foil ornaments (for they certainly are neither dogs nor squirrels), since the cat was not known west of Egypt until late Hellenic times.

That the general range of the civilization was in the south of Greece, if not in Africa, is indicated by the frequent use of the palm as a decoration (while the olive never occurs), and by the very scanty clothing of the male figures, indicating that dress was only used from propriety and not from necessity.

On the other hand this culture reached out to the north of Europe. The silver-lead reindeer or elk, found in grave IV., can only be the result of northern intercourse. The amber so commonly used is proved to have come from the Baltic. And we see in Celtic ornament the obvious reproduction of the decorations of Mykenae, as Mr. Arthur Evans has fully shown. Not only is the spiral decoration indistinguishable, when objects from these lands are placed together; but also the taste for elaborately embossed diadems and breastplates of gold is peculiar to the Mykenae and Celtic cultures.

Another northern analogy deserves notice. In grave IV. occur the very curious ties made in glazed green ware (see fig. 253 Schuchhardt, misnamed alabaster). Of these, there are portions of four ties (not figured by Schuchhardt), bows and tails, of which the bow is curved in a quadrant at right angles to the plane of the bow. Then, as the tail must have hung down, the bow can only have occupied a horizontal inner edge as between a wall and a ceiling. The back or convex side of the bow being rough, and there being plug-holes, prove that it was fixed against a surface. As we are reduced to suppose that these four bows occupied the top edges or corners of a chamber, what sense could they have in such a situation? They must indicate the idea of some hangings tied up against the walls. And the smaller pair which are made all in one plane (one figured by Schuchhardt) might well represent the bows tying the drapery together across the entrance of the chamber. There is also another indication of drapery. In the great treasury at Mykenae, below the symmetrical holes in the 5th to 8th course which are supposed to have held rosettes of bronze, there are other holes in the top of the 3rd and top of the 4th course, and these are not regular, varying from 41 to 51 inches apart. Hence they must have been for sustaining something continuous, and not for isolated rosettes. They could hardly be to hold bronze plates as they are so far apart, whereas for bronze work the holes are close together, as round the inner door. Hence we are led to suppose that some light hangings or drapery was fastened up around the tomb, and this gives a reason for the visible rosettes or other ornament (perhaps dome-headed nails) in the higher courses to which the drapery might well have extended. If then these tombs were draped around, actually or in representation, we see a close analogy to the great Scandinavian tumulus chambers of a later age, which were likewise lined with hangings.

To recapitulate. We have been led to place the flourishing period of pre-Hellenic art to about 1500 or 1400 B.C., when intercourse with Egypt was common. The great treasury tombs probably range from this time to 1200, when the Vaphio tomb was built. At about 1150 the graves were made in the circle at Mykenae, and decadence had already set in. From 1100 to 800 B.C., or until the art was crushed by the Dorian migration, the prevalent decorations were impressed glass; and to this age belongs the beehive tomb

of Menidi, and the private tombs of Mykenae, Spata, and Nauplia. The range of this civilization was from the north of Europe down to Egypt, not only by distant trade but by familiar intercourse.

Now we can compare this with the literary record left us by the Egyptians. The Libyans were allied with the Akhaians, the Dardaians, the Turseni, and other races of the Aegean, implying the existence of a wide-spread civilization and an offensive and defensive league over the northern shore of the Mediterranean which repeatedly invaded Egypt. And this was not merely a barbaric horde, on the contrary the highly civilized Egyptians were immensely rejoiced at the vast booty they obtained when they crushed the confederacy, the thousands of swords and the rich furniture are specially enumerated. This confederacy ate its way into the country largely about 1200 B.C., and was then ejected by a great national war; and again in 1100 B.C. allied with the Philistines, and fought a great naval battle; while there is some reason to suppose that the Libyans succeeded by 975 B.C. in imposing a foreign dynasty (the xxii.) on the weakened Egyptians. This time of enterprise and power agrees with the most prolific time of Mykenean art—1200 to 1000 B.C. But yet the Aegean races had derived their art from Egypt before that, and must have been familiar with that land. If we may grant that the xvth dynasty—a foreign one in Egypt—was of ‘Hellenic shepherd kings,’ as Manetho records, we may see how the Aegeans were already familiar with Egyptian design; and in any case the Aegean people were already in Egypt (as friends or captives) in 2500 B.C., as their pottery there shows. Such a date for the beginnings of a civilization which blossomed independently about a thousand years later seems not at all impossible.

After seeing the archaeological evidences and their unanimity, we may perhaps begin to grant some probability to the legendary Greek chronology. The great period of Mykenae is there represented as being from about 1300 to 1100 B.C.; while the traditional links with Egypt are indicated as belonging to 1500 or 1600 B.C. Such dates accord as closely as we could possibly expect with what we now arrive at from the definite evidence of the objects discovered.

W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.

A JOURNEY IN CILICIA TRACHEIA

[PLATE XII.]

THE district which forms the subject of the following remarks is that which we know from Strabo, as well as from numismatic evidence, to have formed the kingdom of Olba, ruled over in ancient times by a family of priest-kings, priests of Jove, dynasts of Olba, and toparchs of Lalassis and Kennatis. Having made a careful exploration of this district, and collected therein the inscriptions which are to follow, I propose to treat the subject-matter under four distinct heads, into which the ground traversed naturally divides itself:—

First, the ruins of the three great coast towns between the mouth of the Lamas gorge and the plain of Selefkeh, namely Augusta-Sebaste or Elaëussa, Corycos, and Pseudo-Corasion.

Secondly, the first plateau above the sea, studded with ruined towers and villages, and chiefly remarkable for the three great caves or depressions in the ground, one dedicated to the Corycian Jove, a second to the Olban Jove, and a third alluded to only by Pomponius Mela as Typhoncus.

Thirdly, the Lamas gorge, closely lined with towns and fortresses, where the Cilician pirates had their eyries.

Fourthly, the ruined towns in the heart of the Taurus, including the capital of Olba with its great temple, probably of Jove.

This district, by a glance at the map Pl. XII., may be seen, roughly speaking, to lie between the Lamas gorge and the basin of the Calycadnos, and to run up from the coast line to the high mountains and the pass into Karamania. Eastward of the Lamas there is the coast town Pompeiopolis or Soli (properly belonging to Cilicia Campestris), too well known and explored to need further comment here, and a few ancient villages in the mountains behind, which we examined, but which yielded no epigraphical results.

The architectural features of the ruins in the Olban district would seem to belong to two distinct periods, the earliest being that in which the fortress towns were built. Perched on almost inaccessible rocks, they were chiefly constructed with large blocks of polygonal masonry. To this earlier period also we may attribute the vast number of rock-cut bas-reliefs of men in armour, &c., which are found all over the district. Secondly come the structures of the Roman period, for Cilicia Tracheia seems to have attained a considerable degree of civilization and prosperity after the battle of Coracesium in B.C. 67, when Pompey broke the strength of the pirates, and settled them

in the town of Pompeiopolis; from this time, however, their mountain fortress towns were most of them left to fall into ruins.

What is left of the coast towns would appear to belong chiefly to the Roman period, whereas on the first plateau and in the capital itself the architecture is more or less blended; but most of the ruined towns up the Lamas gorge belonged almost entirely to the earlier period. In this earlier period, namely, when the priest-kings of the Teucrid dynasty ruled in Olba, the district would seem to have come down almost, if not quite, to the coast. This is proved by inscriptions Nos. 1 and 2, which were found on a fortress about two miles from the coast; but as the coast towns increased in importance under the influence of Rome, the limits of the rule of the priest-kings must have been confined to the towns in the mountains.

I.

I need do no more than briefly refer to the first division of the district, as Victor Langlois, in his *Voyage dans la Cilicie*, gives an admirable account of Sebaste and Corycos and the ruins by the coast. The character of the ruins is distinctly Roman, and almost the only striking feature which presents itself is the great aqueduct that spans the gorges, and conducted water from the Lamas river to Sebaste. This is, as inscription No. 32 proves, of very late work. At neither Elaeussa nor Corycos were we able to obtain much additional epigraphical information, as at both the chief inscriptions are on sarcophagi and rock-cut tombs, some (*e.g.* No. 21) of Christian date. We were however able to identify the site of the third town as Pseudo-Corasium beyond a doubt by means of inscription No. 31: the one important line of this document had been left out by some former traveller who had copied it, and later authors on Cilicia have followed him. The spot is called 'Chok Ören' or 'many ruins' by the Turks, and is indeed full of late Roman remains, crowded into a narrow valley between two gently undulating hills a few hundred yards from the shore. From this inscription we get a brief account of the condition of this country during the 4th century A.D. It is cut on a stone slab, let into an arch of what was presumably a small Christian church, on the key-stone of which is inscribed the monogram $\text{P}\bar{\text{P}}$.

From both the Stadiasmus and Stephanus Byzantius we are able to identify it. In one it is called Calo-Corakesium, in the latter Pseudo-Corasium, which agrees more closely with our inscription, and it moreover comes in its proper order between Ποικίλη Πέτρα and Corycos. There can be no doubt that a rocky spur coming down almost to the sea, and separating the plain of Selefkeh from the small one of Corasios, was the Poekile Petra of antiquity. There are very near it considerable ruins, which block up the entrance to the gorge of Pershendi, the ruins probably of a town which bore this name.

II.

The second portion of our investigations took us to the first plateau, a few hundred feet above the sea-level, all now covered with thick brushwood, consisting of wild olives and caroubs, myrtle, wait-a-bit thorn, liquorice, arbutus, &c., their dense growth covering the ground wherever the grey calcareous rocks permitted. There are evidences of high cultivation on this plateau in former times. Out of the brushwood, at a distance of very few miles, stand up numerous ruined towns and villages, most of which we closely examined. There were usually several wine-presses in each, an average size being 9 ft. by 5 for the press, out of which a finely cut lip conducted the liquid into a basin 3½ feet in diameter. Each village had its massive sarcophagi, and occasionally a rock-cut relief of a man in armour with a lance in one hand and another weapon in the other: but it must have been during the late Roman period and under the Byzantine emperors that this district was most densely populated, for each village had a large Christian church.


Leaving Sebaste-Elaeussa (mod. Ayash) we ascended gradually for a mile along an ancient paved road, until we came to an encampment of some nomad Yourouks, who have constructed a few hovels out of the neighbouring ruins; in one of these we stayed for four days, as it afforded us a good central point for our observations.

About a mile beyond this encampment are the ruins of an extensive town, built round the lip of the first of the three great caves or depressions which we came across. The approach to the town is by a shallow gorge with numerous rock-cut tombs and fine reliefs cut in the calcareous limestone, representing men in armour with lances and battle-axes, figures reclining on couches, and women with closely fitting robes. On all the tombs there had been inscriptions (now entirely obliterated) and symbols: one of these had on it a half-moon, and a sun with long rays.¹ The cemetery behind the town is decidedly of later date than those in the valley; here we found fine Roman heroa, from one of which (still in almost as good a condition as the day it was built), with the aid of a rudely constructed ladder, I got a squeeze of inscription No. 4; from this we gathered that the town was known as Kanygelleis, a deme of Sebaste (it is now called Khani-diwani).

From the sarcophagi in this cemetery came also Nos. 5-11; the symbols on the tombs were uniform with those we had seen at Sebaste, namely, a little altar in high relief at a corner of the sarcophagi and two outspread hands, a very frequent form of decoration on the tombs of both Sebaste and Corycos. Several tombs also had bunches of grapes in relief upon them, and wine, or oil-presses adjoining them. The vast number of tombs at this spot points to the extent of the population; they cover a space of many acres.

¹ It should be remembered that in the imprecations commonly occurring upon tombstones of this region the sun and moon are often invoked.—E. L. H.

But the great feature of this town of Kanygelleis is the great hole or depression in its very centre. All around is level ground, covered with ruins and *débris*, so that the hole is not visible until you are within a few yards of it. It is a quarter of a mile in width and three-quarters of a mile in circumference, and uniformly 200 feet deep; its walls are straight and precipitous, and recall at first sight the quarries near Syracuse. In ancient times there were two approaches to the hole, one cut in the rock to the south, the other a tunnel also cut in the rock, which can still be seen but not followed, and which apparently came out just beneath a Byzantine church, over the door of which we found inscription No. 7. On the rocky wall of this deep hole are cut several bas-reliefs, one with inscription No. 3. Over it are



represented six draped figures, two seated on a *daïs*, evidently the father and mother, and the four children standing on a lower level. Lower down is a man in armour with an obliterated inscription.

The bottom of the hole is covered with trees and vegetation, amongst which we saw traces of columns and other cut stones; in fact, at first, the whole appeared to us to answer so nearly to Strabo's description of the Corycian cave, that we considered it to be such until a short time afterwards we came across the real one, and were able to identify it by help of inscriptions.

On the southern lip of the depression is a polygonal fortress, on one corner of which we found the symbol of the Triskelis (*vide* Head's *Hist. Num.*, p. 609, for the triskelis as a type of Olba). On the stone below this

symbol was inscription No. 1, and below again, on another stone, No. 2; conclusively proving that this cave and fort once were in the realm of Olba, and that a priest-king of the name of Teucer put up the dedication to the Alban Jove. The illustration here given is taken from the Proceedings of R.G.S., 1890, p. 449.

This fort, constructed entirely of polygonal stones, is 49 ft. wide by 30 ft. A sustaining wall at the edge of the cave, 14 ft. 10 in. off, had been erected to protect it. The door is 3 ft. wide, and the lintel, which is 6 ft. 4 in. long by 2 ft. wide, bears the spring of an arch consisting of seven large stones. The interior is divided into three chambers, and it had apparently three storeys. The basement never had windows, but the other two storeys had small ones.

Whilst encamped near the Alban cave we visited several sites in the vicinity, which did not produce many satisfactory results. One place, however, about three miles distant, is a remarkable ruin, the fortress of which, though considerably larger than that at the lip of the cave, is similar in most respects; it dominates a narrow gorge, and is very difficult of access. On it we found no inscription, but two stones at either end bore the symbol of the club, another distinctive mark of Olba (*vide* Head, *Hist. Num.*, p. 610), very common throughout the district. Around this fortress were ruins of an extensive town, comprising houses built on almost unapproachable points, ruins of several Doric columns, fine rock-cut tombs with bas-reliefs, and a very neat tomb of polygonal masonry, over the entrance to which was carved a vase. There were no traces of Roman or later work about this ruined town, and we were much disappointed at finding no inscriptions by which we could have identified the ancient name of this romantic spot, which we concluded to have been an eyrie of the Cilician pirates.

Our next point of observation lay about three miles to the west of the Alban cave as the crow flies, but owing to the difficulty of the ground to be traversed we had to return to Elaeussa with our horses and baggage and follow another ancient paved road, which led from the coast to a rocky valley full of ruins about three miles inland. On a rock, which jutted out into this valley, stood three forts and a temple of Hermes all of polygonal masonry, while around were traces of inferior buildings; the summit of this rock was supplied with rock-cut cisterns; there were rock-cut steps, and a large platform had been levelled on the summit.

On the three forts we found no inscriptions; only the symbol of a hunting-horn repeated on a corner-stone of each. The hieron of Hermes, however, yielded better results; its outer wall was 47 ft. by 34 ft. 6 in. The pronaos 14 ft. 2 in., and the naos 26 ft. 4 in. In the pronaos we found two stones inscribed with Nos. 13 and 14, and several fragments of statuary fallen together in a mass of *débris*. To the right of the door into the naos was inscribed in red letters the decree No. 12. Over the door were two stones carved with erect caducei, and there was an aperture between the stones. The naos itself had three small windows in it, one on each of the other three walls.

Ruins of varied nature were scattered all over this rocky promontory down into the valley beneath, where were the usual rock-cut reliefs over tombs; on the opposite side of the valley were also many ruins; a Byzantine church, erected on the foundations of what presumably was an ancient temple, and on two large boulder-stones were carved three decrees, two of which were unfortunately entirely obliterated, but the third gave us the long decree No. 16. On a heroon a little way out of the town we copied inscription No. 15.

From the point where we were located near these ruins we were able to make two more interesting expeditions. One of these was up a valley about a mile and a half from the ruined town, but very difficult of access. Here we found in the side of the cliff a very remarkable site of a cave-temple dedicated also to Hermes. There were here three caves one above another and communicating with each other inside, which had each had a frontage wall of polygonal masonry. Over the entrance to the lower cave was a bas-relief representing the busts of two figures, and under them ran the inscription No. 18. This cave had also a window, and inside were various scribblings on the rock, one of which represented a caduceus. The second cave had also a window under a circular arch with inscription No. 19 under it, and the upper cave had a platform built in front of it, and had five windows but no inscription: the height of the three caves must have been about fifty feet.

In front of these cave-temples were scattered all around the *débris* of a fine propylaeon, built evidently at a later date than the frontage of the caves. Over the entrance to it had been a pediment adorned with the busts of nine figures; of these the two central ones were females with spindle and whorl, and behind them a representation of a toilette-box, opening with a hinge, containing the lady's toilette requisites, and similar to one on a stele in the British Museum (*Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, Part ii. No. 142) in honour of the priestess Claudia Ageta. Under the pediment ran the inscription No. 20, which gave us the names of the dedicatress and thoroughly identified the building as dedicated to Hermes. In the immediate vicinity of this cave-temple of Hermes were several rock-cut figures of men in armour, and circular holes below them cut in the horizontal rock, which once had had a metal top. One would naturally suppose this hole, which stretched under the temple, to be the tomb of the figure above it, but from its size (it was fully fifteen feet deep and wide in proportion) I imagine it must have been the treasury of the temple, perhaps the depository of ill-gotten gain; at the top were obvious signs of its having had an iron lid with hinges. Above the three cave-temples towered the high perpendicular cliff of the narrow valley, and about fifty feet below ran a stream, on the other side of which the rocks again ran up to a great height; this gorge with its sacred shrine was one of the most awe-inspiring spots I ever visited.

From our encampment in this locality we made a third expedition to a site about five miles westwards. After crossing the valley which contained

the cave-temples we ascended again to the plateau on the other side. Soon we struck the narrow-paved road of Roman date which leads down from the interior to the coast about a mile from Corycos. In following this road shortly afterwards Messrs. Ramsay and Hogarth found the *milliaria* Nos. 76 foll., copies of which they have most kindly placed at our disposal.

After following this road for two or three miles, we left it and proceeded for about a mile to the west of it, where another fortress (tower and town) dominates another terrific gorge. This gorge is known by the Turks as the Sheitan Dere or Devil's Glen; it begins in the mountains at the ruins now known as Jambazlu, and gradually deepens, until it widens and opens out just to the west of Corycos.

This town and fortress afforded us no special object of interest, but on climbing down the precipitous rock beneath it for about 200 feet by an ancient staircase (which had been much worn away and was exceedingly dangerous), we reached a narrow ledge in the otherwise sheer cliff of 1000 ft., along which were thirteen very large rock-cut reliefs. These were similar in character to those previously mentioned, but larger; under two of them ran inscriptions Nos. 22 and 23. One figure of a man reclines on a couch, another holds a bunch of grapes, another a lance, another a battle-axe; some of the figures are female, with loose flowing robes and kerchiefs over their heads.

We will now proceed to give a description of perhaps the most interesting of all the sites we visited on this first plateau, namely the environs of the great Corycian cave. Following the coast-line for about an hour beyond Corycos we reached a small bog called Tatli-su or sweet waters, from a sweet-water spring which here comes up from the ground close to the sea. A somewhat rapid ascent of about a mile along an ancient paved road leads to the Corycian cave and the ruins of the town and temple at its edge. The natural features of the cave are very extraordinary; a level space covered with pointed calcareous rocks surrounds it, and like the Alban cave one does not perceive it until the edge is reached. The general appearance too is very similar to the Alban cave, only it is oval instead of circular.

Strabo's account of the Corycian cave (Strabo, p. 671) is extremely accurate, suggesting the notes of an eye-witness, if we take the distance he gives of twenty stadia to refer to the distance of the cave from Corycos and not from the shore itself, from which it is only about a mile of steep ascent up an anciently paved road, whereas from Corycos it would be close upon three miles.

Strabo distinguishes very accurately between the depression (*κοιλίς*) and the cave (*ἄντρον*), and the name Corycos (*Κόρυκος*) would also seem to have a similar signification, being used to denote an empty sack of wallet shape hung up in the centre of a gymnasium. The dimensions of the *κοιλίς* are as follows: length, 886 ft.; mean width, 65½ ft., and the height from 98 ft. at the western end to 228 ft. at the southern end, where the *ἄντρον* is entered. Thus it will be seen that the floor (*ἔδαφος*) has a gradient of 100 ft., rapid at first and rocky, but much gentler as the mouth of the *ἄντρον* is approached.

It is oval in shape (*κυκλοτερής*), and the surrounding eyebrow of rock (*περικειμένη ὀφρῦς*) which Strabo gives is an exceedingly happy description of it.

Strabo evidently descended by the road at the S.E. corner and found the floor (*ἔδαφος*), as it is now, 'very uneven and for the most part stone.' The centre of the depression is now, just as it was in Strabo's days, covered with thick brushwood (*θαμνωδῆς ὕλη*), kept fresh and green (*ἀειθαλής*) by the shade of the great cliffs and the moisture therein. This brushwood is now very thick and far more luxuriant than it is ever found on the upper and more exposed plateau. Here too are many pomegranates, the fruit of which the nomads come to gather in the late summer when ripe. There are also at the eastern end traces of walls of sustentation, as if there had been at some time terraces for cultivation, to which Strabo's epithet of *ἡμερος* may refer.

With regard to Strabo's statement about the saffron (*κρόκος*) which flourished here in his day, we could find no trace of it now, though it is common enough in the surrounding district, and I see no reason why in ancient times, in this cool depression, the saffron may not have been cultivated with success.

Then Strabo passes on to describe the *ἄντρον* with its subterranean source of bright clear water, which can now only be heard rushing through the bowels of the earth; and a small pool, formed by drippings from the stream, can now be seen at the extreme end of the *ἄντρον* about 200 ft. from the mouth. Near the sea a fresh stream of water bubbles out of the ground, now called 'Tatli-su' or sweet water; whether this is the *πικρὸν ὕδωρ* of Strabo, and whether it has any connection with the stream in the cave, it was impossible for us to determine.

The entrance to the subterranean passage is now blocked by the ruins of a Byzantine church built on a rock; over the door leading into it is inscription No. 25. The face of the cave, to judge by the *débris* inside, would appear to have been walled up in ancient times with polygonal masonry, probably in much the same way as the three caves of Hermes above mentioned. On the wall of the cave to the left, about twenty yards from the entrance, we found a portion of inscription No. 24 protruding from the *débris*; this we laid bare. There is an old road paved with polygonal stones leading into the bowels of the earth down a gentle descent. As you proceed, this pavement becomes hidden by a coating of sand, and at about 200 ft. from the entrance the cave terminates, and a tremendous roar of water in the bowels of the earth is heard. By crawling on all fours we were able to reach a little pool of water evidently produced by the drippings from the subterranean torrent; there are many stalactites hanging around, and one can easily understand how a spot like this inspired the ancients with awe, and was considered by them as a spot of sacred import. Here was to them the prison of the giant Typhon, where Jove held him fast bound, and here was one of those many spots in Cilicia of which doubtless another existed at the Alban cave, where men, agitated by a divine frenzy and possessed by a prophetic madness, gave out oracles. Strabo xiv. 670-1; Seneca, *Quæst. Nat.* iii. 2; Aesch. *Præc.* 351; Steph. Byz. s.v. *Κῶρυκος*; Pomponius Mela i. 13.


On leaving the inner cave we closely examined the walls of the outer depression. Along the north wall ran a long inscription with letters half a foot in size, only a few of which are now legible, No. 29, and evidently of Christian date. At the eastern end of the depression is another grotto, but comparatively shallow; at the entrance of it are traces of numerous tablets which had been inserted into the walls, but we found in the cave no traces whatsoever of bas-reliefs with which the Olban cave had been so much decorated.

Our most important discoveries however in connection with the Corycian cave were made outside it. About a hundred yards to the east of the Corycian hole is another depression amid rocks of calcareous limestone; this depression is round and only about a quarter of a mile in circumference, but it would appear to be deeper than the Corycian cave and also has vegetation at the bottom. Its aspect is even more awe-inspiring than the other, and the nomads call it Purgatory in contradistinction to the other, which they call Paradise, for they can use it to tether their camels in and shut up their flocks; whereas the sides of this cave slope inwards, and it could not possibly be entered except with a long rope, which we did not possess. So with regret I was obliged to leave it, and was unable to ascertain whether it contained any traces of antiquity or not. Pomponius Mela is the only classical author who appears to allude to it, and he speaks of it curiously enough as *Specus Typhoneus*: the idea therefore occurs to me that this cave, from its inaccessibility, was looked upon as the actual prison of the giant, whereas the other cave was entirely used for religious purposes and the abode of the oracle. The nomads say that there is a subterranean passage between them, and that the smoke of a fire lighted in the Corycian cave will come out here. This is not improbable, as these caves would seem to have been formed by the subterranean stream (or *duden* as they call them in Asia Minor) making its way to the surface.

At the western edge of the Corycian cave are the ruins of the temple and the town; the peribolos wall came to within a few feet of the western edge, and the hieron must have been constructed immediately over the subterranean hole. In later times this had been converted into a Christian church, an apse having been fitted on to the anta walls of the original temple; a portion only of the peribolos wall is still standing, which is of polygonal masonry, whereas the hieron itself was constructed of neatly-cut stone *with a doorway on the northern side*.¹ By pulling down the later Christian addition we discovered on the eastern anta wall a long list of names (see inscription No. 27). The fact that two of the inscribed stones were upside down led me to suppose that the stones with the list on them had been brought from elsewhere, and thus inserted by ignorant workmen. But Prof. Ramsay and Mr. Hogarth, who visited the site shortly after my discovery, do not concur in this view. I am greatly indebted to them for the accompanying plan, and also for additions to my original copy of the list of names.

¹ This doorway Mr. Hogarth considers to have been cut later, and to belong to the church.

• TEMPLE • AT • CORYCUS •



Heavily shaded parts = ancient walls in fair preservation.


Unshaded parts = ancient foundations and traces.

Lightly shaded parts = modern constructions.

D. G. Hogarth *rest*

On the inner wall of the temple there were also many names inscribed later in date than those on the anta wall, and many of them obliterated by a tool, presumably when the building was used as a Christian church. Those that were legible are given under No. 28. Though we searched very carefully amongst the ruins in the immediate vicinity of the cave, we found no more inscriptions.

On the summit of a hill about half a mile from the cave are the ruins of another great temple built of stones similar to those of the hieron of the lower temple. From the few traces left of the foundations of this building,



it would appear to have been considerably larger than the other temple; but only one wall is left standing, and the stones of the other walls have oddly enough entirely disappeared. On this wall I found roughly scribbled an invocation to the Corycian Jove (inscription No. 30), and a few yards off a stele with inscription No. 26. These two inscriptions are important as being the only two we found which identified the site beyond any doubt as the abode of the Corycian Jove. Within a two hours' walk of our encampment by the Corycian cave, I came across two other ruined towns, an examination of which yielded no epigraphical results; only one of the oft-recurring symbols over the entrance to a ruined building.

III.

We will now return to the mouth of the Lamas river, and follow the gorge up to the source of the stream in the Taurus mountains. With all its sinuosities, the whole course of the Lamas cannot be more than fifty miles, and the gorge, which is of extraordinary depth, is never more than half a mile in width. It is flanked on either side by almost perpendicular cliffs, sometimes reaching the height of 2000 ft., so that it is only possible to ascend and descend into the gorge at rare intervals.

Proceeding up the gorge for about four miles we came across the source of the aqueduct which supplied Sebaste-Elacussa with water, the ruins of which town on the coast-line I have already alluded to. About a mile before reaching this source is a boulder on which an armed man is carved, and beneath him inscription No. 33. The aqueduct itself is a very creditable piece of engineering work, its narrow channel being tunnelled along the western side of the gorge in the living rock with occasional openings, until the desired level of the stream is reached. Here stand the ruins of a large house or fortress evidently of the same date as the aqueduct, and presumably constructed to protect the source from attack.

It was impossible for us to push our way up the Lamas gorge by the side of the stream; even the nomads cannot do this, for at one point it becomes so narrow that there is no room even for a foothold.

To give a detailed description of all the ruined fortresses we visited on the Lamas gorge would be unnecessary, as we came across very few inscriptions during this portion of our expedition. These fortress towns occur at intervals of every three or four miles, some on the right and some on the left of the stream, dominating some lofty cliff. Each has the ruin of a polygonal fortress in its midst, massive walls, and the *débris* of houses and public buildings around numerous, rock-cut cisterns, rock-cut steps, bas-reliefs, &c. In the case of one of these fortresses, now called Pireneh, a rock-cut staircase goes right down to the stream, a distance of at least 1000 ft.

Some of the stones employed in the construction of these forts are gigantic, the following being the measurement of one built into the wall erect on its side,—17 ft. 2 in. long, 6 ft. high, and 4 ft. thick. The marvel is, how such a stone was ever brought to such a height, and the sight filled one with admiration for the engineering skill of these Cilicians.

On many of these fortresses we found symbols,—the pilei of the Dioscuri, the caduceus, and the Olban club, besides others the purport of which was not apparent. Here, as elsewhere in this district, rock-cut bas-reliefs of men in armour are very frequent; by the side of one, in red letters, and under a half-moon, was inscription No. 36. But the absence of inscriptions generally amongst such vast and in many cases magnificent ruins was very curious.

Down in the valley itself, near a bridge, we came across two rocks, one facing north and the other south, inscribed in an almost similar fashion in letters about a foot in height with No. 35. These were boundary stones, to

the correct deciphering of which we had no clue. On another rock, a few yards from these, two large O's were inscribed.

At a spot now called Tapoureli the ruins are exceedingly extensive. Three hills are covered with large buildings of both regular and polygonal masonry, several fortresses, temples, and a theatre. These we examined as carefully as the hopeless mass of brushwood would permit, and we only succeeded in finding one late Byzantine inscription (No. 37), and a doorway with four clearly cut symbols over it. Amongst these ruins was a surprising number of men in armour cut in the rocks with holes below, and also circular holes cut in the rock (like those already described), and entered by a circular hole in a square stone, which appears to have had a metal lid. For tombs these holes are very large, and the same idea as before occurred to me, that they might have been depositories for treasure; for the tombs were at some distance from this spot, and not, like these, in the centre of the town.

Three miles to the north of this town is a cave overhanging the Lamas gorge, the front of which is blocked up, like those previously mentioned, by polygonal masonry. This was perhaps a temple, like that of Hermes, and traces of the propylæon before it were still to be seen, though we could find no inscription actually to identify it. In later times it had been converted into a Christian church, or asketerion, for traces of Christian frescoes are still discernible on its walls.

The population in the Lamas gorge in early Christian times must have been very extensive. The cliffs flanking the stream are in places literally honey-combed with small caves, in which, from writings in red on the walls, such as, for example, *ὁ τόπος τῆς μονῆς Χριστοῦ*, &c., &c., I imagine asketes, must have lived connected with the numerous monastic buildings which occur in this district.

Within a few miles of Tapoureli we visited the ruined sites of several other towns, but only succeeded in finding two late inscriptions, Nos. 38 and 39.

Proceeding northwards along the course of the Lamas we visited, amid wild rocks and high mountain scenery, the ruins of an ancient town at a spot now called Esbegli, where we found inscription No. 40 by the side of a much destroyed rock-cut figure.

A small and very beautiful cataract is passed before the source of the Lamas is reached, and a few hours from this point is the Greek village of Maghra, high up in the mountains, and the last inhabited place before the pass to Karaman is entered. Here too was an ancient town, amongst the ruins of which *Osman* coins have been discovered, and on a broken rock-cut tomb No. 41, copied also by Mr. Sterrett, who passed by here on his way to Karaman.

IV.

The last division of the Olba district to be described is the rugged, mountainous country, rent by many gorges and covered with many ruins, which lies behind the first plateau and between the Lamas and Calycadnos rivers. Starting again from the Khan at the mouth of the Lamas river, we ascended rapidly to a height of 2000 ft., where an extensive plateau is reached bounded on the right by the Lamas gorge, and on the left by two conical and fir-clad hills. The whole of this plateau is thickly covered with brushwood, stunted caroubs, wild olives and arbutus, out of which, at intervals of two or three miles, rise the grim and deserted mementoes of the past. Here and there are a few clusters of tents and settlements of the nomads, who pasture their flocks in the early spring at this altitude preparatory to making their way to higher regions as the summer advances. *Ukushukü* is the name of one spot, with many ruins and evidences of a large population. Here there is a fine early Christian church, and a few remains of earlier date; but we found no inscriptions. An hour from here is the small village of Guberlü, the residence of the *mudir* of the district. It is built around a small mountain plain of rich red soil, cultivated by the few inhabitants. These tiny plains in the heart of the mountains are characteristic of this district, and generally have some fortress of ancient structure, which served to protect the cultivation.

Two hours beyond Guberlü we fell in with an ancient paved road, the same which led down to Corycos from the interior, and soon reached the fine ruins of an ancient town built on a beetling cliff over a shallow gorge, the one which eventually develops into the Sheitan Dere, and terminates near the sea at Corycos. This spot is now called Jambazlu, and must have been one of the most considerable places in the Olba district. There are four very fine heroa left standing in fair preservation and in a conspicuous position. At the edge of the cliff stood a large sarcophagus the lid of which represents a lion, seated, with one paw on a vase, quite one of the finest pieces of workmanship we saw in the whole of the Olba district.

There are very extensive underground cisterns here and many gateways, on some of which we saw the symbol of the Olban club. About ten minutes' walk from the town are the well-preserved ruins of a large Christian basilica, the nave of which is flanked on either side with seven Corinthian columns. This apparently promising site yielded but few and very poor inscriptions. Down in the valley we were shown a stone on which was carved the bust of a man and round it inscription No. 42, and the two other inscriptions (Nos. 43 and 44) came from two wells not far from the large heroa.

One hour from Jambazlü we came across another polygonal fort in the centre of a small mountain plain, now called Yiennelli. Over the lintel was the symbol of the club between two triangles, and at the base of the tower was a large wine-press, which was connected with a reservoir, presumably for storing wine, 15 ft. in diameter and 25. ft deep, pointing to the extensive cultivation of the grape in this district in ancient times.

Another hour's ride brought us to what we ultimately discovered was the capital of Olba, and here we encamped for several days at a Yourouk village, amidst the ruins known as Uzunja-burdj, or the 'long castle,' with the object of thoroughly examining them. Here again I am much indebted to Messrs. Ramsay and Hogarth for the use of the plans which they took on their subsequent visit, and for one or two minor inscriptions which had escaped me.

At Uzunja-burdj the two most conspicuous ruins are those of the great temple of the Alban Jove, and the great fortress built on the hill of the upper town, known as Djebel-Hissar, or 'hill of the castle,' by the natives.

The hieron of the temple of Jove is surrounded by a peribolos wall, a large portion of which remains standing. There are many masons' marks on the outer side of this wall, chiefly of Greek letters thus¹ H ∇ , Φ , and most frequently E ; these marks bear a curious resemblance to those found on similar late buildings in Syria. The space enclosed by this peribolos wall is 222 ft. by 209 ft.

The hieron itself is 127 feet long, and probably owes its preservation to the fact of its having been converted into a Christian church at a later date. Most of the columns are standing, twelve of them on either side, two to the front and four to the back; they are of the Corinthian order. The frontage is 65 ft. 8 in., and the intercolumniation is 6 ft.; the circumference of a column 5 ft. above the base is 9 ft. Each column has twenty-three flutings coming down to 10 ft. above the base. The columns are 40 ft. in height, and the effect of the temple as it now stands is very fine, though the date is probably about that of Palmyra, Pompeiopolis, and many other fine buildings erected in Eastern Asia Minor and Syria in the second century after Christ. This is presumably constructed on the site of an earlier temple, where the priest-kings of the Teuerid dynasty held their sacerdotal court.

About a couple of hundred yards from this temple is a small one, which we found to be dedicated to Tyche. By turning over a few likely stones of the architrave we were enabled to complete inscription No. 48 and identify the building. There are only left standing five elegant columns of the Tychaeon, with monolithic granite shafts 18 ft. 10 in. in height, Corinthian capitals and Ionic bases, and with an intercolumniation of 7 ft. 3 in. exactly corresponding to the circumference of the columns at their base. Behind the Tychaeon was another considerable building, the use of which was uncertain. A triple arch of poor

¹ Mr. Hogarth copied the marks as follows.—E. L. H.

E N E E A
 E E O K X
 H H O T ∇ 4

workmanship stands north of these two temples, and presumably formed the chief entrance to the agora in which they stood. Below is a valley full of tombs, mostly of a late date and inscribed; from one of these I took a squeeze of No. 59, and Messrs. Ramsay and Hogarth supplied me with the copies they made of others.

An arched colonnade ran up the centre of the town, offering a peculiar feature in architecture, namely, a narrow drum let into each column at a uniform height, to which was attached a stone bracket.¹ Only one of these brackets we found inscribed (No. 54). This colonnade was doubtless similar to the one at Pompeiopolis, and the one I described in the last number of the *Hellenic Journal* as existing at Hieropolis-Castabala. The columns of the colonnade leading to the temple of the Sun at Palmyra have the same peculiarity of the narrow drum introduced into the shaft. Near this colonnade we found inscription No. 56, and Messrs. Ramsay and Hogarth found three others in this vicinity.

The theatre of Olba appeared to us small and poor for the size of the town. A long and late inscription evidently ran along the proscenium, of which No. 52 is a fragment, dating it about the second half of the second century A.D. Round the top of the theatre ran a handsome colonnade with massive pillars of conglomerate.

Below the theatre was another long building with one wall standing, the purport of which was not apparent; but it had several windows and doors, and reminded us of the fine structures which the Asiatic governors of Imperial Rome erected for themselves at Myra, Patara, and other places.

Amongst the cottages of the Yourouks we came across Nos. 58 and 49; and over a gateway was a curious collection of symbols or letters, a reproduction of which appeared in the July number of the *Classical Review* for 1890.

The second great feature of this upper town is the castle, a large square fortress, the wall of the side facing the town being covered with inscriptions. The oldest of these was No. 45, which gave us again almost the same formula as that on the fortress over the Olban cave. This inscription was on two of the corner stones, whereas Nos. 46, 47, and 48 were put on the centre of the wall, No. 46 especially being cut in very large letters all in one long line. On the south wall of this fortress was a fine balconied window, and the tower itself is 50 ft. 10 in. by 40 ft. 9 in. It is four storeys in height, and has five chambers and a staircase on each floor. To the thickness of the inner walls dividing the chambers and holding everything together, this tower owes its preservation for so many centuries. In a frame on the wall facing the town, cut in stone, was the club of Olba placed horizontally.

Along a Christian edifice near the fortress ran inscription No. 57.

Down in the valley below the town I have just described, at a distance of about two miles, is another town; in ancient times a paved road joined

¹ See Davies' *Asiatic Turkey*, p. 23, where are woodcuts of similar brackets from columns at Pompeiopolis.

the two, flanked on either side by many rock-cut tombs and other traces of ancient buildings. Undoubtedly the two towns were formerly closely connected, one perhaps being the fortress city and the lower one inhabited during the winter months; for Uzunja-burdj, which is 3800 ft. above the sea-level, is generally under snow from November to April. The lower town is built at the edge of a fertile little mountain plain, still cultivated by the Yourouks, and still called by them *Oura*, a word very probably corrupted from the ancient name of *Olba*.

The principal buildings of this lower town are on an isolated hill to the west of the plain formed by two ravines; these presently join together and form a fine gorge, down which the main road southward formerly passed. These ravines, the hill between them, and the vicinity of the little plain, were covered with traces of ancient art, rock-cut tombs and figures, fortresses, and a theatre: there was also a curious fountain approached by a flight of steps, and with three basins into which the water originally flowed.

An aqueduct brought water to this isolated hill, a structure of late Roman date; but on it, in large letters, we got the most important inscription of the district (No. 71), inasmuch as it told us that this was the site of the city of *Olba*, and settled the question once for all. On a round stele in one of the forts, constructed at a later date out of the surrounding ruins, we found inscription No. 43, and outside No. 72. Several of the stones of this fort had masons' marks upon them similar to those on the peribolos wall of the temple of *Jove* in the upper town. For the reading of a much-obliterated milliarium on the plain below I am indebted to Prof. Ramsay.



About a mile and a half to the west of the new road, which leads from the *Karamaniau* pass to *Selefkeh*, we saw the ruins, now known as *Meidan*,¹ and stayed in the tents of some *Yourouks* for several days to examine them. A wall of polygonal masonry, with four large forts in it, enclosed a triangular-shaped town, which with its acropolis at the apex stood on the edge of a precipitous gorge. These ruins were similar in character to most of those we had seen in the *Lamas* gorge and offered the same objects of interest, namely, rock-cut steps, cisterns, tombs, and bas-reliefs. On what presumably was the principal fort, we found again the symbol of the club placed horizontally and framed with an elaborate decoration with a sort of crown at the top.

In the valley below were many tombs and objects cut in the rock, notably an elegant shrine, consisting of an altar with faint traces of letters on the front, on which rested a carved shell. A Corinthian column on each side supported a frieze cornice and pediment of good workmanship, but somewhat worn by the action of water. Ascending the cliff opposite *Meidan* we reached a level rocky plateau, along which we proceeded for about a mile, where we saw a rock-cut figure of a man in armour, with inscription No. 75 running down the side.


¹ It is worth while to note that Mr. Ramsay and Mr. Hogarth call this site not *Meidan* but *Bagehe Deresi*. *Meidan* appears to be a general name for the whole district.—E. L. H.

MEIDAN, OR BAGHCHE DERESI.

PLAN OF RUINS OF WALL.



APPROXIMATE HEIGHT ABOVE SEA 2560 FT.




A. C. Howland fecit.

In the opposite direction from the ruins, at the distance of a mile and a half, we found a solitary column 30 ft. high, down the shaft of which ran inscription No. 74. But Meidan and its neighbourhood, though covered with ruins, proved like the towns on the Lamas gorge, singularly unproductive from an epigraphical point of view.

I am greatly indebted to my friend Mr. Hicks for preparing the following inscriptions for the *Journal*, and for undertaking to see this paper through the press during my absence in Africa.

J. THEODORE BENT.

Mr. Headlam (who is not in England at present) appends the following notes to his plan. 'The name Meidan was applied to the place by a Yonruk, who seemed to designate by Baghelé Deresi the whole district.' (This view agrees with that of Mr. Bent, but not of Messrs. Ramsay and Hogarth, who invert the names on the authority of a Selefke *zaptich*.) 'The masonry is polygonal, and solidly built, but the only architectural "features" are on the large gateways and house-doors: over the door of a house were these symbols:



The most curious features I noticed as to the wall are the numerous doors pierced in it, and the houses built against it on either side, but mostly outside. Inside are many rock-cut cisterns. Three sides of the acropolis are practically inaccessible: west of the city the slope is steep but not precipitous, and just here it is impossible to trace the wall satisfactorily.

The wall is now about 10 ft. high, and there is no way of determining whether it was ever higher. At the S.E. corner is a large shell of masonry, much ruined: traces of a flight of steps up it can be seen. Inside the city are but few traces of building. I could find no inscriptions or public buildings.

My plan is only correct approximately. The towers were drawn in by eye only.'

INSCRIPTIONS FROM WESTERN CILICIA.

Διὸ καὶ τοὺς μετὰ σπουδῆς διαγράψαντας ἡμῖν ἐνὸς τόπου φύσιν ἢ μιᾶς σχῆμι πόλεως ἢ ποταμοῦ μέγεθος ἢ ὕψους κάλλος,—οἷά τινες ἤδη πεποιήκισι, φράζοντες οἱ μὲν τὴν Ὀσσαν οἱ δὲ τὴν Νύσαν, οἱ δὲ τὸ Κωρύκειον ἄντρον, οἱ δ' ὅτιοῦν ἔτυχε τῶν ἐπὶ μέρους,—οἰκτίσειεν ἂν τις τῆς μικροψυχίας, τὰ τυχόντα ἐκπεπληγμένους καὶ μεγάλῃ φρονοῦντας ἐπὶ θεωρίᾳ μικρά.—[ARISTOTLE], *De Mundo Ad Alexandrum*, 1.

THERE is little danger of any reader nowadays sharing the sentiments of the Pseudo-Aristotle which I have placed at the head of this paper, or of being other than grateful to Mr. Bent for the remarkable discoveries made by him in Cilicia last year. Of the inscriptions which he brought home, either in copies or in squeezes, I have already published those from Eastern Cilicia in the last number of this *Journal*. Those that here follow are from Cilicia Tracheia. Shortly after Mr. Bent had been through these regions, Mr. Ramsay in company with Messrs. Hogarth and Headlam passed through the upper part of the Olban district, and made an excursion down to the coast expressly to re-copy the long temple-inscription, No. 27 *infra*. The heat of the lowlands prevented their doing more. They have rendered me all the help they could in editing these documents; several of them are from copies made only by Mr. Ramsay, and the long list of names from the temple over the Corycian Cave is here given from the careful copy of Mr. Ramsay and Mr. Hogarth.

Since I began to prepare these inscriptions for the *Journal*, Mr. Ramsay's remarkable work has appeared on *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*. This makes it unnecessary for me to preface these documents (as I had intended to do) with a sketch of the history of Western Cilicia. It will suffice for me to refer to Mr. Ramsay's work, especially pp. 371 foll., where he has laid out with great care the history of Cilicia Tracheia. On p. 22 and p. 460 of his book, he has paid a valuable tribute to Mr. Bent's discoveries, and the task of preparing these texts for the printer has been lightened by the recollection of delightful days spent last September with Mr. Ramsay and Mr. Bent (both fresh from their Cilician travels) under the hospitable roof of Mr. W. R. Paton, himself no mean authority on the antiquities of Asia Minor.¹

¹ I have to thank Mr. Ramsay and Mr. Hogarth for the trouble they have taken in reading my proofs, and for valuable suggestions.

To them are due the plans which accompany Mr. Bent's and my papers, and also some additions to Mr. Bent's map.

Several features of this region which have been remarked by travellers will find illustration in these documents: (1) the frequency of important ruins, testifying to a large and industrious population; (2) the rarity of inscriptions, indicating a low level of culture; (3) connected with this, the difficulty of assigning its name to each site. It will be observed also that the inscriptions discovered by Mr. Bent cover a wide area of country and a long period of time. Some are pre-Roman, and belong to the prosperous days of the Cilician pirates. Others are of the earlier or of the later Roman period; and some are Byzantine. In the oldest documents we find proof that the territory of the priest-kings of Olba reached down to the coast. After the suppression of piracy the power of Olba shrank, and the cities on the coast, *e.g.* Elaoussa-Sebaste, increased in wealth and importance.

I.—INSCRIPTIONS FROM KANYGELLEIS,

three miles from the coast at Ayash (Elaoussa-Sebaste), on the first mountain-heights, between Kizil-Oren and Kizil-Bagh.

1. 'On a fortress of polygonal masonry standing on the S. edge of a large depression similar to the Corycian Cave: on the fortress is carved the triskelis .'. Squeeze by Mr. Bent.



ΔΙΙΘΑΒΙΩΙ
ΙΕΡΕΥΣΤΕΥΚΡΟΣ
ΤΑΡΚΥΑΡΙΟΣ

Διὶ Ὀλβίῳ
ἱερέως Τεύκρος
Ταρκυάριος (*i.e.* son of Tareuaris).

The letters are rather over 2 in. in height, and beautifully cut. They can hardly be later than 200 B.C.; compare No. 45. This inscription worthily heads our series, being the oldest Cilician document yet known. When this fortress was built, this district belonged to the territory of the priest-kings of Olba. The name Teucer is very important in connexion with Strabo, p. 672: 'Ἐτι δ' ὑπερθεν τούτου τε καὶ τῶν Σόλων ὀρεινὴ ἐστίν, ἐν ἧ Ὀλβη πόλις Διὸς ἱερόν ἔχουσα, Αἴαντος ἴδρυμα τοῦ Τεύκρου· καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς δυναστείας ἐγένετο τῆς Ἰραχειώτιδος· εἴτ' ἐπέθετο τῇ χώρᾳ τύραννοι πολλοί, καὶ συνέστη τὰ ληστήρια. μετὰ δὲ τούτων κατάλυσιν ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἤδη τὴν τοῦ Τεύκρου δυναστείαν ταύτην ἐκάλουν, τὴν δ' αὐτὴν καὶ ἱερωσύνην καὶ οἱ πλείστοί γε τῶν ἱερασαμένων ὠνομάζοντο Τεύκροι ἢ Αἴαντες.

2. 'From the same fortress, on a lower stone.' Squeeze by Mr. Bent: cf. No. 1.

ΕΠΙΣΤΑΤΕΟΝΤΟΣ ΠΛΕΙΣΤΑΡΧΟΥ
ΤΟΥ ΠΛΕΙΣΤΑΡΧΟΥ ΟΛΒΕΩΣ

Ἐπιστατέοντος Πλειστάρχου | τοῦ Πλειστάρχου Ὀλβέως.

Rather smaller letters than in No. 1, but apparently of the same date.

3. On the face of the rock within the depression which Mr. Bent has called the Olbian Cave, but which I prefer to speak of as the Canygeilian Cave. Above a bas-relief with six figures; the first part of the inscription is obliterated, and it was impossible to take a squeeze. It is given in a still less perfect form in Le Bas-Waddington, No. 1457. The following is Mr. Bent's copy.

... ΨΕΘ . ΤΗΘΕΕΡΜΑΙΟ . . .
 ... ΑΡ . ΜΑΡΩΝΖΑΝΤΟΝΙΔΙ
 . . . ΤΟΥΠΑΤΕΡΑΝΚΑΙΓΥΝΑΙΚΑ
 Ι . ΥΚΑΙΤΑΒΑΥΤΩΝΚΑΙΔΙΑΜΗΤΙΣΑΔΙΚΗΟΤΑΤΟC
 5 . . . ΠΕCΑΝΕ . . ΝΕΝΚΑΙ . Θ . ΕΙCΤΟΝΔΡΑΧΜΑΣΧΧΧΧ

Line 5 threatens a fine. I can make out only a word or two besides.

4. 'From the inside wall of a large heroon, 200 yards from the Olbian Cave; squeeze taken with difficulty on a ladder.' From the impression made by Mr. Bent.

ΑΒΑΚΑΛΛΙΓΟΝΟΥΤΟΥΚΑΙΚΑΠΑΙΟΥΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΟC
 ΟΥCΑΑΥΛΟΥΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟCΤΟΥΑΡΙΟΥΤΟΥΑΝΔΡΟC
 ΑΥΤΗCΚΑΙΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟCΚΑΙΑΡΙΟΥΤΩΝΤΕΚΝΩΝ
 ΑΥΤΗCΚΑΤΕΝΤΟΛΗΝΚΑΙΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΝΑΡΙΟΥΤΟΥ
 5 ΑΝΔΡΟCΕΝΤΕΛΛΟΜΑΙΚΑΙΚΕΛΕΥΩΚΑΙΔΙΑΤΑC
 CΟΜΑΙΜΗΔΕΝΑΕΤΕΡΟΝΤΕΘΗΝΑΙΕΙCΤΟΜΝ
 ΜΑΤΟΑΡΙΟΥΠΛΕΟΝΑΥΤΗCΤΗCΑΒΑCΚΑΙΜΕΤΑ
 ΑΥΤΗΝΑΛΛΟΝΜΗΔΕΝΑΝΟΠΑΡΑΤΑΥΤΑΠΟΙ
 ΗCΑCΤΩΗCΕΒΗΚΩCΕΙCΤΕΤΟΥCΚΑΤΑΧΘΟΝΙΟΥC
 10 ΘΕΟΥCΕΞΩΛΗCΤΕΚΑΙΠΑΝΩΛΗCΑΥΤΟCΤΕΟΠΑΡΑΤΑ
 ΤΑΠΟΙΗCΑCΚΑΙΤΟΓΕΝΟCΑΥΤΟΥΚΑΙΑΠΟΔΟΤΩΤΩ
 ΤΑΜΕΙΩΤΟΥΚΥΡΙΟΥΚΑΙCΑΡΟCΧΥΚΑΙΤΗCΕΒΑCΤΗΝ
 ΠΟΛCΙΧΥΚΑΙΤΩΔΗΜΩΚΑΝΥΓΗΛΛΕΩΝΧΥΒΦ *vacant*
 ΚΑΙΤΑΚΕΛΕΥCΘΕΝΤΑΚΑΙΔΙΑΤΑΓΕΝΤΑΥΠ
 15 ΤΟΥΑΝΔΡΟCΑΥΤΗC ΠΑΦΕΝΤΑΕΙΝΑΙΚΥΡ
 ΝΑΙΩΝΑΤΟΥΑΙΩΝΟCΚΑΙΜΗΔΕΝΙΕΖΟΝ
 ΝΙCΑCΗΚΑΤΑΞΕCΑCΕCΤΑΙΥΠΕΥ
 ΝΟ ΕΙΟ *vacant*

After much study most of the letters have been recovered from the impression with tolerable certainty. The stone is much worn or weathered towards the bottom, especially at the beginnings of the lines. Certain portions of letters are visible in the last line, but they are too faint to warrant any safe suggestion. From line 11 onwards the lapidary left less margin becoming afraid lest he should be short of room on the slab.

- Αβα Καλλιγόνου τοῦ καὶ Καπαίου, κληρονόμος
 οὔσα Ἀλλου Νικάνορος τοῦ Ἀρίου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς
 αὐτῆς καὶ Νικάνορος καὶ Ἀρίου τῶν τέκνων
 αὐτῆς, κατ' ἐντολὴν καὶ διαθήκην Ἀρίου τοῦ
 5 ἀνδρὸς ἐντέλλομαι καὶ κελεύω καὶ διατάσ-
 σομαι μηδένα ἕτερον τεθῆναι εἰς τὸ μνη-
 μα τὸ Ἀρίου πλέον αὐτῆς τῆς Ἀβας καὶ μετὰ
 αὐτὴν ἄλλον μηδένα, ἢ ὁ παρὰ ταῦτα ποι-
 ῆσας ἤτω ἡσεβηκῶς εἰς τε τοὺς καταχθονίους
 10 θεοὺς ἐξώλης τε καὶ πανώλης αὐτὸς τε ὁ παρὰ ταῦ-
 τα ποιήσας καὶ τὸ γένος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀποδώτω τῷ
 ταμείῳ τοῦ κυρίου Καίσαρος * μύ(ρια), καὶ τῇ Σεβαστηνῶν
 πόλει * , καὶ τῷ δήμῳ Καρυγιλλέων * , βφ.
 Βούλομαι? δὲ] καὶ τὰ κελευσθέντα καὶ διαταγέντα ὑπ[ὸ
 15 Ἀρίου] τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς [καὶ γρ]αφέντα εἶναι κύρ[ια
 πάντα εἰς τὸ]ν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ μηδεὶ ἐξὸν [εἶναι
 ἀδικεῖν, ὁ δὲ ἀφα]μίσας ἢ καταξέσας ἔσται ὑπεύ[θυ-
 νο]ς κ.τ.λ.

The name Aba was borne by a daughter of Zenophanes, who obtained for herself the monarchy of Olba from Antony and Cleopatra (Strabo, xiv. p. 672). The present document is not earlier than the second century A.D. At this time the little town, whose ruins Mr. Bent discovered near the 'Olbian' Cave, was evidently subject to Sebaste (line 12), and no longer formed part of the territory of Olba (see on No. 1). Its name was ὁ δῆμος Καρυγιλλέων (line 13). Sebaste was a very important town (Strabo, xiv. 671): it was built by Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, B.C. 36—A.D. 17 (Head, *Hist. N.* p. 633), to whom Augustus committed the charge of Cilicia Tracheia, as needing the constant pressure of a strong government to keep piracy in check. The city was named Σεβαστή after Augustus. The form ἤτω, line 9, is worth noting; and the phrase εἰς τὸ]ν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος, line 16. Εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων is common in the LXX. and N. T.; the singular form is not uncommon in the Psalms (LXX.) and occurs once in the N. T., *Heb.* i. 8. We may perhaps attribute the phrase to Jewish influence.

The site appears to be the spot described by V. Langlois, *Rapport sur l'exploration archéologique de la Cilicie et de la petite Arménie pendant les années 1852—3*, Paris, 1854, p. 10: 'Kannidali (ancienne ville ruinée). Sur l'un des nombreux rameaux de la chaîne taurienne, et à deux heures environ d'Aïasch, se trouve une ville en ruines comme celle-ci, et dont les débris couvrent tout un plateau de la montagne. Quelques Turkomans ont bâti, au milieu de ces décombres, un village qu'ils habitent et qu'ils nomment *Kannidali*. Les ruines de cette antique cité appartiennent à deux âges distincts: époque romaine et époque byzantine.'

5. From the ruins of the town close to the 'Olbian' Cave. Small round stele; copy by Mr. Bent. No squeeze taken.

	ΜΑΡΚΙΑΝΟΝ	<i>Μαρκιανὸν</i>
	ΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΥ	<i>Μηνοδότου</i>
	ΟΙΦΙΛΟΙΜΝΗΜ	<i>οἱ φίλοι μνήμ-</i>
	ΗΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ	<i>ης χάριν</i>
5	ΤΟΝΑΥΤΟΝ	<i>τὸν αὐτ(ῶ)ν</i> <i>[εὐεργέτην?]</i>

6—7. One of the many tombs on the same spot. Mr. Bent notes that they nearly always had one or other of the following symbols on them—a pair of outspread hands, or a supine crescent, or a star. The text is from a very clear squeeze of Mr. Bent, given below: a less accurate copy by Langlois is given by Le Bas-Waddington, No. 1460.

(6)	ΑΙΝΓΟΛΙΣΚΟΑΙΟΥ	<i>Αἰνγολις Κοαίου</i>
	ΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥΑΣΕΝΕΑΥ	<i>κατεσκεύασεν εἰαν-</i>
	ΤΩΣΟΡΟΝΕΚΤΟΝ	<i>τῶ σορὸν ἐκ τῶν</i>
	ΙΔΙΟΝΚΑΙΕΘΗΚΕΝ	<i>ιδίων καὶ ἔθηκεν</i>
5	ΝΑΝΗΝΓΥΝΑΙΚΑ	<i>Nân τὴν γυναῖκα</i>
	ΑΥΤΟΥΚΑΙ ΑΙΝΙΝ	<i>αὐτοῦ καὶ Αἰνιν</i>
	ΚΑΙ ΟΡΑ ΑΝΤΑΣΟΥΓΑ	<i>καὶ Ὀρα[ί]αν τὰς θυγα-</i>
	ΤΕΡΑΣΜΕΤΑΔΕΤΟ	<i>τέρας· μετὰ δὲ τὸ</i>
	ΤΕΘΗΝΑΙΚΑΙΑΥΤΟΝ	<i>τεθῆναι καὶ αὐτὸν</i>
10	ΜΗΔΕΝΙΕΞΕΣΤΘΛ	<i>μηδενὶ ἐξέστ(ω) ἀ-</i>
	ΝΟΙΧΑΙΤΗΝΣΟΡΟΝ	<i>νοῖξαι τὴν σορὸν</i>
(7. <i>On another part of the monument.</i>)		<i>[ταύτην, μηδ-]</i>
	ΕΤΕΡΟΝΠΤΟ	<i>ἐ ἕτερον πτῶ-</i>
	ΜΑΘΕΙΝΑΙ ΗΑΠΟ	<i>μα θεῖναι, ἢ ἀπο-</i>
15	ΔΟΤΟΙΣΤΟΝΚΑΙ	<i>δότω ἰς τὸν Καί-</i>
	ΣΑΡΟΣΦΙΣΚΟΝ	<i>σαρος φίσκον</i>
	ΔΡΑΧΜΑΣ ΔΙΣ	<i>δραχμὰς δις-</i>
	ΧΕΙΛΙΑΣ	<i>χειλίας.</i>

Line 1: for the name *Αἰνγολις* see No. 11. The next name Langlois writes ΚΟΛΚΟΥ. Mr. Bent's squeeze ΚΟΑΙΟΥ. Line 6: Langlois ΝΑΝΗΝΓ, and line 7 ANNIN. The first letter Ὀρα[ί]αν is doubtful: for Nân see No. 43.

8. 'From the Byzantine Church built over the old temple, near the same Cave.' From a copy (not a squeeze) by Mr. Bent, which is more complete than Langlois' copy in Le Bas-Waddington, No. 1463, and *C. I. G.* 8857.

ΥΠΕΡΜΗΜΗΣΚΑΙΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΕΩΣΠΑΠΥΛΟΥΚΑΙ
ΤΩΝΤΕΚΝΩΝΑΥΤΟΥΤΗΝΕΥΧΗΝΑΠΕΔΩΚΕΝ

Ἐπεὶ μνήμης καὶ ἀναπαύσεως Παπύλου καὶ
τῶν τέκνων αὐτοῦ τὴν εὐχὴν ἀπέδωκεν.

The nom. to ἀπέδωκεν is, I suppose, Παπύλος understood: he built the church in fulfilment of a vow. The name is not without interest; see Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 148.

9. 'Tomb near the same Cave.' Stone not copied: impression made by Mr. Bent.

ΣΑΡΙΔΗΡΑΣΤΡΙΣΚΑΙΑΒΑΜΑΡΩΝΟΣΗ ΝΗ
ΑΥΤΟΥΤΗΝΣΟΡΟΝΕΚΤΩΝΙΔΙΩΝΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥ
ΑΣΑΝΕΠΙΤΩΜΗΔΕΝΙΕΤΕΡΩΕΞΟΝΕΙΝΑΙΕΝΒΗΝΑΙ
ΗΜΟΝΟΝΑΥΤΟΙΣΚΑΙΕΓΓΟΙΣΑΥΤΩΝΟΠΑΡΑΤΑΥ
5 ΤΑΠΟΙΗΣΑΣΑΣΕΒΗΣΕΣΤΩ

Σαριδήραστρις καὶ Ἄβα Μάρωνος ἡ [γυ]νή
αὐτοῦ τὴν σορὸν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων κατεσκεύ-
ασαν ἐπὶ τῷ μηδενὶ ἐτέρῳ ἐξὸς εἶναι ἐνβῆναι
ἢ μόνον αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐγγ(όν)οις αὐτῶν ὁ παρὰ ταύ-
5 τα ποιήσας ἀσεβῆς ἔστω.

The masculine name Σαριδήραστρις is unknown; every letter is certain. In line 4 ΕΓΓΟΙΣ is an obvious blunder of the lapidary.

10. From the same site. Impression only by Mr. Bent: very hard to decipher, but I think I may warrant my readings. The lettering is bold; the E is crooked in the back, much like Σ with its tongue prolonged to a point. Another copy is given by Le Bas-Waddington (No. 1459) from Langlois, which is worth comparing.

ΜΑΡΚ · ΣΟΥΛΠ · ΟΣΚΝΟΣΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥ
ΑΣΕΝΤΗΝΣΟΡΟΝΕΚΤΟΝΙΔΙΟΝ
ΕΠΙΤΟΙΣΘΕΙΝΑΙΑΥΤΟΝΤΕΚΑΙΣΑΜ
ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΥΕΤΙΚΑΙΜΗΝΑΝΚΝΟΚΑΙΚ
5 ΚΝΩΚΑΙΤΑΣΓΥΝΑΙΚΑΣΑΥΤΟΝ
ΕΤΕΡΩΔΕΜΗΕΞΟΝΕΙ · ΑΙΤΕΘΗΝΑΙ . . . ΝΔ
ΗΑΝΟΙΣΗΒΑΛΕΤΟΙΣΤΟΝ . . ΣΑΥΡΟΝΤΟΥΔΙΟΣ ·
ΛΗΝΗΝΚΑΙΕΙΣΤΟΝΗΛΙΟΝ · ΝΑΜΚΑΙΕΝΟΧΟΣ
ΙΤΟΙΣΚΑΤΑΧΘΟΝΙΟΙΣΘΕΟΙ

- Μαρκ[ο]ς Οὐλπ[ι]ος Κυνῶς κατεσκευά-
 ασεν τὴν σορὸν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων,
 ἐπὶ τῷ ἰσθεῖναι αὐτόν τε καὶ Σαμ...
 Δημητρίου, ἔτι καὶ Μηγᾶν Κυνῶ καὶ Κ...
 5 Κυνῶ καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν.....
 ἐτέρῳ δὲ μὴ ἐξὸν εἶ[ν]αι τεθῆναι. [ὄς ἄ]ν δ[ι]έ . . .
 ἢ ἀνοίξῃ βαλέτω εἰς τὸν [θη]σαυρὸν τοῦ Διὸς [καὶ εἰς τὴν Σε-
 λήνην καὶ εἰς τὸν Ἴλιον [ἀ]νὰ μυ[ρ]ίας) καὶ ἔνοχος [ἔ]στα-
 ι τοῖς καταχθονίοις θεοῖ[ς].

For the mention of sun and moon in the imprecation, compare *C. I. G.* 4380f (from Pisidia), and No. 11, &c.; also see the heading to No. 6.

11. 'From tomb near the same Cave.' Deciphered from impression made by Mr. Bent.

- ΟΩΑΚΜΙΣΑΙΝ ΟΛΕΩΣΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥΑΣΕ
 ΕΙΟΝΕΚΤΩΝΙΔΙΩΝΕΠΙΤΩΤΕΒΗΝΑΙΕΝΑ
 ΝΟΝΑΛΛΟΝΔΕΗΑΛΛΗΝΜΗΞΕΙΝΑΙΤΕΒΗ
 ΕΑΝΔΕΤΙΣΠΑΡΑΒΗΤΑΥΤΑΗΑΠΟΛΥΣΗΤΩΝΕΚΙΣΕ
 5 ΓΕΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΩΝΕΣΤΩΗΣΕΒΗΚΩΣΕΙΣΤΕΤΟΝΔΙΑ
 ΚΑΙΤΗΝΣΕΛΗΝΗΝΚΑΙΒΑΛΕΤΩΕΙΣΤΟΥΣΒΗΣΑΥ
 ΡΟΥΣΑΥΤΩΝΑΝΑΔΡΑΧΜΑΣΧΕΙΛΙΑΣΚΑΙΤΗΝΣΕ
 ΒΑΣΤΗΒΗΝΑΜΚΑΙΤΩΣΕΒΑΣΤΗΝΩΝΔΗΜΩ
 ΑΠΟΔΟΤΩΜΚΑΙΜΗΔΕΝΗΣΣΟΝΕΣΤΩΑΣΕΒΗΣ
 10 ΕΙΣΤΕΤΟΥΣΠΡΟΓΕΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΟΥΣΘΕΟΥΣΚΑΙΤΟΝ
 ΗΛΙΟΝΚΑΙΕΝΕΧΕΘΩΤΑΙΣΑΡΑΙΣΚΑΙΕΓΓΟΝΟΙΑΥΤΟΥ

The first two letters of line 1 and the last three letters of line 4 are difficult to read, and I cannot be sure of them. The cipher too in lines 8, 9, is obscure; I take it to signify *μυ[ρ]ίας*; compare No. 4, line 12.

- Θῶακμις Αἰν[γ]όλεως κατεσκευάσε[ν τὸ μνημ-
 εῖον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ἐπὶ τῷ τεθῆναι ἐν αὐτῷ μό-
 νον, ἄλλον δὲ ἢ ἄλλην μὴ ἐξεῖναι τεθῆ[ν]αι·
 εἰάν δέ τις παραβῆ ταῦτα ἢ ἀπολύσῃ τῶν ἐκίσε
 5 γεγραμμένων, ἔστω ἡσεβηκῶς εἰς τε τὸν Δία
 καὶ τὴν Σελήνην, καὶ βαλέτω εἰς τοὺς θησαυ-
 ροὺς αὐτῶν ἀνὰ δραχμὰς χειλίας, καὶ τῇ ἐν Σε-
 βαστῇ Ἀθηνᾶ μυ[ρ]ίας, καὶ τῷ Σεβαστηνῶν δῆμῳ
 ἀποδότω μυ[ρ]ίας, καὶ μηδὲν ἡσσον ἔστω ἡσεβῆς
 10 εἰς τε τοὺς προγεγραμμένους θεοὺς καὶ τὸν
 Ἴλιον καὶ ἐνεχέσθω ταῖς ἀραῖς καὶ ἔγγονοι αὐτοῦ.

II.—Site about three miles to the West of Kanygelleis and its Cave. The place is described by Mr. Bent *ante*. He had to reach it by returning to the coast and striking inland again from Ayash.

12. 'On the face of the wall of the temple, immediately to the right of the entrance into the cella, facing you as you enter within the antae. The letters were painted red.' From excellent squeeze taken by Mr. Bent.

ΕΔΟΣΕΝΕΑΝΤΙΣ	Ἐδοξεν. Ἐάν τις
ΕΥΡΕΘΗΚΙΛΙΚΙΩΜΕ	εὐρεθῆ Κιλικίῳ μέ-
ΤΡΩΜΕΤΡΩΝΑΠ	τρῶ μετρῶν ἀπ-
ΟΔΩΣΕΙΙΣΤΟΝΦΙΣΚ	οδώσει ἰς τὸν φύσκ-
5 ΟΝΔΗΝΑΡΙΑΕΙΚΟΣΙ	ον δηνάρια εἴκοσι
ΠΕΝΤΕΜΕΤΡΕΙΝΔΕ	πέντε μετρέϊν δὲ
ΜΕΤΡΟΙΣΟΙΣΗΠΟΛ	μέτροις οἷς ἡ πόλ-
ΙΣΝΟΜΙΤΕΥΕΤΕ	ις νομιτεύετε.

The inscription is hardly earlier than 100 A.D.; the last word (= νομιστεύεται) points even later. It is an interesting municipal ordinance. Rome did not compel her subjects to adopt exclusively the imperial weights and measures (Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, iii. 758); but as of course the Roman standards were made legal, while in remoter regions the local standards lingered in use, there would result at times a confusion very injurious to honest trading (see the passage from Eriphanios cited by Mommsen *l. c.*). To prevent this, the ordinance compels the exclusive use of Roman standards.

13. 'In the Pronaos of the temple of Hermes.' From excellent squeeze made by Mr. Bent. A caduceus occupies the bottom right-hand corner.

ΠΟΜΠΩΝΙΟΣΝΙΓΕΡΟΣ
 ΙΕΡΕΥΣΤΟΥΕΡΜΟΥΤΗΝΑΝΑΚΛΙΣΙΝ
 ΚΑΙΤΗΝΑΠΟΚΛΕΙΜΑΚΩΣΙΝΤΟΥ
 ΟΥΚΑΙΤΟΜΑΓΕΙΡΕΙΟΝΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥ
 ΑΣΕΝΕΚΤΩΝΙΔΙΩΝ



Πομπώνιος Νίγερως
 ἱερεὺς τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ τὴν ἀνάκλισιν τε
 καὶ τὴν ἀποκλειμάκωσιν τοῦ [να-
 οῦ καὶ τὸ μαγειρεῖον κατεσκευ-
 5 ασεν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων.

The restoration *να]οῦ* in line 4 is confirmed by No. 14. As Mr. Bent describes this temple as built upon a jutting rock that stands out into the valley, *ἀνάκλισις* may be a bench or seat, and *ἀποκλειμάκωσις* would be a flight of steps, either cut in the rock or built in the slope, leading down from the temple-platform. As Mr. Hogarth suggests, these little temples may have been way-side halting-places. *Μαγειρεῖον* clearly refers to a kitchen now made for the purpose of sacrificial feasts held at the site. The readings given are certain.

14. 'From the inner face of left-hand anta-wall of the same temple; the stone had fallen down.' Mr. Bent's copy only: he notes that the letters were late.

ΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΣ · ΔΙΟΣ
ΙΕΡΕΥΣΤΟΥΝΑΟΥΤΗΝ
ΑΝΑΚΛΙΣΙΝΕΚΤΩΝΙΔΙ
ΩΝ

*Μηνόδοτος Διὸς
ἱερεὺς τοῦ ναοῦ τῆν
ἀνάκλισιν (?) ἐκ τῶν ἰδί-
ων.*

Menodotus seems to have repaired what Niger (No. 13) had built.

15. 'On a tomb near the same place.' Copy only by Mr. Bent.

ΤΟΗΡΩΕΙΟΝΤΕΥΚΡΙΑΔΟΣΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΥ
ΤΑΤΑΚΤΗΓΥΝΕΚ . . ΜΗΝΟΔΟΤΟΥΤΗΣ
ΤΟΥΑΥΤΩΝ

*Τὸ ἠρώειον Τευκριάδος Μηνოდότου·
Τάτας τῆς γυνεκ[ὸς]· Μηνოდότου τ(οῦ)
(ὕ)οῦ αὐτῶν.*

Mr. Bent's copy seems inaccurate. For *Τάτα* see *C.I.G.* 4009*b*.

16. Inscribed upon the face of the rock, side by side with No. 17. From squeeze made by Mr. Bent.

ΕΔΟΞΕΤΟΙΣΕΤΑΙΡΟΙΣΚΑΙΣΑΒΒΑ
ΤΙΣΤΑΙΣΘΕΟΥ . . ΟΙΑΙΣΑΒΒΑΤΙΣ
ΤΟΥΣΥΝΗΓΜΕΝΟΙΣΤΗΝΕΠΙΓΡΑ
ΦΗΝΧΑΡΑΞΑΝΤΑΣΜΗΔΕΝΑΑΚΥ
5 ΡΟΝΠΟΙΗΣΑΙΤΩΙΔΕΠΟΙΗΣΑΝ
ΤΙΕΣΤΩΙΑΓΝΕΙΑΕΑΝΤΙΣΘΕΛΗΤΙ
ΑΝΑΘΕΜΑΘΕΙΝΑΙΤΩΙΘΕΛΟΝ
ΤΙΑΝΑΘΕΜΑΘΕΙΝΑΙΕΞΕΣΤΩ
ΠΡΩΤΟΣΛΕΓΕΙΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΥ
10 ΣΘΑΙΛΙΣΙΒΗΑ·ΟΝΤΟΝΣΥΝΑ

ΓΩΓΕΑΤΩΝΔΕΑΝΑΘΕΜΑΤΩΝ
 ΤΩΝΟΝΤΩΝΕΝΤΕΤΟΙΣΝΑΟΙΣ
 ΚΑΙΤΩΝΕΠΙΓΕΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΩΝΕΝ
 ΤΕΤΑΙΣΤΗΛΑΙΣΚΑΙΤΟΙΣΑΝΑΘΕΜΑ
 15 CINMHΔENIEΞECTΩIMHTEAΠA
 ΛEΨAIMHTEAXPEΩCAMHTEMETA
 PAIEANΔETICΠAPEΓBACΠOIHCHH
 MAPHHTITOEICTONΘEONTONCAB
 BATICTHNKAIAPOTEICATΩIEIC
 20 TONΘEONTONCABBATICTH
 KAITOICCABBATICTAIC·<·PKATHIΠOΛI
 ·<·PKAIDYNACTH·<·PECTΩIDHCTHΛH
 OMOCIAKATIKONMHΔENAYΠODE
 ΞACΘAITOHMAPΔIAIPETIΩIDOIE
 25 PEYCTAICΦEPOMENATΩIΘEΩIIEICKATA
 CKEYHHTOYTOΠOY

Ἔδοξε τοῖς ἐταίροις καὶ Σαββα-
 τισταῖς θεοῦ . . . οἷα Σαββατισ-
 τοῦ συνηγμένοις τὴν ἐπιγρα-
 φὴν χαράξαντας μηδένα ἄκυ-
 5 ρον ποιῆσαι· τῷ δὲ ποιήσαν-
 τί ἐστὼ <ι> ἰγνεία· εἰάν τις θέλη τι
 ἀνίθεμα θεῖναι, τῷ θέλον-
 τι ἀνίθεμα θεῖναι ἐξέστω.
 10 Πρῶτος λέγει· στεφανοῦ-
 σθαι δις Ἰβήλιον τὸν συνα-
 γωγέα· τῶν δὲ ἀναθεμάτων
 τῶν ὄντων ἔν τε τοῖς ναοῖς
 καὶ τῶν ἐπιγεγραμμένων ἔν
 τε ταῖς στήλαις καὶ τοῖς ἀναθέμα-
 15 σιν μηδενὶ ἐξέστω <ι> μήτε ἀπα-
 λείψαι μήτε ἀχρεῶσαι μήτε μετὰ-
 ραι· εἰάν τις παρεγβὰς ποιήσῃ ἢ
 ἀ]μαρτῆ τὸ εἰς τὸν θεὸν τὸν Σαβ-
 βαστιστὴν καὶ ἀποτεισάτω <ι> εἰς
 20 τὸν θεὸν τὸν Σαββατιστὴν [
 καὶ τοῖς Σαββατισταῖς <· P· καὶ τῇ πόλι
 ·<· P· καὶ δυνάστη <· P· ἔστω <ι> δ' ἢ στήλῃ ἀ[π-
 ομοσία κατ' ἴσον μηδένα ὑποδέ-
 25 ξασθαι τὸ ἡμάρ· διαιρείτω δ' ὁ ἱε-
 ρεὺς τὰ ἰσφερόμενα τῷ θεῷ εἰς κατα-
 σκευὴν τοῦ τόπου.

The letters have suffered much from the weather, and they are sadly blurred. After many days' toil I have certainly made most of the letters except a few which remain doubtful; viz. in line 10 we might equally read *αἰεὶ Βήλ[ι]ον* or *Λίθιβήλ[ι]ον* or *δὲς Ἰβήλ[ι]ον*: in line 23 *κατ' ἴσον*.

This is the decree of a religious brotherhood (*συναγωγή*, lines 3, 10–11), the members of which are styled *ἑταῖροι* in line 1 (compare No. 56). Apparently a new register of members had been drawn up, and was ordered to be inscribed (*ἐπιγραφή*, lines 3, 4, which I do not take to be the inscription before us). To guard against misconstruction it is here decreed that the publication of a new register is not to be made the opportunity of excluding any one (*μηδένα ἄκυρον ποιῆσαι*, lines 4, 5); if any one concerned should chance to omit a member's name from the new register, it will be considered as a blunder which needs atonement by purification (*ἀγνεία*, line 6). So far from excluding any, the decree proceeds to invite members to use their privilege of making offerings to the god (lines 6–8). It is evident that some of the brotherhood had been averse to the drafting of a fresh register, urging that the proposal was aimed at certain members whose claims to membership were doubtful and their names likely to be struck off.

Lines 9 foll. contain a rider proposed by Protus. The convener of the brotherhood (*τὸν συναγωγέα*) is to be crowned—a special compliment which is equivalent to a vote of confidence. It was he, it seems, who had desired to reorganize the brotherhood; there was need of it, for the place of meeting was in bad repair (lines 25, 26), and the offerings and monuments in the shrines there had suffered ill-usage from the members or others (lines 11–17). He had carried his point, in the face of opposition; the decree in lines 1–8 was probably introduced by him by way of silencing the arguments of the objectors. Upon which Protus carries a vote of confidence, and lays down certain rules which make in the direction of discipline and even of exclusiveness. The sign $\cdot<\cdot$ is uncommon; compare however Reinach, *Traité d'Épigraphie Grecque*, p. 216; *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* v. 190; Kenyon's *Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens*, p. 109. Mr. Hogarth tells me it is found at Paphos and Salamis in Cyprus. $\cdot<\cdot$ P stands for 100 drachmas. The *πόλις* of line 21 is the town on the adjoining height described by Mr. Bent. Its name is not known (though Mr. Bent was anxious to connect it with the name of the *Σαββατισταί*, which he read *Ἐαββατισταί*). The *δυνάστης* (line 22) must be the dynast of Elacussa, in the district of which this town probably lay. Lines 22–24: the stele is further to be a monument of the brotherhood having sworn that none of them will entertain strangers at his house on the day of the periodical gathering. Such seems to be the meaning; and, if so, it is quite in keeping with the rest of the rider. If no guests were entertained at home that day, strangers were less likely to presume to attend the festival.

In spite of the circular ζ and ϵ , the Ω is of older form, and the iota adscriptum is constant, except at the end of the 3rd pers. subj. The superfluous iota in the imperatives is common enough in documents from the third century B.C. onwards. I cannot therefore make this document much later

than the Augustan age. If there is clumsiness in the drafting, we must not expect too much of these rude Cilician mountaineers; and if some of the lettering seems late, we must remember that the inscription is not a civic document, but the decree of a brotherhood.

If this is the date, then the dynast of Elaeussa (Sebaste) alluded to in line 22 will be Archelaus: see Strabo, pp. 535, 537, 671; Ramsay, *Historical Geography*, p. 371.

But lastly, what of the word *Σαββατισταί*, which is used not only of the brotherhood (lines 1, 21), but also of the object of their worship both in the singular and plural number—*θεοῦ Σαββατιστοῦ*, line 2; *θεὸν τὸν Σαββατιστήν*, line 18; *εἰς θεῶν τῶν Σαββατιστῶν* (*sc. ἱερὸν*), lines 19, 20? The word need not necessarily be connected with the Jewish *σάββατα*. It had another form *Σαμβατισταί*, as we learn from No. 17. We may compare the names *Σανβά[τιος]* in *Arch. Epigr. Mittheil. aus Oesterreich*, viii. 1883, p. 197 (from Prusa); *Σαμβατεῖς Βρομίου Ἀγκυρανῆ* (from Athens, and not Christian) in *C.I.A.* iii. 2225 (= Kumanudes, 1392); *Σαμβάτις* (= *Σαμβάτιος*, Christian) in *C.I.A.* iii. 3525 (= Kumanudes, 3600); *Σανβάτιος* (Christian) in *C.I.G.* 8912. These names probably come from the same root as *Σαβάζιος*, concerning which see Foucart, *Les Associations Religieuses*, pp. 77 foll., and Sterrett's *Epigraphical Journey*, No. 45. With *Σαββατισταί* compare *Ἀδωνιασταί*, *Δημητριασταί*, *Ἡρακλείσταί κ.τ.λ.* If it is strange that the worshippers, and the deity or deities they worshipped, should have the same title, we may understand the worship to have been orgiastic, the title *Σαββατιστής* as describing the god engaged in his *πομπή* or *θίασος*. The epithet would accordingly suit the god and his worshippers equally well.

On the other hand the derivation from *Σάββατα* is the most obvious, and there is really nothing against it. This synagogue of Jews is organized after the manner of an Hellenic *θίασος*.

Mr. Bent notes that this inscription and No. 17, together with another wholly unrecognizable (was it the *ἐπιγραφή* of line 3?), were all found close by a ruined Byzantine church, which he thinks may mark the site of an ancient temple. If so, this would be the temple alluded to in lines 12, 19, 20; and its site the *τόπος* of line 26.

17. On the rock, beside the preceding inscription. The original was not copied; the impression made by Mr. Bent I have failed to decipher after hours of labour. But I have recovered for certain in lines 1, 2 *ΤΩΝΣΑΜΒΑΤΙΣΤΩΝ*, and in line 3 *ΣΑΝΤΟΝ*. Letters, more or less blurred, appear here and there in other lines, but I can make no sense. Immediately before *ΤΩΝΣΑΜΒΑΤΙ* I fancy I read *ΗΕΤΑΙΡΗΑ*, *i.e.* *Ἡ ἑταιρία τῶν Σαμβατι[στῶν]*. The last word is pretty certain, and is another form of *Σαββατιστῶν*, for which see No. 16. The lettering is good and would quite suit the Augustan age, to which the form *ἑταιρία* points.

18-20. About 1½ miles from the site of the preceding documents, Nos. 12-17, in a valley behind Ayash. Three caves in the face of the rock, one

above the other, with intercommunication. The orifice has in each case been walled up with polygonal masonry, the uppermost and lowest having the wall pierced with a doorway. The lintel of the lowest door consists of a sort of dwarfed *acdicula* in relief. Upon the plinth is the inscription; from the plinth there rises on either side a short column supporting a plain entablature and pediment. The space thus enclosed between pillars, plinth, and entablature, is much broader than high, and is occupied by a male and female figure (busts only) in relief. The letters (I judge from Mr. Bent's excellent squeeze) are not later than the second century B.C., and are probably earlier. The middle story has neither door, nor relief, nor inscription. The upper cave has over its doorway the inscription No. 19, but the relief is destroyed. The Propylaeum, with inscription No. 20, was in front of the lowest cave. Below the upper cave, on the surface of the rock, and on the same level as the lowest cave, is a rock-cut figure in relief.

18. From a perfect squeeze by Mr. Bent.

ΕΠΙΗΕΡΕΩΣ ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ

Ἐπὶ ἱερέως Ἑρμοκράτου.

The letters are firm and graceful, and point to the second century B.C. at latest.

19. Over the doorway of the upper cave: see on No. 18. From Mr. Bent's copy; no squeeze could be taken.

ΕΠΙΗΕΡΕΩΣ ΣΑΝΔΑΠ
ΑΝΗΦΙΣΚΟΥ

This is considerably later than No. 18. It clearly is not earlier than the reign of Augustus. The phrase *δαπάνη φίσκου*, and the dedication of the Propylaeum (No. 20) to *Ἑρμῆ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ*, compel us to adopt Mr. Bent's view, that this curious series of caves formed a primitive shrine of Hermes (compare the caves of Pan and of Apollo at the N. of the Athenian Acropolis). Otherwise we should at once take them for tombs.

20. 'Over gateway to Propylaea of the above temple; the stone is overturned. Pediment with nine figures on it.' From an excellent squeeze by Mr. Bent. The letters are all in one line, and are quite certain.

ΕΠΙΗΕΡΕΩΣΛΟΥΚΙΟΥΜΑΙΤΕΝΝΙΟΥΤΙΤΟΥΥΙΟΥΚΟΛΛΕΙΝΑΛΟΝΓΕΙ-
ΝΟΥ ΑΓΟΣΙΑΤΕΡΤΙΑΜΑΡΚΟΥΘΥΓΑΤΗΡΓΥΝΗΔΕΤΙΤΟΥΜΑΙΤΕΝ-
ΝΙΟΥΕΡΜΕΙΚΑΙΤΩΔΗΜΩΤΟΠΡΟΠΥΛΑΙΟΝΕΚΤΩΝΙΔΙΩΝ

Ἐπὶ ἱερέως Λουκίου Μαιτενίου Τίτου υἱοῦ Κολλείνα Λονγείνου, Ἀγοσία Τερτία Μάρκου θυγάτηρ γυνὴ δὲ Τίτου Μαιτενίου Ἑρμῆ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ τὸ προπύλαιον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων.

III.—CORYCUS AND THE CORYCIAN CAVE.

From Corycus (Ghorgos) a road runs up westward from the sea, leading to the Corycian cave. At a spot called Cholakü, to the left of this road, on the first plateau above the sea, are the ruins of a town. Thirteen bas-reliefs are here to be seen, cut half-way down a precipitous cliff, two of which (Nos. 22, 23) have inscriptions.

21. 'On a rock-cut tomb in a valley behind the ruins and mediaeval ortress of Ghorgos.' From copy and impression by Mr. Bent. Published, from a copy by Langlois, *C.I.G.* 9182; Le Bas-Waddington, No. 1432.

† ΗΡΟΕΙΟΝ	Ἡρόειον
ΝΟΝΝΟΥΣ	Νόννον
ΜΕΣΣΙΚΑΣ	Μεσσικᾶ
ΙΜΑΤΙΟΤΡΣ	ίματιοπρά(του?)

The letter enclosed in π is certainly Α. Previous editors read it Ο, and wrote *ίματιοπορ(φυρέως)*.

22. On the road from Corycus to the Corycian cave. Excellent squeeze by Mr. Bent. Inaccurately given by M. Collignon, *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* iv. 1880, p. 137.

ΟΥΑΣΙΞΤΟΝΑΝΔΡΑΤΟΝΑΥΤΗΣΚΑΙ ΔΥΙΟΞΑΥΤΟΥΡΩΣΓΗΤΙΞ
ΜΩΝΡΩΣΓΗΤΙΟΞ

Οὔασις τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν αὐτῆς, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ῥώσγητις, | Μῶν Ῥωσγήτιος.

Letters of good time, and quite clear, not later than the third century B.C. The inscription is complete. Collignon wrongly ὁ υἱὸς αὐτῆς.

23. Under another bas-relief at the same spot. From squeeze taken by Mr. Bent. Inaccurately given by M. Collignon, *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* iv. 1880, p. 136.

Ι Ε Μ Σ Τ Ο Ν Α Ν Δ Ρ Α Τ Ο Ν Α Υ Τ Η Σ Κ Α Ι Τ Ο Ν Υ Ν
Γ Λ Ι Ρ Α Κ Ι Σ Ο Γ Α Μ Β Ρ Ο Σ Τ Ε Ρ Θ Ε Μ Α Σ Ι Ν ᾽ Ἰ Τ Ο
Ι Ν Τ Ε Ρ Β Ε Μ Α Σ Ι Ο Σ
Ε Π Ο Ι Η Σ Λ Ν Σ Α Δ Α Σ Α Μ Ι Σ Τ Ε Τ Ε Ο Υ Σ Π Ρ Η Ν Α Μ Ε Υ Σ


. . . εμ[ι]ς τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν αὐτῆς καὶ τὸν υἱὸν,
 . . . ρακίς ὁ γαμβρὸς,
 Τερβέμασιν [Ζᾶ]το[ς],
 Ἄρ[?]ιν Τερβεμάσιος.
 Ἐποίησεν Σαδάσαμις Τετεοῦς Πρηναμεύς.

The last word in line 5 must give the name of one of these Cilician towns. The letters are good, and cannot be much later than the Christian era.

The inscriptions from the Corycæan cave will best be prefaced by Strabo's description of it, which is evidently that of an eye-witness, pp. 670, 671 (see Mr. Bent's remarks *ante*): Κώρυκος ἄκρα, ὑπὲρ ἧς ἐν εἴκοσι σταδίοις ἐστὶ τὸ Κωρύκιον ἄντρον, ἐν ᾧ ἡ ἀρίστη κρόκος φύεται. ἔστι δὲ κοιλὰς μεγάλη κυκλωτέρας ἔχουσα περικειμένην ὀφρὺν πετρῶδη πανταχόθεν ἰκανῶς ὑψηλήν· καταβάντι δ' εἰς αὐτὴν ἰνώμαλόν ἐστιν ἔδαφος καὶ τὸ πολὺ πετρῶδες, μεστὸν δὲ τῆς θαμνώδους ὕλης ἀειθαλοῦς τε καὶ ἡμέρον· παρῆσπαρται δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐδάφη τὰ φέροντα τὴν κρόκον. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄντρον αὐτόθι ἔχον πηγὴν μεγάλην ποταμὸν ἐξείεισαν καθαροῦ τε καὶ διαφανοῦς ὕδατος, εὐθὺς καταπίπτοντα ὑπὸ γῆς· ἐνεχθεὶς δ' ἀφανὴς ἔξεισιν εἰς τὴν θάλατταν· καλοῦσι δὲ πικρὸν ὕδωρ. The description of Pomponius Mela (i. 13, § 71 foll.) is more elaborate, but to the same effect: Non longe hinc Coryceus oppidum portu saloque incingitur, angusto tergoze continenti adnexum. supra specus est nomine Coryceius singulari ingenio, ac supra quam ut describi facile possit eximius. grandi namque hiatu patens montem litori adpositum et decem stadiorum clivo satis arduum ex summo statim vertice aperit. tunc alte demissus et quantum demittitur amplior viret lucis pendentibus undique, et totum se nemoroso laterum orbe complectitur: adeo mirificus ac pulcher, ut mentes accedentium primo aspectu consternat, ubi contemplari duravere non satiet. unus in eum descensus est angustus asper quingentorum et mille passuum per amoenas umbras et opaca silvae quiddam agreste resonantis, rivis hinc atque illinc fluitantibus. ubi ad ima perventum est rursus specus alter aperitur ob alia dicendus. terret ingredientes sonitu cymbalorum divinitus et magno fragore crepitantium. deinde aliquamdiu perspicuus, mox et quo magis subitur obscurior, ducit ausos penitus, atque quasi cuniculo admittit. ibi ingens amnis ingenti fonte se extollens tantummodo se ostendit, et ubi magnum impetum brevi alveo traxit iterum demersus absconditur. intra spatium est magis quam ut progredi quisquam ausit horribile et ideo incognitum. totus autem specus augustus et vere sacer, habitarique a diis et dignus et creditus, nihil non venerabile et quasi cum aliquo numine se ostentat. (He then proceeds to describe the smaller depression near by, which was also visited by Mr. Bent, *ante*.) alius ultra est quem Typhoneum vocant, ore angusto et multum, ut experti tradidere, pressus, et ob id adsidua nocte suffusus neque unquam perspicui facilis, sed quia aliquando cubile Typhonis fuit et quia nunc demissa in se confestim exanimat natura fabulaque

memorandum. There is an account of the cave by Tchihatschew in *Ergänzungsheft 20 zu Petermann's Geographische Mittheilungen* (Perthes, Gotha, 1867, with Map by Kiepert), p. 54: 'Excursion zur Coryeischen Höhle. Nach viertelstündigem nicht steilen, aber durch die Zerstrümmung des antiken Pflasterweges erschwerten Steigen ein halbzerstörtes altes Gebäude von dem Stufen nördlich in eine Engschlucht hinabführen, an deren Ende nach einer weiteren Viertelstunde eine zerstörte Kirche mit Resten byzantinischer Malerei im Innern, die jetzt als Moschee dient, unmittelbar am bequemen Eingang der Grotte; diese ist voll von Stalaktiten und Stalagmiten, zeigt auf dem Wande noch griechische Inschriften, fällt gegen N.O. hinab; ihr Hauptraum hat eine mittlere Höhe von 50 m. (am Eingange über 80 m.) bei einer Breite von 20 m. und einer Länge von 270 m., weiterhin verengt sie sich zu einer ungangbarer Felsenspalte, in der man einen Bach rüuschen hört. Die Schilderungen der Alten, namentlich Strabon's und Mela's, zeichnen sich als dichterisch ausgeschmückt, von der angeblichen reichen Vegetation (namentlich Crocus) im Innern ist keine Spur zu finden und überhaupt steht der Grotte von Antiparos und anderen weniger berühmt gewordenen weit nach.' This does not substantially differ from Mr. Bent's account; Tchihatschew seems to confine his attention too exclusively to the inner cavern. The ancients meant by the Corycian Cave not only this cavern, but also the large depression out of which it led. What caused their wonder was the contrast between the rich profusion of growth in this deep depression open to the sky, and the gloom and mysterious noises of the inner cave. The grotto visited and described by Victor Langlois in the Sheitan-lik is, of course, not the Corycian Cave (Langlois, *Rapport*, &c., p. 9).

24 'Within the cave itself, just below the old temple, and previously covered up in part with rubble.' From a good squeeze by Mr. Bent.



Ἀγκεσι καὶ δρυμοῖς ἢ δ' ἄλσεσι,— πρὶν μυχθὼν εὐρὼν
 δόμεναι ἐν γαίης βένθεσιν εἰναρίμοις,
 ἠχηεῖς ὄθ' Ἄωος ἀφένγησι ρεύμασι φεύγει,—
 Πάνα καὶ Ἑρμείην [Ζ]εῦ Πάφιε εἰκάσαμε[ν].

The letters are quite clear, and probably belong to the latter half of the second century A.D. The names of the dedicators may have been inscribed

on the plinth of the statues or reliefs referred to in line 4, *εἰκάσαμε[ν]*. They had set up figures of Pan and Hermes amid the wild brushwood of the outer and open cave, just before one enters into the inner cavern. The latter is described in exact terms which recall the descriptions of Strabo and Mela. It is *ἐν γαίης βένθεσιν*: the epithet *Εἰναρίμοις* takes us back to *Hicel* ii. 783, and *Aeneid*, ix. 716. Virgil was not the only writer who read *εἰν Ἀρίμοις* as one word (see commentators on both passages), and the legend of Typhoeus belonged to Cilicia more than to S. Italy, though Pindar (*Pylh.* i.) harmonizes the two accounts. From line 3 we learn that the name of the river which rose and disappeared so noisily within the cave was Aous; this agrees with *Etymol. Mag.* s.v. Ἄφος, where, though the gloss is sadly confused, a line is cited from Parthenius referring to the Cilician Aous:

Κωρυκίων σεύμενος ἐξ ὀρέων.

Similarly Hesychius s.v. Ἄωου· θεοὶ οἱ ἐκ Δρόμου μετακομισθέντες εἰς Σαμοθράκην λίμνην (Lobeck corrigiit ἢ Λήμνον). καὶ Κίλικες ἀπὸ Ἄωου τοῦ Κεφάλου, [ἢ τοῦ] παραρρέοντος ποταμοῦ. These glosses will be found discussed by Meineke, *Analecta Alexandrina*, pp. 279 foll. Line 4: it is not strange that Pan and Hermes should be associated together in this wild sport. But Oppian, who was a native of Corycus, tells us the local legend which connected the two deities with the cave (*Halicent.* iii. 1—28). Invoking Hermes as the god of his fathers and of Corycus (*ἐν Κιλικεσσιν ὑφ' Ἑρμαίοις ἀδύτοισι*, | Ἑρμεία σὺ δέ μοι πατρώϊε, κ.τ.λ.), he tells how Hermes instructed his son Pan in the fisherman's arts, and how Pan helped Zeus thereupon to slay Typhon. It was Pan who by a tempting dinner of fish drew the monster out of his cave to the shore; there Zeus at once slew him with the thunderbolt, and the marks of his blood were still seen on the sands:

*Πᾶνι δὲ Κωρυκίῳ βυθίην παρακάτθεο τέχνην,
παιδὶ τεῶ, τὸν φασὶ Διὸς ῥυτῆρα γενέσθαι,
Ζητὸς μὲν ῥυτῆρα, Τυφαόνιον δ' ὀλετῆρα.
Κείνος γὰρ δειπνοῖσιν ἐπ' ἰχθυβόλοισι δολώσας
σμερδαλέον Τυφῶνα παρήπαφεν, ἕκ τε βερέθρου
δύμεναι εὐρωποῖο καὶ εἰς ἰλὸς ἐλθέμεν ἀκτῆν·
ἐνθα μιν ὄξειαι στεροπαὶ ῥιπαὶ τε κεραυνῶν
ζαφλεγέες πρήνιξαν· ὁ δ' αἰθόμενος πυρὸς ὄμβροισι
κρᾶθ' ἑκατὸν πέτρῃσι περιστυφελίζετο πάντη
ξαινόμενος· ξανθαὶ δὲ παρ' ἠϊόνεσσιν ἔτ' ὄχθαι
λίθρῳ ἐρευθιώσιν Τυφαονίων ἀλαλητῶν.*

The invocation of Paphian Zeus is strange: the dedicators were doubtless from Cyprus, and on p. 35 of Mr. Hogarth's *Discia Cypriaca* will be found an inscription from old Paphos mentioning Ζεὺς Πολλεύς (= Le Bas, 2795). It is also worth while to remember that the Corycian Cave was sacred to Zeus

(the destroyer of Typhoeus), and that there was an Λους river in Cyprus. Strabo does not give the name of the Corycian stream; he simply says: *καλοῦσι δὲ πικρὸν ὕδωρ.*

25. 'Over the door of the Byzantine Church in the Corycian Cave. No squeeze taken.' Copy by Mr. Bent.

†ΩΕΙΠΕΡΘΕΟΝΕΔΟΞΩΤΟΝΧΩΡΗΤΟΝΛΟΤΟΝ
ΧΑΙΡΟΥΣΑΜΕΙΚΡΟΙΣΕΝΚΑΤΩΚΗΣΟΝΔΟΜΟΙΣ
ΟΙΣΠΑΥΛΟΣΑΝΗΓΕΙΡΕΘΕΡΑΠΩΝΟCΟCΚΑΜΩΝ
ΤΟΝΠΑΙΔΑΤΟΝCΟΝΧΡΙCΤΟΝΕΚΜΙΜΟΥΜΕΝΗ

*ᾠ(σ)περ Θεὸν ἐδ(έ)ξω τὸν [ἀ]χώρητον Λόγον,
χαίρουσα μικροῖς ἐνκατ(οί)κησον δόμοις,
οἷς Παῦλος ἀνήγειρε θεράπων ὁ σὸς καμῶν,
τὸν παῖδα τὸν σὸν Χριστὸν ἐκμιμουμένη.*

A beautiful quatrain, recording the dedication of the church to the Blessed Virgin by one Paulus, probably in the fourth century.

26. 'From temple on height above Corycian Cave.' From a good squeeze by Mr. Bent.

	ΔΗΚΟΡΥΚΙΩ	Διὶ Κωρυκίῳ
	ΕΠΙΝΕΙΚΙΩ	Ἐπινεικίῳ
	ΤΡΟΠΑΙΟΥΧΩ	Τροπαιούχῳ
	ΕΠΙΚΑΡΠΙΩ	Ἐπικαρπίῳ
5	ΥΠΕΡΕΥΤΕΚΝΙΑΣ	ὑπὲρ εὐτεκνίας
	ΚΑΙΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΙΑΣ	καὶ(αὶ) φιλαδελφίας
	ΣΤΟΝΦ	τῶν
	ΣΕΒΑΣΤΩΝ	Σεβαστῶν.

Line 5 appears to have been anciently erased, to judge by the impression. But either Φ is clear, and also the last three letters and ΔΕ: parts of the other letters are also faintly visible, so that there is no doubt of the reading.

The inscription is an ex voto on behalf of Caracalla and Geta, A.D. 211, and the word *φιλαδελφίας* was erased after Geta had been murdered and declared a public enemy, A.D. 212.

27. On the front of North anta of Temple above the Cave. For the text I have Mr. Bent's excellent squeezes of stones III.-IX. In addition, Mr. Ramsay has given me his own and Mr. Hogarth's very careful copy of the whole of the original, which I have collated minutely with the impressions: only in one or two slight details could I detect any error. The uncial text gives their copy. Mr. Ramsay notes: 'O and Ω are smaller by a very little than other letters; the vertical stroke of I leans, sometimes more, sometimes less. The entire surface of upper stones has scaled off, and they are very hard to read; the lower stones are clear and well-preserved. All has been seen by me, and in great part by D. G. Hogarth. I send you my copy (W. M. R.), which in almost all respects is that of both. All variants of D. G. H. were verified carefully by W. M. R., and in most cases re-verified by D. G. H. One or two variants are recorded, where of interest.' I may add, from the evidence of the impression, that Π and Γ are both found. The letters, strange to say, increase in size towards the bottom; the reverse is usually the case with inscriptions on temple-walls, for convenience of reading.

STONE I.

Λ Α
 ΎΟΣΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΥ
 ΩΝΛΙΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ
 ΑΛΩΝΙΔΗΣΥΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΥ
 5 ΑΠΕΛΛΗΣΥΣΙΣΤ ΑΤΟΥ
 ΑΞ ΑΠ ΑΛΩΤΟΣ
 ΝΟΣΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΟ
 Ν ΚΟΜΟΡΡ
 ΝΟΔΩΡΟΣΖΗΝΟΔΟ
 10 ΑΥ ΤΑΣΑΙΕΡΑΚΛ
 ΕΛΕΥ Ο ΑΤΕΑ
 Flaw in Stone.
 ΡΙΟΥ
 ΝΔΒ Ο
 15 ΙΟΣ
 Ν ΜΙΩ ΟΙ
 ΑΡΙΩΝΑΠΕΛΛΕΟΥΣ
 ΝΩΡΑΠΟ ΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ
 ΡΑΚΛΕΟΥΣ
 20 ΤΡΑΙΟ

STONE II.

ΚΥΑΡΙ . . ΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΟΣ
 ΚΡΑΤΗΣΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ
 ΔΙΟΜΗ//ΙΗΣΑΓΓΟΛ/ΩΝΙΔΟΥ
 ΘΥΡΟΛΑΟΣΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΟΣ
 25 ΙΑΣΩΝΝΕΩΝΟΣ
 ΒΙΘΥΣΛΑΚΡΑΤΟΥ
 ΘΡΒΙΣΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ

Line 21.—Hogarth preferred ΕΥΑΡΙ . . . Ρ . ΕΥΣ ΙΟΣ even after comparing my copy.

Line 26.—ΒΙΟΥΣ, Hogarth.

Line 27.—ΟΤ ΙΣ, Hogarth.

In the cursive text I follow Messrs. Ramsay and Hogarth's readings, save only when they are corrected by the impressions.

STONE I.

Λ Α

..... ος Ἀθηναίου
 Κλέ[?]ων Λ(υ)σιστράτου
 Ἀπο]λλωνίδης Λυσιστράτου
 5 Ἀπελλῆς Λυσιστ[ρ]άτου
 .. αξ Ἀπ[ο]λλῶτος
 ... νος Ἀρτέμων[ς]
 .. ν .. Κομορρ ...
 Ζη]υόδωρος Ζηνοδό[του
 10 .. ατ ... τας ... ρακλ ...
 .. ελευ . ο . . [Ἀπ]ελ[λέους
Flaw in Stone.
 ρίου
 Ρώ]υδβιος ...
 15 ιος ...
 Ῥωμ]υ[α]μίω[υ] Ὀ(ξ)[ολλᾶ ?
 Ἀρίων Ἀπελλέους
 Νικά]νωρ Ἀπο[λ]λωνίδου
 Ἡ]ρακλέους
 20 Μι](σ)ραίο[υ

STONE II.

Ῥαρ]κύαρι[ς] Ἀρτέμωνος
 Ἐπι?]κράτης Ἀπολλωνίδου
 Διομήδης Ἀ(π)ολ(λ)ωνίδου
 Θυρόλαος Ἀρτέμωνος
 25 Ἰάσων Νέωνος
 Βίθης Λακρίτου
 Ὀρβις Ἀπολλωνίοι

ΜΟΥΡΜΙΣΝΕΙ
 ΡΩΣΓΗΤΙΣ
 30 ΚΝΙΔΑΣΝΕΝΑ
 ΤΕΡΒΕΜΑΣΙΣΣΑΝΔΑ
 ΤΕΤΗΣΝΕΝΑΥΙΟΣ
 ΤΕΔΙΑΡΙΣ ΡΟΥ Λ
 ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΣΝΕΝΑΜΩ
 35 ΞΕΝΩΝΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΔΟΥ
 ΡΩΠΡΥΜΕΡΙΣ_ΕΤΑΣΙΟΣ
 ΛΥΣΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟΣ
 ΙΑ_ΑΡΜΑΣΡΩ
 Μ ΣΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΟΥ
 40 ΜΩ_ΑΛΗΣΡΩΝΔ
 ΝΕΩΝΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟΣ
 ΝΙΚΑΝΩΡΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΟΥ

STONE III.

Ε
 ΑΡΧΟΣΟΞΕΟΥΣ
 45 ΟΛΛΙΣΤΡΟΚΟΑΡΒΑΣΙΟΣ
 ΡΩΝΔΒΙΗΣΞΕΝΩΝΟΣ
 ΡΩΝΙΡΥΜΕΡΙΣΘΕΥΑΣΙΟΣ
 ΤΕΤΗΣΟΞΕΟΥΣ
 ΜΩΣΡΩΣΓΗΤΙΟΣ
 50 ΝΕΩΝΡΩΙΑΡΜΑ
 ΜΑΡΟΛΛΑΣΟΗΤΑΣΙΟΣ

Line 28.—Or ΜΩΡ. Impossible to say how much, if anything, is lost at the end of these lines.

Lines 30, 32, 34.—Probably the same name: but the text is very doubtful, the stones being much decayed. My reading approximates to ΝΕΝΑΡΙΟΣ, Hogarth's to ΝΕΝΑΟΡΜΙΟΣ (cp. 72, on which we agree).

Line 34.—Or ΡΙΩ at end of line.

Line 36.—The variation of spelling in 36, 47, was carefully compared by me. Read ΘΕΥΑΣΙΟΣ. (So W.M.R. But the impression in 47 has ΟΕΤ, in 51 ΟΗΤ, E.L.H.)

Line 38.—ΡΩΙΑΡΜΑΣ may be correct: Α several times was read in my first copy for Ω: but compare 62.

Line 39.—Μ[Ω]Σ certainly, as in 49.

Line 45.—The impression certainly has ΠΡΟΚ, E.L.H.

Line 51.—The impression certainly has ΜΑΡΡ, E.L.H.

- Μοῦρμις Νει . . .
 Ἐρώσγητις . . .
 30 Κνίδας Νενά[ριος
 Ἐρβέμασις Σ(α)νδᾶ ?
 Τετῆς Νενά(ρ ?)ιος
 Ἐεδίαρις [Δ]ρου[μ](ά)[ριος
 35 Πολύκλειτος Νενά(ρί ?)ω
 Ξένων Ἀπολλωνίδου
 Ἐωζρύμερις (Ἰη)τάσιος
 Λυσίστρατος Νικάνορος
 Ἰα[ξ]άρμας Ἐω(σ)[γήτιος
 Μ[ῶ]ς Ἐπικράτου
 40 Μο(τ)άλης Ἐωνδ[βίου
 Νέων Νικάνορος
 Νικάνωρ Ἐπικράτου

STONE III.

- ε . . .
 45 Δηλί ?]αρχος Ὁξέους
 Ὀλλις Προκοαρβασιος
 Ἐωνδβίης Ξένωνος
 Ἐωνζρύμερις Ὀετάσιος
 Τετῆς Ὁξέους
 Μῶς Ἐωσγήτιος
 50 Νέων Ἐωζάρμα
 Μαρρόλλας Ὁητάσιος

Line 36.—See lines 47, 51. W. M. R. conjectures Θενάσιος.

ΤΕΤΗΣΟΞΕΟΥΣ
 ΟΞΟΛΛΑΣΟΞΕΟΥΣ
 ΠΑΠΑΣΔΗΛΙΑΡΧΟΥ
 55 ΡΩΜΒΙΓΡΕΜΙΣΡΩΣΓΗΤΙΟΣ
 ΠΑΡΑΣΡΟΥΝΙΣΡΩΜΝΑΜΙΟΣ
 ΜΙΣΡΑΙΟΣΡΩΣΓΗΤΙΟΣ
 ΚΟΜΩΝΡΩΜΝΑΜΙΟΣ
 ΔΙΟΜΕΔΩΝΡΩΝΔΒΙΟΥ
 60 ΤΡΟΚΟΜΒΙΓΡΕΜΙΣΝΗΝΙΟΣ
 ΥΒΡΙΣΤΕΥΚΡΟΥ
 ΙΗΝΟΦΑΝΗΣΑΙΑΡΜΑ
 ΤΒΕΡΑΣΗΤΑΣΤΟΚΡΙΟΣ
 ΡΩΣ *///* ΗΤΙΣΑΡΤΕΜΩΝΟΣ

STONE IV.

65 *///* ΩΝΔΒΕΡΡΑΣΡΩΝΔΙΝΑΣΙΟΣ Β
/// ΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΙΟΣΤΑΡΚΥΜΒΙΟΥ
/// ΛΟΥΣΤΕΔΙΑΡΙΟΣ
 ΙΑΣΤΕΔΙΑΡΙΟΣ
 ΙΗΝΩΝΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ
 70 ΟΞΗΙΣΤΕΤΕΟΥΣ
 ΞΥΙΣΠΑΡΑΣΕΡΡΥΜΟΥ
 ΟΝΙΑΣΝΕΝΛΟΡΜΙΟΣ
 ΤΡΟΚΟΙΑΡΜΑΣΡΩΙΑΡΜΑ
 ΟΠΡΑΜΩΣΙΣΝΗΝΙΟΣ
 75 ΡΩΝΙΕΙΣΡΩΝΔΒΙΟΥ
 ΓΙΑΛΙΣΤΕΔΙΑΡΙΟΣ
 ΡΩΣΓΗΤΙΣΜΩΙΟΣ (*siv*)
 ΡΩΝΔΒΙΗΣΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ Β
 ΡΩΝΔΕΡΒΕΜΙΣΝΗΝΙΟΣ
 80 ΡΩΝΔΙΝΕΣΙΣΡΩΝΔΒΕΡΡΑ
 ΚΒΕΔΙΑΣΙΣΡΩΝΔΒΙΟΥ

Line 63, 64 should change places, so impression certainly, E.L.H.

Line 66.—Impression certainly ΑΤΡΟΣ, E.L.H.

Line 67.—ΚΛΟΥΣ.

Line 71.—Probably ΑΡΙΣ, W.M.R. But Σ . . Σ certainly in squeeze, E.L.H.

Line 72.—Probably ΩΝΙΑΣ.

- 55 Τετῆς Ὀξέους
 Ὀξόλλας Ὀξέους
 Παπᾶς Δηλιάρχου
 Ῥωμβίγρεμις Ῥωσγήτιος
 Παρασρούνης Ῥωμνίμιος
 Μίσραιος Ῥωσγήτιος
 Κόμων Ῥωμνίμιος
 60 Διομέδων Ῥωνδβίου
 Τροκομβίγρεμις Νήνιος
 Ὕβρις Τεύκρου
 Ζηνοφύνης Ἀζίρμα
 Ῥώσ[γ]ητις Ἀρτέμωνος
 Ὑβερασήτας Τύκριος

STONE IV.

- 65 Ῥῶνδβέρρας Ῥωνδινίσιος β.
 Ἀντίπατρος Ταρκυμβίου
 Κ]λοῦς Τεδιάριος
 Ζᾶς Τεδιάριος
 Ζήνων Ἀπολλωνίου
 70 Ὀξηῖς Τετέους
 Σ . . ς Παρασερρύμου
 (Ω)νίας Νευλόρμιος
 Τροκοζάρμας Ῥωζάρμα
 Ὀπρίμωσις Νήνιος
 75 Ῥωνίεις Ῥωνδβίου
 Γιάλις Τεδιάριος
 Ῥώσγητις Μῶ(τ)ος
 Ῥωνδβίης Ἀπολλωνίου β.
 Ῥωνδέρβεμις Νήνιος
 80 Ῥωνδίεσις Ῥωνδβέρρα
 Κβεδίασις Ῥωνδβίου

ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣΙΗΝΟΦΑΝΟΥ
 ΡΩΝΔΙΝΑΣΙΣΡΩΝΔΒΙΟΥ
 ΜΩΣΜΙΚΥΡΟΥ
 85 ΙΑΣΔΟΡΤΙΟΣ

STONE V.

///ΚΙΜΩΣΚΟΜΑΣ///ΙΟΥ
 //ΑΣΤΡΟΚΟΜΒΙΓΡΕΜΙΟΣ
 ΟΠΡΑΜΩΣΙΣΤΕΥΚΡΟΥ
 90 ΔΙΟΝΙΚΟΣΤΑΡΚΥΜΒΙΟΥ Β
 ΠΛΩΣΟΑΡΙΟΣ
 ΙΑΣΩΝΡΩΜΒΙΓΡΕΜΙΟΣ Β
 ΤΕΥΚΡΟΣΥΒΡΙΤΟΣ Β
 ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΣΥΒΡΙΤΟΣ
 95 ΝΕΝΙΚΑΜΙΔΙΣΡΩΜΒΙΓΡΕΜΙΟΣ
 ΝΙΚΑΝΩΡΙΗΝΟΦΑΝΟΥ Β
 ΑΝΤΙΓΕΝΗΣΡΩΝΔΒΕΡΡΑ Β
 ΙΗΝΟΦΑΝΗΣΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ Β
 ΕΡΜΙΠΠΟΣΤΒΕΡΑΣΗΤΑ
 100 ΙΑΣΡΩΝΔΕΡΒΕΜΙΟΣ
 ///ΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΣΟΞΕΟΥΣ
 ΔΗΛΙΑΡΧΟΣΠΑΡΑ
 ΚΛΕΑΓΟΡΟΣΓΟΡΓΙΟΥ
 ΝΙΚΑΝΩΡΡΩΣΓΗΤΙΟΣ
 ΚΛΟΥΣΜΩΤΟΣ
 105 ΔΙΟΝΙΚΟΣΔΗΛΙΑΡΧΟΥ
 ΙΑΣΓΙΑΛΙΟΣ

STONE VI.

///ΑΝΩΡΧ_ΙΡΟΚΡΑ
 ///ΕΩΝΙΗΝΟΦΑΝΟΥ
 ΓΠΑΡΑΣΕΡΡΥΜΟΣΡΩ////////ΒΕΜΙΟΣ
 110 ΡΩΝΔΒΙΗΣΑΝΤΙΓΕΝΟΥ Β
 ΜΕΝΕΔΗΜΟΣΔΙΟΜΕΔΟΝΤΟΣ

Line 86.—Impression ///ΛΟΥ, E.L.H.

Line 101.—Impression ΠΑΠΑ, E.L.H.

Line 102.—ΡΟΣ or ΡΩΣ; doubtful [ο impression (E. L. H.).]

85 Ἐρμοκράτης Ζηνοφάνου
Ῥωνδίασις Ῥωνδβίου
Μῶς Μικύρου
Ζᾶς Δόρτιος

STONE V.

90 . . κίμως Κομασ . . . λου
Ζ]ᾶς Τροκομβιγρέμιος
Ῥπράμωσις Τεύκρου
Διόνικος Ταρκυμβίου β.
Πλῶς Ῥάριος
Ῥιάσων Ῥωμβιγρέμιος β.
Τεύκρος Ῥβριτος β.
Ῥριστόβουλος Ῥβριτος
95 Νευικάμιδις (*sic*) Ῥωμβιγρέμιος
Νικάνωρ Ζηνοφάνου β.
Ῥντιγένης Ῥωνδβέρρα β.
Ζηνοφάνης Ῥντιπάτρου β.
Ῥρμιππος Τβερασήτα
100 Ζᾶς Ῥωνδερβέμιος
Π]ολύκλειτος Ῥξέους
Δηλιάρχος Παπᾶ
Κλεάγορος (*sic*) Γοργίου
Νικάνωρ Ῥωσγήτιος
Κλοῦς Μῶτος
105 Διόνικος Δηλιάρχου
Ζᾶς Γιάλιος

STONE VI.

110 Νικ]άνωρ Χ(ει)ροκρά[του
Κλ]έων Ζηνοφάνου
Παρασέρρυμος Ρω[δερ]βέμιος
Ῥωνδβίης Ῥντιγένου β.
Μενέδημος Διομέδοντος

- ΝΕΟΠΤΟΛΕΜΟΣΕΡΜΙΠΠΟΥ
 ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΔΩΡΟΣΒΙΟΥ Β
 ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣΙΑΤΟΣ Β
 115 ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ Β
 ΑΝΤΙΓΕΝΗΣΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ Β
 ΥΒΡΙΣΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΥ Β
 ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣΤΕΥΚΡΟΥΤΟΥΥΒΡΙΤΟΣ
 120 ΙΗΝΟΦΑΝΤΟΣΜΙΣΙΟΣ Β
 ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΗΣΕΡΜΙΠΠΟΥ
 ΟΡΟΝΤΗΣΜΩΤΟΣ Β?
 ΤΑΥΡΙΣΚΟΣΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ Β
 ΔΑΙΑΣΙΑΤΟΣ
 125 ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ Β
 ΥΒΡΙΣΤΕΥΚΡΟΥ
 ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣΠΟΛΕΜΩΝΟΣ

STONE VII.

- ΟΡΑΣΕΑΣΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ Β
 ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣΤΕΥΚΡΟΥΤΟΥΥΒΡΙΤΟΣ Β
 ΔΙΟΜΗΔΗΣΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ
 130 ΖΗΝΟΦΑΝΗΣΤΕΥΚΡΟΥ
 ΚΛΕΩΝΕΡΜΙΠΠΟΥ Β
 ΙΑΣΩΝΕΡΜΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ Β
 ΕΡΜΟΦΑΝΤΟΣΝΙΚΑΝΟΡΟΣ Β
 ΚΛΕΩΝΔΙΟΜΗΔΟΥ
 135 ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣΜΩΤΟΣ Β
 ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΟΤΟΣΔΙΟΝΙΚΟΥ Β
 ΑΡΜΑΡΩΝΙΑΣΜΙΣΙΟΣ
 ΚΛΕΩΝΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΟΥ
 140 ΑΝΤΙ ΟΧΟΣΜΕΝΕΔΗΜΟΥ Β
 ΙΑΣΩ ΝΝΙΚΑΝΟ////ΟΣ
 ΤΕΥΚΡΟΣΝΙΚΑΔΟΥ Β

Line 113.—Perhaps ΒΙΟΥ.

Line 120.—Β at end of line in impression, E.L.H.

Line 121.—Doubtful if Β or mark in stone.

Line 127.—ΘΡΑΣ . .

Line 137.—Impression Ζ, E.L.H.

Lines 139, 140.—N.B. Flaw in stone.

- 115 Νεοπτόλεμος Ἐρμίππου
 Ἡρακλεόδωρος Βίου β.
 Ἐπικράτης Ζᾶτος β.
 Ἀντιπατρος Ἀντιπάτρου β.
 Ἀντιγένης Ἀπολλωνίου β.
 Ὑβρις Ἀριστοβούλου β.
 Ἐπικράτης Τεύκρου τοῦ Ὑβριτος
 Ζηνοφάντος Μίσιος β.
 120 Διοσκουρίδης Ἐρμίππου β.
 Ὀρόντης Μῶτος β. ?
 Ταυρίσκος Νικολάου β.
 Δάζας Ζᾶτος
 Ἐρμοκράτης Πολυκλείτου β.
 125 Ὑβρις Τεύκρου
 Διοκλῆς Πολέμωνος

STONE VII.

- (Θ)ρασέας Ἐρμοκράτου β.
 Ἐρμοκράτης Τεύκρου τοῦ Ὑβριτος β.
 130 Διομήδης Ἐρμοκράτου
 Ζηνοφάνης Τεύκρου
 Κλέων Ἐρμίππου β.
 Ἰάσων Ἐρμογένους β.
 Ἐρμόφαντος Νικάνορος β.
 Κλέων Διομήδου
 135 Ἐρμοκράτης Μῶτος β.
 Ἀπολλόδοτος Διονίκου β.
 Ἀρμαρώνζας Μίσιος
 Κλέ(ω)ν Διοσκουρίδου
 Ἀντίοχος Μενεδίμου β.
 140 Ἰάσων Νικάνορος
 Τεῦκρος Νικαίδου β.

ΤΕΥΚΡΟΣΔΙΟΚΛΕ.ΥΣ
 ΔΙΟΜΗΔΗΣΔΙΟΝΙΚΟΥ
 ΕΡΜΟΦΑΝΤΟΣΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΟΥ Β
 145 ΕΡΜΙΠΠΟΣΛΑΚΡΑΤΟΥ

STONE VIII.

ΝΕ ΙΟΜΗΔΟΥ
 ΛΟΥ ΣΔΡΥΜΑΡΙΟΥ Β
 ΚΝΩΣΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ
 ΔΙΟΝΙΚΟΣΕΥ.ΟΥΛΟΥ
 150 ΑΡΙΣΥΒΡΙΤΟΣ
 ΕΡΜΗΣΙΑΝΑΞΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΟΥ
 ΕΡΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΟΥ
 ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣΤΕΥΚΡΟΥ
 ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΗΣΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΟΤΟΥ
 155 ΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΣΤΑΥΡΙΣΚΟΥ
 ΕΡΜΟΦΑΝΤΟΣΕΡΜΟΦΑΝΤΟΥ

STONE IX.

ΖΗΝΟΦΑΝΤΟΣΕ . . . ΟΦΑΝΤΟΥ
 ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΗΣΕ.ΜΟΦΙΛΟΥ
 ΔΗΜΑΡΧΟΣΤΕΥΚΡΟΥ Β
 160 ΔΙΟΝΙΚΟΣΒΟΗΘΟΥ Β
 ΕΠΙΚΡΑΤΗΣΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΟΤΟΥ
 ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΗΣΚΛΕΩΝΟΣ Β
 ΤΕΥΚΡΟΣΠΑΠΟΥ

 165 ΠΟΛΥΚΛΕΙΤΟΣΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΟΥ Β
 ΑΡΧΕΛΑΟΣΑΡΧΕΛΑΟΥ

Lines 146, 147.—Probable number of letters lost indicated by dots.

Line 148.—Β at the end of line in squeeze, E.L.H.

Line 150.—Name anciently erased after ΑΡΙΣ in squeeze, E.L.H.

Line 158.—Apparently Ρ never engraved.

Line 159.—ΔΗΜ, W. M. R.; but certainly ΔΗΛΙ on squeeze, E.L.H.

- 145 Τεύκερος Διοσκουρίδης
 Διομηδῆς Διοσκου
 Ἐρμόφαντος Διοσκουρίδου ἕ.
 Ἑρμῆπιος Λακωνίου

STONE VIII.

- 150 Νεῖων Διοσκουρίδου
 Λου... Διοσκουρίδου ἕ.
 Κυῖης Ἐρμωκράτου ἕ.
 Διοσκου Εὐβουλίου
 Ἄρης Ἰθρύτος
 Ἑρμῆσιμναξ Ἐρμωκράτου
 Ἐρμωκράτης Ἐπιερῆτου
 Ἐπιερῆτης Τεικεῖ
 Διοσκουρίδης Ἀπολλυδάτου
 155 Νικόλαος Ταυρῶν
 Ἐρμόφαντος Ἐρμωκράτου

STONE IX.

- 160 Ζηροφάντος Ἐβρωφιδίου
 Διοσκουρίδης Ἐβρωφιδίου
 Δηλιασχος Τεικεῖ ἕ.
 Διοσκου Βορῆου ἕ.
 Ἐπιερῆτης Ἀπολλυδάτου
 Διοσκουρίδης Κλεωνος ἕ.
 Τεύκερος Πιπτι
 Πολύδευτος Διοσκουρίδου ἕ.
 165 Ἀρχέλαος Ἀρχελάου

ΟΥΙΟΣ
 ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ Β
 ΙΑΣΩΝ ΖΗΝΟ
 ΦΑΝΟΥΣ Β

The list reads as follows :—

- | | |
|-----|---|
| (a) | Μ[. ὁ
καὶ Ἄπ
Κάτυλλος
Ἐπικράτους,
5 Ἀθηνόδο[τος
Ζηνοφάν[ους, |
| (b) | . . . ν . . . Διοσκουρί[δου,
ἠνόδ[ω]ρος
Ἐπικράτους
10 τοῦ καὶ Ἄππα β,
Κάτυλλος
Καλλιστράτου β,
Πο. Αἴλι[ος] (Κ)νη-
τὸς Ἀπε[λ]λῆς β,
15 Ζηνοφάνης β,
ὁ καὶ Ῥωμύλος,
ἱερεὺς διὰ βίου
τῶν Νεμέσεων,
(c) Δημήτριος
20 Ζηνοφάνους,
Διογένης ὁ καὶ
Κόππαλος (?) Ἄππα
ὁ υἱὸς
25 τῆς πόλεως Β,
Ἰάσων Ζηνο-
φάνους β, |
| (d) | β
. . . . λευς Β,
. . . . σγιος
30 Λ ς
Μ. Αὐρ υἱὸς
Ε . . . υχε . . . ν
δὲ, ὁ καὶ Πομπή[ιος] |
| (e) | ὁ καὶ . εδῖς
35 καὶ Ζηνοφάνης
Ν
. . . . α
. . . Ὀ]πίμιος Λι . .
. . . . καὶ χος . . Β |

The inscription here is illegible.—D.G.H.

- (f) 40 M. Λύρ. Μου . νης δις ό κέ 'Αν(ά)τολις ?
 ις . . β
 M. Λυρ. Κω σας και ἴσα β.
 M. Λύρ. 'Ερμολογένης Δοκε . . .
uninscribed εχ . . . Ἴσογέ[νης
- 45 M. Λύρ ος 'Αθηνόδο[τος
 . . . οσιος . . . ν(δ)ρι ακε
 . . . ωνου
 Καλλί(σ)τ[ρατος . . .
 τοῦ Λίσε . ου β,
 Π. Λίλιος
 'Ερμησιά[ναξ] β,
 Ζη[νοφαν] . . .
- 50

29. 'A long inscription running along the side of the cave, in one line; letters 6 in. high.' Copied by Mr. Bent; no squeeze.

. . . ΚΑΙ . . . ΠΟΥΟΛΟCCIOYEP . . . ΟΥC . . ΓΑ . ΠΑΠΑΙΔΑ . .

30. 'On the inner wall of the temple of Zeus above the Cave, rudely scratched.' Mr. Bent's MS. copy; no squeeze taken.

ΞΕΥ ΚΟΡΥ	(Ζ)εῦ Κ(ω)ρύκιε
Τ	Τ .
ΤΡΑΓΑΝΟΣ	Τρα(ί)ανός ?

It is conceivable that this *graffito* dates from the time of Trajan's illness and death at Selinus on the coast (afterwards named Trajanopolis), A.D. 117?

IV.—KORASION.

31. 'On the coast, about five miles south of Ghorghos, at a spot called Chok-Oren: over the inscription is the sign of the cross.' From Mr. Bent's excellent impression. Published in *C.I.G.* 4430 from Beaufort's copy: but he omitted line 6, which reveals the name.

ΕΠΙΤΗΣΒΑΣΙΛΙΑCΤΩΝΔΕCΠΟΤΩΝΗΜΩΝ
 ΟΥΑΛΕΝΤΙΝΙΑΝΟΨΚΑΙΟΥΑΛΕΝΤΟCΚΑΙΓΡΑΤΙΑΝΟ
 ΤΩΝΑΙΩΝΙΩΝΑΥΓΟΨCΤΩΝ
 ΦΛ'ΟΨΡΑΝΙΟCΟΛΑΜΠΡΟΤΑΤΟCΑΡΧΩΝ
 ΤΗCΙCΑΥΡΩΝΕΠΑΡΧΙΑCΤΟΝΤΟΠΟΝ
 ΤΟΥΚΟΡΑCΙΟΨΠΡΟΤΕΡΟΝΑΓΝΟΟΨΜΕΝΟΝ
 ΚΑΙΕΡΗΜΟΝΟΝΤΑΕΞΟΙΚΙΩΝΕΠΙΝΟΙΩΝ
 ΕΙCΤΟΥΤΟΤΟCΧΗΜΑΗΓΑΓΕΝΕΚΘΕΜΕΛΙΩΝ
 ΑΠΑΝΤΟΕΡΓΟΝΚΑΤΑCΚΕΥΑCΑC

35. 'To right and left of Lamos R. are many towns and fortresses. By a bridge, about fifteen miles from the mouth of river, are two stones facing opposite ways cut thus in large letters.' Copy by Mr. Bent.

(a) 'Facing north; letters 1 ft. high.'

ΟΡ
ΠΡΕ
ΙΡ·Ι<ΟΚΜ

(b) 'Thirty feet distant, on a rock facing south.'

ΟΡ
ΠΡΕ
ΙΡ
<ΟΚΜ

(c) 'On another rock near.'

Ο Ο
,

These must surely be boundary stones—*ῥο[ος]*, *ῥο[ος]*. But the rest I cannot explain.

36. 'From a town a little higher up the Lamos gorge, on the right-hand cliff: rock-cut figure with sword and lance, and inscription in shallow letters painted red.' Mr. Bent's impression, which is very dim.

ΟΣΔΑΝΒΑ	“Ος δ' ἄν βιά-
ΛΗΗ	λη ἦ [ἀπο-?
ΑΣΣΗΤΟΝ	λέση τὸν
ΔΟΜΟΝΒΑ	δόμον βα-
Λ ΑΥΤΟ	λ[εῖ ?] . . .
Ε ΟΣ
ΣΕΛΙΣ	

The letters are very difficult to read, but are of fairly good time, not later than the Christian era.

37. 'Ruins of very large town on left bank (Tapourelü), with castles, temples, theatre, &c. overgrown with brushwood. Only one inscription found, over window of a Byzantine church; no squeeze possible.' Copy by Mr. Bent.

†ΤΗΒΕΜΙΣΟΥΠΟΛΙΑΚΩΝΕΥΣ
ΑΜΕΝΟΤΗΝΕΥΧΗΝΑΠΕΔΩΚΕ

Τ(έρ)βεμις ὁ ὑπο(δ)ιάκων εὐ(ξ)-
άμενος τὴν εὐχὴν ἀπέδωκε.

38. 'Village near this point, with fortress guarding a plain.' Copy by Mr. Bent.

ΕΥΞΑΜΕΝΟΙΟΙΤΕCΑ
ΡΕCΑΔΕΛΦΟΙΥΙΟΙΑ
ΡΟΥΑΡΑΤΗΝΕΥΧΗΝ
ΑΠΕΔΩΚΕΝΤΩΑΠΩ
5 † ΚΟΝΩΝΕΙ †

Εὐξάμενοι οἱ τέσσα-
ρες ἀδελφοὶ υἱοὶ Ἄ-
ρουάρα (?) τὴν εὐχὴν
ἀπέδωκ(α)ν τῷ ἀ(γί)ῳ
Κόνωνει.

There was a St. Conon martyred at Iconium under Aurelian; see *Dict. of Christian Antiq.* s.v., and D. G. Hogarth, *Devia Cypria*, pp. 13, 14, where this saint is named.

39. 'Ruins a little inland from Lamos River, at spot called Settè Gul: no squeeze.' Copy by Mr Bent.

ΜΑCΤΟΝΕΑΥΤΗCΑΝ
ΔΡΑΜΝΗΜΗCΧΑΡΙΝ
ΤΕΧΝΗΘΡΑCΕΟΥ

Μᾶς τὸν ἐαυτῆς ἄν-
δρα, μνήμης χάριν.
Τέχνη Θρασέου

40. 'Ezbeqli; further up the Lamos valley. In relief a soldier with lance at his side. The letters are large and clear, and painted with red.' From impression.

ΕΤΡΑΤΩ
ΝCΤΡΑΤΩ
ΝΑΤΟΝΥ
ΟΝΜΝΗΜΗC
5 ΧΑΡΙΝϑ

Στράτω-
ν Στράτω-
να τὸν ὕ-
δον μνήμης
χάριν.

41. 'Mara. Near source of Lamos, high up in mountains on frontier of Karamania; extensive ruins, in acropolis of which many coins of Olba have been found. Only one inscription, on a late tomb: no squeeze taken.' Copy by Mr. Bent. Given by Sterrett, *Wolfe Expedition* No. 2.

BENT.
ΑΙΛΙΟCΒΙΑΝΩ
ΤΟΥΕΤΡΑΝΟ
ΑΑΙΛΙ
ΤΗΕΥΕ
5 ΕΠΟΙΗCΕ

STERRETT.
ΑΙΛΙΟCΒΙΑΝΩ////
Ι'ΟΥΕΤΡΑΝΟ^////
ΑΜΑΑΙΛΙ,/////////
ΤΗCΥΙ/////////
ΕΠΟΙΗCΕ/////////

Αἴλιος Βιάνω-
ρ οὐετρανὸ[ς
ἄμα Αἴλι[ανῆ
τῇ συ(μ)[βίῳ
5 ἐποίησε.

The name Βιάνωρ is not uncommon in these parts, see Sterrett, *ib.* Nos. 240, 328.

VI.—FURTHER INLAND: JAMBAZLI.

42. 'Jambazli: extensive ruins, but yielding only three poor inscriptions. On a late stele, the following inscription running along the top and sides, round male bust.' From Mr. Bent's copy and partial squeeze.

ΑΙΝΓΟΛΙΣΕΡΜΑΙΟΥ. ΑΡΚΙΩ		
ΑΥΤΟΣ	ΕΠΟΙ	ΝΙΝ
ΗΓΙΡΗ	ΕΡ	ΤΟΝ
ΒΩΜΟΝ ΜΟ	ΕΙ	ΥΕΟΝ
ΜΝ	ΦΙ	
ΑΣ	ΛΟΣ	
ΧΑ		
ΡΙΝ		

*Αἰνγολίς Ἐρμαίου [Τ]αρκίωνιν τὸν ὑέ(ι)όν· αὐτὸς ἡγερὴ βωμὸν μν[εί]ας
χάριν. Ἐρμόφιλος ἐποίει.*

43. 'Jambazli: circular stele built into a well; no squeeze taken.' Copy by Mr. Bent.

ΜΑΥΡ	Μ. Λύρ.
ΑΙΝΓΟΛΑΣΔΙΩ	<i>Αἰνγόλας Διο-</i>
ΓΕΝΟΥΣΝΑΝΑΛΑ	<i>γένους Νᾶν Λα-</i>
ΚΡΑΤΟΥΣΤΗΝ	<i>κράτους τῆν</i>
5 ΕΑΥΤΟΥΓΥΝΑΙ	<i>ἐαυτοῦ γυναι-</i>
ΚΑΜΝΗΜΗΣ	<i>κα μνήμης</i>
ΧΑΡΙΝ	<i>χάριν.</i>

44. 'Jambazli: stuck into a well; probably taken from one of two fine heroa just above.' Copied by Mr. Bent.

ΣΑΒΙΝΟΣΑ ΑΓΓΟΗΡΩΝ

Possibly: Σαβίνος Ἀᾶ (τ)ὸ ἡρῶον. The name Ἀᾶς is not impossible.

VII.—OURA (OLBA) AND UZUNJABURDJ.

45. 'On large square fortress at Uzunjaburdj.' From a good impression which was taken with difficulty on a ladder. The letters are well preserved, and are 3½ in. in height. Lower down on the fortress, carefully cut and surrounded by an oblong frame or border is a horizontal club, the Olban symbol.

	ΕΡΗΠΕΡΕΛΣΤΕΥΚΡ	Ἐπὶ ἱερέως Ἐύκρ[ου]
	ΤΟΥΤΑΡΚΥΑΡΙΟΣ	τοῦ Ἐαρκυάριος,
	ΕΠΙΣΤΑΤΗΣΑΝΤΟΣ	ἐπιστατήσαντος
	ΤΒΕΡΗΜΛΣΙΟΣ	Ἐβερημώσιος [τοῦ ?]
5	ΟΡΒΑΛΑΣΗΤΑ	Ὀρβαλασίτα
	ΟΛΒΕΩΣ	Ὀλβέως.

The letters are quite certain, and are at least as early as 100 B.C.

46. 'Uzunjaburdj: running along wall of the same fortress, and too high to take a squeeze; letters late, but well and deeply cut.' Copy of Mr. Bent corrected from copy by Mr. Hogarth.

ΕΠΙΠΕΤΡΩΝΙΟΥΦΑΥ. . ΕΙΝΟΥΤΟΥΑΛΛΑΠΡΟΤΑΤΟΥΥΠΑΤΙΚΟΥΚΑΙΚΤΙΣΤΟΥ

Ἐπὶ Πετρωνίου Φαυ[στ]είνου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ὑπατικοῦ καὶ κτίστου.

47. 'On a large square fortress at Uzunjaburdj, too high to take a squeeze.' Copy by Mr. Bent.

ΛΟΡΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΟΣ	Λο(γ)ιστεύοντος
ΠΑΠΙΑΚΑΠΕΤΩΛΕΙ	Παπία Καπετωλεί-
ΝΟΥΤΟΥΚΡΑΤΙΣΤΟΥ	νου τοῦ κρατίστου.

Compare the following document.

48. 'On the same level as the preceding: no squeeze taken.' Copy by Mr. Bent.

ΕΡΓΕΠΟΠΤΟΥΑΝ	Ἐργεπόπτου Ἐν-
ΤΩΝΕΙΝΟΥΣΕΚΟΥΝ	τωνείνου Σεκούν-
ΔΟΥΤΟΥΚΡΑΤΙΣ	δου τοῦ κρατίσ-
ΤΟΥ	του.

These three last documents date the repair of this fortress at a later period.

49. 'Uzunjaburdj; found built into the wall of a Yourouk's cottage.' Impression by Mr. Bent.

ΞΑΙ ΟΝΑΙΘΛΛΟΕΝΤΙΠΥΡΗ
 ΧΡΥΣΕΟΝΑΧΡΑΝΤΩΙΘΗΚ
 ΜΩΓΓΙΔΡΙΣΤΕΥΡΟΙΟΣΥΔΩ
 ΟΠΛΙΞΕΙΣ ΙΤΟΥΔΕΚΑΤΑΝΣ

Ξά[νθι]ον αἰθαλόεντι πυρὶ [πρήσας πτολίεθρον
 χρύσειον ἀχράντων θήκα [θεῶν στέφανον
 Μώγγιδρις Γεύκροιο· σὺ δ' ὦ [πτολίπορθος Ἀθήνα
 ὄπλιζ' εἰς [αἰε]ῖ τοῦ δεκάταν σ[ὺ δέ]χει.

Inscribed in letters of good style, with iota adscriptum: the bar of Θ does not quite touch the circle. I should incline to assign the inscription to the first century B.C. If Ξά[νθι]ον is rightly restored in line 1 (and I can think of nothing else), I should take the dedication to be made by some Cilician of mark who had assisted in the pillage and burning of Xanthus by Brutus, B.C. 43 (Appian, *Bell. Civ.* iv. 18 foll.). The endings of the lines are merely suggested *metri gratia*.

50. 'Uzunjaburdj: façade with five elegant columns, and inscription running along the architrave; the last stone overturned. Letters about a foot high, all in one line; no squeeze possible.' From Mr. Bent's MS. corrected from a copy by Mr. Ramsay.

ΟΠΠΙΟΣΟΒΡΙΜΟΥΚΑΙΚΥΡΙΑΛΕΩΝΙΔΟΥΗΓΥΝΗΟΠΠΙΟΥΤΟΤΥΧΑΙΟΝΤΗΠΟΛΕΙ

Ὅππιος Ὀβρίμου καὶ Κυρία Λεωνίδου ἡ γυνὴ Ὀππίου τὸ Τυχαῖον τῆ πόλει.

Apparently of the first century A.D.

51. 'Block of entablature, Uzunjaburdj'; from copy communicated to me by Prof. W. M. Ramsay.

ΙΑΝΟΥΠΑΡΘΙ
 ΑΙΑΝΟΝΑΔΡΙ

Ἀὐτοκράτορα Καίσαρα, θεοῦ Τρα]ϊανοῦ Παρθι[κοῦ
 υἱὸν, θεοῦ Νερούα υἱωνὸν, Τρ]αῖανὸν Ἀδρι[ανὸν κ.τ.λ.

52. 'Uzunjaburdj: from ornamental border of the proscenium of theatre badly engraved letters, 6 in. high.' No squeeze; copy by Mr. Bent.

ΙΝΕΙΝΩΣΕΒΑΡΜΕΝΙΑΚΩ
 ΒΑΡΜΕΝΙΑΚΩ

Ἀὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι Μ. Ἀὐρ. Ἀντ] (ω)νεῖνω Σεβ. Ἀρμενιακῶ·
 Ἀὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι Λ. Ἀὐρ. Βήρω Σε]β. Ἀρμενιακῶ.

The date is within A.D. 164-165.

53. 'On a base beside No. 56.' Copy communicated by Prof. Ramsay.

	ΣΩ	Διονύ σφ
	ΑΡΠΩ	πολυκ ύρπφ
	ΑΝΟΣ	'Αππι ανός
5	ΙΕΙΝΟΣ	'Αντ(ω) ν,είνος
	ΙΣ	δ]ίς
	ΟΥΡΓΟΣ	δημι]ουργός.

Compare No. 55; and, for *δημιουργός*, see also the inscription from Hieropolis-Castabala, *Hell. Journal*, xi. (1890), p. 248.

54. 'Uzunjaburdj: on a bracket on a column. Compare the brackets on rows of columns at Pompeiopolis and Hieropolis.' A good woodcut of one of these brackets from Pompeiopolis (carved in one piece with the drum) may be seen in Davis' *Asiatic Turkey*, p. 23. The inscription is complete on the right, but broken on left. The copy below is by Mr. Ramsay.

=====	
ΑΜΥΝΤΑ]'Αμύντα
ΜΟΝΑΚΑΙ	τὸν ἡγε]μόνα καὶ
ΑΡΕ ///	κτίστην] ἀρε[τῆς
=====	[ἔνεκα.]

55. 'Among the ruins at Uzunjaburdj.' Copy communicated by Prof. Ramsay.

	ΗΠΟΛΙΣ	'Η πόλις
	ΠΟΑΙΛΙΟΝΤΙΒΕΡΙ	Πο. Αἰλιον Τιβέρι-
	ΟΝΚΙΝΤΥΛΛΙΑΝ	ον Κιντυλλιαν[όν
	ΑΠΠΙΑΝΟΝΑΝΤΣ	'Αππιανόν' Αντ(ω)-
5	ΝΕΙΝΟΝΤ	νείνον τ[όν δις
	ΔΗΜΙΟΥΡ	δημιουρ[γόν.

Compare No. 53.

56. 'Square stone which had supported a statue; at Uzunjaburdj: no squeeze.' Copy only.

ΜΑΥΡΠΑΠΕΙΡΙΑΝΟΝ	Μ. Αὐρ. Παπειριανόν
ΤΟΝΚΑΙΑΜΑΧΙΝ	τὸν καὶ Ἄμαχιν,
ΙΕΡΕΑΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΥ	ιερέα Διονύσου,
ΤΟΝΥΙΟΝΤΟΥΑΖΙΟΛΟ	τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀξιολό-

5	ΓΩΤΑΤΟΥΑΘΗΝΟ	γωτάτου Ἀθηνο-
	ΔΩΡΟΥΟΕΤΑΙΡΟΣ	δώρου, ὁ ἑταῖρος
	ΗΡΑΚΛΑΣΤΟΥΓΝΗ	Ἡρακλᾶς τοῦ γνη-
	ΣΙΩΤΑΤΟΥΦΙΛΟΥ	σιωτάτου φίλου.
	ϙ	

We expect *φίλου*, but the writer has either been confused by the preceding genitives or else he intends the genitive to depend on *ἑταῖρος*.

57. 'Round the exterior of the apse of a church, Olba.' From a copy by Mr. Bent, supplemented by a copy communicated by Prof. Ramsay.

† ΕΠΙΩΑΝΝΟΥΛΗΤΟΙΟΥΤΟΥΜΑΚΑΡΙΩΤΑΤΟΥΗΜΩΝΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ
ΤΟΕΡΓΟΝΤΟΥΤΟ

† ΕΡΓΟΝΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΥΛΟΥΚΑ †

† Ἐπὶ Ἰωάννου Λητοίου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπου ἐγένετο
το ἔργον τοῦτο.

† Ἐργον Στεφάνου Λουκά.

58. 'Broken stone built into a wall at Uzunjaburdj.' From good impression by Mr. Bent and copy by Messrs. Ramsay and Headlam.

ΤΕΡΒΕΜΑΞΙΣΤΕΔΙΝΗΝΙΟΣ
ΠΛΑΤΑΝΕ ΣΦΑΙΛΙΛΟΥΣΗΓΥΝΗ
ΤΕΥΚΡ ΥΝΤΟΝΕΑΤΩΝΥΙΟΝ
ΑΝΔΡΑΓΑΘΙΑΣ

Τερβέμασις Τεδινήνιος | Πλατανε[ν]ς καὶ Λίλους ἡ γυνὴ | Τευκρ[ο]ῖν
τὸν ἑατῶν υἱόν, | ἀνδραγαθίας.

There is some doubt about the 8th letter in line 1, which may be **Ξ** ; and about the third of line 2. All the other letters are quite certain, so far as they are given in the uncial text. Πλατανεύς points to a deme of Olba; hardly to Platanea in Bithynia (Ramsay, *Historical Geography*, p. 65).

59. 'Tomb in valley at Uzunjaburdj.' From impression made by Mr. Bent, 1 a MS. copy communicated later by Messrs. Headlam and Hogarth; the latter add that the tomb stands 'on the W. side of gorge, by the Sacra Via.

ΠΙΑΝΟΣ ΜΗΝΑΚΑΙ ΑΒΑΑΠΠΙΑΝΟΥ Η ΓΥΝΗ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΝΟΡΚΙΖΟΜΕΝΤΟΥ ΟΥΡΑΝΙΟΥΣ ΘΕΟΥΣ

ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΚΑΤΑΧΘΟΝΙΟΥΣ
ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΜΕΒΗΜΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΓΟΝΕΙΣ
ΗΜΩΝ ΜΕΧΡΕΙΤΕ ΚΝΟΥ ΚΑΚΑ
ΜΟΟΥ ΕΞΟΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΤΕΒΗΝΑΙ
ΕΝ ΤΑΥΤΗ ΤΗΣ ΟΡΩΣ ΔΑΝ
ΤΟ ΛΜΗΣ Η ΕΠΙ ΤΗ ΔΕΥΒΗ
ΕΞΕΙ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΒΕΙΑ ΚΕΧΟΛΩ
ΜΕΝΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΣΤΥΓΕΡΑΣ ΕΡΕΙΝΥΑΣ

ΚΑΙ ΙΔΙΟΥ ΤΕ ΚΝΟΥ ΗΠΑ
ΤΟΣ ΓΕΥΣΕΤΑΙ ΟΣ ΑΝ ΠΑ
ΡΑΚΟΥΣ Η ΤΩΝ ΑΡΩΝ
ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΑΝΟΙΣ Η
Η ΑΛΛΟ ΠΤΩΜΑ ΕΠΕΝ
ΒΗ

πιανός Μηνῆ καὶ Ἄβα Ἀππιανουῦ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἐνορκίζομεν τοὺς οὐρανίους θεοὺς
καὶ τοὺς καταχθονίους
εἰς τὸ μεθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ γονεῖς
ἡμῶν μέχρην τέκνου Κακα-
μούου ἐξόν εἶναι τεβήναι
ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ σορῶ· ὃς δ' ἂν
τολμήσῃ ἢ ἐπιτηδεύῃ
ἔξει πάντα τὰ θεία κεχολω-
μένα καὶ τὰς στυγερὰς Ἐρεινύας,

καὶ ἰδίου τέκνου ἥπα-
τος γεύσεται ὃς ἂν πα-
ρακούσῃ τῶν ἀρῶν
καὶ παρανοίξῃ
ἢ ἄλλο πτόμα ἐπεν-
θῇ.

For the Furies, see *Hell. Journal*, xi. (1890) p. 239. The imprecations are even fiercer than are commonly met with on Cilician tombs. The word *κεχολωμένος* occurs frequently in this connexion in Mr. Sterrett's tombstones (*Epigraphical Journey*, Nos. 28-30, &c.).

60. 'At Uzunjaburdj: on E. side of gorge by Sacra Via.' This and the following epitaphs are given from a MS. copy communicated by Messrs. Headlam and Hogarth. They may be compared with the similar group of Christian tombstones from Cilicia in *C.I.G.* 9155 foll.

+ ΘΗΚΗΚΟΝ ΕΥΓΕΝΙΟΥ ΞΥΛΙΚΑΡΙΟΥ ΚΑΤΑ ΕΠΠΡΟΠΙΝ +

+ Θήκη Κόν[ωνος] Εὐ(γ)ενίου, ξυλικαρίου κατὰ ἐπ(ιτ)ροπίν +.

61. Same place: see No. 60.

+ ΒΗΚΙΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΝΤΕΚΑΙ ΕΙΑ . Τ

+ Θήκη Παρθένου τε και Εία . τ

Probably the second word was intended for a possessive.

62. Same place : see No. 60.

+ ΔΗΚΗΚΥΡΙΑΚΡΥΚΕΙ /
ΔΙΑΡΙΣΕΡΓΙΟΥ
ΤΟΥΤΗΚΝΩ
ΑΤΤΥ

+ Θήκη Κυριακ(ο)ῦ κέ
. Σεργίου
τοῦ τήκνου
(ἀ)ττῦ (= αὐτοῦ !).

63. Same place : see No. 60.

+ ΘΙΚΗΑΝΔΡΕΑ
ΑΒΗΒΑΣΤΟΝ
ΑΥΤΩΤΕΚΝΟΝ +

+ Θ(ή)κη Ἀνδρέα·
Ἀβήβας τὸν
αὐτοῦ τέκνον +

64. Same place : see No. 60.

+ ΕΗΓΕΟΡΓΙΩ
ΠΡΟΜΑΧΙΩ +

+ θή(κη) Γεοργίου
Προμαχίου.

65. Same place : see No. 60.

+ ΣΩΜΑΤΟΘΗΚΗ
ΠΑΥΛΟΥΒΑΣΙΛΙΑ^Ε
ΤΑΤΙΑΝΗΣ . ΤΩΝ
ΑΥΤΙΣΤΕΚΝΟΝ +

+ Σωματοθήκη
Παύλου, Βασιλίας,
Τατιανῆς, τῶν
αὐτῆς τέκνον.

66. Same place : see No. 60.

+ ΘΗΚΕΙΔΙΑ
ΦΕΡΟΥΕΑΓΕΝΑΔΙΟΥ
ΚΑΙΤΟΝΑΥΤΩ
ΤΕΚΝΟΝ +

+ Θήκει δια-
φέρου(σ)α Γενναδίου
καὶ τ(ῶ)ν αὐτοῦ
τ(έ)κν(ω)ν +.

67. Same place : see No. 60.

ΜΝΗΜΑΔΙΑΦΕΡΟΝΤΑ
+ ΚΩΝΟΝΟCΥΙΟC +
ΕΑΝΔΑΝCΑΚΑ

Μνήμα διαφέροντα
+ Κώνονος υἱὸς +
Σανδανσάκα.

68. Same place : see No. 60.

ΤΟΠΙΝΑΝΑΤΟΛΙΟΥ ΕΥΤΥΧΙΟΥ	Τόπιν Ἀνατολίου Εὐτυχίου.
----------------------------	------------------------------

69. Same place; on W. side of Via Sacra. See on No. 60.

5	ΛΑΦΡΕΙΟ ΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΑΓΑΘΗΜΕ ΡΟΥΤΕΦΚΡ ΟΣΜΝΙΜΗΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ	Μ. Αὐρ. Δειό- φαντος Ἀγαθημέ- ρου Τεῦκρ- ος· μνίμης χάριν.
---	---	---

70. 'In the same gorge; about $\frac{1}{2}$ mile to the S. on W. side.' See on No. 60.

ΜΝΗΜΙΟΝ Μ. ΑΥΡΗ ΛΙΩΝ ΖΟΙΛΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΟΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΙΟΥΔΕΩΝ	Μνημιόν Μ. Αὐρη- λίων Ζοίλου καὶ Διογένους, Ἰουδέων.
--	---

71. 'On the aqueduct at Oura, which spans the valley; too high up to take squeeze, except of the words ΠΛΒΕΩΝΗΠΟΛΙΣ. The inscription is 20 feet long, and the outer stones are obliterated.' Besides this squeeze, I have Mr. Bent's MS. copy, and a still fuller copy made by Mr. Ramsay. The letters are $3\frac{1}{4}$ in. high.

ΑΥ	ΣΑΡΙΛΣΕΠΤ	ΣΕΟΥΗ	ΜΕΥΣΕ
ΠΕΡΤ	ΡΑΒΙΚΩΔΙΑΒΗΝΙΚΩΠΑΡΒΙΚΩ	ΩΓΗ	
ΚΑΙ	ΡΑΤΟΡΙΚΑΙΣΑΡΙΜΑΥΡΗΛΙΩΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝ		
	<i>erasure</i>	ΚΑΙ ΠΟΥΛΙ	
5 ΑΗ	ΚΑΣΤΡΩΝ ΠΛΒΕΩΝΗΠΟΛΙΣ		
	ΗΣΤΟΥΥΔΑΤΟΣΚΑΙΑΠΟΧΡ	ΝΗΝ	
. ΤΑΔ . .	ΙΕΣ . ΗΩ	ΠΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΙ	ΓΙΑΠ
ΑΦΛ		Τ . Ν . ΟΙ ΠΥ	ΣΚΕΛ
ΑΝΤΙ	Α	ΡΟΤΑΤΟΥ	Π

The foregoing text is from Mr. Ramsay's MS. He notes further: 'In line 7 my earlier copy has ΕΙΣΙΝΤΩΙ·ΛΟΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗ. It was taken by me in the evening at close inspection; the copy here given was taken by Hogarth and myself next morning with a glass.'

Ἀὐ[τοκράτορι Καί]σαρι Λ. Σεπτ[ιμίῳ] Σεουή[ρῳ] Εὐσε[βεί]
 Περτ[ίνακι Σεβ. Ἀ]ραβικῶ Ἀδιαβηνικῶ Παρθικῶ [μεγίστῳ] . . .
 καὶ [Ἀὐτοκ]ράτορι Καίσαρι Μ. Ἀύρηλίῳ Ἀντωνείνῳ Σεβαστῶ
 καὶ *Nomen Getae erased* καὶ Ἰουλί[α Σεβαστῆ]
 5 (μ)η[τρι] κάστρων Ὀλβέων ἡ πόλις
 ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀγωγ[ῆ]ς τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ ἀποχρ
 Ἡρακλείδ[ης]
 τοῦ λα[μπ]ροτάτου [ὑπατικ]οῦ

The date falls between A.D. 199, when Septimus Severus assumed the title *Parthicus Maximus*, and 211, when he died. Geta's name was erased in 212, upon his assassination.

72. 'Built into wall of tower above aqueduct of Oura.' From impression and MS. copy by Mr. Bent.

ΕΡΜΟΙΝΝΕΑΝΙΑΝΑΜΕ
 ΠΤΟΝΜΗΝΑΣΑΙΓΓΟΛΙΟΣ
 ΤΟΥΑΠΕΛΛΟΥΟΠΑΤΗΡ
 ΜΝΗΜΗΣ ΧΑΡΙΝ

Ἑρμοῦ(ν) νεανίαν ἄμε(μ)-
 πτον Μηνᾶς Αἰγγόλιος
 τοῦ Ἀπελλοῦ ὁ πατήρ
 μνήμης χάριν.

73. 'Oura: wall of later fort. On a round column or stele.' From a copy and impression. The inscription is complete, and letters quite clear and well engraved.

ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΝ Παρθένον
 ΟΙΓΟΝ Οἶγον.

The meaning is obscure: perhaps a funeral monument to a virgin named Oigos.

VIII.—MEIDAN.

74. 'Ruins of Meidan, six or eight miles west of Uzunjaburdj, and just to right of the Selefkeh and Karamanian road: very extensive and fine polygonal towers, but no inscription, only an ornamented circle enclosing the club of Olba. But on a solitary column, about half an hour from Meidan, was inscribed the following: it was too high up to make a squeeze.' Copy by Mr. Bent.

	ΔΙΚΚΑΛΟΜΙΣ
	ΚΑΙΑΙΝΓΟΛΙΣ	καὶ Αἰνγολίς
	ΚΑΙΟΙΚΟΥΛΛΙΟΣ	καὶ
	ΚΑΙΜΙΝΙΘΑΙΟΣ	καὶ
5	ΚΑΙΚΟΥΒΑΒΑΛΟΜΙΟΣ	καὶ
	ΤΟΥΣΕΑΥΤΩΝΓΟΝΕΙΣ	τοὺς ἑαυτῶν γονεῖς,
	ΚΑΤΑΦΑΝΚΝΑΤΗΝ	κα(ι) Ἄ (ιδ)α τὴν
	ΕΑΥΤΩΝΝΥΜΦΗΝ	ἑαυτῶν νύμφην ?,
	ΕΥΝΟΙΑΣΕΝΕΚΕΝ	εὐνοίας ἔνεκεν.
10	ΘΕΟΝΔΕΣΔΙΟΝ	Θεο(κλή)ς Διον-
	ΥΣΙΟΥΕΠΟΙΕΝ	υσίου ἐποίη(ε)ι.

75. 'Opposite side of Meidan, up deep valley, inscribed on a rock in clear letters painted red. By the side of the inscription is carved the figure of a man with arms.' From an excellent impression by Mr. Bent.

	ΔΙΟΔΩ	Διόδω ρος Ῥο α ρβ ά σεως καὶ Του -
	ΡΟΣ(ΡΟ)	κόλεις Μοόρμι ος ἱερα σάμεν οι Ἐρ-
	ΑΡΒΑ	μεί τὸ σπή λαιον καὶ τὸν Ἐρμῆν
	ΓΕΩΣ	ἀνέθη καν ἐκ τῶ ν ἰδίων.
5	ΚΑΙΤΟΥ	
	ΚΟΛΕΙΣ	
	ΜΟΟΡΜ(Ι)	
	ΟΣΙΕΡΑ	
	ΓΑΜΕΝ	
10	ΟΙΕΡΜΕΙ	I have bracketed in the uncial
	ΤΟΣΠΗ	text those letters which are
	ΛΑΙΟΝ	doubtful in the impression.
	ΚΑΙΤΟΝ	
	ΕΡΜΗΝ	
15	ΑΝΕΘΗ	
	ΚΑΝΕΚΤΩ	
	ΝΙΔΙΩΝ	

IX.—MILLIARIA FROM THE DISTRICT NEAR OLBA.

I am indebted to Mr. Ramsay for the following memoranda of the Roman milestones of the district, which will form a valuable appendix to this paper.

76. '1½ miles from Uzunjaburdj, ¾ mile from Oura, column in valley by road side.'

	IMPCAES	Imp(erator) Caes(ar)
	PTIMIVS	L. Se]ptimius
	S VERVSPIVS	S[e]verus Pius
	PERTINAXAVG	Pertinax Aug(ustus)
5	ARABADIABP	Arab(icus) Adiab(enicus) P(ontifex) [M](ax.),
	TRIBPOTVIMP	Trib(uniciae) Pot(estatis) V, Imp(erator) VII,
	COSII///ROCPPET	Cos. II, [P]roc(onsul), P(ater) P(atriciae), et
	VRELIV	M. A]ureliu[s
	INVSCAESAR	Anton]inus Caesar
10	MPDESIG	I]mp(erator) desig(natus).
	MPV/////	M(illia) P(assuum) V.

‘The titles of Severus fix the date to A.D. 197; the titles of Caracalla fix it to 197 or the first months of 198.’

77. ‘Beside the last. It could all be read, with time.’

ARI

78. ‘Beside the last, on the opposite side of the road.’

	ΔΔNN	D(ominis) N(ostris)
	MAXIMIANO	Maximiano
	MAXIMIANO	[et] Maximiano
	INUICTISAVGG	invictis Aug(ustis),
5	€TMAXIMINO	et Maximino
	€TCONSTANTINO	et Constantino
	BILISSIMIS AAA	no]bilissimis
	€S///I A IS IMPX	Ca]es(aribus)
	COS . PP	
	MPII	M(illia) P(assuum) II

Towards the bottom right-hand corner is seen the relic of a previous inscription of a similar kind, of which the dating (says Mr. Ramsay) points to A.D. 198.

79. ‘Milestones on the road from Korykos to Jambazli, Olba, Koropissos, and Laranda.’

‘First; group of several milliararia, at original position, but all fallen. One has the numeral inscribed very large.’

A

‘Second; group, one standing in its original position, not legible after sunset except these letters’:

PIO

'Third, not observed.'

Fourth, a group; one has the following':

	Imp Cae.]SARLSEPTIMIVS
	Severu.]SPIVSPERTINAX
	Aug.]ARABADIABPM
	trib.]POTVIMPVIII
5	Cos.]IPROCPPETM
	Aurelius]ANTONINVS
	Caesar]IMPDESIG
	Imp. Caes.]MARCOAVRE
	lio]ANTONINOPIO
10	ET////////////////////
	////////////////////
	Δ

Line 1. The date is A.D. 197.—E. L. H.

'Several other groups of stones were observed between the last and Jaubazli: thence to Oura we did not touch the line of the road. Between Oura and the hieron the road is still quite distinct, and the group of stones described above (Nos. 76-78) belongs to this point. Between Uzunjaburdj and Maghra we followed it for about five miles, and found milestones (all illegible or buried) every fifteen minutes. In all cases our time between each group of stones was within a fraction of a minute of fifteen minutes.'

E. L. HICKS.

ON THE
ANCIENT HECATOMPEDON WHICH OCCUPIED THE SITE
OF THE
PARTHENON ON THE ACROPOLIS OF ATHENS.

[PLATES XVI.—XVIII.]

AMONGST the many interesting discoveries made in the excavations carried on chiefly during the year 1889 between the Parthenon and the citadel wall were two inscriptions which were put together by Herr Lolling and published in the *Athena* for 1890. These show that a temple named the Hecatompodon existed at Athens previous to the Persian invasion. It is the object of this article to show that this Hecatompodon occupied the same site as the present Parthenon.

Previous to the discovery by Dr. Dörpfeld of the site of the great archaic temple between the Erechtheum and the Parthenon, and the views which he has propounded with respect to its theoretical restoration, every archaeologist was disposed to agree with Col. Leake that an earlier Parthenon had existed—and must have supposed that the sub-basement on the south side of the Parthenon and the entablatures which are so well known to visitors to Athens, which have been built into the north wall of the Acropolis, originally belonged to each other; and I propose in the first instance to endeavour to show what a high probability there is for the correctness of this view, and afterwards to discuss the newer theory both in its bearings on the substructure of the Parthenon and on such of the extant remains as undoubtedly belonged to the archaic temple itself.

Firstly we may consider what historical, epigraphical or architectural evidence there may be bearing on the question. Of the first there seems to be very little, and what there is, limited to the fact that Herodotus when describing the storming of the Acropolis by the Persians speaks only of one temple. This however we must reduce somewhat in its application, as we now know that there must have been at that time many smaller sacred edifices of which fragments have been recovered, and indeed the earlier Erechtheum is in a subsequent passage referred to by Herodotus himself; but we may at any rate accept the statement as demonstrating that there was only one great and preeminent temple. There is also the well known passage in Hesychius which states that the Parthenon was 50 feet longer than its predecessor. As

respects inscriptions, which are tolerably numerous, they appear, with the exception at least of those relating to the completion of the Erechtheum, to be all Treasury documents, and it seems to be established by these and some other records that the opisthodomus of the archaic temple was used for secular purposes till a period at least as late as 406 B. C. Still it is only an indirect light that they throw upon the question.

The architectural evidence however is tolerably abundant. We have first the means of recovering the exact extent of the stylobate of the archaic temple and the width of the stylobate itself on the flank. The data also upon which the following Hecatompedon theory is based are preserved on the substructions of the Parthenon in a condition admitting of exact measurement, viz. the dimensions measured from the south-west corner and taken along the channels of the panelled course, 3·40 feet below the great marble steps, and extending 104·253 from north to south and 231·481 from west to east.¹ These measurements are assumed as giving the size of the terrace or podium of the temple as it stood before it was extended in both directions to support the present Parthenon.

Then we have a great many fragments, *dissecta membra* of temples, some and the most important of which are the objects of the rival claims. Pre-eminent amongst these are the two conspicuous groups of entablatures consisting of architrave, frieze and cornice built into the north wall of the Acropolis. These stones, whilst agreeing well amongst themselves in the two groups, give different measures of length for the columniations deduced from them. The cornice top of the longer variety is flat and that of the shorter sloping; showing that the latter occupied the flanks of the temple as its upper surface exhibits the slope of the roof. In height and all details except that of length they are identical and therefore belonged to the same temple. The material is poros stone with the exception of the metopes which are of marble. The mean length obtained from three stones of the front architraves is 13·268 and that of the flank from four stones 12·561. These must be close approximations to the columniations (*arxevite*) on the front and flank respectively.

Built into the north wall of the Acropolis about 200 feet eastwards of the last-mentioned are remains of marble steps suitable for a large temple: and there are some unfinished marble drums of columns, twenty-six in number, but these latter cannot be associated with the poros stone entablatures. There is also a three-facia moulding of stone identical with a course which may be seen on the top of the sub-basement wall of the Parthenon, but which seems there to have been shifted from its original position² and reduced in thickness in adapting it to the newer temple. Under a broken portion of

¹ As respects the *οικήματα τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἑκατομπεδῷ* of the inscription published in the *Δελτίον*, 1890, p. 97, I conclude that these were store chambers built subsequently to its first foundation within the Naos of the Hecatompedon.

² As it bears a certain resemblance to a step

it may have been taken from one of the lower steps of the temple which preceded the Parthenon, but the position I should assign to it would be the coping of the sub-basement wall on which it may have carried some kind of parapet.

the stylobate of the present structure one of these stones may also be seen used as foundation for the inner part of the stylobate. There are also built into the north wall a number of blocks of poros stone which it is reasonable to suppose originally formed part of the cella walls.

Built into the Cimonium or south wall of the Acropolis may be seen other fragments, amongst which is a marble lion's head which, if (as may be fairly presumed from existing remains) the cymatium of the temple we are considering was of that material, may have very fitly formed its termination at one of the angles; and there are some large poros stone blocks which judging from the suitability of their length and height may also have belonged to the same temple.

The recent excavations on the Acropolis which laid bare the internal face of the citadel wall also produced some very important fragments, many of which must evidently be referred to the same building as the entablatures. The principal recoveries were some large poros stone capitals of a type very similar to the capitals of the temple of Jupiter at Olympia, sufficiently well preserved to determine the upper diameters of the columns which supported them. There were four varieties as regards diameter but of similar character in other respects, so that it is reasonable to consider them as originally in juxtaposition.

<i>Total depth of capital including abacus.</i>	<i>Breadth of abacus.</i>	<i>Full diameter at necking.</i>
ft.	ft.	ft.
1 3·580 7·150 4·282
2 about 3·430 broken 4·088
3 3·430 7·080 3·843
4 2·330 about 4·70 2·790

Variations to this extent may be fully expected in the same temple and we may properly assign the first to the front, the second to the flank, the third to the pronaos or posticum, and the last to the interior order of the naos. There were also some poros stone drums of size and character suitable to the corresponding columns. One of these in remarkably good preservation with the contour of its flutes beautifully worked showed a full diameter of 5·811 ft. The capitals and drums retained portions of the fine stucco with which they had been coated and for the most part exhibited traces of the action of fire.

The marble drums referred to seem to have been prepared for an order considerably larger than the poros stone remains. Their probable destination will be mentioned further on. One point however connected with these and some other of the fragments is material to the question before us as it bears on the question of when they were inserted in the citadel wall. This seems to be exactly in accordance with the words of Thucydides i. 93.

δήλη ἡ οἰκοδομία ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν ὅτι κατὰ σπουδὴν ἐγένετο· οἱ γὰρ θεμέλιοι παντοίων λίθων ὑπόκεινται καὶ οὐ ξυνεργασμένων ἐστὶν ἢ ἀλλ' ὡς ἕκαστοί ποτε προσέφερον· πολλαὶ τε στήλαι ὑπὸ σημάτων καὶ λίθοι εἰργασμένοι ἐγκατελέγησαν.

The passage would by itself be conclusive as to the time when these drums of columns and the poros stone capitals were built into the wall, viz. by the orders of Themistocles on the occasion referred to in the above passage, but for the fact that Thucydides is primarily speaking of the city walls; but it seems very unreasonable to except the walls of the Acropolis from the statement, especially as the particular courses in which these remains are used were evidently both inside and out built up hurriedly and they occur exactly in that portion of the citadel where it had been proved to be most accessible. In the remains of the walls of Themistocles near the Dipylum gate is to be observed a curious and interesting converse of the construction of the citadel wall we are speaking of. At the base of the former are two courses of beautifully finished polygonal walling, whilst the upper courses are built in a more hurried manner and contain various borrowed blocks. From this we may conclude that the Athenians began their city wall deliberately, leaving the citadel alone at first. Then came the threatened interruption from the Spartans—the city walls were hurried on and the Acropolis walls begun where most required, also hurriedly, up to a certain point, after which they had leisure to construct the citadel walls in a more workmanlike manner. The entablatures are inserted in the upper and more carefully finished part of the north wall.

In addition to the above the sub-basement wall of the Parthenon retains some evidences of the very highest importance towards the solution of the question, in a series of original chiselled marks extending along nearly the whole extent of the original wall at a level about 7 feet below the bottom of the present great marble steps. Each mark is a sharp V-shaped cut which has been coloured red and formed in a separate smooth sunk tablet about $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches square. The first, reckoning from east to west, is 20.56 feet from the point where the paneled blocks change their character at a distance of 231.481 from the finished arsis of the same course at the S. W. angle already referred to, and where presumably the extension provided for the present Parthenon joins the older work. In the measurements below given I call this point *Y* and the chiselled marks *A*, *B*, *C*, etc. in order as far as *T* and I call the S. W. angle itself *X*. See Pl. XVII.

<i>Y</i> to <i>A</i> 20.560	<i>G</i> to <i>H</i> 6.894	<i>Q</i> to <i>P</i> 6.224
<i>A</i> — <i>B</i> 7.873	<i>H</i> — <i>I</i> 7.185	<i>P</i> — <i>Q</i> 6.181
<i>B</i> — <i>C</i> 6.874	<i>I</i> — <i>J</i> 7.912	<i>Q</i> — <i>R</i> 11.722
<i>C</i> — <i>D</i> 7.628	<i>J</i> — <i>K</i> 6.547	<i>R</i> — <i>S</i> 17.272
<i>D</i> — <i>E</i> 6.926	<i>K</i> — <i>L</i> 4.810	<i>S</i> — <i>T</i> 12.827
<i>E</i> — <i>F</i> 8.910	<i>L</i> — <i>M</i> 5.977	<i>T</i> — <i>X</i> 57.623
<i>F</i> — <i>G</i> 6.992	<i>M</i> — <i>O</i> 11.010 ¹	

It has been shown that the architraves which give near approximations to the columniations on the front and flank measure respectively 13.268 and

¹ *X* is omitted from the list as between *M* and *O* about 5.8—6.0 from the former there is a defect in the stone, so it is possible that a mark

may have been there but there is no sign of it. ² *TX* if measured to the face of the panel instead of along the channel would be 57.775.

12·561. We can find very remarkable coincidences between multiples of both these quantities and certain continuous combinations of the distances between the marks.

<i>Front Measurement.</i>	<i>Multiples of</i>	<i>Flank Measurement.</i>	<i>Multiples of</i>
	13·268.		12·561.
<i>HL</i> 26·451	26·536 2	<i>YE</i> 50·361	50·211 4
<i>MQ</i> 26·450		<i>BF</i> 37·830	
<i>LP</i> 26·213		<i>CH</i> 37·850	
<i>CF</i> 52·917	53·072 4	<i>DI</i> 38·007	37·633 3
<i>YG</i> 66·263	66·310 5	<i>EJ</i> 37·893	
<i>EK</i> 66·368		<i>JP</i> 37·606	
<i>KS</i> 66·231		<i>IM</i> 25·216	25·122 2
<i>FA</i> 231·633 or 231·181 to finished axis	231·665 17½	<i>HS</i> 87·875	87·927 7
		<i>RX</i> 87·871	
		<i>OQ</i> 12·410	
		<i>ST</i> 12·827	
		Mean of the two latter.	
		12·618	12·561 1

It is quite impossible to ascribe so great a number of coincidences to chance and it is evident that a relationship has been established between these sub-basement measures and the north wall entablatures, and we may now proceed without hesitation to correct our approximate columniations by the small amount of -0.30 in the case of the fronts and $+0.26$ in the case of the flanks which thus become 13·238 and 12·587 respectively, and we may notice that these quantities bear to each other the proportion of 20 to 19 (13·238 : 12·576). I have confined the above comparison except in one instance to integer multiples of the columniation measures, but if, as indeed might have been expected from the habits of the Greeks to subdivide their measures of length into eight or sixteen parts, they be subdivided further say into quarters the number of close coincidences will be vastly increased. I have also found in the case of other temples, as will be more fully mentioned further on, that a close relation exists between the proportions of the main divisions of the plan and elevation and the measure of the columniation.

These marks evidently served a similar end in the building on which they are found with those used by modern masons for the purpose of setting out their work full-size on an extended floor or boarded surface. These therefore in the attempt to restoration of the earlier Hecatompedon cannot fail to be of the greatest use.

The excavations showed that the substructions of the south peristyle of the Parthenon consisted of a wall of about 20 courses of poros stone resting on the Acropolis rock. More or less of the 4 or 5 upper courses had long been visible. Lying against this wall, as shown in section on Pl. XVI., was a mass of earth more than 30 feet deep which rested upon the top of the rock. The upper and larger portion had been evidently formed subsequently to the Persian invasion, as it contained many fragments of architecture and sculpture and pottery of which the combination could only be referred to that period. The lower portion however was pre-Persic and contained only evidences of

the fact that the pools further on that this upper stratum was filled in (no doubt for the purpose of levelling up the ground) against a wall already existing, and that in the stratum there were evidences that the older soil had at some period been cut down in a sloping direction (see Pl. XVI.) for the purpose of building the great sub-basement wall, which supports the south flank of the terrace surrounding the temple. Upon the surface of this earlier soil and with no other foundation, was built the retaining wall, shown in the same figure, for the purpose of supporting the earth thrown in after the Persian invasion. The sub-basement wall itself is built of large well-jointed stones, but with uneven face except the 4 or 5 upper courses, so that it was evidently intended to be covered with soil. This work resembles very closely both in workmanship and material the walls built by Pisistratus for the foundations of his temple of Jupiter Olympius, which are of superior workmanship and of different orientation to the foundation prepared for the later temple. It is reasonable to suppose that the cause of the delay of the levelling up the soil against this sub-basement wall until the post-Persic times was in consequence of the area below having been occupied by houses at a time when the Acropolis was the great defence of Athens and was crowded with population.

It has already been stated that when we look at this sub-basement wall and also at that under the west front of the Parthenon, we see that the former has at some period been lengthened towards the east, namely at a point underneath the S. E. angle column of the Parthenon, and the latter has been lengthened towards the north at a point between the two columns of the west front nearest to the N. W. angle. Both these increments were for the sake of enlarging the old foundations to suit the increased size given to the Parthenon. That under the west front is of a rough character. It was certainly concealed under the pavement. The upper courses of the extension towards the east are highly finished and must have been intended to be exposed. There are signs of the pavement level having been below them. In 1887, at the commencement of the excavations, I saw that the ground lying against the sub-basement wall had towards the east end been cut down so as to reach the rock for the purpose of building this extension (see Fig. 1). Photographs were taken from time to time as the excavations proceeded—and these show that at various points further towards the west there had been no such disturbance of the filling in (see Fig. 3). The junction of the masonry at the east end has been effected with great skill,¹ but this cutting of the outside ground and the difference of character noticeable in the course worked into panels (about 3·40 feet below the great marble steps) is decisive of the point. This change occurs at the point I have called *Y* in Pl. XVII. The reader may also be referred to *The Principles of Athenian Architecture*, Plate IX.

As a confirmation of the connection between the chiselled marks described above, and the temple of which we obtain the columniation from the

¹ It was not necessary to work the courses for the north-west extension with such exactness because the rock was immediately below them, but here the angle of the temple had to be sup-

ported on a very deep artificial foundation so that it was necessary to bond the new and old together more carefully.

remains on the north wall, we may try what would happen if we were to apply a similar treatment to other temples of which the plans and dimensions are known. This I have done in the cases of that of Jupiter at Olympia, the Theseum and the temples of Bassae and Aegina, viz. on a straight line I form a series of points derived from the main divisions of the temple. A on the extreme right is taken to represent the south-east angle of the step. Measured from it to C is the angle columniation of the flank, viz. the distance from the angle of the upper step to the axis of the *second*




FIG. 1.

column if we reckon the angle column as the first. CE represents the distance from the angle to the corresponding column of the front. Then H and I are determined by the distance from A of the pronaos wall; HI being the thickness of that wall. Then follows the east peristyle IM and then MP is the distance across between the axes of the columns of the naos. (This of course is deficient in the Theseum.) We then proceed to the extremity of the naos T , then measure back from T ST , equal to the depth of the posticum. Observe—the step of the cella, not the wall, is selected for

measurement. SQ is then taken as the height of the exterior columns and QR as the width of the flank peristyle. Lastly, MA is made equal to the entire length of the upper step. It may happen in some cases that these points will vary from their alphabetical order. It will be found that in the case of each temple, but less conspicuously in the Parthenon than in the other examples, if a scale be applied formed of integer multiples of the columniation, there will be found a considerable number of *close* coincidences which proves, what indeed might have been inferred *à priori*, that a relationship exists between the main subdivisions of a temple and the measure of the columniation, and this is what is claimed for the marks on the sub-basement of the Hecatompedon. These last, if compared with the columniation scale of the Parthenon or of the temple at Bassae, show only very few and unimportant coincidences. But both with the Aegina scale and that of the temple of Jupiter at Olympia there are a good many; but that is easily explained, for the columniation of the former temple is almost exactly 5-eighths of the front measure (13·238) of the temple under consideration and to that of the example at Olympia; it bears the proportion of 9 to 7.

The attempt to reconstruct upon paper this older Hecatompedon would have been well-nigh impossible without the aid of these marks; but with them I hope to show a scheme which carries with it a high degree of probability.

I hold it then as incontrovertible that the marks have reference to the building on which they are found.

If they had reference to the Parthenon, they would have shown a number of exact coincidences with the important subdivisions of the temple. I have searched diligently for these and can find but three, viz. the columniation itself GI , the west peristyle RS , the height of the order from stylobate to cymatium inclusive, HO , leaving a very large majority of marks totally without significance. That in so great a number of combinations possible (210) there should be three coincidences with some of the spaces on the Parthenon need not imply any relationship whatsoever. We may therefore conclude that they have nothing to do with the Parthenon. But they have distinct relationship with the multiples of the north wall columniations as has been shown. We are therefore justified in the endeavour to apply them to a restoration of the Parthenon's predecessor on its proper site.

This restoration, of which a plan is given in Pl. XVII., is based on the following considerations, viz.

Let it be granted that we have the full extent of the original sub-basement as above stated $104\cdot253 \times 231\cdot481$, and that the ordinary front and flank columniation measured respectively 13·238 feet and 12·587, as explained above. We have to decide two unknown points, viz. what was the number of the columns and what were the distances in each colonnade of the columns contiguous to the angle column from the angles of the stylobate. For this last point we must look for the analogy of early examples; of these we may take three, viz. the temple at Corinth, that of Jupiter at Olympia and Aegina.

As compared with the ordinary columniation we have :

	<i>Front.</i>	<i>Flank.</i>
Corinth	1:121	1:200
Jupiter at Olympia	1:160	1:152
Jupiter at Aegina	1:137	1:137
Mean of these three examples	1:139	1:163

Hence we find that approximately in this case the angular spaces in question should be about 15.080 on the fronts and 14.640 on the flanks. With the data as above collected two solutions are possible as to the number of the columns in front, one hexastyle, the other octastyle. As regards the latter, the platform measuring 104.253 would indeed admit of a façade of 8 columns with one or even two projecting steps, and if we suppose 16 columns on the flanks the proportion of 2 to 1 could have been formed between the length and the breadth on the upper step; but this arrangement is very unlikely, as the width would have been inconveniently great for the sub-basement, as it would have admitted of no margin between the stylobate and the lower levels on the south side—a necessity which has been felt in the construction of the existing Parthenon. Moreover the proportions of breadth and height, unless the columns had been made much loftier than the date would warrant, would have been unpleasing. The hexastyle arrangement is free from the above objections, besides which at the time we are supposing it was the usual disposition even for the largest temples of the Doric order, for instance, the great temple at Olympia. We may then accept the hexastyle as by far the most probable form of the temple and proceed to enquire if any confirmation can be found from the measurements taken from the sub-basement of the temple. Firstly as regards the front.—We have seen that analogy offers 15.080 as a probable dimension for the columniations nearest the angles. On the sub-basement there is $BC = 15.054$. To twice this quantity, 30.108, add 3 columniations 39.714 and we obtain 69.822 for the breadth of the upper step. Deducting this from 104.253 we obtain 2 margins each of 17.215. This dimension also is represented on the sub-basement by $RS = 17.272$. We may compose our front thus: $2 RS + 2 CE + 3 \times 13.238 = 104.366$ to compare with the measured extent 104.253.

Secondly as regards the flank.—The angular dimension from analogy is 14.640. This is well represented on the sub-basement by $AC = 14.747$. The number of columns is not supposed to be known, but let it be assumed that the number was 16. Then $2 AC + 13 \times 12.587 = 193.125$ leaving 38.356 to make up the total length of the platform. We have no reason to suppose that the two margins would be exactly equal, but it is a fair presumption that $YI = 20.560$ represents the eastern one, leaving about 17.796 for the western. We find this last dimension represented very closely by $PK = 17.906$. Let the flank be now composed of $YA + 2 AC + 13$ columniations + $PK = 231.591$ to compare with the measured length 231.481 or 231.633 if the general face instead of the channel between the panels is taken.

It will be observed that not only have we succeeded in finding amongst

the marks on the sub-basement dimensions practically identical with those pointed out by analogy and which satisfy the known conditions, but also they are taken not by arbitrary selection but exactly from significant places along the sub-basement. The lines YA and AC have simply to be ruled up to occupy the places where they are wanted. EC , which adjoins AC (being at right angles to it), adjoins it on the sub-basement also, and BS and PI which are complementary to each other on the proposed restoration adjoin each other also on the sub-basement.

Omitting now the margins which have helped so much in this preliminary enquiry we find we have for the upper step of the temple a length of 193.125 and a breadth of 69.822. But the temple by all analogy is bound to have a simple proportion between the length and the breadth on one of its steps; generally the upper or lower; but on an intermediate step it is not unknown, as in the case of the great temple at Olympia.

In the case of this Athenian temple the measurements on the upper step are not in harmony, but if 4.16 feet be added to each term of the comparison it will be exactly as 8 to 3. This would probably mean that the step or steps had a projection of 2.08 feet each, which would be a very suitable quantity, and the ratio of 8 : 3 would hold on the middle step if there were two projecting steps, or on the lower if there had been but one.

A proportion so long as 8 : 3 is rather unusual but not without parallel. The Heraeum at Olympia has this proportion exactly and also the same number of columns as we have assumed. There are also several examples of 5 : 2; and here on the Acropolis a long temple was obviously very desirable for the sake of its effect from a distance. And besides if the naos was to be Hecatompedos length was a necessity.

Let us now consider or assume the upper step as determined in its length and breadth and proceed to the other arrangements of the plan which we may approach in the following manner, viz. :

The analogy of a great number of temples amongst which the greatest weight has been given to the most ancient examples, namely Corinth, the two great temples at Olympia, the archaic temple on the Acropolis itself, and the temple at Aegina,¹ points out that the length of the cella at the bottom of the step or steps is $\frac{3}{4}$ (.74975) of the total length on the upper step, also that the ratio of the eastern to the western peristyle is as 11 to 10 (661 : 600).

Of the flank peristyle it is in this case unnecessary to speak from analogy as there is, as we shall see, a better guide.

The eastern and western peristyles according to the above should be respectively 25.291 and 22.990. Referring to the marks we find $IM = 25.246$ and $BH = 22.796$. Deducting these dimensions from total length that of the cella becomes 144.844.

That of the existing Parthenon is 196.390 or 51.546 longer.²

¹ Whenever Aegina is mentioned, I always mean, unless otherwise stated, the temple of Jupiter Panhellenius.

² That is, taken on the lower step of the cella in each case.

Ἑκατόμπεδος νεὸς ἐν τῇ Ἀκροπόλει Παρθενῶν κατασκευασθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων μείζων τοῦ ἐμπρησθέντος ὑπὸ τῶν Περσῶν ποσὶ πενήτηκοντα. Hesyehius.¹

It will be observed that up to this point we have used the mark spaces continuously from *Y* to *M* with one break only, namely *III*.

This occurs exactly where we should expect the pronaos wall. If we look to the example of Aegina and take a proportional distance to what occurs there from the edge of the eastern stylobate we should have to the face of the pronaos wall 52·30 ft. Here *AII* is 52·597. Again in the Parthenon the thickness of the pronaos wall is 6·76, which is exactly the dimension of the abacus of the columns of the E. front. That of the poros stone capitals measures 7·150, and *III* = 7·185. Thus we cannot be far wrong in ruling up *III* to give the lines of the pronaos wall. The point *T*, which is the last mark of the series, can be no other than the eastern face of the wall dividing the naos from the posticum. No double line was here necessary, as the wall would be determined by the depth to be given to the posticum or would share in the thickness given to the longitudinal walls of the cella. A very important discovery gives the evidence wanted for the position of these longitudinal walls, and thus determines the breadth of the flank peristyle. In a recent excavation under that part of the pavement which was shattered by the explosion A.D. 1687, an ancient foundation was revealed running E. and W. of finely jointed blocks of poros stone, which extended about 2·8 feet southwards of the slightly raised stylobate of the north row of naos columns of the Parthenon, but the original wall to which these blocks belonged must have extended several feet further south, as is evidenced by the joints which were exposed and which showed that the wall had been reduced in thickness.

The darker shading in Pl. XVII. shows the position of this foundation: it is also shown in the section Pl. XVI. This foundation can have served no other purpose than to carry the north cella wall of the earlier temple, and when in the plan that wall is placed upon this foundation it is found that *RQ* among the sub-basement marks agrees with the width of the flank peristyle, whilst in *ST* we find the requisite dimensions for the depth of the posticum. This latter seems no doubt to be shallow compared with most other temples; but as the opisthodomus of the archaic temple was still doing duty as a Treasury, a deeper posticum would not be so much required, especially as a main object in this temple was to obtain the length necessary for the Hecatompodos naos. *RQ* attributed to the flank peristyle, it should be observed, is also narrower than analogy would have suggested, but the argu-

¹ The sequence of growth in these three temples is remarkable, the cella of the Hecatompodon being approximately equal to the whole length of the archaic temple 144·844 at the bottom of the step compared with 142·273. The Parthenon cella again, as shown above, is fifty feet longer than that of the Hecatompodon, but

also if reckoned on its upper step almost exactly equal to the total length of the Hecatompodon, viz. 193·733 compared with 193·125, and the interior length of the Parthenon within the walls from pronaos to posticum 144·950 to compare with the total exterior length of the cella of the Hecatompodon 144·844.

ment derived from the foundation must have the preference. Still though narrow it is not without example.

The proportion found at Rhamnus is very nearly as narrow and that in the Parthenon itself much more so: for if in the Parthenon the proportion had been the same to the total width as here it would have been more than 3 feet wider than it is. Something also had to be sacrificed in the peristyles to get a good proportion of width for so long a naos.

If *T* has been rightly taken as the Eastern face of the posticum wall and its Western face as measured from *A* has been given by *PR*, *EH*, and *ST* the thickness of the wall becomes 4.094, which is quite sufficient for it; there could be no reason for making a wall not pierced by a doorway any thicker.

Let us now consider the dimensions measured eastwards from *T*. It will be found that from *T* to the middle point of the wall *III* is 97.109.¹

No greater exactness than this could be wished for the 100 feet. By the laws of Solon this dimension would be 97.114 (29.60 m.)—see Dr. Dörpfeld's paper on this subject in the *Mittheilungen* for 1882—and this value agrees very well with other authorities. Here then we find most clearly the Hecatompædon and the connection of this measurement with the age of Solon may perhaps not be altogether without significance.

It will have some further confirmation of what has gone before, if the Solonian foot with its palms and dactyls be found to measure accurately some of the subdivisions proposed for the temple and obtained from the sub-basement marks, and some are very close indeed.

	<i>Solonian.</i>	<i>Calculated.</i>	<i>Measured.</i>
<i>LM</i>	26 feet	25.218	25.216 + .002
	ft. 4.		
<i>AC</i>	15 : 3	11.719	11.717 + .002
<i>EC</i>	15 : 8	15.053	15.051 + .002
<i>RQ</i>	12 : 1	11.715	11.722 + .007
<i>MP</i>	29 : 7	29.273	29.266 + .006
<i>PR</i>	18 : 7	17.905	17.906 + .001
<i>YA</i>	21 : 3	20.576	20.560 + .016
<i>ST</i>	13 : 3	12.807	12.827 + .020
<i>EH</i>	23 : 8	22.821	22.797 + .024
		To which may be added	
<i>RS</i>	18 : 12½	17.267	17.272 + .005

The total width assumed 69.82 would be 7.2 feet less 1½ dactyls and the total length of the temple 199 feet less 2 dactyls—both exactly.

There is no particular reason for expecting exact integer numbers of feet, as exact *proportion* of one part with another was the thing aimed at and the standard foot would be used only as a medium for measurement.

Besides the poros stone capitals, drums, and entablatures there are some other fragments which seem to have belonged to the earlier Hecatompædon. I refer to the marble steps built into the north wall and some other marble fragments which have been more lately discovered. We may the more

¹ Mr. W. W. Lloyd has shown that in the Parthenon the *Hecatompædon* measure is to be looked for between the same points.

readily admit the use of this material, as the metopes which are combined with the entablatures in the north wall are of marble; and when we consider both the beauty of the material, and, owing to its hardness, its suitability for steps, and the opportunity which the neighbourhood of Pentelicus afforded, there seems good reason for allowing its use in combination with the stuccoed poros stone architecture, and on similar considerations we may admit for the finish of the pediment the marble cornice which was discovered a few years ago near the S.E. angle of the Acropolis adorned with paintings recalling the Aeginetan decorations, and also a cymatium of marble which corresponded in all respects. The marble drums in the north wall are of a different category and will be further referred to later on. We may also attribute to this temple, namely to its eastern pediment, the spirited sculptures which were found in the recent excavations to the south of the Parthenon representing the combat of the gods and the giants with a marble figure of Minerva in the centre, of which a large fragment remains. The dimensions of the marble steps referred to above are very favourable to the hypothesis that they were used for the stylobate of the Hecatompædon (possibly the upper step only was of marble). From the lengths of ten of them of which I have obtained the measure, two complete sets can be formed of three each, of which each set differs by less than half an inch from the calculated columniation.

From analogy of early examples we might expect the height of the columns to be about 28·600. If obtained from the mean columniation by the favourite proportion of 9 : 4 it would be 29·050. Here we have $QS = 28·994$ and contiguous to it is $OQ = 12·420$. The *known* total height of entablature including cymatium is 12·386.

The section in Pl. XVI. shows the Parthenon and the rock to the south of it, as ascertained from a trigonometrical survey, and points out how the more recent temple would inclose the walls of the Hecatompædon so that it would have been possible (as indeed probably may have been done) to have retained the use of the naos of the old temple, restored as we must suppose it in a temporary manner, until the new temple was very near its completion. This has been done both in mediæval and modern times in respect to churches. It also would explain why the peristyles of the Parthenon are so remarkably narrow.

The solution arrived at in the previous discussion produces a plan of a temple surrounded by margins of moderate extent, whereas we are more familiar with cases where a more ample peribolus was provided. With reference to this point it has to be remembered that the Acropolis was in early times above all things the citadel and was crowded with houses, great economy of space was therefore imperative.


A temple of greater proportional length than this and with still narrower peristyles has just been discovered at Plataea.¹

¹ The excavations at the temple referred to have been conducted by the American School under the superintendence of Mr. Washington.

It promises to be a very interesting discovery in many ways.

It is a natural enquiry how far the foundations of the earlier temple as thus restored would be available for the Parthenon. This consideration has not entered into the calculations by which the plan has been formed in the slightest degree, except in the one instance where the old foundation shown by the dark hatching on Plates XVI. and XVII. presented itself and was used as a guide to the position of the N. cella wall.

The adjoining woodcut gives a plan of the lines of wall and stylobates of the old temple, the hatched portions of which are coincident with walls or stylobates of the Parthenon.



PLAN OF THE WALLS AND STYLOBATES OF OLD HECATOMPEDON ·
SHOWING HOW FAR THEY ARE COVERED BY THOSE OF PARTHENON ·

FIG. 2.

Speaking first of the walls which range E. and W. the great sub-basement or terrace wall ¹ performs the same office now as then. We have no knowledge of the thickness of this wall. If it had been altogether solid so as to include the foundations of the southern peristyle it would scarcely have exceeded the known thickness of the Cimonium; but assuming it to have been about 8 feet thick there might have been a vacuity of about 5 feet between it and the wall supporting the peristyles. The builders of the Parthenon would have found ready means of adapting these walls to their use by providing supports between the two walls at intervals for their columns with a comparatively small amount of material. A portion of the stylobate would have had a direct bearing upon the old wall.

¹ It has been objected that so costly a wall as this would never have been built merely for the purpose of upholding a terrace, but must have been intended for the direct support of the peristyle of a magnificent temple, but the ancient wall-builders—witness the costly substructions

at Sunium, the Heraeum near Argos and other places—were not penetrated with the economic ideas of the present day. This terrace around the temple, answering to the peribolus in places where there was more space available, would have had an important function of its own.

Then as respects the naos columns of the Parthenon, fully 60 feet in length of the southern row would have coincided vertically with foundations required for the old Hecatompedon as now restored. The parallels drawn east and west through the centres of the two colonnades would have differed by less than ten inches and we may feel certain that the margin provided for the foundations of the old building would have been ample for the new.

Almost the whole length of the N. row of naos columns in the new temple would have been assisted by the old cella wall. That there was an ancient wall which does this duty is not a matter of speculation but, as has already been shown, of certain evidence. Two of the columns of the opisthodomus would rest exactly centrally upon the line of the old naos wall. To the north of this latter wall there would be no more coincidences in an E. and W. direction but no deep foundations would be there required owing to the nearness of the rock.

Looking at the walls running N. and S. the plan shows how large an amount of assistance the new temple would receive from the foundations of the old. Particular attention may be called to the posticum wall of the Parthenon. To the western face of this wall the measurement from the podium is 40·130 feet whilst the distance attributed to the commencement of the stylobate of the posticum in the old temple is 40·703. These walls therefore practically coincide. It is also evident that (as judging from the analogy of other early structures a wide margin was allowed in building the foundations) the actual assistance afforded to the newer temple would be in excess of what is shown by the hatched lines on the plan.

Having now established what I venture to think is an extremely probable restoration of the Hecatompedon on the Parthenon site, I find myself obliged to take account of the very different view which has been advanced on this subject. There is indeed no dispute on one point, viz. that the foundations we are considering except at their extreme eastern end were built previous to the works of Pericles: what is in question is the lapse of time which intervened between the two constructions.

It seems quite essential to the acceptance of the new views that the sub-basement of the Parthenon should not be coëval with the north wall remains, otherwise its claim upon them would be irresistible. Accordingly the theory has been advanced that it was built by Cimon, to whom also the authorship of the marble drums has been referred. The late excavations have shown that when the ground to the south of the Parthenon was levelled up, the part first taken in hand was that between the Parthenon and the retaining wall shown in Pl. I. and that this part contained the richest store of pre-Persic fragments, and that afterwards the Cimonian wall was built and the space between it and the retaining wall before mentioned was then filled up with layers of earth differently arranged and with a rather scantier store of relics. Let us notice then these points following: viz.—

(1) The great wall of the sub-basement is entirely composed of squared blocks, without a single *architectural* fragment that can bear witness to the ravages of the Persians embedded in it.

(2) The Cimonian citadel wall both inside and out contains a great number of such stones borrowed from pre-Persic structures.

(3) If the temple foundation had been built immediately subsequent to the Persian invasion, doubtless some of the materials afterwards found so useful for the citadel wall would have been used in it.

(4) Several marble unfinished drums were found embedded in the filling in contiguous to the temple foundations. If Cimon had prepared these materials for the intended temple with which he has been credited, would he,




FIG. 3.

when superintending the filling in which has covered them, have wasted in this manner such costly material? Whereas, had they only been the Tyrant's property, there would have been rather a satisfaction in burying them.

(5) The photographs taken during the progress of the excavations show conclusively that the sub-basement wall was built before the soil was thrown in against it. It is part of the new theory that this soil was laid in bit by bit as the wall arose and was used instead of a timber scaffolding to

aid in building it. Some of the stones of that wall weigh not less than 3 tons—it is easy to imagine the disturbance which would have been occasioned by the traction and handling of such weights upon it, whereas the photograph bears witness to the perfect evenness of the layers. It is evident that the pre-Persic rubbish was thrown in against a wall which for the greater part of its length was already built.

There is really no difficulty in believing that the wall was built with the help of timber scaffolding, nor is there any that the wall, although always intended to be covered except as to its 3 or 4 upper courses by a terrace, may have remained, for the reasons already assigned, unfinished in this particular.

As respects the marble drums built into the north wall, it is evident that they must have been considered as material immediately available for the fortification of the Acropolis when that work was hurried forward in the time of Themistocles.¹ It is reasonable to suppose that they had been prepared by Pisistratus or his sons for rebuilding the poros stone temple. As to the theory that they were built into the north wall at a later period and had formed part of the material prepared by Cimon for his imagined temple on the Parthenon site, it is in the first place entirely wanting in any historical support that he ever had that intention, and secondly supposing he had left them as prepared but unused materials, was Pericles so reckless and regardless of expense as to have thrown away masses of marble so admirably adapted to his work and, if not for the lower drums of his columns, suitable for almost any other situation? The unfinished drums already referred to, which were found underground south of the Parthenon, were evidently part of the same batch of materials and point to the same Pisistratid origin.

If in consideration of the preceding arguments we refuse the claim of the archaic temple to the entablatures preserved in the north wall and the fire-marked capitals and the poros stone drums associated with them, we must still allow that the discovery of that temple, which with so many other things we owe to Dr. Dörpfeld's sagacity, is a great and important fact and requires to be considered both for what it was and what it was not. There is, I believe, no dispute of any consequence as to the general facts and dimensions of the parts which exist. The length of the stylobate according to Dr. Dörpfeld is 43·44 m. = 142·522 ft. By my measurement 142·273 ft. The breadth according to Dr. Dörpfeld is 21·34 = 70·014 ft. By my measurement 69·987. The width of the stylobate *in situ* 1·59 = 5·219 ft. I made it 5·210.

The above differences are very slight and will not in any way affect the arguments which may be based on them.

In my drawing of the restoration of the Hecatompedon I have supposed—although no part of my argument rests upon it—that a poros stone drum measuring 5·811 ft. from fillet to fillet belonged to that temple. This drum however Dr. Dörpfeld thinks may have belonged to a different structure alto-

¹ See the observations on this head in a previous page.

gether. So in the present enquiry I make no use of it and I will even leave out of my reckoning a large poros stone capital embedded in the inside of the north wall close to the entablatures which, where it joined the column, measured 4·282 ft. from fillet to fillet, and according to Dr. Dörpfeld about 4·266—a difference of no consequence: but as I said before I will pass over this capital and found my calculations upon another which is also embedded in the N. wall a little to the east of the Erechtheum, which measures 4·088 from fillet to fillet where it rested on the column.

The upper diameter of the column being thus given, we have to seek from analogy of the earliest examples the dimension at the base. In this enquiry we may include one of the columns of the Heraeum at Olympia, from among the great variety of different proportions in that temple, which seems to hold a middle place between excessive archaism and quite late work. This column gives the value marked (*a*) in the following table.

<i>a.</i>	1·285m. at the base and 0·930 at the neck giving the ratio	13·817 10
<i>b.</i>	After this we place Corinth from Stuart's measurements ¹	13·440
<i>c.</i>	Then the temple of Jupiter at Olympia, Blouet	13·231
<i>d.</i>	" " " Laloux and Monceaux	13·060
<i>e.</i>	" " " The <i>Ausgrabungen</i>	13·195
<i>f.</i>	From the Peristyle at Aegina, Cockerell	13·330
<i>g.</i>	" " Blouet	13·506
<i>h.</i>	The temple at the Port Aegina, Cockerell	13·653
<i>i.</i>	An archaic example on the Acropolis of Athens, measurement at necking 2·927, combined with a drum, not necessarily the lowest, measuring 4·010 ft. } at least	13·700

The general mean of all the above gives $\frac{13\cdot437}{10}$ as the proportion of the lower to the upper diameter in these early examples. But for the purpose of the arguments following, we may even afford to discard the six larger proportions and use the mean of the four smaller varieties which would be $\frac{13\cdot207}{10}$.

We have now to see if a column with a lower diameter applicable to this cap of 4·088 ft. could be placed on the stylobates of which we have, in part at least, certain data.

In addition to the block in situ there lie near the western front of the Parthenon a certain number of stylobate slabs which from their material shape and workmanship it is evident had been placed there when the archaic temple was dismantled.

They are of various breadths to which allusion will be made hereafter, but

¹ The measurements given by Stuart of this temple seem to give the only record where we can feel any confidence that the two diameters are measured from the same column. Blouet, who seems to have had access by ladder to the

top, fails to record the measurements required. Stuart's measurements are generally trustworthy and in his measure of the height he agrees with Blouet—and also with my own taken trigonometrically.

the width of the stylobate resulting from such of the stones as can be measured agrees in making it about 5·320 ft., which is a little wider than that given by the block in situ but not so greatly in excess but that they might have belonged to the southern stylobate of the same temple. If we place them on the fronts the argument would of course be at an end, for they would not have received the column of which the diameter (derived by multiplying the dimension at the necking by 1·3207) would be 5·399: and it is necessary that the stylobate should also be considerably wider than the diameter of the column which rests upon it. With 5·210 on the north side and 5·320 on the south we must suppose that the width we have to calculate from, to obtain that on the fronts, is 5·265. There are at least two instances, namely the Heraeum at Olympia and the temple at Corinth, in which the width of the front stylobate exceeds that on the flanks. It is therefore legitimate to look for it in this case. The question however will turn upon the extent that is permissible, and it amounts to this, Could the stylobate of the fronts according to any admissible analogy have been wide enough to receive a column of 5·399 diameter?

For the excess of the width of the stylobate beyond that of the column we must look to the temple at Corinth and that of Jupiter at Olympia, for nothing could be concluded from the extraordinary varieties of diameter found at the Heraeum. At Corinth the stylobate exceeds the diameter of the column on the flanks by $\frac{23}{163}$ and on the fronts by $\frac{20}{172}$. In the temple at Olympia the excess is $\frac{21}{221}$ on the flanks and $\frac{17}{225}$ on the fronts. The general mean of these four values shows the stylobate as exceeding the column in the proportion of 1 to ·90334, and therefore for a column of 5·399 diameter it should require to have a width of 5·975. Let us see now from the examples how much excess may be given to the front stylobate over that of the flanks, that is beyond 5·265 feet. We have three cases to refer to, namely the temple at Corinth, and the two great temples at Olympia (for in *this* examination we may admit the Heraeum). The excess at Corinth is $\frac{6}{186}$, at the Heraeum of Olympia $\frac{9}{134}$, and at the temple of Jupiter there is no difference. The mean of these three shows that we may add ·174 to our 5·265 making it 5·439. But we have seen that we require 5·987 to carry the column consistently with precedent; it is therefore more than six inches too narrow, and it has been by a *very indulgent* use of the proportions applicable to the known upper diameter that so small a base diameter as 5·399 has been deduced.

It follows from this enquiry that the width of the stylobates of the archaic temple is inconsistent with the dimensions of the order which it is proposed to place upon them; and if the analogies which I have pointed out are to be discarded, the advocates of the new faith must be contented with a very much lower amount of probability than if they were accepted.

Now suppose instead of combating these difficulties we accept the Hecca-

toumpedon theory as above explained, and let us suppose that the 4.088 cap was used on the flanks, and the 4.282 cap, which has in the previous discussion been kept in reserve (although the measurements of its depth and abacus and the character of its annulets and necking proclaim its relationship with that which has been worked from), was used in the fronts of the temple: and let the legitimate mean of 13.437 be applied to determine the lower diameters. We should then have for the latter 5.492 and 5.752 respectively, which bear to each other exactly the proportion of the example at Corinth, viz. 162.67 : 172, and if this were so, we should find in LM and OP of the sub-basement marks breadths for suitable stylobates within the conditions established by analogy, viz. 5.977 and 6.226.

The sole favourable argument in favour of a Doric hexastyle and 12 column arrangement on the site of the archaic temple appears to me to be the fact that this number could be fitly arranged, supposing the diameters were suitable, on a stylobate having the dimensions given above, and that the columniations would agree with those of the north wall architraves both front and flank. If it be thought an objection to the Hecatompedon theory above given that its breadth should so nearly equal that of the archaic temple, I can only reply that it is the only objection I can see and that there seems very little in it. When it was determined to rebuild the temple in a stately fashion and on higher ground there would have been obvious economy in using some of the roof materials in a temple of the same span.

It must however be granted that if the hexastyle Doric and 12 column plan was the only disposition that the stylobate of the archaic temple admitted of, there would be much temptation to endeavour to strain the analogies almost to the breaking point or else to imagine, what is unlikely, that every vestige of it had perished; but firstly I must call attention to a difficulty independent of the question of diameter which occurs in placing any Doric peristyle of 12 columns on the site in question.

This arises from the block in situ on the north flank. That block is situated at such distance from the N.W. angle of the stylobate that one, namely the fifth, of the supposed Doric columns would be placed upon it: as shown in Pl. XVIII., not indeed exactly centrally, but approximately so. It was doubtless the usual practice to place the centres of the columns over the joints of the stylobate, but it was not invariable, and the stylobate blocks near the Parthenon show such differences of breadth that probably in this temple the centres of the columns were sometimes over the joints and sometimes over the middle of the block: that therefore is not the difficulty, but it is this. There is on that block a sinking which has every right to be considered an original sinking¹ but which does not coincide with the centre of the block and therefore could have no relation to the construction of the columns, but seems rather to have been formed between them and to have

¹ The hole may of course have been formed subsequently to the removal of the columns, but the leading probability is that of its co-existence with them, especially as the wall of

which the traces are visible against the Caryatid porch must probably have been built over it at an early date.

carried some statue or *anathema*. This sinking therefore appeals against this position of the column; compare Pl. XVIII.

It is nevertheless certain that we have the foundations and dimensions of a great temple. Is the Doric disposition the only possible one? It is *not* the only possible disposition. An Ionic octastyle temple with 16 columns on the flanks would fit the stylobate equally well. The columniation on the flanks would be 9:13 and on the fronts 9:23.

On this scheme the block which has been referred to falls approximately centrally between two columns (see Pl. XVIII.) but nearest to the western one of the pair. And now there is seen a reason for the *eccentric* cutting of the sinking before referred to, being so done that the pedestal, for which it seems to have been cut as a socket, should occupy more nearly the centre between the two columns.

The stylobate stones near the Parthenon offer also a certain amount of support to this theory. It is in the first place likely that among the 6 or 7 which are there, two at least should have occupied positions adjoining one another.

There are two which measure respectively 5·177 and 3·928 in breadth, which combined make 9·115, a satisfactory correspondence with 9·130. There is however also a combination of 3 stones which agrees almost as closely with the 12·561 columniation. So that as between the two systems this proves nothing except that there is nothing inconsistent with the Ionic theory. That the Erechtheum was successor to the archaic temple as that of Minerva Polias is generally allowed. The fact of its being Ionic is in favour of the view that its predecessor was built in that order also.

The recent thorough search for architectural relics on the Acropolis has brought to light a fragment of a large Ionic cap of poros stone. The lower diameter of a column suited to it would have had a diameter of about 4 feet, and if a base were added on the analogy of the early temple of Juno at Samos, it would have occupied about 4·6 or 4·7 ft. of the width of the stylobate, which would suit its width very well: but the question will be asked—How is it, if the temple had originally 44 such columns, that only one portion of a cap should be extant? Was it not rather part of the base of some statue, of which several instances (though much smaller) have occurred? This answer would have great weight if we had to suppose that the Ionic peristyle had existed in the time of the Persian invasion; but this is by no means a necessary conclusion.

The theory of the early Parthenon or Hecatompedon supposes that that temple was founded at least 100 years (and probably more) before the Persian invasion, in greater magnificence and on a more commanding site and more in accordance with the prevailing taste than the archaic temple; and that the latter was taken down except so much of it as was used for secular purposes as a treasury, and which remained, so used, until the final completion of the Erechtheum, the new Hecatompedon taking its place as a temple and being that which was the one conspicuous temple of Minerva answering to the description by Herodotus, in which the fugitives vainly sought for asylum.

There would have been plenty of time in the interval we are supposing for the remains of the columns of the archaic temple to be broken up and dispersed. Length of time and domestic occupation of a site has much more effect in obliterating objects of antiquity than sudden catastrophe.

At the same time I wish to make this point clear, viz. that the acceptance or otherwise of this particular view which I have propounded respecting the Ionic order used in the Cecropium (if that was one of the names by which the archaic temple was known) has extremely little to do with the main contention of this paper, which is that the entablatures built into the north wall and most of the great Doric capitals and poros stone drums which have been brought to light during the recent excavations belonged to a temple which preceded the Parthenon on the same site, and not to the archaic temple discovered about seven years ago.

F. C. P.

POSTSCRIPT.

Some mention ought to be made of an independent source of enquiry which, when the details are confirmed by a more complete examination of the subject, cannot fail to throw much light on the occasion of the archaic temple being superseded by a temple built on the lines of the Parthenon.

It may be said to have been practically demonstrated by Mr. Lockyer¹ that the orientation of the Egyptian temples was determined by the *amplitude*, or distance northwards or southwards of the true east or west of certain conspicuous stars, as they rose or set above or below the visible horizon of the place, and careful observations of Greek temples show that similar principles must have prevailed in that country at the earliest times although apparently neglected later.

It is one of the facts of astronomy that year by year the apparent position of the stars with reference to the equator and the poles is affected by the change which is known as the *precession of the equinoxes* by which the earth's polar axis shifts its place continually though slowly along a definite course (approximately circular) in the heavens, so that the position of the stars (which amongst themselves can roughly but not quite accurately be called fixed) is altered very materially with reference to the equator and the pole, and this affects very much the time and place of their rising and setting for any particular place.

Although as before stated this motion is slow, yet after the lapse of two

¹ Mr. Lockyer (as he informs us, in *Nature*), after he had commenced the investigations alluded to, found he had been anticipated by Herr H. Nissen in Germany. Mr. Lockyer however has carried the enquiry much further (*vid.* articles in *Nature*, Nos. for April 16, May 7 and 21, and June 1 of this year, on *The Early History of Astronomy*). He has also expounded

his views on Orientation in a lecture to the Society of Antiquaries in May last). See also the contributions to this subject by H. Nissen in the *Rheinisches Museum f. Philologie*, particularly the 1885 and 1887 volumes. M. Émile Bernouf also in his *Légende Athénienne* seems to have approached very near to the point without however reaching it.

or three centuries or sometimes even less, a star which could be seen from the sanctuary of a temple through an eastern or western opening at its rising or setting would be altogether shifted out of sight, so that either its use in connection with the ceremonial, whatever it was, would have to be given up, or some structural change made to retain the observation.

In Egypt in several instances alterations of the jambs of the doorways have been made as if for the purpose of prolonging the means of observation, and in more than one instance a new temple has been built alongside of the original one with a slight deviation of axis suitable for the observation at its rising or setting of the identical star which presumably had determined the axis of the adjacent and earlier temple. In every instance of such alteration or renewal the sculptural and epigraphical archaeology appears to accord in sequence of date with the precessional movement of the star and the second temple is found to follow the same cult as the previous one.

Accurate observations of several of the temples in Greece show that in these, in every case excepting one (the Theseum), of which the date of foundation is probably comparatively late, a connection exists (similar to that which prevails so generally in Egypt) between the direction of the axis and the heliacal rising or setting of a conspicuous star or constellation at an epoch not inconsistent with the *earliest* foundation on the site: and it is probable that when the detail has been sufficiently worked out it will be found possible to determine within fairly close limits the dates of the foundations of the earlier temples from the directions of their axes and the apparent heights of the opposite mountains. The two temples on the Acropolis which are under discussion and the two at Rhamnus which also have slight deviations from one another seem particularly to invite examination on these principles. On the best hypothesis that in the present state of the enquiry can be formed the foundation of the Hecatompedon and consequently the probable supersession of the archaic Temple would have taken place long before the Persian invasion.

EXCAVATIONS IN CYPRUS.

THIRD SEASON'S WORK—POLIS TES CHRYSOCHOU.

[PLATES XIII.—XV. (A).]

THE main object of the third season's work of the Cyprus Exploration Fund was the excavation at Salamis, of which the results were published in the last number of this *Journal*. But, as was there mentioned, a small additional sum of money was procured to continue the previous season's work at Polis tes Chrysochou. It was especially important that the field known to us as Site T should be excavated, both because it promised to yield objects of rare beauty and interest, and because the results of the previous operations were, as was pointed out in last year's report, of little scientific value owing to the character of the evidence on which they were based, and required to be tested by further excavation on more trustworthy sites. Before leaving England, therefore, I had written to Mr. J. W. Williamson asking him to negotiate a contract, which (our departure having produced a good effect on the owner's mind) he was fortunately able to secure. To him and to Mr. Cecil Smith, who was most active in procuring the funds, the execution of the project is largely due.

It was near the end of June before work was started at Poli. H. A. Tubbs had been called home by other engagements, so that I was deprived of his cooperation for the remainder of the season. Poli is not to be commended as a summer residence. The heat in the valley is intense, fevers are more easily caught than avoided, and every drop of water fit to drink has to be brought an hour's journey on a donkey. The excavation was uneventful. The only incident which interrupted its course was an attempt by the joint-owner of one of the sites to conclude a contract on his own behalf and defraud his partners of their share of the price, a malpractice which was at once detected by the ever watchful Commissioner, and cost us a couple of days.

Site T was of course the first object. It lies, as a reference to the plan

published last year¹ will show, in the eastern necropolis immediately to the south of Mr. Williamson's vineyard. Our contract covered the whole field right down to the road, a larger area than is enclosed in the red dotted line on the plan. The tombs lay on either side of the shallow dip which runs down the middle of the field, and did not extend so far as the southern end of the site. With few exceptions they proved to be, as had been anticipated, of early date (the majority perhaps of the last decades of the sixth and first part of the fifth century B.C.), in fair preservation, and undisturbed. The record is therefore valuable, but the contents were a little disappointing. Comparatively few tombs contained more than the staple unpainted and Cypriote pottery, plain black-glazed ware, iron knives, etc., and where black-figured vases were found they were usually isolated specimens. Some of these vases are, however, of interest, and several tombs yielded jewellery and other objects to break the monotony of the finds. The tombs were mostly very small and at no great depth from the surface, so that the fifty-six opened on this site were cleared within three weeks.

Having still funds in hand I cast about for another site. There was no time or money to spend in experiments, and of the possible sites the field of our old friend the blind Turk in the western necropolis seemed the most promising. Although it was now bare of crop Mehemet Halofta was not to be hurried into a bargain, and remembering our experience of the previous season I was not sorry to secure first of all the courtyard which borders on the south end of the field. Here we found in one tomb two Attic *kykli* of the very finest style, which would themselves have repaid a whole season's work. Encouraged by this find I acquired first Halofta's field, agreeing to pay according to the number of shafts sunk, and lastly, to round off the excavation, a second yard which lies between the first and our old "Oven Site." The ground explored is in fact that bounded by the three tracks to the east of the Oven site and site A. None of the remaining tombs were comparable to the one mentioned, most of them indeed seemed to be of quite late date and many had been robbed, but two or three contained valuable jewellery and other interesting objects. On the whole the results of the excavation amply repaid the small sum devoted to it. We may now consider them in detail taking first the tombs, then the finds, and lastly any conclusions that may be drawn from them.

I.

Eighty tombs were opened, fifty-six in the eastern and twenty-four in the western necropolis. In the eastern necropolis the type was very constant—a small chamber sometimes rounded, sometimes of very irregular shape, but

¹ *J.H.S.* xi. Plate III.

most often roughly rectangular, measuring from five to nine feet both ways by four or five high, at a depth of from three to six feet from the surface to the top of the door, which was usually level with the roof. Larger tombs were occasionally met with, especially towards the eastern extremity of the site,² but it was very rare to find one that measured more than twelve feet in either direction, or lay at a greater depth than seven feet. One small group³ near the north-west corner of the field consisted of mere shallow holes scraped in the ground. The door seems as a rule to have been approached by a straight sloping *δρόμος*, but in the case of very shallow tombs the approach was sometimes dispensed with altogether. The *δρόμος* of course is not excavated, but false casts for the door now and then furnish information about it. We may note therefore that the *δρόμος* seems usually to have been a long one, sometimes very long for the depth of the tomb.⁴ Two examples were discovered of a *δρόμος* with a double turn in it (12, 47), and in one of these (47) the difference of direction coincided with a difference of level, making a staged descent. True steps in an orderly flight appeared only once (46). The doors were almost without exception⁵ built of small unsquared stones, as suits the humble character of the tombs. Many of them⁶ were found intact, but even where the door or the tomb was broken down, there was very seldom any trace of disturbance other than was caused by the fall. One tomb (13) had certainly been robbed, and another (18) probably, but (although nearly one third of the total number had collapsed) there is no reason to suppose that any one of the rest had ever been tampered with, indeed a robber would soon have found that his labour was ill requited. A second chamber, whether opening off the first or on to the same *δρόμος*, was never found. Bed-niches and raised banks were extremely rare,⁷ and of sarcophagi there was scarcely a trace.⁸

The western necropolis had a different character. There was greater variety in the tombs, robbers had been more active,⁹ and some tombs seemed to have been used a second time.¹⁰ The same general type was

² The largest of all was tomb 11, which measured 15 feet in length. 37, 49, and 45 were large tombs in the same region.

³ Tombs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7.

⁴ Tomb 9, for instance, over 15 ft., tomb 10 over 14 ft., tomb 16 over 16 ft., tomb 25 over 11½ ft., tomb 46 over 15¾ ft.

⁵ The only certain exception is tomb 25, which had a door of rough unsquared slabs, or flakes of stone.

⁶ Numbers 6, 9, 15, 16, 17, 22, 25, 29, 31, 36, 37, 49, are *certain* instances.

⁷ There were two instances of bed-niches, in tomb 15 one was built up with a supporting wall of rough stones in a recess 5 ft. long by 2½ ft. deep, and in tomb 41 was a series of them cut in the walls, some closed with stone slabs.

In 37 there was a raised bank formed of three stone blocks laid side by side.

⁸ From tomb 29 were extracted several large stone blocks. The tomb had collapsed, and I at first believed the blocks to have come from the door, but the door of unsquared stones was afterwards discovered intact, so the blocks may perhaps be referred to some sort of *μνήμα*. A few iron nails, which may possibly be taken to imply a wooden coffin, were found in 40 and 47, and in 16 two straight bronze clamps, each with two large bronze nails sticking in it.

⁹ Four tombs, 57, 58, 59, 62, had certainly been robbed, two more, 61 and 74, probably, and possibly others.

¹⁰ The mixed contents of 68, the fact that outside the door of 74 three fragments of fine

predominant, but there was a larger proportion of tombs above the average size, and the depth from the surface was sometimes much greater.¹¹ The greater depth may, however, be explained by the difficulty, which must frequently have been experienced by the tomb-diggers on this site, of finding near the surface suitable strata in which to excavate a chamber.¹² Perhaps it is partly owing to the greater depth and steepness of many of the shafts that steps were more common¹³ than in the eastern necropolis. As to the length of the *δρόμος* there is nothing to be said, except that in one instance (75) it was over twenty-one feet long. Niches or *μνήματα* in the *δρόμος* outside the door were found twice (69, 72). The doors were in striking contrast to those of the eastern tombs. Only two (74 and 76) were built of unsquared stones, the rest were all of regular stone slabs or blocks placed sometimes lengthwise, sometimes upright. Fully one half of them were found intact.¹⁴ A limestone block from the door of tomb 60 bears an inscription in the Cypriote script,¹⁵ and in the *δρόμος* of tomb 58 was found a small sculptured limestone *stèle*. Double-chambered tombs were again absent. Long narrow niches at right angles to the walls appeared for the first time in 65 and 75. In 65 there was but one, which was closed with a large plaque of tile, and one of the four in 75 was similarly closed with a stone slab. Bed-niches, closed with upright stone slabs resting on the floor, were discovered in 66 and 67, and one side of the narrow tomb 60 was occupied by an open bed or bank. A low bed-niche in 72 contained a small stone sarcophagus with a gable-lid. Sarcophagi built of slabs came to light in 57 and 70. In the latter were remnants of a wooden coffin with bronze nails. Similar nails with clamps were found in 74 and 75, nails only in 69, and smaller nails in 66 and in the niche outside the door of 69. Tomb 70 seemed to be merely an earth-grave with the sarcophagus at the bottom. Analogous was tomb 64, a mere niche at the bottom of a hole, with a door of roughly piled stone slabs.

On the whole the condition of the tombs may be pronounced to have

red-figured vases were found, and the presence of isolated incongruous fragments among the thoroughly homogeneous contents of such undisturbed tombs as 63, 66, and the *μνήμα* in the *δρόμος* of 69, seem to prove this; other cases are possible.

¹¹ The floor of 76 was 17 ft., of 75 within one inch of 22 ft., below the surface. 71 was a mere shaft, which we followed down 19 ft. 3 inches to find nothing but solid rock and a Roman lamp with two little Cupids in relief.

¹² Between one third and one half of the tombs had wholly or partially collapsed. 57 was excavated in a bed of hard sand and gravel, an unpromising material which had stood the test of time better than could have been expected, but had sadly incrustated the vases.

¹³ Flights of steps led down to 60, 63, 69, 74, and 75. The stair of 75 was partly composed of stone blocks.

¹⁴ Numbers 60, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 75, 76, 77. The niches outside 69 and 72, and the sarcophagus in 70 were also intact. The door of 57 was undisturbed but an entrance had been cut round the left side of it. The robbers seem to have closed the tomb again by laying across the door and hole a great slab of gypsum.

¹⁵ See p. 320 for the inscription, and p. 319 for the *stèle*. On the narrow side of one of the slabs from the door of 66 was incised the Cypriote symbol *μe*, and on the face of a slab from the door of 67 was painted in purple the symbol *sa*.

been good, in spite of the ravages of nature and of man. The occasional refurnishing or reconstruction of a tomb in particular had done little mischief beyond the inevitable substitution of inferior art for better. No real confusion capable of misleading the investigator had been introduced by it save in the rarest instances,¹⁶ for nothing beyond the merest stray fragments of the former contents were left behind at the time of the second burials. In this respect the tombs contrast most favourably with those discovered on the neighbouring sites the year before, where the mixture of periods was more serious, and the work of the tomb-riper had effectually obscured it by reducing all to confusion.

The plans on Plate XV. (A) will give some idea of the tombs.

II.

The staple contents of the tombs, taken as a whole, present great uniformity. The great bulk of the finds consists of Plain and Cypriote pottery, to which may be added black-glazed ware and iron knives. It will be well to consider these commonest contents first, the attenuated remnant may then be dealt with tomb by tomb, and any supplementary notes added, without running to undue length.

The annexed Tables, A and B, furnish a rough classification of the Plain and the Cypriote pottery, and a synoptic view of the distribution of the various types of vessels among the tombs. Types which are so rare as to occur in only two tombs are not included, but will be afterwards enumerated. Under the term 'Plain pottery' are comprehended all vessels without painted *patterns*, glaze, or plastic decoration. Light (from greyish white to yellow), red, and brown are the ordinary varieties, in rare instances small vessels are coated with a simple wash of matt red or black. In the table of Cypriote pottery the numbers in heavy type denote that the vases of the particular class, which were found in the tomb indicated, are in what may be named the 'red technique,' are painted, that is to say, with a deep red ground-colour. The other vessels are of the surface colour of the clay, light or pale red as the case may be. The clay of the light vases is sometimes of the same colour as the surface throughout, in which case it has a more or less yellow tone, sometimes the surface is nearly white but the clay beneath is red or grey. Yet the white surface appears to be no artificial coating, but

¹⁶ The contents of 68 are very miscellaneous, and objects unconnected with any tomb have found their way in. The extreme eastern verge of the field, towards which this tomb lay, falls within the limits of the site of the ancient city, and has probably been a good deal turned over in digging foundations etc. We sank several shafts in the same region, and here and there

came upon fragments of marble and architectural remains.

I hesitate to say definitely whether the fragments of a terracotta figure of poor style, which were found in the shaft of 75, and a hand, perhaps from the same figure, inside the door, are really to be assigned to that tomb or not.

the natural result of some process of firing, a slight variation or miscarriage of which has now and then produced a vase half white half pale red. There seems therefore to be no reason for distinguishing the two. The decoration of the Cypriote pottery is mostly of the usual kind, dark or red bands, concentric circles, etc., with occasional floral ornaments, or more rarely birds, on the shoulders of jars or jugs. Additional white touches or details are found especially on vases of the red technique. One or two jugs with plastic decoration are altogether without colour or patterns, and in the western necropolis appears a system of decoration¹⁷ not found in the eastern, narrow bands, streaks, zigzags, crosshatchings, and other patterns are painted either on the natural red or brown surface of the vessel, or on a white ground laid over it. The colours are usually bright, red, magenta, or yellow, and the lines are thin, carelessly drawn with a free hand without any of the mechanical precision of the ordinary patterns. Concentric circles are entirely absent. This style may be called the 'polychrome technique.' The little smooth red bottles with meagre dark bands round them,¹⁸ and one or two pots with stems, one of which bears a red ivy-branch round the shoulder, seem also to belong to this same class rather than to any other. The magnificent Cypriote ware with tawny ground and dark leaf patterns, hatchings, etc., is not represented at all among the finds, except by a stray fragment in tomb 66.

¹⁷ Cf. *J.H.S.* xi. p. 37 (c).

¹⁸ Cf. *Ibid.* p. 36 (c).

A.—PLAIN POTTERY.

VESSELS.	EASTERN NECROPOLIS.	WESTERN NECROPOLIS.
1. Large amphorae (* long-necked form).	6, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 23, 29, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53.	57, 59, 63, 64 ⁺ , 66, 66 ⁺ , 67 ⁺ , 68 ⁺ , 69, 69 ⁺ , 72 ⁺ , 73 ⁺ , 73, 75, 75 ⁺ , 76, 77 ⁺ .
2. Large-cared neckless diotae.	13, 14, 16, 25, 30, 37, 38, 44, 47, 49, 52, 54.	
3. Neckless jars, with little vertical ring handles.	10, 11, 18, 25, 13.	
4. Large jars, with neck, and handles on the shoulder.	6, 11, 15, 31, 36.	57, 61, 66, 67, 76.
5. Wide-mouthed jugs (* with pinch in the lip in front).	1, 13, 19, 20.	57, 63 ⁺ , 65 ⁺ , 69 ⁺ , 72, 73, 75 ⁺ .
6. Jugs with narrow pinched lip (* slender tapering neck).	3, 7 ⁺ , 8, 8 ⁺ , 11, 12 ⁺ , 13, 16 ⁺ , 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 35, 40 ⁺ , 45, 46, 47 ⁺ , 49, 50, 51, 51 ⁺ .	58, 59, 66 ⁺ (with ribbed bands), 69.
7. Funnel-necked jugs of smooth red clay.	3, 28, 31, 36.	63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 75, 79.
8. 'Bottle jugs' (* pinched lip).	2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11 ⁺ , 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23 ⁺ , 29, 30, 31, 32, 31, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 45, 46, 49, 51 ⁺ , 54, 55.	57, 59, 66, 67, 76.
9. Minute jugs.	2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 15, 17, 29, 32, 36, 37, 41, 49, 51.	59.
10. Flat basins.	7, 10, 13, 30, 36, 40, 42.	
11. Plates.	17, 36, 37, 43, 47, 49, 50.	61, 75.
12. Bowls (* with independent rim).	3, 6, 15 ⁺ , 17 ⁺ , 19 ⁺ , 20 ⁺ , 22, 22 ⁺ , 27 ⁺ , 34 ⁺ , 35, 35 ⁺ , 36, 36 ⁺ , 41, 45 ⁺ , 46 ⁺ , 47, 47 ⁺ , 49, 55 ⁺ .	57, 59, 59 ⁺ , 63 ⁺ , 67, 68, 75 ⁺ .
13. One-handed pots.	35, 36, 37, 54 (similar, but two-handed, 47).	78.
14. Jars or pots with a vertical rim.		59, 61, 67, 79.
15. Saucers.	2, 3, 6, 8, 12, 13, 15, 17, 22, 26, 30, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 13, 47, 49, 53.	57, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 75, 76.
16. Little open cups with one vertical handle.	7, 20, 23, 27, 13, 47, 48, 49.	
17. Cocked-hat lamps.	3, 16, 17, 26, 30, 40, 41, 46, 54 (a 'double' specimen in 30).	57, 59, 66, 67.
18. Bottles with swelling middle and slender ends.		68, 69 (both tomb and <i>μνημα</i>), 72, 73.
19. Simple straight-necked jugs.		64, 67, 69 (tomb and <i>μνημα</i>).
20. Jugs with a double rim.		63, 65, 69.

B.—CYPRIOTE POTTERY.

VESSELS.	EASTERN NECROPOLIS.	WESTERN NECROPOLIS.
1. Large jars, with neck, and handles on the shoulder.	7, 11, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 30, 33, 31, 36, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54.	57.
2. Small jars of the same type.	1, 13, 15.	59.
3. Large jars with vertical handles.	5, 23, 54.	
4. Small jars of the same type.	13, 20, 49, 50.	
5. Simple straight-necked jugs.	8, 10, 17, 29, 37, 40.	
6. Jugs with narrow pinched lip (* with slender tapering neck).	3 ⁺ , 6 ⁺ , 11, 11 ⁺ , 11, 16 ⁺ , 19 ⁺ , 20, 21, 22 ⁺ , 23, 24, 26, 30 ⁺ , 31, 34 ⁺ , 35 ⁺ , 36 ⁺ , 37 ⁺ , 41 ⁺ , 45, 48, 50, 51, 53 ⁺ , 54, 54 ⁺ .	59 ⁺ .
7. 'Bottle-jugs' (with pinched lip).	20, 42, 43, 44, 52.	
8. Jugs with spouts.	5, 17, 20.	
9. Jugs with figurine and pitcher (* standing type).	3, 40, 40 ⁺ , 41.	57, 58 (without colour).
10. Jugs with ox-head (* without colour).	6 ⁺ , 15, 17, 37, 40.	59, 75 (polychrome), 79 ⁺ .
11. Funnel-necked jugs.	36, 41, 42.	
12. Minute jugs.	7, 17, 20, 23, 32, 34, 35, 36, 43, 54.	
13. Little jugs with double stepped necks (the red usually more or less shiny).	13, 19, 24, 26, 28, 33, 42, 49, 50, 51.	
14. Bowls with independent rim.	16, 20, 21, 24, 24, 26, 40, 43, 47, 54.	57, 59.
15. Open cups (* with one little vertical handle).	13, 17, 19, 20 ⁺ , 24, 26 ⁺ , 33, 35, 41.	
16. Jars or pots with a vertical rim.	28, 30, 41, 43.	
17. Saucers.	1, 6, 17, 23.	
18. Plates.	11, 13, 19, 20, 21, 42, 43.	
19. Flat basins.	6, 10, 16, 17, 32, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 47.	59.
20. Little smooth red bottles with dark bands.		61, 63, 74.
21. Polychrome technique.		61, 74, 75. §

§ The shapes are : funnel-necked jug (61), simple straight-necked jugs (74), jugs with ox-head (75).

It is instructive to compare the two necropoleis as they appear on the Tables. It will be observed that, of the 21 forms¹⁹ under which the Plain pottery is grouped, 12 are common to both, and 4 peculiar to the one, 5 to the other. Peculiar to the eastern necropolis are (1) Large-eared diotae, (2) Neckless jars, (3) Flat basins, and (4) Little cups with a vertical handle. One of these four forms, the flat basin appears in the western necropolis under Cypriote guise, but only in tomb 59. Peculiar to the western necropolis are (1) Long-necked amphorae, (2) Jars or pots with an upright rim, (3) Swelling bottles with slender ends, (4) Simple straight-necked jugs, (5) Jugs with a double rim. But of these five forms two, the second and the fourth, are not uncommon as Cypriote vases in the eastern necropolis. Turning now to the other Table we find that among the 21 types of Cypriote vessels 7 are common to both necropoleis, 12 are peculiar to the eastern, and 2 to the western necropolis. These last are of the class, peculiar to the western necropolis, which I have for convenience called polychrome. If now we examine more closely the 7 types common to both necropoleis, it appears that 5 of them are accounted for by tombs 57 and 59. There remain only the two classes of jugs with plastic decoration, the figurine-and-pitcher type, and the ox-head type. If we examine again the several western specimens of these two types, we find that whereas those from tombs 57 and 59 are in the red technique, which is extremely frequent in the eastern necropolis, those from tombs 58 and 79 are wholly without colour, and those from tomb 75 are in the polychrome technique. Except, therefore, in the two tombs 57 and 59, all 7 types which seemed to be common to the two necropoleis disappear, so far as painted decoration goes, from the western. Those two tombs would seem accordingly to be related in character rather to the eastern necropolis than to the western, an inference which is only strengthened, as will become evident, by a consideration of their other contents. Putting them aside, therefore, we arrive at the important fact that not a single example of the ordinary Cypriote painted pottery was found in the whole of the rest of the western necropolis, but the traditional plastic decoration and the degenerate polychrome technique alone survive there. On the other hand of the 19 types with the ordinary decoration, which are thus confined to the eastern necropolis (and tombs 57 and 59), 11 occur in the western as plain or polychrome. It would seem in fact that the distinction between the two necropoleis is more strongly marked with reference to the decoration than the shapes of the vessels. With these two general observations we may content ourselves for the present, and pass on to the rarer specimens not included in the Tables. Briefly they are as follows:—

Plain pottery.

Plain light jugs with a spout (2, 13).

A plain red *cotyle* (3).

Little squat wide-mouthed jugs or mugs (3, 59).

A curious vase like a swelling short-necked bottle with handles rising

¹⁹ 21 not 20, because the long-necked amphorae are readily to be reckoned another form.

from the shoulders (20), and a somewhat similar vase but with a wider neck and smaller handles (39).

A clay disk, like a bung, with a hole through the centre (20).

A little amphoroid jug (23).

An open saucer with a little cup rising from the middle, the whole rudely resembling a bed-room candlestick (25).

A small cup of egg-cup shape but with little vertical catch-handles on each side (30).

A jug of the true *askos* shape (31).

A large jar with a vertical handle in addition to the two ordinary horizontal handles (42).

Little globular jars with two vertical handles (42).

Narrow-necked jars with little handles on the shoulders (43, 49).

A two-handled bottle (61).

A long jar (66).

A large red open pot with horizontal rim and rudimentary handles (67).

A jug with a wide mouth and narrowing neck on a pretty ovoid body (67).

Four very large jugs like amphorae with one handle and a base (75).

A two-handled red pot with a lid (8).

A large jar with vertical handles (57).

Jugs of elegant form with a slender neck like a bottle's (64, 69).

A little 'rouge pot' (68).

Cypriote pottery.

A small top-shaped vase (6).

A small jug with a mouth shaped as if to take a capsule cover (11).

A large jar with a third (*vertical*) handle (13).

A jug of upright ovoid form with a broad rim (cf. *J.H.S.* xi. p. 37) (16).

A large jar with double 'ogee' handles (21).

A large round jar with a wide low neck (28).

A jar with a small plain neck and vertical loop handles (42).

Two jugs with a stepped neck (42, 43).

A jar with a simple round aperture and rim but no neck (43).

An *askos*, plain red with a black top, short handle (43).

An *askos* in the form of a bird with barrel-shaped body and fan tail, light ground covered with little dark concentric circles (51).

Of the variety which has been classed with the polychrome are:—

Stemmed pots with handles rising high above the shoulder and low rimmed apertures as though for a lid (66, 79, the latter with an ivy pattern on the shoulder and a vandyke pattern of lines on the body).

A jug of novel shape, with very slender bottle-neck and delicate handle, red ground, narrow dark and white bands (69, *μνήμα* in the *δρόμος*).

Next in quantity after the Plain and Cypriote pottery comes the Black-glazed ware. Under this term are comprehended only vessels which are glazed all over so far as they are meant to be visible. Figured vases, and vases in the black-figure or red-figure technique, will be noted under their

respective tombs. To the black-glazed vessels are here added the few red-glazed, and a certain number which are partly red partly black. The colour of the glaze does not seem an essential distinction. The vessels are mostly plain, but some few bear little impressed patterns. The list is as follows:—
Plain black.

- Cotylæ (15, 17, 67, 68, 76).
- Cylices, with independent rim (17, 25, 35 (stemless), 38, 40, 41, 45).
- Stemmed cups, or cylices without handles (41, 55).
- Two-handled open cups (35, 59).
- One-handled open cups (6, 41, 66).
- Saucers, ordinary (2, 6, 15, 41, 66).
- Saucers, flat type with independent rim (35, 36, 41).
- Little 'ointment pots' (41, 61).
- Askos-lamps, plain (41, 66, 76).
- Askos-lamps, decorated (v. the several tombs) (41, 66, 67).
- A large amphora (30).
- A pinax with central 'well' (67).
- A fragmentary pyxis with lid (40).
- A ribbed mug (15).
- Irrecognizable fragments (73).

Plain red.

- A one-handled open cup (15).
- An ordinary saucer (one of a pair, of which the other is black) (66).
- A little vessel with a spout and vertical ring-handle to one side (75).

Plain red and black.

- Cotylæ (36, 59).
- Cylices with independent rim (35 stemless, 40).
- A one-handled open cup (76).
- A little 'ointment pot' (40).

Black with impressed patterns.

- Two-handled open cups (15 merely an impressed circle, 66).
- Saucers, ordinary (15 *δρόμος*, 66, 67).

Red with impressed patterns.

- A two-handled open cup (15).

Red and black with impressed patterns.

- A stemless cylix (3) (fragment of another? in 19).

Many of these vessels bear inscriptions scratched on the bottoms, which will be noticed under their respective tombs.

To clear off another class of very common objects let us here note that *iron knives* were found in tombs 3, 6, 11, 13, 15, 26, 35, 36, 41, 54, 59, 66, 67.

We may now take stock of the remaining finds tomb by tomb, commenting on anything that appears to be of interest.

Tomb 1.—The only distinctly late tomb opened in the eastern necropolis. Besides glass and a fragmentary iron implement, it contained only a Roman lamp with a representation of Aetæon attacked by a hound, which leaps against his right side. Aetæon is, as usual, horned. He holds a branch or club in each hand. The right arm is raised to strike, the left held back. Round the latter hangs a chlamys floating out behind. The composition is strikingly like that of the small marble group in the British Museum, wherein the influence of Myron has been traced. I saw in private possession at Larnaca two more lamps with the same design.

Tomb 3.—An iron strigil.

Tomb 6.—A small squat lecythus with decoration in the red-figure technique, a stroke pattern round the root of the neck, a wreath of olive leaves round the shoulder, and just below it a meander pattern.

One of the plain large amphoræ from this tomb bears an inscription in the Cypriote script incised on the shoulder in the wet clay—



20

mi' ti' ri' vo' se'

Mίθριφος.

A genitive *Mίθρεος* from *Mίθρησ* = *Mίθρασ* is found, and the form *Μιθριδάτης*, almost universally used by the Greeks, seems to show that *Mίθρεος* or *Mίθριος* was the more familiar declension. The name is not confined to the deity, v. Pape's *Wörterbuch sub voc.*

At the root of one of the handles of the same vessel is incised the symbol ζ.

Tomb 8.—A cylix, black-figure technique, 'Kleinmeister' type, without figures.

A gold pendant, amphora shape, with a granulated line at the top and bottom of the neck.

Tomb 10.—A black-figured cylix, 'Kleinmeister' type, with the same pair of figures on each side. A nude male figure, raising his left hand before him, strides rapidly to the right. He seems to hold something (a cup?) in his right hand close to his hip, and looks back at another figure

²⁰ This and the other Cypriote inscriptions (except the last) are reproduced from photographs of squeezes pencilled with chalk. I

find this method a good practical compromise between clearness and accuracy.

muffled in a purple cloak, who follows him more slowly. Rough hasty work.

Tomb 11.—A little bronze suspension ring.

Tomb 12.—A cylix, black-figure technique, 'Kleinmeister' type. No figures, but black-and-purple palmettes from the roots of the handles.

A minute light-blue porcelain figure, seated, having an animal head. Behind the shoulder is a little hole for suspension (Pl. XV.).

Tomb 13.—Two little jars ornamented with red and black vertical streaks.

Tomb 14.—A small bronze bracelet ending in snakes' heads.

A curious open lamp, plain on the under side, glazed (red to black) above, with a yellowish white line round the rim. In the middle of the circular aperture rises a hollow cone, intended no doubt to fit on to a pointed stand. There is a wick-spout, but no handle. Cf. another specimen from tomb 25.

Tomb 15.—An iron signet-ring.

A black-glazed saucer, and a red-glazed two-handled cup with impressed pattern, bear scratched on their bottoms the same monogram $\Lambda\Phi$, *ta sa*.

Tomb 16.—A plain large-eared diota has the symbol *mī* painted in red between the roots of one handle.

A small light-blue porcelain 'sacred eye' (Pl. XV.).

A silver signet-ring.

A black-figured cylix, 'Kleinmeister' type, an excellent specimen of its class. The figures are below the rim, which is black. On the one side a man flees before a leopard. He looks back at his pursuer, and in his extended right hand holds a white stone ready to throw at him. Over his left arm, as though to shield him, hangs a black *chlamys* adorned with a purple spot in the centre surrounded by white dots. He wears a purple tunic and close-fitting purple helmet. The leopard, black with white spots and a red mane, is ludicrously stiff and grotesque. His neck is very high and long, his head full *en face*. He raises one paw as if to strike. On the other side the positions are reversed. A huntsman in close-fitting helmet and white tunic, mounted on a powerful horse with purple mane and tail, chases a wounded hind. The animal (white spots and purple neck) falls on one knee looking backward. She is stricken in the hind quarter by a spear with a loop handle in the middle of the shaft, and the red blood flows out. The work is delicate and careful throughout. The vase although much broken is practically complete.

Another black-figured cylix of the same type. Beneath a black rim is a band of birds in plain black without incised lines. The glaze is a good deal eaten and incrustated, but among the birds may be distinguished a swan and two cocks.

Tomb 17.—A silver signet ring.

Tomb 18.—A large amphora (mouth and handles lacking), of rather slender form, with smooth white ground. At wide intervals are narrow dark bands, and on the shoulder at each side what seems to be a sinuous snake.

Tomb 19.—Fragments of a small bronze vessel.

A cylix, 'Kleinmeister' type, with patterns outside in the black-figure technique—a band of rays or spikes from near the stem, then a wreath of leaves, and outermost a circle of ivy.

Tomb 22.—A good black-figured cylix, with inner picture, and two outer pictures between 'eyes.' Inside a bearded warrior, nude but for a crested helmet and sword-belt, advances rapidly to the right, but looks back behind him. His right hand seems to rest on his hip, his left on the hilt of his sword. Outside, the scene is a wood or vineyard. Bearded Satyrs peer through the trees from beyond the 'eyes' at the struggle between Heracles and the Cretan bull on the one side, and Theseus and the Marathonian bull on the other. Heracles, clad only in a cloth about the loins, his cloak hung on a branch above, and his club resting against a stem behind, has just brought the bull to his knees by reaching forward over his shoulders and straining on a rope, which he has slipped over a fore and a hind leg. The motive is not an uncommon one, and is repeated without change on the opposite side, only Theseus is beardless and has no club. White, purple, and incised lines are used in moderation. The glaze often passes into brown, and is a good deal damaged on the second outer picture. The drawing is firm and confident, the vase an excellent example of its kind. Although much broken it is complete.

Tomb 23.—On the shoulder of a plain large amphora is a symbol in the form of a Greek cross (? *lo*) incised in the wet clay.

Tomb 25.—An open lamp similar to the lamp from Tomb 14.

Fragments of a bronze vessel.

A small jug of exceptional character, black-glazed with a band left of the natural colour of the clay, on which are painted two purple lines.

A small cylix, 'Kleinmeister' type, without figures.

A black-figured cylix, 'Kleinmeister' type. Under a black rim is a band of figures, seven on the one side, six on the other. All stand in much the same attitude, the hands nearer the spectator muffled in their mantles, the others holding up the ends of the mantle. All wear a close-fitting red cap. The artist seems to have started painting them in pairs, a black-cloak, adorned with three red-and-white flowers, facing a red-cloak, with a white tunic showing below. But a black-cloak always occupies each end. The figures are grotesque and puppet-like. The work is ordinary.

Tomb 27.—A cylix, 'Kleinmeister' type, black-figure technique. Glaze black to red. Below the rim a band of black palmettes with white dots, between each a purple lotus bud.

Tomb 28.—Fragments of a bronze saucer.

Tomb 29.—A broken cylix, 'Kleinmeister' type, black-figure technique, similar to that from Tomb 27.

A little red-figured lecythus, with an owl between two olive twigs. The neck and shoulder of the vase are left red, and round the latter is a dot and dash pattern. Above the owl a meander pattern runs round the top of the body of the lecythus. The style is facile and hasty, but I should judge the

vase to be an early specimen of its class, and find in the decoration of the shoulder a confirmation of my impression. Nevertheless it was surprising to find in the same tomb—

An aryballos with the curious, but not uncommon, conventional pattern in which four almond-shaped radiating ‘wings’ form the most prominent element. The conjunction naturally excites distrust, but although the tomb had collapsed, the door was intact, and there was no proof of any disturbance. An exact parallel is, moreover, quoted by Mr. Cecil Smith from Camirus (*J.H.S.* vi. p. 375). The vases stand side by side in Fig. 1.



FIG. 1 (a).




FIG. 1 (b).

Tomb 30.—A black-figured cylix, of ‘Kleinmeister’ type, with black-edged rim decorated with vertical strokes, palmettes from the handles. The figures are in plain black without incised lines, both sides alike, a winged Sphinx between two ‘mantle-figures’; on the one side she raises a fore-paw. Commonplace work.

Tomb 32.—A broken cylix, ‘Kleinmeister’ type, black-figure technique, with a band of palmette and lotus bud pattern.

An iron sheep-bell had found its way in from above, the tomb having collapsed.

Tomb 35.—A silver signet-ring.

Part of an iron signet-ring.

A bronze strigil.

On the bottom of a black-glazed saucer are inscribed the Cypriote symbols \triangle , \uparrow , $\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\ \Delta\iota\kappa\alpha$, and Σ , σ , Θ .

Tomb 36.—A black-figured cylix, ‘Kleinmeister’ type, with two rams charging, the same both sides. White on the horns and bellies. Ordinary style.

Several crude little terracotta figurines—a dove; a horse with head-harness; a dog with traces of red on his ears and paws; a grotesque horse-

man wearing a curious high cap, his hair, which falls behind his neck, black, the head-stall and saddle-cloth (?) of his high-necked horse red.

A gold earring, of the woosack type, adorned with patterns of minute granulation (Pl. XV.). The fretted indented edge below was clearly intended to grip a gem or bead now lost. The fellow to this pretty little prize was not discovered.

A number of silver ornaments—three signet rings, a pair of silver-plated bronze spirals of $3\frac{1}{2}$ turns each, nine small silver spirals and fragments of several more, a little connecting link in the form of two cylinders side by side, six small silver-gilt plates (besides fragments) of curious shape, forming one may suppose part of a necklace or bracelet, and lastly a little flat piece of silver like a half sixpence.

Tomb 37.—Between the roots of one handle of a large diota is painted in red a circle with a horizontal stroke above and below it.

A red-glazed cylix, with two bands of the natural pale red ground left clear on the outside, has an early appearance.

A silver ring with points for holding a scarab.

A plain silver ring still on the finger bone.

A pair of silver earrings of the woosack type with tassel-like pendants.

Tomb 40 is of especial interest and importance for the chronological evidence furnished by a silver coin found in it, which proves to be of the Lion's head type, *circa* 480-400 B.C., attributed by M. Six²¹ to Soli.

Among the nine or ten Cypriote jugs with plastically decorated spouts is one with a *ram's* head in place of the ordinary ox-head, and one with a *standing* figurine to five or six of the seated variety. The latter especially have a distinctly archaic appearance, the better worked out examples, with neatly tired hair and a crinkled woollen tunic under their mantles, recalling some of the statues in the Acropolis Museum at Athens, while others with their knob-like breasts and rat-tail locks exhibit a style of art more rude and simple, although, to judge from the heads, contemporary.

A little bearded terracotta head in a pointed hat with a brim. Close under the brim on each side of the head is a little round boss, from which depends a streamer. Although much too high set the bosses may be meant for ear-ornaments and the streamers for locks of hair. The features of the face are very indistinct.

A gold ring with an elaborate setting for two seals or gems side by side, of which one is preserved, a porcelain or paste scarabaeoid not engraved. The ring has a richness and elegance far above the average, and is altogether a very pretty piece of work (Pl. XV.).

A fragment of a light blue porcelain ornament or amulet.

²¹ *Revue Numismatique*, 1883, pp. 302, 368. Cf. *Head Hist. Num.* pp. 626-7, De Luynes *Num. Cyp.* Pl. ii. no. 12. M. Six was formerly inclined to attribute the coins of this type to Marium, and the discovery of one of them in a

tomb at Marium may be held to support that attribution, but it cannot be proved that the city was not subject to Soli in the fifth century B.C.

Two little blue glass beads.

Fragments of a bronze strigil.

Tomb 41.—A little thin gold pendant with an embossed Sphinx *en face* (Pl. XV.).

Six hollow ribbed gold beads.

Three small bronze gilt spirals.

Two small fragments of a silver ring.

A small bronze mirror.

A fragment of alabaster bottle.

The body of a little red-figured aryballos, with a horse of strong stout type with a short high neck. The style is fairly good, and the drawing quite free.

There may be mentioned the brilliant crimson and yellow drapery of a figurine (seated type, crude body, archaic head) on a jug, and the following graffiti on black-glazed vessels—*on an askos or ur* = 'Ova, and three horizontal lines intersected at right angles by three vertical, *on a saucette* = Ti, *on a cup* ti mo' = Τιμο, and *a riv* = 'Αρι combined in a monogram, and in the Greek alphabet ΑΙ no doubt incompletely written for ΑΡ, for *on another askos* the same monogram is accompanied by a combined ΑΡ.

Tomb 43.—A cup with high independent rim painted with what seems to be an inferior red to black glaze.

Tomb 45.—A cylix, 'Kleinmeister' type, black-figure technique, with the ordinary black and purple palmette and bud pattern.

A two-handled cup like a stemless cylix, reddish-brown ground, shiny black or inferior glazed bands.

Tomb 47.—The rim and handles of a large red amphora are adorned with dark red stripes.

Tomb 51.—Several little light blue porcelain amulets shaped like the blade of a saw.

Tomb 53.—A plain large amphora with painted red lines about the neck and handles.

A little wide-mouthed jug, light clay with a shiny black surface coating.

A plain red two-handled cup with a shiny black rim.

A very small aryballos, light grey ground, plain black bands, the glaze a good deal damaged.

Tomb 54.—A bronze candelabrum, 9 inches high, of the type figured on p. 336 of Cesnola's *Cyprus*, or *Salamina* pl. IV. A, B, and C. The design, probably derived from Assyria, is a common one for candelabra found on early Cypriote sites, there is more than one example from Poli in the Cyprus Museum, Nicosia.

Tomb 55.—A plain red jug, the neck and shoulder covered with a shiny red to black ground-colour.

Tomb 56 seemed to contain little or nothing beyond common plain or Cypriote pottery, and was never worked out.

Tomb 57.—A Cypriote jug of the red technique with figurine and pitcher spout (figurine of the seated type and archaic style), with black birds and twigs on the shoulder.

An Attic lecythus with white ground and outline drawing. This vase, which is figured on Plate XIII., was found in scattered pieces, but is practically complete. It had suffered not only from the wanton violence of the robbers who had rifled the tomb, but also from the damp, which filtered through the sandy gravel bed in which the tomb was excavated, and coated it with a hard white incrustation. Much of the brilliancy of the red colour has therefore



FIG. 2.

been sacrificed to the necessity of cleaning. The vase proves to be of singular beauty, and may challenge comparison with the very finest examples of its class. The representation is a parting scene. A soldier receives his helmet from a lady, whom we may conjecture to be his wife. He stands fronting the spectator, his face turned in profile to his right, his left hand holding his long upright spear, and his right extended to take the helmet. A belt over his right shoulder carries a sword. His tall rather slender figure, concealed by no clothing, and his short crisp beard and hair, show him to be in the prime of life. Figure and features are of genuinely

Attic type, such as involuntarily suggests to us the Athenian citizen of the generation of Alcibiades. Facing him stands the lady, proffering his helmet. Behind her is the stool from which she has just risen. She is fully draped in a long *chiton* with *diplois*, but, as so often on the vases of this class, within the drapery are drawn with exquisite grace the delicate outlines of her lovely form. Her head, bound with a simple red snood, is slightly bowed, and her face bears a gentle expression of tender sorrow. Although far beneath it in beauty of style and noble sweetness of sentiment, no vase known to me so vividly recalls this figure as the white lecythus in the British Museum inscribed *Ῥγαίῶν καλός*, on which is represented a lady handing a cloak to her maid. So striking is the resemblance of the heads in particular, that we can scarcely refuse to admit that both were painted at least in the same workshop. There is another lecythus of the same technique and style in Madrid, which bears the same inscription.²² From the character of the letters, and the style of drawing, the two inscribed vases seem to be among the latest of those with love-names,²³ and our lecythus cannot be separated from them by any considerable interval of years. We may probably conclude that all three were made not long after the middle of the fifth century B.C. A curious detail is the goose between the two figures. On Stephani's principle of interpretation²⁴ it would symbolize conjugal affection. More natural is the supposition that the bird is a token of domestic life simply, an accessory of the home. Penelope's geese have the run of the house,²⁵ the goose with which the young boy wrestles in the often repeated group is generally held to be a domestic pet.²⁶ A goose might be added to the scene before us with the same pathetic touch of home associations as is sometimes given in a modern picture by a dog. It is, however, also possible that the goose may have somehow become an omen of death. The bird appears not infrequently in funeral scenes on sepulchral vases, e.g. the white lecythus figured in Dumont's *Céramiques* p. xxxii., where a goose is seen under the bier whereon a corpse is laid out for burial.²⁷ The favourite oath of Socrates may have a significance beyond what has usually been attributed to it. Can geese have been a customary offering at the grave?

Second only to the white lecythus in beauty is a red-figured lecythus found with it, and like it in scattered fragments, but practically complete. The picture is Aphrodite riding on a swan over the sea (v. Pl. XIV.). The bird flies to the right, the Goddess is seated in profile on his right shoulder, her feet hanging down in front. Her left hand carries a long sceptre, her

²² v. Klein, *Die griech. Vasen mit Lieblingsinschriften* p. 86, where a rough sketch of the British Museum lecythus is given, and Wernicke, *Die griech. Vasen mit Lieblingsnamen* p. 95.

²³ Cf. Wernicke, *ibid.* p. 108.

²⁴ *Compte Rendu*, 1863, pp. 17-105.

²⁵ *Od.* xix. 536-553.

²⁶ Cf. Mr. E. A. Gardner's article, *J.H.S.* vi. pp. 10-11. But the newly-discovered poems

of Herodas (iv. 32) seem to bring the motive of the Boy and Goose once more into connection with Asclepius; cf. *Anthol. Gr.* T. ii. p. 324, 9 and 10. There may have been some legend of the childhood of Asclepius which would explain the connection did we but know it. Is it possible that the *sex annis* of the MSS. of Pliny (*N. H.* xxxiv. 84) is a corruption of *Asculapius*, or ought it to be omitted altogether?

²⁷ Cf. also *Denkmäler des Inst.* 1858, Pl. 23, 2.

right is raised towards the swan's neck as if to guide or moderate his flight. She is dressed in a long tunic, with a mantle cast about her waist and over her left shoulder. Her long hair falls rippling down her back, and is bound by a plain diadem, above the front of which rises a row of leaves projecting at regular intervals. The swan is a strong powerful bird with mighty wings, rather clumsy and stiff about the legs and tail, but far more slender and long in the neck than his brother on the British Museum cylix. That cylix furnishes the closest parallel to our vase, in their general scheme of composition the two pictures are practically identical. The cylix picture will still



FIG. 3.

remain the finest representation of the theme, but the lecythus is at least no unworthy second. Its style is considerably later, full of graceful charm, although not without some faint echoes of the more severe manner. The least successful point is the hands of Aphrodite, which are clumsy and misshapen. Except for the great wing-feathers the plumage of the swan is but lightly indicated, contrasting with the 'scale-armour' in which the swan on the cylix is sheathed. The sea beneath is represented merely by dashes of white.

Aphrodite riding over, or rising from, the sea on a swan is, if not a frequent subject in Greek art, at least not a rare one. The subject has been handled by O. Jahn, Stephani, and more recently by Dr. Kalkmann,²⁸ who sees in the swan a symbol of the star of Venus. That the leading idea is the advent of Spring, that Aphrodite is conceived of as Queen of the Heavenly Host, and that the swan has some relation to the celestial company of the stars, seems probable from the literary and artistic evidence brought forward by Dr. Kalkmann, but I hesitate to follow him farther in his mythological combinations, and to pronounce the swan to be definitely the particular planet he would have it. If Aphrodite has her home on the 'plaga lactea caeli' (Statius *Silv.* I. ii. 51), may not the swan be connected with the constellation Cygnus, the brightest group of stars at the zenith of the Milky Way? Any future elucidation of this difficult problem must, however, start from Dr. Kalkmann's results. What one desiderates is some clearer evidence to identify the swan, and, if possible, some cult-relation between Aphrodite and the bird. Be the interpretation what it may our vase supplies an interesting link in the series, between the British Museum cylix and the later vases noticed by Dr. Kalkmann, and better still is a treasure to be prized for its own sake. We pass on to other objects found in the same tomb, which had evidently been robbed in haste and not completely despoiled even of its jewellery.

A plain gold signet ring, with an oval red transparent stone, swivel-set, not engraved (Pl. XV.).

Two little pendants of gold wire, enclosing a blue and white bead, the one bead lacking.

Part of a silver 'alabastron mouth.'

A piece of an iron ring.

Tomb 58.—In the *δρόμος*, besides a small terracotta bird, was found the limestone sepulchral *stele* represented by Fig. 4. It measures 2 ft. 11 in. by 1 ft. 6½ in. A young boy in high relief squats in a curious attitude. His right arm is broken off above the elbow, but was evidently raised to the shelf-like remnant of something in the corner above. His left hand grasps the end of an object which has disappeared, but has left its mark on the wall of the recess a little higher up. The surface has suffered a good deal and the lower part of the boy's face has been broken away. The character of the work bespeaks the Ptolemaic period. On the hair are traces of red colour, and the eye-balls were painted blue or black. The top of the *stele* is of the usual pediment form. Of an inscription there is no trace.

The tomb had been thoroughly cleared by robbers. There remained only a little brown jug and a headless figurine from a jug. The latter is of a novel type, the woman is seated on a chair against the neck of the jug, the pitcher resting at her left side. The jug was apparently perfectly plain.

Tomb 59.—Robbed but not thoroughly. The pottery but little hurt.

²⁸ O. Jahn, 'Frauen mit und auf Schwänen,' *Arch. Zeit.* 1858, p. 230 f., Stephani, *Compte Rendu* 1863, pp. 17-105, Kalkmann, 'Aphrodite auf dem Schwan,' *Jahrbuch* i. p. 231.

A large red amphora bore an incised X in front, and on each side of the neck what might be a Cypriote *br* painted in dark colour.

Fragments of a large seated terracotta figure of heavy style, with traces of red and yellow.

A small silver signet ring.

A little thin silver ring.

A silver-plated bronze bracelet terminating in a snake's head.

Two bronze mirrors.



FIG. 4.

Tomb 60.—Although the door was found intact and the tomb undisturbed, there was absolutely nothing inside. Just outside the door, however, lay in scattered fragments the female terracotta head figured on Pl. XV. No. 1. The style is fairly good, but perhaps rather of early Hellenistic date than of the fourth century. The head is about 6 inches high. The pupils of the eyes, as commonly on the terracotta heads from Poli, are marked by a lightly incised circle drawn from a central point.

One of the upright limestone blocks which closed the door was inscribed

in the Cypriote script with the only inscription on stone found by excavation during the season. The block measured 3 ft. 4 in. \times 11½ in. \times 7½ in., the letters about ⅔ in. high, roughly but plainly cut.



ti' mo' va' ma' ko' to' se' to' ti' ma' k' e' mi'

Τιμοφάνακτος τῶ Τιμα...ῆμι.

For the name Τιμοφάναξ cf. Meister *Die griechischen Dialekte* II Bd. pp. 184-5 Nos. 147i and 147k, and the Τιμοφάνασσα of our previous season's inscription No. 14, *J.H.S.* xi. p. 69. The tenth, eleventh, and twelfth letters, being the whole of the second name except its first letter, are hard to decipher on the stone, which is here a good deal weather-worn. The 10th must, I think, be *mo'*. *vi'* is perhaps not impossible, but both the marks on the stone and the analogies of Cypriote nomenclature favour *ma'*. The 11th is damaged, but would naturally be read as *se'* or *ke'*, and the 12th as *w'*, for the hole near its base seems purely accidental, and there is no sign of a cross stroke. But to read *w'* leads us into difficulties. A genitive ending in *-v* would be unparalleled in a Cypriote inscription except from an *a* stem. Τιμαίου (ti' ma' jo' u', for the form of *jo'*, which might be thought possible here, cf. Meister p. 133) is therefore inadmissible. Neither can the 11th letter be plausibly interpreted as any of the *-a* signs, nor a probable name suggested to fulfil the conditions. I take the twelfth symbol, therefore, to be an eccentric or carelessly cut *no'*. Reading 11 as *ke'* and 12 as *no'*, we get ti' ma' ke' no, Τιμαγένω. The genitive in *-ou* from compounds of γένος is sufficiently supported by epigraphical and literary evidence, and Τιμαγένης is a common enough name. Should this suggestion seem too bold, it would still be possible, although to my mind unsatisfactory, to fall back on the rare name Τιμάξενος, and read ti' ma' ke' [se'] no' or ti' ma' [ke'] se' no'.

Tomb 62.—A piece of a seated terracotta figure of the ordinary type, with traces of red colour.

Tomb 63.—A small terracotta head of fair style, probably female, regular features, traces of a wreath or headband.

Tomb 64.—A pair of gold earrings terminating in animal heads, very similar to a pair from tomb 69 which is figured on Pl. XV., but rather plainer.

A large silver signet ring, probably hollow.

A silver finger ring.

Tomb 66 was found quite undisturbed and in excellent condition, the door was intact, and the stone slabs which closed the bed-niche were all in place. The hole communicating with tomb 65 (also undisturbed) as it

appears on the plan may be said to be entirely of our making, for until we enlarged it there was hardly room for the insertion of a land, and there were fragile objects close against it, which had evidently never been displaced. The excavators of tomb 65 had cut a few inches too near to the neighbouring sepulchre, and even driven the point of a pick through the wall, but they were no tomb-robbers. On the narrow side of one of the horizontally laid slabs forming the door of 66, which we pulled down from inside, was the mason's mark $\rho\alpha$. In the tomb was found a single small stray fragment of one of the fine Cypriote jugs of the figurine-and-pitcher type with warm ruddy ground and rich dark decoration. The patterns on it are a cross-hatching and a band of olive leaves. This fragment, unique and isolated, seems to indicate that the tomb had been cleared and used a second time.

A long-necked red amphora bore traces of red colour including H (an η ?) in front of the neck.

Graffiti were frequent on the bottoms of the very numerous black-glazed vessels. Nine of them, open cups and saucers plain or with impressed patterns, were inscribed $\hat{\alpha}$ F , $\text{to } \rho\alpha$, and a black-glazed *askos* bore what is probably meant for the same inscription imperfectly executed. $\rho\alpha$ also appeared on a saucer.

A black-glazed *askos* with a Sphinx in low relief. She has upturned wings and a flat Egyptian head-dress. The style looks comparatively late.

A red-figured *askos*, with a raised central boss and a carelessly drawn beast to each side of the handle.

A red-figured cotyle of late style with two figures on each side. All are beardless 'mantle-figures.' Each pair stands facing one another, the left hand figure on either side holding a staff before him. No particular action seems to be represented. The work is hasty and wholly without merit.

A large bronze bowl (much damaged) with a double swing handle and solid circular base.

A bronze saucer or lid.

A bronze mirror.

A small bronze *spatula* or rod with bulbous end.

A sheaf of bronze-headed arrows or darts with wooden shafts, the wood much decayed.

Several iron spear-heads with remains of wood about them.

An iron candelabrum, 2 ft. 3 in. high, with a tripod base, and a circular disk on the top, $4\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter.

Fragments of an iron strigil.

Several small pieces of lead plating.

A gold signet ring (Pl. XV.), fairly solid, with engraved bezel. The subject is Athena, seated, with her shield by her side, on which she rests her left hand (left in the *impression*). Her right is extended and supports her owl. She wears a thin *chiton*, and an upper garment wrapped about her lower limbs. On her head is a helmet with triple crest. The com-

position is skilfully adapted to the space, the work deep and incisive, the style not earlier than the fourth century, probably early Hellenistic. Beneath the owl is the plainly engraved inscription ΑΝΑΞΙΛΗΞ, for the interpretation of which there are practically only two alternatives: either a κ has dropped out and we have to read Ἀναξι[κ]λῆς, or Ἀναξίλης is meant to be equivalent to Ἀναξίλας. The latter is less violent but not perhaps more probable.

Now there is in the Naples²⁹ Museum a gold ring found at Capua, engraved with a portrait of some eminent Roman, formerly identified with M. Junius Brutus, but whom Furtwängler has shown good reason for supposing to be of the third or second century B.C. The ring bears an inscription very hard to decipher, which used to be read Ἀναξίλας ἐπόει, but which Braun from the original and Furtwängler from an impression have agreed in pronouncing to be [Ἡρ]ακλείδας ἐπόει. On the other hand Mr. A. S. Murray recently read the name on the original as Ἀναξίλας, and so do the authorities of the Naples Museum and Mr. E. N. Rolfe, who has examined the ring with the express object of deciding the point. Ἀναξίλας is invariably read by those who see an impression for the first time. The reading ultimately agreed upon will depend on the significance to be attached to the marks in front of the first Α. Furtwängler, who gives an enlarged facsimile of the inscription, holds them to be the base points of the letters ΗΡ which have otherwise disappeared. It is perhaps possible that they are punctures made by the engraver in spacing out the inscription before cutting it. In favour of the *prima facie* reading may be adduced the excellent preservation of the ring, which makes it improbable that the two first letters should have so completely disappeared, and the practice usual with gem-cutters of beginning the word ἐπόει, where it occupies a second line, about under the first letter of the name.

Assuming that the name on the Naples ring *may* be Ἀναξίλας, can we identify the engraver with the Ἀναξίλης of the Poli ring? The rings are of the same material and not dissimilar, the signatures are perhaps possible forms of the same name, the style of both, if the one be put at the earliest the other at the latest date, might be brought within the same period. Nevertheless I am far from being convinced by such slender evidence in the face of many obvious objections. Ἀναξίλης is not Ἀναξίλας, it is not likely that the same man would spell his name differently on different works. It is equally improbable that he would engrave it in two such different styles as the inscriptions present. Ἀναξίλης is simply and freely written without any affectation of care or ornament, with a straight crossed Α and a narrow four-barred Σ. Ἀναξίλας is very neatly inscribed, with little terminal cups at the ends of the strokes, and what seems to be an angular barred Α and a rounded C. The difference of subject makes it hard to compare the style, but there seems to be an essential difference. The artist of the Naples ring would have treated the Athena in a broader style with less

²⁹ v. Braun, *Bulletino dell' Istituto*, 1855, xxxii. : Furtwängler, *Jahrbuch* iii. p. 207, taf. 1. 12 : Middleton, *Engraved Gems*, p. 73.

abrupt relief. Moreover, although it might be possible, were there any cogent reason, to approximate the two rings to a central date, say about the middle of the third century, yet the one would naturally be placed quite half a century earlier the other half a century later, and the collateral evidence from the other contents of the tomb must make us jealous of any such straining of chronological probability.

Tomb 67.—On one of the two upright stone slabs that formed the door was painted in purple the Cypriote symbol *sw*. Outside the door were found the fragments of a reclining terracotta figure of the usual type and scale.

A brown long-necked amphora bore traces of red decoration.

A small bronze suspension ring.

A bronze mirror, or rather what would be called a mirror-case, but no mirror was found and there is only half a case. The handle is joined to it by a Gorgoneion, which, although far from early in style, retains the archaic type with large eyes, wide cheeks, protruding tongue, and snaky locks.

The most interesting objects found in the tomb were the remains of a gold necklace, of which specimens are figured on Pl. XV. The members consist of eight double-petalled gold rosettes or open flowers, with a central globule and delicate granulations; eight gold stars of six points with granulated edges and terminal globules, and a floral centre, the whole resembling an open narcissus flower; twenty-five little hemispherical gold buttons. All these rosettes, stars, and buttons are furnished with little wire loops behind for stringing on a thread. The central ornament is a thin gold pendant, in the form of a very naturalistic open flower with petals and stamina, surmounted by two winged genii, on the knees of each of whom is a fighting-cock. Below the flower depends by a delicate gold chain a small rosette, and behind are two loops for the thread. The whole design is rich and elegant, but especially interesting are the figures with the cocks, which closely resemble the well-known relief on the chair of the priest of Dionysus from the theatre at Athens.

Tomb 68.—This tomb seemed to be in great confusion, so much so that it was hardly possible to determine which was the outside which the inside of the door.

A fragment of a small limestone altar (Fig. 5) of very good workmanship, worthy of the best period. On the curved moulding is painted a series of alternating pairs of red and blue dashes meeting in a point above or below. The colours were very bright and fresh.

A small limestone figure of a boy, headless and armless, 1 ft. 5¼ in. high. He is clad in a *chiton*, which reaches below the knee, and seems to have been seated in much the same attitude as the boy on the *stèle* from tomb 58 already described. Very inferior work.

The feet and broken plinth of a limestone statuette.

A headless female terracotta figure, seated on a chair (the high back of which is broken away) with a footstool, and holding on her lap a little pup-

pet-like child (Fig. 6). The child, which has none of the proportions of a baby, but resembles a diminutive full-grown man, is especially archaic in appearance. His head is the best finished part of the work which is otherwise of the ordinary heavy style.

Fragments of another seated terracotta figure, and of two reclining figures, of the same style. To one of the latter is probably to be assigned the torso and thighs of an attendant boy bearing a jug in his right hand.

Two female terracotta heads from figures of about the same scale as the above (Pl. XV. Nos. 2, 3). The one has short curly hair bound with a thick head-band on which are traces of purple colour. The face, which is badly damaged about the chin and lower lip, is broad and full. The ears are




FIG. 5.

pierced for earrings. This type is not uncommon at Poli, but that of the second head is even more frequent. The hair is enclosed in a snood, and the edge of the drapery is carried over the top of the head. The features are regular and unusually well modelled. The eyes of both heads are incised.

A footless and headless female terracotta figure, about 9 inches high, draped in a sleeved mantle girt about the waist. The right hand is lacking, the left holds a wreath. Work of middling quality.

An iron object resembling the rim of a jug.

Fragments of an iron strigil.

Tomb 69.—A long-necked light amphora with red decoration, the handles of which bear an illegible oblong stamp.

A number of clay beads or buttons (they are not pierced right through) with a red surface on which are remains of gilding.

A bronze platter.

A bronze lid, or slightly concave disk with a peg in the centre.

But the more interesting objects are from the niche outside the door. They are, so far as not already given—

A pair of gold earrings of the common pattern with animal heads, possibly in this case ox-heads (Pl. XV). The rings are prettily finished and decorated with spiral and other patterns. A plainer pair were found in tomb 64.



FIG. 6.

A little cushion-shaped transparent red gem (garnet?).

A large silver signet ring, probably hollow.

A fragmentary smaller silver signet ring.

A silver finger ring.

Two silver pins with a blue and white glass bead at the end.

A small silver *spatula*.

A thin oval piece of silver, perhaps a coin.

A small bronze swing-handle (or bracelet?).

A crude little terracotta horse's head of archaic appearance is perhaps a stray fragment.

Tomb 70.—A silver drachma of Alexander the Great.

Fragments of an iron strigil.

Tomb 72.—A little blackened Roman lamp with raised star-points radiating from the central aperture.

Tomb 73.—Two light amphorae with stamped handles, on the one (1) Ἐριστοκλεῦς, (2) ἐπὶ Σώσικλεῦς Ἀρταμιτίου, on the other (1) Ζήμωνος, (2) ἐπὶ Εὐσύμου Ἰακινθίου, all four inscriptions circumscribed round Rhodian roses.

A Roman lamp.

Tomb 74.—(In the shaft outside the door were found three fragments of good fourth century red-figured ware, on one of which is a pair of white feet, on the other portions of drapery.)

A female head from one of the large terracotta statuettes, with aquiline nose, squinting eyes, and wiggly incised hair. The edge of the mantle is carried over the head. Poor work.

Tomb 75.—(In the shaft were found fragments of a seated terracotta female figure of the ordinary type.)

Two large red amphorae have each one stamped handle, on the one ζο, on the other a bearded head and three illegible letters. Both have a red band round the neck.

An *alabastron* of plain light pottery.

The hand of a terracotta figure.

A bronze mirror.

An iron strigil.

Tomb 77.—A bronze gilt ring, the circlet in the form of a spiral twist or cable, with a light blue porcelain scarab (not engraved) in a gold setting.

Tomb 78.—Six Roman lamps.

Fragments of ordinary transparent glass vessels.

Tomb 79.—The remnant of an *alabastron*.

A little black-glazed pot with a spout and little vertical handle, no neck. On the top surface round the aperture are spirals roughly drawn in the red-figure technique.

Tomb 80.—A silver drachma of Alexander the Great.

A gold leaf mouth-piece precisely similar to that figured *J.H.S.* xi. Pl. V. No. 8.

An otherwise unproductive shaft yielded a small flat Ionic limestone capital from a *stèle* of some sort, with a small oblong hole through it vertically, perhaps for the affixment of a piece of sculpture. The volutes bore traces of red. Apparently good work, but damaged.

III.

Let us now try to gather and apply any larger conclusions which it appears possible to deduce from our evidence. It has already been pointed out that tombs 57 and 59 belong in character to the eastern necropolis, from which the rest of the western necropolis, in spite of a considerable resemblance in the plain pottery, is sharply distinguished by the painted decoration of its Cypriote vases. In the one necropolis only the usual geometric decoration, executed with mechanical precision in black and red on the natural or reddened ground, is to be found. In the other only that system of decoration which we have termed the polychrome. The distinction is fully maintained in other classes of objects. In the eastern necropolis the black-figure technique predominates, vases in the red-figure technique are comparatively rare and of good style, in the western the black-figure technique disappears altogether, and the few red-figured vases exhibit the last degeneracy of the style. Porcelain amulets occur in the eastern tombs, but are absent from the western. The terracotta figurines of the eastern necropolis are very small and crude, the larger figures do not appear³⁰, in the western necropolis on the other hand the larger figures are common, and the crude little ones are scarcely found. Obviously the two necropolises are of quite distinct periods and the eastern is considerably the earlier. Can we more precisely define those periods? I think to some extent we can. There was found in tomb 40, as has been noticed, a silver coin of the Lion type, 480-400 B.C. The vases from tomb 57 may be probably assigned to the earlier part of the second half of the same century. Now tomb 40 belongs to one of the younger groups of tombs in the necropolis. Both tomb 40 and tomb 57 are later in character than perhaps the majority of the eastern tombs. If then these two date from the middle of the fifth century B.C. or thereabouts, the earlier tombs will extend from, say, towards the close of the sixth century over the first half of the fifth. None are probably so late as the fourth century. For the eastern necropolis then we may assign the century 520-420 as a rough but probable date. Now are we to place the western necropolis in the fourth century or the Hellenistic period? Is it to be connected with Marium or with Arsinoe? I am inclined to think the latter, for the following reasons: (1) There is no transition from the one class of tombs to the other, no gradual substitution of the one kind of pottery for the other, but a new start which implies a decisive gap. (2) There is evidence of several tombs having been used a second time, and of two at least of the former burials having been of the fourth century³¹. A repeated use involving the violation of a tomb is scarcely

³⁰ The apparent exception of tomb 59 is probably to be explained by the fact that two other tombs were robbed through it.

³¹ Tomb 66, in which the fragment of Cypriote ware with tawny ground and ornate black patterns was found, a variety not present in the eastern necropolis, and evidently indu-

enced by fourth century red-figure style, and tomb 74 outside the door of which were found fragments of fourth century red-figured vases with white flesh-painting. Two tombs containing fourth century vases were, I understand, found close by in the excavations of 1886-7.

conceivable until two or three generations have passed away. The destruction of Marium by Ptolemy Soter in B.C. 312 and the transportation of its inhabitants, on the other hand, must have caused a break in family traditions, after which it is not surprising that the new settlers of Arsinoe should have used the old tombs without scruple. (3) In tombs 70 and 80 were found drachmae of Alexander the Great. But until 312 B.C. Marium was an independent state with a coinage of its own. Were the burials earlier than that date the coins would more naturally be those issued by Stasioceus king of Marium³². (4) The contents of the tombs as a whole point to the Hellenistic period. The earliest tombs, 66 and 67, one would perhaps naturally assign to the end of the fourth century if they stood alone, but I cannot see any cogent reason for separating them from the rest with which they have so much affinity. Their contents seem to be no less possible at the beginning of the third century than at the end of the fourth. About the Hellenistic character of the majority of the tombs of this necropolis there can be little doubt.

If our conclusions as to the two necropoleis are just, certain results seem to follow from them. It appears that the distrust expressed in our last year's report with regard to the evidence of the western tombs was more than justified. The confusion was even worse than was supposed. One or two errors have therefore to be corrected. The suggestion (*J.H.S.* xi. p. 29) as to the sepulchral *stelae* is pure moonshine, and only serves to show how atrocious was the condition of the tombs. The suspicion arises that the tombs with two or three chambers opening on to the same *δρόμος* (*ibid.* p. 22) may have been rather groups of small tombs, and that this arrangement may not always have been original. The general view stated for what it was worth on p. 59 requires some modification. On the other hand it is surprising how much is confirmed—the general similarity of the common staple articles in tombs of widely different dates, the persistence after the fourth century of some, although not all, varieties of Cypriote pottery (cf. especially *J.H.S.* xi. pp. 36-8 (*c*), (*c'*), (*f*)), and the probable extension of the black-glazed stamped ware and the slightly executed red-figure technique on both sides of that century. Without pretending to certainty we may add perhaps the retention of the native script for some decades after the Ptolemaic conquest, and the comparatively late date of the larger terracotta figures. What was said of the tombs seems to require no further correction than has already been made.

The general result of the work at Poli goes to confirm the suggestion of Dr. Dümmler (*Jahrbuch*, ii. p. 168) that the eastern necropolis is in the main to be connected with Marium, the western with Arsinoe. The part of the former on which we have excavated this season belongs to the age


³² The lack of pottery in both tombs, as well as in the tomb on Kaparga in which a coin of Alexander was found during our previous excavations, may suggest that they belong to the probably brief period between the destruction of

Marium and the foundation of Arsinoe. That the site was absolutely desolate is improbable, possibly there was a foreign garrison in possession.

of the severe style of Greek art. and has received but little admixture of a later date, whereas the site tried in the western necropolis seems to have been very largely worked over in Ptolemaic times. But it must be remembered that these sites are but a small part of their respective necropoleis. One Roman tomb was discovered even this last season in the eastern necropolis, and on the north side of the vineyard late tombs appear to be frequent, if not the rule. In the western necropolis the earlier burials on our last site are of the fifth and fourth centuries, although but few of the early tombs remain in tolerable condition. Similarly on our previous sites tombs perhaps as early as any of those opened in the eastern necropolis were occasionally discovered, especially on Kaparga and Site A, and sites like Kaparga and Hagios Demetrios we may now see to have consisted mainly of fourth century tombs in spite of later admixtures and reconstructions. It would seem, therefore, that both necropoleis were used by the inhabitants of both Marium and Arsinoe, but the later tomb-makers on the whole preferred the western, without, however, changing the character of large tracts even of that.

The tombs here assigned to the fourth century are marked by an abundance of black-glazed ware (much of it stamped with impressed patterns), and red-figured vases of the later style (chiefly *aski* and small vessels), in company with the not yet extinct older kind of Cypriote pottery. It appears probable that the manufacture of that pottery went down with the fall of Cypriote independence, and was to a large extent replaced by importation from Rhodes and Alexandria. Whether it persisted locally to a still later date at Citium or elsewhere³³ is a question with which we are not here concerned, the above account seems to me to be true at least of Poli. I regret to find myself on this point in opposition to the great authority of Dr. Furtwängler, who would have us believe that the older geometrical Cypriote pottery died out before the end of the *sixth* century, and that no Cypriote pottery whatsoever survived the *fourth* (v. *Jahrbuch* v. p. 163). That his contention, which is stated with unnecessary emphasis and perhaps not very seriously weighed, is an exaggeration, I hope this paper has shown reasons for believing. If we can put any confidence whatever in the repeated testimony of the tombs the older Cypriote style continued to flourish during the whole of the fifth century, and the later persisted into Ptolemaic times. But I am also convinced that there is more than sufficient evidence from the previous season's work to prove that the earlier and more familiar Cypriote ware maintained itself during the greater part of the *fourth* century. In the fifth century tombs it shows no symptoms of decay, and it is found not twice or thrice but again and again, and that in tombs which seem above suspicion, together with Greek pottery, red-figured vases of late style in particular, which no one could hesitate for a moment to assign to the fourth century.

³³ So Colonna Ceccaldi *Mons. Ant. de Chypre*, p. 279; M. O. Richter, *Mith. d. Inst. in Athen*, vi. p. 194.



The country immediately to the east of Poli is full of ruined mining villages; but their ruins are not of great interest. There is one at no great distance to the N.E. of the eastern necropolis, where are heaps of slag and a few stray pieces of thin marble. The latter may be derived from a church, the former certainly indicate a smelting station. It is from this site that the limestone capital that serves as a step to the school-house at Magounda is said to have been taken. The marble block on the roof of the same building (let the itinerant archaeologist note) is *not* inscribed. There are in Magounda two or three great earthen *πίθοι*, brought from the old site just below the present village. They probably served as receptacles for grain. Similar receptacles cut in the rock are not uncommon, *e.g.* at the neighbouring deserted site of *Χορτίνη*, or (as the local pronunciation has it) *Φόρτινι*. At *Φόρτινι* are the most considerable remains of a village, with two churches, one of which is still standing. It is a charming spot, and a spring of delicious water gushes out under the shade of a large fig-tree. On the other, the western, side of Poli we may note the (probably) ancient pier at Latzi, which is now and must always have been the port or anchorage. The pier or mole is constructed of very massive squared blocks of stone, and although many of the blocks are displaced the pier is far from a complete wreck. Little appears above the water, but enough is left to give a welcome shelter to small craft when a gale blows down from the Acamas. Just beyond Latzi, where the track begins to mount the rocks, are a few tombs. Inland are two or three villages not noticed by Mr. Hogarth. Neokhorio is uninteresting. At *Androlikou*, a nest of cutthroats haunted by memories of the famous brigand Hassan Poli, there are, as was mentioned in last year's report, some indications of an ancient settlement. The split column engraved with an effigy and inscription I now take to be a very late tomb-stone, but have no plausible reading of the latter to offer. At *Drousa*, pleasantly situated high up on the ridge, with a plentiful supply of good water, there is a considerable *κατάλοιμα* or tract of ruins, but I cannot vouch for their antiquity.

At *New Paphos*, among other inscriptions, I saw the mediaeval French epitaph copied by Mr. Hogarth (*v. Devia Cypria* p. 9 no. 4) and can confirm the reading *HABIOR*.

Ten minutes west of *Paramali* near the ruined church of *S. George* there lies a limestone *cippus* with a damaged inscription, which I was unable, in the few minutes I had to devote to it, satisfactorily to decipher.

ΧΑΙΡΟΙΣ ██████████ ΩΣΤΙΝ ██████████ ΧΡΗΣΤΗ . ΕΙ ████████ ΟΙ . ΚΑΤΕ Ι ΧΙΙΙ██████
 ΤΗΣ ██████████ ██████████ ΚΟΘΕΩΣ ██████████ ██████████ ΤΙΟΥ ΜΝΗΜΗ ΧΑΡΙΝ ██████████ ██████████

A tomb in the neighbourhood is reported to have contained glass and 'vases with colours.' On the hill-top round the church are miscellaneous fragments of limestone building, columns, coarse red pottery, a black mill, etc.

In Maroni I noted another *εἰρημὸς* inscribed :—

. . . ΦΡΟ . . . ΧΡΗCTE ΧΑΙPE	Εὐ]φρό[ν]ιε χρηστὲ χαίρε.
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

and built into the wall (upside down) over the door of Koussacs Kara Mustapha's yard a limestone fragment inscribed :—

ΝΙΚΑΙΘΥΜΟ	. . . νικα θυμο (?) or . . . νι καὶ θυμο (!).
-----------	--

At Larnaca in the garden by the Tourabi Teke, are two limestone *εἰρημί*, used as supports to a water-channel with the inscriptions :—

ΕΥΤΥΧΗ ΧΡΗCTE ΧΕΡΕ Εὐτύχη χρηστὲ χέρε	and ΟΝΗCΙΚ // Α ΤΗΧΡΗCTE ΧΑΙPE Ὀνησικ[ρ]ά- -τη χρηστὲ χαίρε.
--	--

The following inscription, on a blue marble base in the shop of M. Zanetos, Chemist, Larnaca, has not, so far as I am aware, been published. The stone is broken to the left.

ΙΟΥΛΙΟΝΙΟΥΛ//ΟΥΙ//ΛΡ// ΡΟΝΦΛΑΥΙΑΝΟΝ ΙΠΠΑΡΧΟΝ ΟΥΛΙΟΣΦΛ/ΙΑΝΟΣΜΝΑΣΕΑΣ ΤΟΝΑ//ΙΙΙΙΙΙ//ΟΝ	. . . Ἰούλιον Ἰουλ[ί]ου [Πυθ]άρ[χου] υἱ[?]όν Φλαυιανόν ἵππαρχον . . . Ἰούλιος Φλ[αυ]ιανὸς Μνασέας τὸν ἀ[δελφ]όν.
---	--

I was enabled by the kindness of the authorities to take copies and squeezes of several Cypriote inscriptions from Poli now in the Cyprus Museum at Nicosia. They have most of them been published by Dr. Deecke in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* 1886. I denote them by the numbers under which they appear in Dr. Meister's supplement to Deecke's collection.

25b. 25f. 25o. Confirm Deecke's reading.

25*l*. Line 2. I read *sc ta (?) ka a sc*. The *a* was the the only letter I could make out with any confidence in the third line.

25*n*. Deecke reads *Νίκα Πρώτιφος ἡμι*. The third letter I read as *ko* (not *po*) and the fourth as *ra* (not *ro*). The first line would thus run *ni ka ko ra ti vo sc*. May not the *ka* and *ko* have been transposed by a stone-cutter accustomed to write left to right, and the true reading be *Νικοκράτιφος*?

25*p*. There can be no doubt about *Θεμιστοκύπρας* for the first line. At the beginning of the second I fancy I can make out *e mi ta sc ἡμι τᾶς* and the remaining characters look like *ti ? vo sc*.

There is one stone without a tomb-number, which I have not been able to identify. The letters are poorly cut and in bad condition, very hard to read. On one side is a mason's mark \sqcap . Read from right to left the lines run as follows:

1. ? *ti si te a*
2. ? *a to no ja*
3. ? *ne to se ke*
4. ? *pa mi*

This reading is given for what it is worth, I feel no confidence in the interpretation of several characters.

J. A. R. M.

HERAKLES AND EURYTOS

AND A

BATTLE-SCENE UPON SOME FRAGMENTS OF A CYLIX IN
THE NATIONAL MUSEUM AT PALERMO.

[PLATE XIX.]

THE high degree of interest possessed by the subject-matter of the design upon the two fragments numbered 2351 in the National Museum at Palermo, and here published for the first time, has induced me to bring them to public notice earlier than I intended, and apart from the wider subject with which they are connected by their style. I am indebted to the kindness of M. Salinas of Palermo for the drawing of the fragments which was executed there by Signor Carmelo Giarizzo. They have been noticed already on several occasions by Klein, *Euphronios*, pp. 53-4, by Koepf, *Arch. Ztg.*, 1884, p. 42, note 21, and recently by Hirsch, *De Animumorum apud Antiquos Imaginibus*, p. 10, No. 19, and are described in greater detail by Klein, *Meistersignaturen*, p. 113, No. 11. Klein has classed these fragments on which ἐπολήσεν twice repeated is still preserved with the group of red-figured vases signed ἐπολήσεν only. Certainly the master who painted them belongs to the earlier group of painters of red-figured vases, the so-called 'Epiktetic school.' To this point, however, further reference will be made at a later point.

First I will proceed to discuss the design of the fragments. A, the larger of the two (Pl. XIX.), represents four male figures hastening to the right, three of whom are looking backward and carry a bow (touched in with red) in the outstretched left hand and an arrow in the right, which is depressed. The foremost of them, on the contrary, seems to be stretching out his unarmed hands towards a figure with drawn bow which faces him from the left.¹ Of the latter figure, the archer, only the right leg, which is advanced, a piece of the quiver-case and the lower part of the bow are preserved. On the other, the left side of the fragment opposite the archer just mentioned, a fully-draped female figure, of which only the lower part is preserved, is

¹ The incorrect description in Klein, p. 113 n. 11, is to be set right by this.

standing quietly. With these six figures the composition was undoubtedly complete.

The method by which we may explain this singular scene is suggested by a black-figured amphora of later style which is figured by Minervini (*Illustrazioni di un vaso Volcente*), and after him by Brunn in his *Vorlegeblätter*, No. 2 (without the inscriptions). The design on the amphora shows on the left side Herakles in the lion-skin, facing right, with drawn bow. This figure, which can be recognized at once, is the only one which is not accompanied by an inscription; the following figures are all provided with them. Two men are rushing towards Herakles with arms upraised, one of whom, Eurytos, wears chiton and himation, while the other, Antiphonos, is in full armour. To the right and left two other men are lying on the ground: the one, Deion, or Deioneus, wears a chiton and carries quiver and bow; the other, Iphitos, is in the close-fitting dress of an Asiatic archer. Opposite Herakles, at the right end of the scene, a female figure, Iole or Ioleia, brings the composition to a close. She is raising both arms, and a target, in which a number of arrows are sticking, is visible behind her head. The elements of a similar scene are found on the fragments of a red-figured cylix of ripe archaic style found in 1882 among the layers of *debris* on the Akropolis and published by Winter in the *Arch. Jahrbuch*, 1887, pp. 230-31. These fragments may from their style be assigned with certainty to the hand of Brygos.¹ The female figure, Iole, standing in a passive attitude, is certainly recognizable on fragment 1,² and seems to have closed the composition on the right side, as it does in the black-figured amphora. Her right arm, of which parts are preserved, seems to have been raised as if in astonishment. An archer in short chiton, with bow and arrow in the down-dropped left hand, looks back as he hurries away from her. Above and between these two figures we can recognize the upper part of an arrow whizzing away to the right.

Fragment No. 2 shows Herakles facing right—only the lower half of the figure is preserved, but he is plainly to be recognized by his lion's skin. He stands with his legs crossed—an attitude which at that period was a favourite one for archers. We may assume that here as well Herakles corresponds to Iole, and closes the composition on the left side.

Considerable difficulties present themselves in the interpretation of the other parts of the design preserved to us. In front of Herakles on fragment 2 portions of a palm-tree and the remainder of a quiver still exist. I cannot feel sure whether we should recognize here the upper part of a quiver, or the lower and rounded end as in the quiver Herakles is wearing at his side. In the former case we must assume that the quiver was suspended from the palm-tree as it is on the Eurystheus-cup of Euphronios (Klein,

¹ The proof of this I hope to produce in my *Griech. Meisterschalen*. Furtwängler in Roscher's *Lexicon*, p. 2234, is already disposed to assign the fragments to Brygos rather than to Duris,

as Winter proposed.

² The numbers of the fragments do not correspond with those of note 46, p. 229, which may easily give rise to confusion.

Euphronios, p. 89). The predilection which Brygos had for indicating the locality by a tree, a rock, or a pillar is well known.

The chief difficulty lies, however, in the interpretation of the third fragment. Winter assumes that this belongs to the same side of the cup as fragments 1 and 2, and recognizes upon it the feet of one warrior rushing onwards and of another who has fallen. It is certain that we should rather distinguish here the feet of three figures; there are two left feet of figures moving rapidly to the left, and the left foot of another moving to the right or else possibly lying on the ground.

We should therefore be compelled, if fragment 3 is to be placed on the same side as the shooting-match, to suppose that the design comprised at least six figures: Herakles and Iole on the left and right of the composition, and between them three male figures rushing to the left, and a fourth advancing in an opposite direction or lying on the ground with his face turned towards them.

In the former case—that is, if fragment 3 does not after all *certainly* belong to the design—we may suppose that the gap between Herakles and the advancing archer was filled up, after the fashion of the fragment at Palermo, by three more male figures pressing forward against him. In the opposite case—that is, if the fragment certainly belongs to the same side as 1 and 2—the design, containing a fallen warrior at the feet of Herakles, would stand in a close relation to that upon the black-figured amphora published by Minervini, which has two fallen figures at the feet of four which are standing.¹

And now that we have reached this point, let us turn our attention again to the fragment of the Palermo cup.

The identification of the figures on the fragment is now quite certain. On the right, at one end of the composition, stands Herakles in the attitude of an archer. Eurytos and three of his sons, whatever names we choose to give them, are hurrying towards him, and on the left side of the composition

¹ I believe that I can prepare the way for a more correct explanation of the fragments of the interior design of the Akropolis cylix than that given by Winter in the *Jahrbuch*, 1887, p. 229. The club still preserved on fragment 6 proves that this as well as the external design is concerned with the representation of one of the adventures of Herakles. The vine-leaves on fragment 8 led Winter to conjecture that it might be that which took place in the vineyard of Syleus. But the posts of a couch with the remains of the pillow on fragment 7 show too plainly that those vine-tendrils are to be considered as hanging from a dining-table, as is often the case in vase-paintings of this period (cf. the cotyle with the ransoming of Hector, also from the hand of Brygos, Conze, *Vorlegel.* i. 3 after *Mon.* viii. 27, or the Symposium cup of Duris). In all probability, then, Herakles

was represented as advancing upon a man lying upon a couch. We may recognize a resemblance between the Brygos cup from the Akropolis and the interior design of the Louvre cup with white ground (972)—a splendid vase, though almost entirely destroyed—which has been interpreted by Furtwängler in Roscher's *Lexicon*, p. 2233, as representing the slaying of Iphitos by Herakles at a banquet in his (*i.e.* Herakles') own house, according to *Odyssey* xxi. 27 ff.: a view in which he is undoubtedly correct. This interpretation is especially commended in the present instance by the fact that an incident from the same cycle of myths is also represented on the exterior of the vase; and besides this, the staff lying under the couch speaks strongly in favour of the wandering Iphitos who went in search of the horses he had lost.

stands Iole. The fact that the whole composition is here reversed is of little or no importance. There can be no doubt that the three designs, on the black-figured amphora, on the fragments of a cup in Palermo, and on the Brygos cup from the Akropolis, represent one and the same, or at least closely connected incidents. But of what nature are these?

If any legend appears in confused and conflicting forms in the shape handed down to us by literary tradition through the writers of myths and lexicons and scholia, it is that of Herakles and Eurytos, the archer-king of Oichalia.

Even the scene of the incidents is sometimes placed in Thessaly, sometimes in Messenia, and sometimes in Euboea. Every town of the name put in its claim to be that of the legendary Eurytos. The number of the king's sons varies; sometimes they are only two, sometimes three or four. Their names, too, are uncertain. And finally, the versions preserved to us of the incident itself are various and conflicting. Naturally, we can only avail ourselves of the older versions of the myth that can be traced back to Epic sources in the interpretation of the three vase-paintings we have grouped together, since they all belong to the last decades of the sixth or the early decades of the fifth century.

Creophylos, one of the masters of the later epos, seems to have been the first to condense the legends of Eurytos and Herakles in his epic poem, *Oichalia* or *Οἰχαλίας ἄλωσις*.¹ It is possible that our vase-paintings were inspired by this poem either *directly*—that is, if we assume that they were conceived by the vase-painters themselves independently—or *indirectly*, if we suppose them to be derived from materials already existing in monumental painting. It is impossible, however, to prove this in detail, since the accounts we possess of the contents of the *Oichalia* are extremely slight. Let us consider how far they will aid us in the explanation of our three vase-paintings. Eurytos, famed as a bowman, offered his daughter, Iole, as a prize for the man who should surpass him (and his sons?) in archery. Herakles was victorious in the contest, but the king refused him the prize. He then returned, intent on vengeance, and destroyed Oichalia (Schol. Soph. *Trach.* 265).

So much is clear at once. The archery contest between Herakles and Eurytos was the pith of the story and the point on which it all turns. At first Herakles is kindly received in the house of Eurytos and hospitably entertained. We possess a proof of this in the design on an early Corinthian krater (*Mon.* vi. 33 = Welcker, *A.D.* v. xv.), in which Herakles appears reclining at a banquet with the family of Eurytos. Between the king and Herakles stands Iole. (The correctness of the names given to the figures is warranted by inscriptions.) Then followed the contest. The refusal of the king to deliver the prize gave rise to mortal enmity and to the destruction of the whole house of Eurytos.

There can be no doubt that the designs of our three vase-paintings

¹ Cf. Welcker, *Ep. Cycl.* i. 214, ff.

have for their subject the most pregnant moment of the legend—the actual shooting for the prize.

On this supposition, no difficulties of importance will present themselves, I think, in the interpretation of the Palermo fragment. Herakles, victorious in the contest, has discharged his last arrow, or is on the point of doing so, and Iole, the prize of victory, should be his own. At this moment, Eurytos and his sons, who gaze with wonder at the mark, throw themselves across the hero's path to hold him back.¹

As far as it is possible to judge from fragments 1 and 2 the incident is represented in just the same way on the Brygos cup from the Akropolis as on the earlier Epiktetan cup in Palermo. In the former, the arrow shot from the bow of Herakles, the last, that which decides the issue, is still whizzing through the air, when already one of the sons of Eurytos, who are taking part in the contest, rushes upon him. In the gap between fragments 1 and 2 we must suppose that the king and his other sons were represented. As to the way in which they were represented, it is clear from what has been said above that no absolute certainty can be attained. The interpretation of the design on the black-figured amphora published by Minervini has still to struggle with unsolved difficulties. Furtwängler (in Roscher's *Lexicon*, p. 2206) considers that the moment here represented is that in which Eurytos and his sons declare themselves conquered in the archery contest, and that two of the sons are lying on the ground 'completely vanquished.'

Even if unaffected by literary tradition, we nevertheless receive a distinct impression here of *hostile* action on the part of Herakles against the family of Eurytos, two of whom are lying on the ground, while the others are pressing towards the hero as if to beg for mercy, while he is standing over against them with drawn bow.

The supposition that the painter has confused the different elements of the Eurytos myth in a meaningless way has especially little to commend it, since he has given ample evidence of his acquaintance with the story by adding their names to the figures.

Consequently, there remains for us only one way out of the difficulty, that which has already been adopted by Minervini (*loc. cit.*, p. 14) and by Braun (*Bull.*, 1842, p. 186), namely, the hypothesis that the two most important elements of the Eurytos myth—the shooting-match and the destruction of the king and his family—have been combined in one scene. This combination may rest upon a distinct version of the myth which has chanced to disappear. An analogy is offered by the battle of the Centaurs and Lapiths at the wedding-feast of Peirithoos. According to some, the fight took place at the wedding itself, while others tell of an expedition undertaken after an interval by the Centaurs to revenge the insult they received when summarily dismissed from the wedding-feast. It is also possible however

¹ It would lead to over-subtlety of interpretation were we to assume that the king's sons have not yet discharged their arrows because

they still hold their bow and arrow in their hand. These should rather be considered as merely attributes.

that the combination of the two motives from the Eurytos myth took its rise in the vase-painter's own mind. The disposition of the scene may have been influenced by artistic types with which the master was acquainted, e.g. Herakles contending against an overwhelming force of his enemies. We need only cite as an example the battle of Herakles against Busiris and his followers.

There is one feature in the representation of the contest between Herakles and Eurytos on the *fragments from Palermo* which we have not noticed, and which gives it a distinct and peculiar character; I mean the singular dress worn by Eurytos and his sons. They all three wear a chiton of moderate length with short sleeves, the finer folds of which on the upper part of the body are indicated by lines with diluted colour, while the long, perpendicular folds from the hips downwards are touched in with black colour. A nebris, spotted with different colours (a panther's skin rather than, as Klein suggests, that of a fawn) is girt around the body above the chiton.¹

In addition to this, one of the sons of Eurytos, the foremost, wears his hair gathered up under a cap. Klein characterizes this costume (*loc. cit.*) briefly as 'female dress,' and in fact these figures bear the greatest resemblance to representations of running Gorgons, or to the archaic Nike statues discussed by Petersen (*Athen. Mitth.*, 1887, p. 372).

The supposition that the vase-painter intended by this apparently female dress to characterize the sons of Eurytos as effeminate is quite impossible. There is not the slightest justification for such a view.

I think it more likely that the master's design in adopting this unusual dress was to represent the family of Eurytos as half-barbarian, or at least as dwelling far away from Attica. It is possible that the version which tells of a Thessalian Oichalia and its royal family was floating in his mind (*H.* ii. 736).

As the Thracian dress is represented with more or less completeness on a number of vases of the fifth century,² it is possible that elements of a distinct (Thessalian) costume exist here,³ with which the painter was acquainted from personal observation, or which he borrowed from an original which formed the groundwork of his design. The works of the vase-painters of the sixth and fifth centuries are continually affording more convincing proofs of the lively interest they took in foreign dress, whether Asiatic, Egyptian, or Scythian.⁴ Some parts of these foreign costumes, such as the felt-hat and Thracian horseman's cloak, were directly adopted by the Athenians (cf. Furtwängler, *loc. cit.*).

The same cap which is worn by one of the sons of Eurytos upon our fragment is, as is well known, not uncommonly found on men on Attic vases.

¹ Just in the same way as on the fallen Eurytion on the Geryoneus cup of Euphronios: cf. Klein, *Euphr.* p. 54, and on the torso from the Akropolis, *Ephem. Arch.* 1891, 13.

² Cf. especially Furtwängler, 50 *Berl. Wiackelmann's Progr.* p. 159 ff.

³ Strabo, xi. 530b: οἱ δὲ Θετταλοὶ μάλιστα βαθυστολοῦντες . . .

⁴ I hope to publish some new vases with representations of barbarians in my *Griech. Meisterschalen*.

Reisch has recently (*Röm. Mitth.* 1890, p. 323) collected a number of examples of this dress when discussing the beautiful kantharos by Nikosthenes from the Bruschi collection in Corneto, on which Dionysos wears a similar cap.

Such caps are worn as a rule by komastae (*Berlin* 2100, *Jahrbuch*, i. *Taf.* 12; *Berlin* 2289, cup by Duris, figured by Gerhard, *Trinkschalen und Gefässe*, Pl. XIV., &c.), and by those men, not yet satisfactorily explained, who pace along dressed in women's robes with sunshades, and preceded as a rule by female flute-players.¹

Still, I cannot presume to establish any connection between this head-dress and that of the sons of Eurytos on the fragment in Palermo so direct that we might conclude that we had here some portions of a costume,



FIG. B.

originally foreign, which afterwards passed into use among the Athenian people in connection with an especial priestly or social and religious guild.

The connection between the smaller fragment, here figured *B*, and the larger fragment *A*, which we have just discussed, is established by their common provenance—the Casuccini collection at Chiusi, by the correspondence in the size of the figures, and by the equal delicacy and care shown in the design and manipulation of both.

Upon it are represented parts of a battle-scene, consisting of a warrior, partly visible, who has fallen backward and is supporting himself upon his shield, and two others contending for his spoils after the customary design. The one advancing from the left certainly wore a helmet; the tip of the plume is preserved. This warrior's shield is drawn obliquely from below in

¹ Zannoni, *Scavi della Certosa*, Pl. 39; *Él.* 166, 1843, p. 90, 1879 p. 1, Hübner, *ant. Gram.* IV. Pl. 90—93; cf. *Bullet.* 1842 p. *Bildwerke in Madrid*, National bibliothek, 392.

three-quarter view, and in the hollow of the shield the joints of the fingers of the left hand which holds the strap are indicated by small semi-circles. The shield of the warrior on the right is in full front view, and bears the 'triskeles'¹ in (black) silhouette as its device.

In the middle, a little naked male figure with wings is hovering over the fallen warrior. The position of the fragment somewhere in the middle of side *B* of the cup seems to me to be quite certain. The remarkable winged figure must have occupied the centre of the composition, and one more advancing warrior must have been represented on either side, so that on this side of the cup a composition consisting of five figures—the fallen warrior naturally took up more space than a standing figure—corresponded to one containing six figures on the other side *A* of the cup.

It might occur to us, considering the representation of the shooting-match between Eurytos and Herakles on side *A* of the cup, that these fragments of a battle-piece might have belonged to some version of the *Οίχαλίας ἄλωσις*. But no reliable tokens of this are to be found on the fragment. Herakles certainly could not have been wanting in the principal group of a 'capture of Oichalia.' Such a struggle too must for the most part have been fought with the bow, in the use of which Eurytos and his sons were masters. Consequently I can only see in this fragment the remains of a struggle between hoplites, the nature of which cannot be more closely determined.

The little winged figure however in our fragment is of exceptional interest. This being has hovered down upon the fallen man from behind; it is holding its open right hand with pointed fingers over his open mouth, while it is pressing its left—the fingers of which unfortunately, through an injury to the surface, have not been completely preserved—upon his forehead.

Our next attempt must be to gain from the action of this figure a clue to guide us in the search for its name.

It is floating down upon the fallen man; it is not endeavouring to leave him, and therefore it cannot possibly be an *εἶδωλον* which is *forsaking* his body. And, besides this, the *εἶδωλα* of fallen warriors are always, as far as I know, armed.² The winged figure is visibly pressing the fallen hero with one hand to the ground, and prevents him from rising again. It is therefore a hostile being.

The gesture of the right hand, too, can only be interpreted in the sense Klein gives it in his *Euphronios*, 1st ed., pp. 53-4. It is catching in its hand the soul of the hero as it escapes from his body through the mouth, as a hound lies in wait for and seizes its prey as it leaves its lair. It is therefore a being which brings death!

¹ The triskeles is very often used as the device on shields on black-figured vases (cf. Götting, *Jenaer Programm*, 1855: 'de crure albeo in clipeis vasorum Græcorum'); more rarely on red-figured (cf. *Él. Céram.* i. 9, where it is painted black, as here).

² Cf. Gerhard, *A. V.* 198 and *Annali*, 1883, Pl. Q. Our fragment is accordingly to be removed from Hirsch's list of the *εἶδωλα*, 'de animarum apud antiquos imaginibus,' p. 10.

A series of Homeric conceptions of Death seem to have combined to produce the representation of the singular action of this being.

According to the Homeric view, the vital principle is an actual substance which leaves the body of the dying man through his mouth or his wounds (*Il.* ix. 409):

ἀνδρὸς δὲ ψυχὴ πάλιν ἐλθεῖν οὔτε λείσται
οὔθ' ἐλετή, ἐπεὶ ἄρ κεν ἀμείψεται ἔρκος ὀδόντων.

Life escapes through the wounds (*Il.* xiv. 518, xvi. 503). Again, at the bottom of the expressions *φρένας, θυμὸν ἐξελέσθαι* (*Il.* vi. 234, xix. 137, xv. 460, xvii. 678) there lies probably the same material conception of 'taking the life out of the body' which, in the vase-painting, finds pictorial expression in the hand of the winged being held over the open mouth of the fallen man. Finally, the epithet *ταμηλεγής*, so often attributed to death by Homer, seems to be reflected in the pressure exerted on the fallen hero by the left hand of the winged being as it stretches him upon the ground. But now the question arises, whether we are justified in looking upon the little winged figure of our fragment as a representation of Thanatos itself.

A series of well-accredited representations of Thanatos are preserved to us in Greek vase-paintings,¹ which we must briefly bring forward here for comparison. The representation of Thanatos and Hypnos on a cup in the British Museum, No. 837 (published in Klein's *Euphronios*, p. 272), which was made by Pamphaios and painted on the exterior by Euphronios,² stands nearest to our fragment in point of time. In this, just as on a black-figured amphora in the Louvre (once in the possession of Piot), discussed by Helbig, *Bullet.* 1865, p. 175, and by Robert, *Thanatos*, pp. 8-9, Thanatos appears with Hypnos as a fully-grown youth in complete armour. On a red-figured krater of severe style he appears, again with Hypnos, as unarmed, naked, and winged (*Mon.* vi. vii. Pl. 22, and after this in Robert's *Thanatos*, p. 4, and Banmeister's *Denkmäler*, i. p. 727). Unfortunately, the upper part of the figure of Thanatos has been restored, so that it is uncertain whether he is represented here also as a fully-grown youth or as a bearded man—a form in which he appears on a number of lekythi which Robert has discussed, *loc. cit.* p. 19 ff., and on the (Epigene) kantharos of the Berlin Museum (Raoul Rochette, *Mon. inéd.* Pl. 40; Panofka, *Cab. Pourtales*, Pl. 7; *Arch. Zeitung*, 1880, p. 189). On none of the vases I have mentioned has the action, in which we find Thanatos engaged, any resemblance to that of the winged figure on the fragment from Palermo. In three of the older representations we see him laying the body of Sarpedon in the tomb; in one, the

¹ Cf. in especial Robert, *Thanatos*: 39 *Berliner Wöckelmann's Programm*.

² Six (in the *Gazette archéol.* 1888, p. 21) and Reisch (*Röm. Myth.* 1890, p. 331) have recently denied, without further proof, that Euphronios painted this cup. I hope in my *Griech. Meister-schulen* to establish his claim more conclusively

than it was possible for Klein to do with the material at his command. The figures putting on their armour on the exterior *B* are *certainly* Amazons, a point which Robert denies (*Thanatos*, p. 10). The female breast can be plainly recognized in the one which carries a snake as the device on her shield.

kantharos in London, he is present at the destruction of Laokoon and takes the dying son in his arms. The lekythi transfer the scheme of the Sarpedon designs, the laying of the corpse in the grave, to any dead person at will. Nor can the appearance of Thanatos on the vases we have named encourage us, as will be seen from the above remarks, to give that name with any certainty to the winged figure on the fragment from Palermo.

The *diminutive size* of the figure on the fragment at Palermo is especially remarkable. We could certainly find an external reason for it in the relatively small space the painter had at his disposal above the fallen warrior in which to represent the god of death. For a similar reason, Nike, when she hovers over a sacrificial altar, is represented as a small winged creature (Gerhard, *A. V.* 155).

But we are driven too forcibly to the analogy offered by whole groups of little winged figures of similar shape which are found on vase-paintings. The earliest examples are those which appear repeatedly on Cyrenaic vases. They are both male and female, and Studniczka (*Kyrene*, p. 24) takes them, no doubt with reason, as good and probably also evil daemons, in the widest possible sense.

A second group is formed by the little 'daemonian' creatures which appear, sometimes in the shape of human beings and sometimes in that of birds,¹ in representations of Alkyoneus, and which have recently been fully discussed by Koepp (*Arch. Ztg.* 1884, p. 31 ff.). He decides in favour of naming these little creatures 'Hymnos,' while earlier authorities decided sometimes in favour of Thanatos and sometimes of κῆρες.

A third group is composed of the εἶδωλα which sometimes appear fully armed, sometimes as birds and sometimes as little naked winged creatures who flutter around the tomb where the dead are lying (cf. *Mon.* viii. 5, 1). They have been treated, as we mentioned above, by Hirsch, *de animarum apud antiquos imaginibus*.

And, finally, we should mention here the little creatures which frequently fly above the horses of a chariot. Sometimes they have the body of a bird with a human head; that is, they are like harpies in form (as in the amphora of Exekias, *Vorlegebl.* 1888, Pl. v.), or they are shaped exactly like the creature on the fragment from Palermo, and are naked and winged (as on the cup by Pamphaios at Corneto, *Mon.* xi. 24). The designation of these little figures, if not placed beyond the reach of doubt by an accompanying inscription, or by action or by surroundings, must often remain uncertain in any particular instance.

In general, however, we may feel sure that we are brought into contact here with a class of daemonic beings which the popular belief of the Greeks pictured to itself as friendly or hostile powers flying between heaven and earth as the ministers and agents of the divine will. It is thus that they are described in Plato's *Symposium* (xxiii. 203): οὗτοι δὲ οἱ δαίμονες πολλοὶ καὶ

¹ In the vase published in the *Arch. Ztg.* 1884, Pl. 3, the winged figure sitting on Alkyoneus is in the shape of a bird, not of a man, and should be compared to *Annali*, 1883, Pl. Q.

παντοδαποί εἰσιν. Hermes and Eros are their closest connections among the gods.

Let us consider for a moment the winged beings on the cup of Pamphaios, quoted above (*Mon.* xi. 24), and the way in which they are characterized. The subject is the fight between Herakles and Kyknos, which is taking place in the middle, while the horses of the heroes with their charioteers are standing on either side. A little naked winged figure is flying towards each of the charioteers. Heydemann suggests Hypnos and Thanatos (*Annali*, 1880, p. 97), while Koepp (*Arch. Ztg.* 1888, p. 43, note 22) thinks we should recognize in the figures Erotes, of whom at that time several were generally represented together.

But it must be allowed that this does not afford a satisfactory explanation. Eros, on the side of the victorious Herakles, might certainly be considered as the 'bringer of victory,' but what meaning would he have hovering over the chariot of the defeated Kyknos? It would rather seem that two of those daemons are here represented by whose agency the heroes receive the good or evil destiny assigned them by the will of a higher power. The details harmonize with this explanation, for the daemon over the horses of Herakles wears a wreath and is holding flowers in his outstretched hand, while the other, over the horses of Kyknos, seems to make a hostile gesture with his hands, and is certainly without either wreath or flowers.

The executive power of death, and especially of death in battle, is, in Homer and the poets of the Epic Cycle, the κῆρ or κῆρες θανατοῖο. In the *Iliad*, Σ 535, in the description of the shield of Achilles, and in the *Shield of Herakles* (249) she is represented as an individual of the female sex. She roves over the field of battle with Eris and Kydoimos on the watch for prey and thirsting for the blood of heroes. On the chest of Kypselos she was represented in a similar way as a creature something like a Gorgon. But by the side of this conception of the κῆρ as an individual there appears in Homer already a generalization of this being and a division into κῆρες with a personal existence, who attack men by land and sea and bring to each the death allotted him by the will and counsel of the gods.

The action of the little winged figure on the fragment from Palermo will harmonize exceedingly well with the character of a being of this nature. Its gestures express with the utmost distinctness its malice, its habit of lying in wait, its tendency to destroy.

But this interpretation seems to be excluded by the sex of the daemon, which is clearly male, for we must, to proceed strictly, assume that the κῆρες, as well as the κῆρ θανατοῖο, were fashioned as women. Otto Crusius has however, I believe, indicated a way of escape from this difficulty in his article 'Keren' in Erseh and Gruber, which, as he is now in possession of ampler materials, he hopes shortly to work out more fully in Roscher's *Lexicon*. For the Athenians κῆρ is equivalent to ψυχή (that is, the ψυχή of the departed), cf. Hesychius and Suidas; and consequently the ancients could give the κῆρ the shape of a man and yet say ἡ κῆρ. The εἶδωλα and ψυχαί, which flutter away from the dying, were represented as of either sex.

I believe, therefore, that the designation *κῆρ θανατοῖο* is a possible one for the little winged figure on the fragment at Palermo, and is preferable to that of *Thanatos*. Robert too has been led by his investigations to the conclusion that *Thanatos*—in contrast to the extremely animated conception of the spirits of death and their activity in the popular superstition of Attica—is not a popular but a purely poetical figure, and that a representation of *Thanatos* does not occur before the end of the fourth century, except in connection with poetry and myth.

For popular conceptions, however, the Attic vase-paintings of the fifth century have an excellent claim to rank as authorities of the first order.

I should like to extend the designation *κῆρ θανατοῖο* to at least one more representation of a little naked winged figure—that which appears on a black-figured lekythos (late in style) from Gela, which is published by Benndorf, *Griech. und Sicil. Vasenbilder*, Pl. 42, 2. Two Ethiopians are laying the corpse of Memnon on the ground. Above it, in just the same way as on the fragment at Palermo, there hovers a little naked creature with wings, which grasps the corpse by the shoulder and presses it down with both arms. The sex of the figure is not quite clear. Heydemann (3 *Hall. Winckelmanngr.* p. 80) and Koepp (*Arch. Ztg.* 1884, p. 42, 2) assert that it is male. The former calls it *Thanatos*, the latter an *εἶδωλον*. Robert, on the contrary (*Thanatos*, p. 17), considers it a female figure, and declares it to be a *κῆρ*. The resemblance to the fragment at Palermo favours the belief that this figure too is male.¹ The possibility of its being an *εἶδωλον* is at once excluded by its action in pressing down the body with a hostile intent; so I consider this too to be the *κῆρ θανατοῖο* of the fallen hero engaged in its specific activity.

A representation entirely parallel in shape and action to the last-named figure on the lekythos from Gela is found upon a black-figured amphora which has frequently been figured and discussed, on which Herakles, supported by Athena, is fighting against Alkyoneus, who lies upon the ground.² The creature, advancing with long strides, takes the hero by the head with both hands and presses him down. Its sex, in consequence of its dress, a short chiton, cannot be certainly determined. Koepp (*Arch. Ztg.* 1884, p. 42) considers it male on account of its black colour, and names it *Hypnos*, as he does all the other winged creatures of the same kind, though not engaged in a similar action which are to be found in representations of Alkyoneus. We cannot expect to find any pronounced difference between the outward characteristics of the genius of sleep on the one hand and that of death on the other; yet the characteristic action of this creature and its impetuous onward motion, which has not escaped Koepp's notice, might be urged in favour of

¹ I consider it in general a doubtful point whether small *naked* winged figures of this kind are ever represented in ancient art with the character of the female sex. They are either draped and hence to a certain extent sex-

less, like our pictures of angels, or if they are naked, they bear the character of the male sex.

² Tischbein ii. 20; Millin *cx.* 459; *Annali* 1833, Pl. D. 1; Müller-Wieseler ii. 70, 881; Jahn, *Sächs. Berichte*, 1853, Pl. VII. 2.

the explanation which we have given to both the winged figures—that on the lekythos from Gela, and that on the fragments of a cylix from Palermo.¹

I remarked, when entering upon the discussion of the two fragments from Palermo, that Klein (*Meistersignaturen*, p. 113) has classed them with the group of vases signed *ἐποίησεν*. In presence of the fragments however on which *ἐποίησεν* is still preserved, twice repeated, it is impossible to say with certainty whether an artist's name may not have existed on the parts which are lost. The one fact which may be urged in favour of Klein's view is the comparatively large amount of empty space on the left side of the larger fragment A, where we should expect to find the artist's name or at least its final letters. But if we compare the very small space occupied by the artist's name +Α+ΡΥΛΙΟΝ on the cup by this master in London (Klein, *Meistersign.* No. 8, *Vorlegeblätter*, D. 7), we shall see that between the two figures which occupy the extreme left of the fragment there is still space enough for an artist's name. (This name could only, from the style of the fragment, be that of a master belonging to the earlier group of painters of red-figured vases.) The cups which bear only the word *ἐποίησεν* have been assigned by Klein to the Epiktetan group of artists. The external evidence in favour of connecting these cups with those of the associates of Epiktetos consists in the fact that one of them (Klein, *Meistersign.* p. 111, 1 = p. 109, 7, British Museum, E 8, published by Gerhard, *A.T.* 195, 96) bears the love-name ΠΡΑΡ+ΟΣ ΚΑΛΟΣ together with the word *ἐποίησεν* only. The question then arises whether they correspond in style to the manner of the so-called 'Epiktetan' group. This is not the case with the cylix, No. 115, of the Thorwaldsen Museum in Copenhagen, No. 6 of Klein's list, of which I have had a new drawing made. (There is an older one in Gerhard's *Apparat des Berliner Museums*, xxi. 83.) But I also found that the inscription on a vase, which had been read as *ἐποίησεν*, was nothing but an unmeaning collection of letters. All the cups, which are *certainly* signed *ἐποίησεν* only, bear this abbreviated signature on the *inside*; where designs exist on the outside as well, *ἐποίησεν* is repeated there too.

The Copenhagen cup, therefore, which shows traces already of the influence of Euphronios, is to be removed from Klein's list of those signed *ἐποίησεν* only.

In the case of No. 10 in Klein, which was once in the possession of Durand, we are compelled to rely on the description which gives *ἐποίησεν* only in the interior design. Since this consisted of a single figure, we may conclude with considerable probability, if not with absolute certainty, that the cup was in the style of Epiktetos.

The remaining vases signed *ἐποίησεν* only, some of which I know from

¹ Genelli, in his *Illustrations of Homer (Iliad*, xvii. 361-66), has introduced an exactly similar little winged figure in the 'Death of Hector' which, with one hand, presses the head of the

fallen man to the ground. It would be interesting to know whether Genelli originated this motive or borrowed it from some ancient model.

personal inspection, and some from drawings which I have, are certainly from the hand of masters of the Epiktetan school.¹

The same holds good of two cups which should be added to the list of those signed *ἐπιόησεν*.

The first is a cup in the Louvre,² mentioned by Klein, under the head of vases with fragmentary inscriptions (*Meistersign.* p. 220). This cup, the diameter of which was considerable, is very much broken. Of the exterior design only three feet are preserved: the interior design, on the contrary, is complete; an ephebos facing left is reclining on a couch with a drinking-horn



FIG. C.

in the right hand, and a cup, just touched in, in the left. To the left of this figure, as in all the other cups with this signature, stands the word *ἐπιόησεν*. The space to the right is intact, and shows no trace of any other letters.

¹ I should like to call attention to the fact that the interior design of No. 8 in Klein, Brit. Mus. 842 (E 52), represents a warrior taking aim with his arrow—a motive which will be fully discussed in my *Griech. Meisterschalen* in connection with the cup in the Bourguignon

collection (Klein, *Lieblingsinschriften*, p. 49, 2) with the love-name ΑΘΕΝΟΔΟΤΟΣ ΚΑΒΟΣ.

² No. 603, *Camp.* 577.

The drawing of the cup is extremely poor and slight. In all probability we may trace in it the hand of Pamphaios.

The second is the cup possessing an interior design only, which I noticed briefly in the *Röm. Mittl.* 1887, p. 169, No. 10. It comes from Chiusi, was purchased in Rome from a dealer in antiquities, and is now in the Archaeological Museum in Baltimore. The surface of the cup is much injured by damp, but it is quite certain that there was no further inscription than ἐπόησεν beside the figure in the interior. The accompanying drawing (C) reproduces the motive of the figure, as far as it was preserved, one-half the size of the original. The simple design gains especial interest from the fact that it corresponds almost exactly with one on a cup of Euergides found in



FIG. D.

Corinth and published by Tsountas in the *Ephem. Archeol.* 1885, Pl. III. 2. The latter is reproduced here (D) by the kind permission of Professor Kumanudes of Athens, from a tracing taken from the copy in the *Ephemeris*. It is a singular fact that the inscription on the little cup of Euergides is also abbreviated. The words ΕΥΕΡΛΙΔΕΞΕ can only be completed by the ΕΠΟΙΕΣΕΝ found on the other cup.

The task of assigning the cups signed ἐπόησεν only to individual masters (with some degree of certainty) will only become possible, perhaps, when we have complete series of copies of the works of those early artists. We do not possess a copy of a single cup of Epiktetos even, the chief master of this group, which gives an exact and faithful reproduction of his style.

At present, Glachrylion and Pamphaios, Epiktetos and Chelis, Hermokrates and Euergides, seem to have an equal claim to this one or that one among these vases.

Attributions made by one archaeologist to-day on the ground of his private opinion, and rejected by another to-morrow who takes a different view, will not help us. This unhappy instability will never be put an end to by the publication of works which, like catalogues, group the vases together on the ground of certain external marks, but only by the multiplication of *copies* which faithfully reproduce the style of the originals. Trustworthy scientific results will then follow of themselves.

P. HARTWIG.

MYTHOLOGICAL STUDIES.

I.—THE THREE DAUGHTERS OF CECROPS.

ANY one who investigates the mythology of Athens is confronted first and foremost by the figures of Cecrops and his daughters, Pandrosos, Herse, and Aglauros. Such shadowy personalities as Porphyrio, Kolamios, &c., are obvious interpolations from other local cults, and as such *quâ* Athens may be disregarded. In visiting the outlying demes Pausanias was told of other kings (P. i. 31, 5) who preceded Cecrops. Well and good for the demes, jealous of their local heroes and anxious to interpolate their names in the genealogical table of the pre-eminent Athens; but for Athens herself, and for the Athenian Apollodorus (*Bibl.* iii. 13, 8), it is with Cecrops the autochthon that the real live mythology of Athens begins—he is a person in art as well as in literary tradition. Above all, for our present purpose he has three famous daughters, whose personalities and activity are considerably more vital than that of their father.

In dealing with Athenian local cults (*Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*, p. xxxiii.), and especially on examining the ceremony of the Hersephoria, I was constantly haunted by the conviction that behind the personalities of these three sisters more was hidden than came to light on the surface. Father and daughters alike seemed to me too personal—if I may be allowed a seeming contradiction—to be mere impersonations. Cecrops we are usually told is the eponymous of the Cecropidae; his three daughters some mythologists hold are impersonations of the dew, a view I hope I have shown is unsatisfactory, if not untenable (*op. cit.* p. xxxiv.), or else they were incarnations of certain attributes and aspects of Athene, bearing to her much the same relation as Erechtheus to Poseidon. If so, these incarnations are very vivacious, and their activity is strangely independent and even adverse to that of the goddess herself. Such solutions somehow fail to carry conviction. The subject has been so long and so ably investigated that it is with considerable deference I offer for criticism a solution I believe to be wholly novel.

The conviction has slowly grown up in my mind that, in seeking for the significance of a mythological figure, the only fruitful method is to examine the cultus. Rites and ceremonies are the facts, and are of amazing permanence; myths are the professed explanation of these facts, and shift and vary

with the mental development of generations of worshippers. I proceed, then, to examine the cults of the three sisters, reserving for the present the cult of the father Cecrops.

At the outset one fact strikes us. Aglauros and Pandrosos had regular shrines and precincts known in historical times, Aglauros on the N. slope of the Acropolis (P. i. 18, 2) and Pandrosos to the west of the Erechtheion (P. i. 26, 6)—shrines, it should be noticed in passing, quite distinct and apart: that of Pandrosos more intimately connected with the Athene and Erechtheus cults on the Acropolis. Of a shrine, precinct, sanctuary of Herse, no mention is made. Ovid (*Met.* ii. 739), probably feeling the difficulty, places Herse in a middle chamber between Aglauros and Pandrosos.

Herse, then, has no recorded shrine. Has she a cult? At first the answer seems obvious: she has the all-important ceremony of the Hersephoria, to which she gave her name. A glance at facts, however, shows that this is not the case. We can have no better authority than inscriptions, which deal with actual ritual statements and records, not with the often merely poetical fancies of literature. Three inscriptions deal with the Hersephoria as follows:

C.I.A. iii. 887, . . . [τὴν ἑαυτῶν] θυγατέρα Να[υ]σιστράτην ἐ[ρ]ρήφορή-
σασαν Ἀθηναῖα Πολιάδι καὶ Πανδρόσ[φ] ἀνέθηκαν ἐ[πὶ] ἱερῆας Καλλιστ[οῦς].

C.I.A. iii. 318, Ἐρσηφόροις β. Εἰλειθυία[ς] ἐν Ἀγραις.

C.I.A. iii. 319, Ἐρσηφόροις β. [Γῆς Θέμιδος].

One thing is clear: Herse was not the object (so far as the evidence of inscriptions goes) of the Hersephoria. The only sister mentioned, *i.e.* if Kochler's restoration of *C.I.A.* iii. 887 be correct, is Pandrosos; her connection with Athene, &c., Themis, and Eileithyia, will be noted later. Against the evidence of inscriptions such literary statements as that of Istros (*Schol. Aristot. Rh. Lys.* 643), τῇ γὰρ Ἐρση πομπεύουσι τῇ Κέκροπος θυγατρὶ, weigh light on the scale; the γὰρ betrays the prejudice of the etymologist. Moreover, to put one literary passage against another, Athenagoras (*Leg.* c. 1) says, Ἀγραύλω Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ τελετὰς καὶ μυστήρια ἄγουσι καὶ Πανδρόσφ, where, as the Hersephoria was a typical mystery, the omission of Herse is at least significant. I take it, then, that Herse is *a mere etymological eponymos of the festival Hersephoria*—a senseless double of Pandrosos put in to make up the sisters to the convenient canonical three of the Charites; as such, for mythological purposes, she falls out of our investigation. It is worth noting that the Athenian women seem to have held her useless to swear by, another note of unsubstantial personality—κατὰ γὰρ τῆς Ἀγραύλου ὄμνου κατὰ δὲ τῆς Πανδρόσου σπάνιωτερον (*Schol. Aristot. Rh. Thesm.* 533).

We are left, then, with Pandrosos and Aglauros. These can certainly not be resolved into equivalents; their shrines, their cults, their characters, are all alike diverse, even antagonistic. Take Pandrosos first, and first her cult. The inscription quoted leaves, if it be correctly restored, no doubt that the Hersephoria was in her honour; further, though Pausanias does not distinctly state that there was any connection, he describes the ceremonial of the Hersephoria immediately after his mention (i. 27, 2) of the Pandroseion.

What we know of the Hersephoria can, as I have shown elsewhere (*Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*, pp. xxxiii. and 102), be supplemented by our knowledge of the analogous Thesmophoria. The scholiast on Lucian (*Dial. Meretr.* 211), and Clement of Alexandria in the *Protrepticus* (14, 15 P), both distinctly state that the ceremonies of the Thesmophoria, Arretophoria (*i.e.* Hersephoria) and the (obscure) Skirophoria were substantially the same, and the clue to the meaning of all three is in the words of the scholiast: *καὶ ἄγεται τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἔχουσα περὶ τῆς τῶν καρπῶν γενέσεως καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων σποράς.* My object for the present is not to elucidate the festival, which has indeed, with abundant analogies from the rites of primitive peoples of all parts of the world, been fully expounded by Mr. J. G. Frazer in his *Golden Bough*, vol. ii. 44–48, but rather to show how the analogy of these festivals lets out the secret of the nature and significance of Pandrosos. Setting aside the Skirophoria, we know that the Thesmophoria was a primitive rite carried on by women in honour of the Earth-goddess both at Athens and Megara, and probably at many other places. I say advisedly of the Earth-goddess, because, though it was associated later with the names of Demeter and Persephone, it probably preceded the formation of their myth. The women of Athens accounted among their various conservative excellences that ‘they kept the Thesmophoria as they always used to do’ (Aristoph. *Ecol.* 223). The meaning of the *Ἐρσηφόροις β. Γῆς Θέμιδος* thus becomes clear. Pandrosos, goddess of all young things, is none other than a form of Ge Themis, who is but the earlier aspect of Demeter Thesmophoros. Ge had, we know, not only a statue on the Acropolis (P. i. 24, 3) as Karpophoros, but also a sanctuary as Kourotrophos just at the entrance to the Acropolis gates (P. i. 22, 3), *ἔστι δὲ καὶ Γῆς Kouροτρόφου καὶ Δήμητρος ἱερὸν Χλόης*; the goddesses, so near akin—in fact the one but the later form of the other—seem to have had a sanctuary in common. The foundation was of great antiquity, and attributed to Erichthonios. Suidas, *sub voc.* Kourotrophos, says: *Kouροτρόφος Γῆ. ταύτη δὲ θῆσαι φασὶ τὸ πρῶτον Ἐριχθόνιον ἐν Ἀκροπόλει καὶ βωμὸν ἰδρύσασθαι χάριν ἀποδιδόντα τῇ Γῇ τῶν τροφείων κ.τ.λ.* Pandrosos, as (according to Apollodorus and Pausanias) faithful keeper of the chest, gains a new significance seen to be one and the same with the actual Earth-mother Ge. She could not violate her own trust—she who was essentially Kourotrophos. Themis is substantially Earth, earth when cultivated and owned by ordered men, a somewhat later conception than the primitive earth the mother. We observe the same sequence in the precedence of the oracle at Delphi—

*πρῶτον μὲν εὐχῇ τῆδε πρῆσβέω θεῶν
τὴν πρωτόμαντι Γαίαν· ἐκ δὲ τῆς Θέμιν.*

Aesch. *Enim.* 1, 2,

where Themis is clearly but the later form of Gaia. We know from Clement of Alexandria that the *ἀπόρρητα τῆς Θέμιδος* were of the same significance as those of the Thesmophoria (*Protrept.* 86). The *Ἐρσηφόροις β. Εἰλειθυίας ἐν Ἀγραις* has a less obvious connection; but in the old primitive days,

when every god was a god of all work, that Pandrosos-Ge-Kourotrophos-Karpophoros should also be Eileithyia would present no difficulties. I fancy that the Eileithyia, so consistently present at the birth of Athene, was no mere late impersonation, but this early Earth-goddess.

The figure of Ge-Pandrosos-Themis was bit by bit effaced by the more splendid personality of her later double Demeter. With Ge Pandrosos had also faded the image of her old original husband Hermes, god of fertility—not however without leaving some, if dim, traces on the Areopagos (P. i. 28, 6) *κεῖται δὲ καὶ Πλούτων καὶ Ἑρμῆς καὶ Γῆς ἄγαλμα*. Still more important is the ancient image (kept in the temple of Athene Polias) of wood, entirely concealed by myrtle boughs, and said to be the offering of Cecrops (P. i. 27, 1). A statue so ancient and so carefully preserved must have been of very early and very great ritual importance; I hazard the conjecture—a mere conjecture—that the other ancient image of the Acropolis, later associated with the name of the dominant Athene, may have been the familiar correlative of Hermes, this very Ge Pandrosos. It is curious that Tertullian says (*Ap.* 16) ‘et tamen quanto distinguitur a crucis stipite Pallas Attica et Ceres Raria quae sine effigie rudi palo et informi ligno prostat.’ Literary tradition leaves us with another curious reminiscence of some link between Hermes and a Cecrops’ daughter. In the story as told by Ovid, a story to which, when we come to Agrauros, I shall have occasion to return, Hermes woos Herse; but by another tradition (Ptolemaios in *Schol. Il.* A 334 and Pollux, viii. 103) Pandrosos was his bride, and his son by her was Keryx, the eponymous ancestor of the priestly *κήρυκες* of Eleusis—a tradition which again brings Pandrosos very appropriately into contact with the Demeter cycle. It is true that tradition here, as constantly, with reference to the sisters is very confused, and each sister is in turn given indifferently to Hermes; but as Herse has been shown to be non-existent, and as Agrauros will shortly be shown to have had a very different husband, only Pandrosos remains. Very possibly the similarity in name—Herse, Hermes—led to their being linked together; as again, when conjointly they are given as parents to Kephalos, a perfectly unmeaning piece of genealogy.

I pass to the third sister, Agrauros, considering first her cult, which throws, as in the case of Pandrosos, a curious light on her special attitude in the myths told of her, which at once are proved to be purely aetiological.

No author, no inscription, connects the name of Agrauros with the Hersephoria; her festival was of widely different significance, and this festival was the Plynteria. Hesychius says: *Πλυντήρια· ἑορτὴ Ἀθήνησιν, ἣν ἐπὶ τῇ Αγραύλου τῆς Κέκροπος θυγατρὸς τιμῇ ἄγουσιν*; and Photius, *Lex.* p. 127: *τὰ μὲν Πλυντήριά φασι διὰ τὸν θάνατον τῆς Αγραύλου ἐντὸς ἑνιαυτοῦ μὴ πλυνθῆναι ἐσθῆτας, εἶθ’ οὕτω πλυνθείσας τὴν ὀνομασίαν λαβεῖν ταύτην*. Toepffer (*Attische Genealogie*, p. 133) has put together what is known of the ceremonial, and has shown clearly that it was a festival of purification and atonement. The image of Pallas was taken down, stripped of its raiment, and carried in procession to the sea, washed, and returned to its place. Other

cathartic ceremonies took place, among them the carrying of the *παλάθη ἡγητρία*. Photius says, *sub voc.*: ἡγητρία παλάθη ἦν σύκων ἦν ἐν τῇ πομπῇ τῶν Πλυνητρίων φέρουσιν.

A second important function of Agrauros was that of one of the *θεοὶ ἱστορες*. She comes first on the roll given by Pollux (viii. 106): *ἱστορες θεοὶ Ἄγραυλος Ἐνυάλιος Ἄρης Ζεὺς Θαλλὸν Λύξὸν Ἡγεμόνη*: the oath was taken actually in the Agraulion (Dem. xix. 303 τὸν ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀγλαύρου τῶν ἐφήβων ὄρκον). Why one of the dew-sisters should head the list, and her name be immediately followed by that of Ares Enyalios, has long been a problem to mythologists. We may note here that oaths were frequently taken by underworld gods whose character was known to be avenging. A further sinister light is thrown on the nature of Agrauros by a chance reference to her worship at Salamis in Cyprus. Porphyry (*De Abst.* ii. 54) in enumerating instances of human sacrifice, says: ἐν δὲ τῇ νῦν Σαλαμῖνι πρότερον δὲ Κορωνίδι ὀνομαζομένη μηνὶ κατὰ Κυπρίου Ἀφροδίτῃ ἐθύετο ἄνθρωπος τῇ Ἀγραύλῳ τῇ Κέκροπος καὶ νύμφης Ἀγραυλίδος. καὶ διέμενε τὸ ἔθος ἄχρι τῶν Διομήδους χρόνων εἶτα μετέβαλεν ὥστε τῷ Διομήδει τὸν ἄνθρωπον θύεσθαι ὑφ' ἓνα δὲ περίβολον ὃ τε τῆς Ἀθηναῶν νεώς καὶ ὃ τῆς Ἀγραύλου καὶ Διομήδους. ὃ δὲ σφαγιαζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐφήβων ἀγόμενος τρεῖς περιθεῖ τὸν βωμόν. ἔπειτα ὁ ἱερεὺς αὐτὸν λόγχῃ ἔπαιεν καὶ οὕτως αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν νησθεῖσαν πύραν ὠλοκαύτιζεν. Porphyry goes on to say that Diphilos, King of Cyprus, commuted the human sacrifice for that of an ox.

Agrauros, then, at Athens was sworn by in conjunction with Ares, and in conjunction with Diomedes at Cyprus had a human sacrifice. That she once had a human sacrifice at Athens is more than possible, as the constant story that Agrauros threw herself down from a precipice, or sacrificed herself for her country, is probably aetiological. Diomedes, it has long been recognized, is but the heroic form of the god Ares; and of the god not only in his later warlike but in his earlier chthonic aspect.

Agrauros, then, in her cultus is associated with Ares; in mythology the connection is definitely formulated by so good an authority as Apollodorus (iii. 14, 2): Ἀγραύλου μὲν οὖν καὶ Ἄρεος Ἀλκίππη γίνεται. To such a genealogy I should attach little importance, could it not be based on an identity of cultus. It gains, however, some additional weight as forming part of the aetiological myth respecting the Areopagos. In discussing the connection of the Areopagos and the cult of the Erinyes, I have elsewhere (*Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*, p. 563) fallen into the error of supposing that Ares 'had originally nothing whatever to do with the Areopagos.' Ares as the war-god of Homer, the only aspect in which I had then considered him, had indeed little or no connection; but Ares, god of the underworld, Ares of Thebes, Ares husband of Agrauros, had everything to do with the hill of the Semnae. It is time to ask who was the original wife of Ares—who was the ancient, underworld goddess worshipped with such rites at Cyprus confirmed by oaths at Athens? The scholiast on the *Antigone* (126) states very clearly; speaking of the birth of the Kadmos snake, he says:

ἐγένετο ὁ δράκων ἐξ Ἄρεως καὶ Τιλφώσσης Ἐρινύος. The old Theban underworld powers were Ares and Tilphossa Erinys. As was long ago seen by Tümpel, the Erinys, no less than Ares, ever haunted the heroes of Thebes. The sinister aspect of Aglauros is now clear enough, and even Ovid is haunted by its remembrance. Aglauros is the envious sister; she, Gorgon-like, has the power to petrify, a power expressed so often in these late forms of myths by its action on herself—

letalis hiems paulatim in pectora venit—Ovid, *Met.* ii. 827.

To Aglauros belongs the snake; she brought it to Athens—the snake which signifies, I think, always primarily things chthonic in their sinister, not their fruitful aspect. She lent her snake to Erichthonios, and when the cult of Erinys, through the medium of Persephone, became blended with that of the Earth-goddess to Demeter, the snake like all else Athene took to herself, with better right perhaps, as I shall hope to show another time, than we have hitherto supposed. Briefly to resume.

1. Of the three Cecropidae I believe Herse to be merely eponymous of the Hersephoria.

2. Pandrosos I believe to be the old earth-goddess Gaia Themis Eileithyia, probably also Anesidora and Pandora, later supplanted by Demeter Thesmophoros. Her cult the Hersephoria, and her figure in mythology and art that of the *faithful* sister, the true Kourotrophos. Her original husband Hermes.

3. Aglauros I believe to be the Attic and Cyprian form Erinys Tilphossa, wife of Enyalios Ares, whose cult, so far as it can be traced back, was indigenous at Thebes. Her festival the Plynteria.

4. The whole story I feel is a clear instance of the action of two mythological laws long ago pointed out by H. D. Müller, but too often forgotten:

(a) That in the *heroic* mythology of a city will be found much of the history of those who were originally its gods.

(b) That in the fusion of tribes and tribal cults the cult that belongs to the weaker tribe keeps only its goddess; the god *quâ* god is effaced, or the connection between god and goddess obscured.

Of the old tribal couples Ares and Erinys-Agraulos, Hermes and Pandrosos, Agraulos and Pandrosos survive, but only as heroines, and henceforth for orthodox mythology they appear under the presidency of a common father, Cecrops.

I reserve for a future paper the questions of the fatherhood and significance of Cecrops, of the connection of Erichthonios with the group, and of the relations of Athene both to Cecrops and his daughters and to Erichthonios.

JANE E. HARRISON.

VITRUVIUS' ACCOUNT OF THE GREEK STAGE.

AN interesting contrast may be drawn between the results obtained from the study of Vitruvius in the early years of the sixteenth century and the exposition of his meaning and text by the scholars of to-day. This contrast is almost always to the advantage of the latter-day scholars. Archaeology has done everything in recent times to clear up by consideration of existing monuments a host of difficulties not dreamed of in the days of the Renaissance, and archaeologists—so far as they are agreed as to the testimony of recent discoveries—have little or nothing to learn from remote predecessors. But a serious disagreement exists among them in regard to the stage of the Greek theatre. This want of agreement is reflected in the current interpretations of a difficult passage in Vitruvius. About this very passage the scholars of the early Renaissance were agreed, and since their explanation of it differs in some material respects from any now offered, it may be of some use to us to-day.

The Florentine Leo Battista Alberti¹ reproduced the meaning of Vitruvius, without undertaking to construe his text, then very corrupt. In 1511 was printed the text of Vitruvius which, in spite of many subsequent labours, has bravely held its own up to the present day. This text we owe to Fra Giocondo,² a Franciscan friar who was equally great as an inspiring teacher, a painstaking scholar, and a daring and original architect.³ The condition of the text in the three first editions was lamentable, as appears in the passage describing the Greek theatre which especially concerns the present inquiry. The second (1496) and the third (1497) both reproduce an absurd and confusing printer's blunder made in the first (1484-1492), and all

¹ See his *De re ædificatoria*, posthumously published, Florence 1485, *passim*.

² M. Vitruvius per locundum solito castigatior factus cum figuris et tabula ut iam legi et intelligi possit...Impressum Venetiis æ magis q̄ unquam alio tempore emendatum: sumptu mira q̄ diligentia Ioannis de Tridino alias Tacuino. Anno Domini, M. D. XI. Die. xxii. Maii Regnante inelyto Duce Leonardo Laudano. Dedicated to Pope Julius II.

³ On his teaching see note (17) below. His scholarship is known by his *editio princeps* of

Pliny's *Letters*, by his remarkable elucidations of Caesar's *Commentaries*, published at Venice (1517), reprinted by Giunta (1520) at Basle (1521) and finally in a sumptuous folio, Paris (1543.) See for his pains in collecting MSS, the dedication of this work to Giuliano de' Medici. Also he there speaks of a meeting of scholars at Venice where his text was discussed in detail. His architectural abilities caused him to be employed by the Emperor Maximilian, Louis XII. of France, Pope Leo X. and the Venetian Republic.

and v = intersections with cc''). These are required alike by the sketch-plan and the diagram of Fra Giocondo, as well as by his text of Vitruvius.

The use of paraphrase and digression in explaining this passage is clearly justified, but might not be necessary in the present case if Fra Giocondo himself had explained his plan and diagram instead of leaving them simply confronted by the Vitruvian text which runs as follows:—

In Græcorum theatris non omnia iisdem rationibus sunt faciendæ, quod primum in una circinatione, ut in Latino trigonorum iiii, in eo quadratorum trium anguli circinationis lineam tangunt, et cuius quadrati latus est proximum scenæ præciditque curvaturam circinationis ea regione designatur finitio proscenii, et ab ea regione ad extremam circinationem curvaturæ parallelas linea designatur, in qua constituitur frons scenæ, per centrumque orchestrae a proscenii regione parallelas linea describitur et qua secat circinationis lineas dextra ac sinistra in cornibus hemicyclii centra signantur, et circino conlocato in dextro ab intervallo sinistro circumagitur circinatio ad proscenii *dextram* partem, item centro conlocato in sinistro cornu ab intervallo dextro circumagitur ad proscenii *sinistram* partem, ita tribus centris hæc descriptione ampliorem habent orchestram Græci et scenam recessiorem minoreque latitudine pulpitum, quod *λογέον* appellant, ideo quod eo tragici ac comici actores in scenam peragunt, reliqui autem artifices suas per orchestram præstant actiones itaque ex eo scenici et thymelici græce separatim nominantur, eius logei altitudo non minus debet esse pedum x., non plus duodecim, *De Architectura*, V. viii.

The explanation of the above suggested by Fra Giocondo's diagram and sketch-plan is indeed unavoidably complicated to-day by what seems to me its misconception in the Vitruvian commentaries that have appeared since 1511-1523. Having fixed upon the situation of the scena, (g g' in the diagram, f in the sketch-plan), we are required to describe a circumference, as shown in the diagram. Then we must inscribe three squares,—only one of which concerns the present inquiry,—and let c c' the side lying next the scena,⁷—Green-room building it may be called,—be the *finitio proscenii*. By this is meant the forward boundary line ending the proscenium space, marked f f' on the diagram.

The sense attached by Fra Giocondo to proscenium here is given by his townsman and enthusiastic pupil⁸ as follows:—

‘That space on either side of the pulpitum reaching to the forward wall of the scena (ad extremam scenam) which was left vacant was called by the Greeks Proscenium. Let no man opine that here were the sides of the scena.’

⁷ *σκηνή* or *scenæ* had various meanings. Used strictly, in a context where the other parts of the stage-building are explained, it has usually the most primitive of its meanings as here. The stricter and earlier meaning of *προσκήριον*, or *proscenium*, corresponded to this meaning of *scenæ*, and designated a mask which screened the *scenæ* from view. There might or might not

lie between vacant space (as in Fra Giocondo's diagram). See Dr. J. Sommerbrodt, *De Ischoli et scenæ*, part II. (1851) and III. (1858). See also his *Scenica collecta*, 1876.

⁸ Julii Caesaris Scaligeri, ‘De Comœdia ac Tragedia’ in vol. iii. of Gronovius' *Thesaurus* (1699).

But the *frontis proscenii* was a part of the proscenium, and was far more important than the useless space behind it. To this *frontis proscenii*, without reference to Scaliger's vacant space, applies Perrault's definition: 'Le Proscenium estoit la face de la scène qui estoit ornée de colonnes.'⁹ Fra Giocondo's Greek proscenium, then, was a narrow unused space in front of the scena, bounded by a row of columns which stood on the line marked *frontis proscenii* on his diagram. To this *frontis proscenii* would apply, I think, the definition of the Greek proscenium sometimes given on the authority of Dr. Dörpfeld to-day.¹⁰ But there is a difference, for Fra Giocondo interrupts this line of columns by the forward projection of the pulpitum (*λογέιον*). Moreover, for reasons to be entered into below, he indicates in front of the *frontis proscenii* a second proscenium which is clearly that of the Roman theatre and need not here be taken into account. It may be added that the forward projecting stage (*λογέιον*) is spoken of by Bulengerus and by Scaliger as a part of the orchestra. Their plain meaning is that it projected into the orchestra from the forward line of the *proscenium*. Scaliger also says that this stage was always of wood and removable.

Returning now to Vitruvius, the second line which he requires to be drawn is *g g'* tangent to the circle and parallel to the *frontis proscenii* just drawn. This line is the *frons scenæ*, and separates the scena from the unused space in front. Vitruvius next requires us to draw a third line parallel to the two others, which shall pass through the centre of the orchestra. This third line is a diameter, as all now agree, for schemes like Rode's second, Schoenborn's and Albert Mueller's first¹¹ have been finally condemned. Vitruvius now requires us to use two new centres, *b* on the spectators' left, and *c* on the right. Put your compass, Vitruvius says, at *c* (on the playgoer's right), measure off the radius toward his left, and then describe the arc *o n* cutting *e e' n*, the right hand portion of the proscenium—*ad proscenii dextram partem*.

⁹ *Abrégé des Livres d'Architecture de Vitruve*, Paris, 1671, and 1681. An Italian translation appeared in 1717, and English ones in 1692, 1703 and 1729. Perrault makes nowhere any attempt to reconcile this definition with his very different account of the Greek proscenium in his two translations, Paris, 1673 and 1684.

¹⁰ If I rightly understand Dr. Dörpfeld's view, which he has kindly communicated to me, he regards the *frontis proscenii* as the forward line of the *proscenium*, then the *proscenii pulpitum*—on this phrase see note (16) below—is the *λογέιον* built in front of this line. So far he agrees substantially with Fra Giocondo. But, according to Dr. Dörpfeld, the *proscenium* was at the same time the mask-front or façade of the *scenæ*, and also—because of the interval between it and the masked *scenæ*—a second *λογέιον*, i.e. the *θεολογέιον*. This last, he sup-

poses, was confused by Vitruvius with the *λογέιον* pure and simple. Dr. Dörpfeld thinks that Vitruvius gives a correct plan with the right names attached to its component parts, but is led into the confusion above noted by misunderstanding the way in which plays had been represented. The Greek authors at his command took for granted the distinction between *λογέιον* and *θεολογέιον*, and therefore did not explain it. Dr. Dörpfeld thinks.

¹¹ See Rode's *Kupfer zu Vitruv's zehn Bücher* &c. Berlin 1801, Schoenborn's is in the *Zeitschrift für Alterthums Wissenschaft* 1853 (Nos. 40 and 41), Albert Mueller's first is in the *Philologus* (1863) vol. xxiii. The common feature of them all is their attempt to distinguish between the *centrum orchestræ* and the centre of the circle originally drawn. This, as A. Mueller has himself shown, contradicts the plain meaning of Vitruvius.

Here following Marini's text of 1836, Rose and Mueller-Struebing correct all the MSS. and read *sinistram* for *dextram*. Fra Giocondo, whose reading I have italicized, gives with all the MSS. *dextram*.

Put your compass now, Vitruvius proceeds, at *b* on the playgoer's left, measure off the radius toward his right, and then describe the arc *cr* to *c'c''*, the left hand portion of the proscenium—*ad proscenii sinistram partem*.

Here Fra Giocondo makes the correction which Marini and Rose think should be made above. They of course leave the MS. reading *dextram* uncorrected in this place. All admit that correction must be made in one place or the other. There is nothing in any MS. to justify either correction as against the other. The decisive reason which led Fra Giocondo to correct the second rather than the first *dextram* was plainly his understanding of the general architectural context, and he is the only great architect who was also a great scholar by whom this question has been debated. Rose and Marini on the other hand decided to change the first *dextram* and leave the second, because there had been much trouble in making any sense out of Fra Giocondo's text. This difficulty connected itself with controversial questions about right and left.¹² This will become clear by an examination of Rode's and Schoenborn's and Albert Mueller's plans already alluded to. The relief afforded by Rose's text, published in 1867, encouraged Wecklein to offer a new explanation, and Albert Mueller very soon recanted his first explanation and substituted a new one.¹³ Indeed a very strong case might be made out in favour of Marini's text, if its adoption in Germany, which has been very general, had resulted in any explanation which commanded universal or even general assent. Unhappily the reverse is the case, as may be seen in the three last German Handbooks. In Hermann's *Lehrbuch* (1888), Baumeister's *Denkmaeler* (1888), and Iwan Mueller's *Handbuch* (1890), will be found three diagrams to fit this passage of Vitruvius. In each of these the arcs drawn from the right and left centres of Vitruvius produce results in regard to stage and orchestra not favoured by the other two.

The fact is that no one since Fra Giocondo has been able to make plain why Vitruvius attached so much importance to the drawing of the last two circles and Claude Perrault's criticism¹⁴ applies to all subsequent attempts, including his own, at understanding their function. One exception should however be made in favour of Schneider.¹⁵ Of these two circles then the first one drawn

¹² See Marini's note on the passage, folio edition, Rome, 1836. 'At. . . in sibimetipsis contradicentes pro dextero cornu intellexerunt prius dexteram manum spectatorum, deinde dexteram proscenii partem declaraverunt spectatorum sinistram. Non est credibile Vitruvium considerare voluisse eandem rem in eodem loco sub duplici aspectu. Non secunda vox *dexteram* sed prima mutetur in *sinistram*.' For some of the accounts, like those of Gallianus and Pollens to which Marini alludes, see Lemonius' dissertation, St. Petersburg, 1850. He there criticizes five diagrams and gives a sixth of

his own. Fra Giocondo had no difficulty whatever in dealing with right and left.

¹³ For Wecklein's diagram see the *Philologus* 1871, p. 435 ff. of vol. xxxi. A. Mueller's first appeared in 1873, and is reproduced in Hermann's *Lehrbuch*.

¹⁴ Perrault—the well-known architect of Colbert and Louis XIV.—says in a note to his translation: 'Le mystère de ces trois cercles est une chose bien obscure ou bien inutile.'

¹⁵ G. K. W. Schneider's plan is in his 'Attisches Theaterwesen' 1835. It must be admitted that his stage has a most ridiculous

brings us, at its intersection with the *limitio proscenii*, to the right hand limit of the *pulpitum*, while the second brings us to the left hand limit of the same.

Returning now to the text, after thus drawing the circles with Fra Giocondo and Schneider, we find Vitruvius saying: 'Thus the Greeks obtain, by using three centres an orchestra that is roomier (*ampliorem*), a scena that lies further back (*recessiorem*), and a *pulpitum* or *logcion*, as the Greeks call it, which is narrower (*minore latitudine*).

Vitruvius thus requires us to refer to the Roman theatre and stage, and the comparison is made easy because the Roman stage is well understood to-day through existing remains. If comparison be made according to the requirements of Vitruvius the differences which he enumerates will all appear. Only we must use the Roman stage as we know it rather than the Roman stage as Vitruvius describes it. This is because Vitruvius insists upon a feature in the Roman stage which he really borrows from the Greeks, namely the *pulpitum proscenii*. This is apparently an invention of Vitruvius, one of those 'refinements in practice not observed by his predecessors nor followed by his successors.'¹⁶ The Roman Theatre was after all only a modified type of the Greek theatre changed to suit the New Comedy and thus adapted to the plays of Terence and Plautus. Applied to this type of theatre the words *scena* and *proscenium* have a new meaning. *Scena* takes the place of *proscenium*, and *proscenium* is applied to the *pulpitum*. Hence the comparison required by Vitruvius is between the *pulpitum* of the Greek and the *pulpitum-proscenium*, not the *proscenii pulpitum*, of the Roman theatre. The only thing which the *proscenii pulpitum* of Vitruvius can mean is a small temporary stage built on the centre of the larger and permanent *proscenium-stage*. And this is what Scaliger and Fra Giocondo make it out to be.

The closing words of Vitruvius on the Greek theatre sum up the results of the comparison just made. Just these differences, says our author, were forced on the Greeks because only their tragedians and comedians performed on the stage, whereas the others, the *artifices*, went through with their performance up and down the orchestra (*per orchestram*). This circumstance in fact leads the Greeks to distinguish the former as *scenici* from the latter whom they call *thymelici*. The height of the raised stage occupied by these tragic and comic must be, says Vitruvius, ten feet at least and twelve feet at most. And here ends that part of Vitruvius' account of the Greek theatre which concerns the stage. If we take the temporary wooden *pulpitum*, (*e*) on Fra Giocondo's sketch-plan, to have been ten or twelve feet above the orchestra-level, the difficulties are insurmountable. Accordingly we must either suppose with Dr. Dörpfeld that Vitruvius confused the *λογεῖον* with

shape,—like that of a ship's prow,—but he uses the two circles last drawn to determine the position of the stage (*λογεῖον*), and so far agrees with Fra Giocondo: but Schneider is too much hampered by the words of Vitruvius and his details therefore are impracticable.

¹⁶ Quoted from a review of Wilkins' Vitruvius in a MS. note to a Bodleian Vitruvius, Douce V. subt. 2. Compare on the *proscenii pulpitum* Perrault's shrewd remark that the phrase applies rather to the Greek than to the Roman theatre.

the *θεολογεῖον*, but only so far as the dimension of height was concerned, or we must believe¹⁷ that our author had in mind such a theatre as that of Cuiculum (Djemika) where the level of the *orchestra* was considerably below that of the *scenæ*-floor. See Amable Ravoisié, *Exploration Scientifique de l'Algérie*. This last would not be a Greek theatre, but a transitional type, between the earlier Greek and the later or Roman theatre.

And now some account must be given first of the arcs *oa* and *orf'* which I have added in Fra Giocondo's diagram, second of the double proscenium which he provides, the Greek proscenium *f* and the Roman proscenium *i*. I have regarded the departure of Fra Giocondo from Vitruvius' literal directions for drawing the second and third circles as a device for greater clearness in teaching.¹⁸ In practice he found it less confusing to accomplish what Vitruvius had in mind by a method of his own: 'I will simplify the matter,' we can almost hear him say, when his pupils were dazed by the Vitruvian directions about a centre to the left, a radius to the right and an arc to the left, 'Take your centre at *b* to the left, measure off your radius toward the left *b'*, and from there describe your arc until you cut the *frons scenæ* on the left at *f'*. Similarly take your other centre at *c*, on the right, measure off your radius toward *c'* on the right, and describe your arc until it touches the *frons scenæ* at *f*, on the right. Produce both these arcs until they intersect the *limitio proscenii* *e'' e' e'''*,—the matter is a simple one and I need not draw the arcs further. Now these two points (*r* and *n*) of intersection with *e'' e'*, are the limits to the right and left of the forward projecting *pulpitum* shown at *e* on my sketch-plan.'

My reason for thinking that Fra Giocondo's arcs were thus produced in thought by him is that the limits of the *pulpitum* are determined on his sketch-plan in the manner just described. If any doubter should object, then I should appeal to Vitruvius and, neglecting Fra Giocondo's arcs entirely, I should draw *oa* and *orf'* according to the letter of Vitruvius' instructions. After that I should proceed as Fra Giocondo has done in his sketch-plan.


As for the introduction into his diagram of the Roman proscenium *i* in front of the *limitio proscenii*, behind which lies the Greek proscenium *f*, that can also be explained as a teacher's device to make plain the difference be-

¹⁷ Possibly these two ways of accounting for the error of Vitruvius' mistake should be combined. He makes no mention of the *θεολογεῖον*, and probably did not know its function. Finding his authorities giving its height at ten or twelve feet, he might refer for better understanding to existing theatres of the Cuiculum type. There the *λογεῖον* was of the height in question and so he was justified in a confusion between it and the *θεολογεῖον*.

¹⁸ In his commentary on the Pandects, fol. cii. verso in the 1532 edition, Budé gives a sketch of the teaching by Fra Giocondo,

and refers especially to Vitruvius: 'I had the good fortune to get, while reading that book, the help of a most rare preceptor, Lucundus the Friar, then king's architect, a man of consummate antiquarian lore. Not only by speech but with his pencil (graphidi) did he explain what we were seeking to understand. Those were the times when I emended my Vitruvius at my ease.'... For the testimony of Scaliger and others on this same point, see the *Supplementum ad Scriptores trium ordinum S. Francisci*. Rec. Lucas Waddingers, Rome, 1806.

tween the earlier and the later sense of *proscenium*. It is also possible that Fra Giocondo may have had two minds about the matter, though this is unlikely. Fra Giocondo would in fact have belied the times in which he lived if he had not kept the Roman theatre and the Roman stage before his pupils even when he was discoursing about the Greek stage. In



SKETCH-PLAN.

those days the centre of interest was in things Roman far more than it is now. Perhaps for that reason Vitruvius was easier of approach, and could more readily be explained in those days than in these. It is at least certain that, like the pupils of Fra Giocondo and like Bulengerus (*De Theatro*, 1603), Vitruvius was primarily concerned with things Roman. This is true in spite of a certain pedantry which inclined Vitruvius to suggest Greek

improvements,—as in the case of his Roman *proscenii pulpitum*. One of his very earliest and most competent critics, Politian's friend the Florentine architect Leo Battista Alberti, cleverly summed up the matter in 1485 by complaining that Vitruvius was Greek to the Romans and Roman to the Greeks. The one building of which we know Vitruvius to have been architect was in fact a Roman basilica. In the forties nearly twenty years after Friar Giocondo's death the Vitruvian academy at Rome went about with the most ambitious plans, and one thing which may be traced back to their schemes is undoubtedly the last building planned by Palladio, Fra Giocondo's townsman,—I mean the Roman stage begun at Verona three months before the great architect died in August 1580, and finished by his son in 1584. It stands to-day a monument of the study of Vitruvius in the 16th century.¹⁹

What very different results the latest study of Vitruvius has brought about, we have already seen. Instead of borrowing from contact with great public works, like those of Fra Giocondo at Paris, Rome, and in the Veneto, a broad and practised power of insight, recent expounders of this passage have too often cavilled about the words of Vitruvius. His use of the most innocent and everyday terms like *intervallum*,²⁰ *sinistram*, *dextram*, *centrum*, and *latitudo*, has been tormented, discussed, and strained first this way and then that way until their meaning has been fairly driven out of them. Geppert, Lemonius, Schönborn, Wecklein and Albert Mueller were too busy with one or the other of these words to heed the one plan which, so far as the stage is concerned, simply followed the straightforward meaning of Vitruvius' words. Schneider's plan is mentioned by no one with respect. Geppert laughed at it and Schoenborn lost his temper over it, but it remains for all that the most nearly faithful presentation of the Greek stage as Vitruvius described it which has appeared since the year 1523.²¹

The total inability of all others to agree in one interpretation of this passage in our author has meanwhile led to a feeling that it cannot be understood. Geppert began to despair of it, Lemonius also gives it up, and

¹⁹ *Le fabbriche di Andrea Palladio*, Ott. Bertozzi Seamozzi in Vicenza 1796.

²⁰ It is discouraging to find in the last number of the *Rheinisches Museum* (Vol. xlvi. Heft 3) a new attempt to conjure with the word *intervallum*. Schönborn was certain that it meant Parodos. Albert Müller could not believe this, but agreed that something very uncommon was to be got out of the word. So he consulted a mathematical expert, who revealed to him that its meaning at the end of the account of the Greek stage must be determined by the context in which it last occurred,—at the beginning of Vitruvius' account of the Roman stage. So they two agreed that it must mean one of the twelve equal segments into which the circle was divided by its inscribed squares. Müller selected

the two segments which he found convenient. Now comes Fabricius and selects two others which suit his view. Oemichen may well be left in the field against all these over-ingenuities. His objections have not been and cannot be answered.

²¹ Fra Giocondo's plans were reproduced,—unaccompanied however by the necessary marginal keys, and with no lettering whatever upon them—in the French translation of Jean Martin (1547). They were completely supplanted in 1556 by that prepared by Daniele Barbaro under advice from Palladio. Perrault followed Barbaro, and began the modern controversies where no account is ever taken of Giocondo's plans.

Dumon, in 1888, convicts Vitruvius,—at least so far as the Greek stage is concerned,—of ignorance, carelessness, and stupidity.

Therefore I maintain that it is time for us to break away from these tangles of German controversialists and to begin again, following the lead of Fra Giocondo as far as it will go with us. Since the task of bringing the statements about the Greek stage in Vitruvius to bear upon what we know of existing monuments is before us, we cannot perhaps do better than follow the example which that same Friar Ioannes, described as *animi humanitate vere locundus*, has set before us. His method is briefly given by himself in the dedication of his Vitruvius to Giuliano della Rovere, Pope Julius II. 'Take now, my ever blessed father, with favouring countenance,' he writes, 'these my accomplished labours,—Vitruvius, restored to the right rule of his original speech. But think not the toil has been slight. For in seeking to understand him I have compared his words and his meaning with the remnants of ruins and the fabrics of the ancients, and this not once only but often and many times again,—not without great exhaustion and abundant perspiration.'

LOUIS DYER.

TWO VASES BY PHINTIAS.

[PLATES XX.—XXIII.]

It was my intention to publish in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* a cylix by Phintias in the Central Museum at Athens, together with the substance of a paper read at a meeting of the British Archaeological School in March of this year. Learning, however, that Dr. P. Hartwig was anxious to publish the cylix in his forthcoming *Meisterschalen*, I entered into correspondence with him, and by his kindness am enabled to publish in its place the well-known hydria in the British Museum (Klein, *Meistersignaturen* 3) and fragments of a stannos in the possession of Dr. Friedrich Hauser, now at Stuttgart, whose kindness in furnishing me with drawings by his own hand I would gratefully acknowledge.

A.—The first vase to be discussed is the hydria in the British Museum (E 264) found at Vulci.¹ The form is the older one with sharp divisions between neck, shoulder, and body, which is characteristic of b.f. hydriae, and disappears after the 'severe' period of r.f. vase-painting, shoulder and body passing into one and leaving only one field for decoration. On the inside of the lip, in front of the junction with the handle, are three round knobs suggesting pegs or nails. These are in this case painted purple, whereas usually when they appear they are varnished—cp. Petersburg I, 337 and Berlin 1897 = Gerhard, *A. V.* 249, 250.² The handles are left unvarnished, which is also comparatively uncommon. The main field of the vase is occupied by a scene, which if not of surpassing originality or interest, is at least unusual. Three naked ἐφηβοί are represented in the act of carrying water from a fountain in hydriae which are of the same form as the vase itself, except that that which is carried by the second youth from the right on his shoulder is apparently of a more developed form, in which the sharp division between shoulder and body is given up. On the extreme right a stream of water issues from a

¹ The body of the vase is reproduced at three-quarters of the original size on Plate XX., the shoulder at two-thirds of the original size on Plate XXI.

² This splendid vase Furtwangler conjectures to be by Hischylos, on what grounds it is not easy to see, probably because the Berlin

Museum contains a pinax of Hischylos (2100). I mention this because Klein (*Vasen mit Lieblingsinschriften* p. 22) speaks of the hydria inscribed Τέλης καλός (*Jahrbuch* 1889 x.) as 'in the style of Hischylos.' What is the style of Hischylos?


lion's head of admirable execution, worthy to stand beside analogous portions of the work of Sosias and Peithinous, and a youth fills his hydria. Behind him comes a second, bearing an empty hydria on his shoulder, and turning his head to look at a bearded figure, presumably the *παιδοτρίβης*, clothed in a *ἰμάτιον* which passes over the left shoulder, and leaning on a staff. On the left the scene is closed by a third youth, carrying a hydria with both hands. All the figures wear vine-wreaths like those of the Kottabospsykter of Euphronios, with the exception of the youth who carries his hydria on his shoulder, who is crowned with laurel. In the field is inscribed *Μεγακλῆς καλός*, the significance of which will be discussed later on. The subject may be regarded as a variant for the scenes so common on b.f. hydriac where a train of maidens is represented in the act of drawing water from a fountain (cp. British Museum B 93 with the inscription *Ἴπποκράτης καλός*). An exact parallel from a later period is furnished by the painting in the



interior of a kylix from Bomarzo of later 'fine' style preserved in a drawing in the library of the Berlin Museum (Mappe xxi. 89), which represents a youth drawing water from a fountain in the shape of a lion's head. The scene immediately succeeding that depicted on our vase—viz. the act of washing, in which the contents of the hydriac are poured by one youth over the kneeling figure of another, is not uncommon on kylices. (Cf. Gerhard. *A.V.* 277.)

The subject of the shoulder is drawn from a sphere as well-known to the early r.f. vase-painters as the palaestra, viz. the symposion. Two figures—one bearded and one youthful—are represented lying on couches, with *ἰμάτια* thrown over the lower half of their bodies and crowned with vine-wreaths. The elder of the two, on the left, holds in either hand a kylix, that in his left hand being inverted, and turns his head to look at his companion. It is noticeable that these kylices are of the characteristic b.f. shape with high

foot, and a division between the upper and lower half of the bowl. The two cylices of course serve for the practice of the *κότταβος*, as is evident from a comparison with the cylix of Kachrylion in the Museo Bocchi (II. 4 Schöne = Klein *Euphronios*,² p. 113). The youth on the right holds in his left hand a lyre. It is useless to multiply parallels for this scene. Besides being extremely common in the interior of cylices (see Klein, *Euphronios*,² p. 310) the subject was found to be well adapted to a field such as that in which it appears in this instance. The best parallel is the hydria of Euthumides (*A.Z.* 1873 IX.), which has an external point of connection with our hydria in bearing the inscription *Μεγακλῆς καλός*. In painting this hydria Euthumides has taken the first step towards the later development in which one field of decoration only is offered by the vase. But he has only gone a very short distance. The vase is one of a numerous class of 'severe' r.f. hydriae which appear simply to leave out the main subject and leave us with only the subordinate subject of the shoulder. We may also compare a hydria of Euthumides (*Philologus*, xxvi. 1867 II.) similar in shape to our vase, where the shoulder is occupied by a scene closely resembling the greatest of all Kottabos vases, the Petersburg psykter of Euphronios.



FOOT OF THE BRIT. MUS. HYDRIA.

In the alternation of r.f. with b.f. ornament we may compare Phintias with Euthumides, and trace the survival of the influence of b.f. vase-painting. The style of the drawing will be discussed later in relation to that of the period to which Phintias belongs.

B.—I also publish (Pl. XXII.—III.), from drawings executed by Dr. Friedrich Hauser, fragments of a stamnos in his possession,¹ which I have unfortunately not seen. I must therefore express my indebtedness to Dr. P. Hartwig, who has examined the fragments in Stuttgart, and has kindly given me such information as I required. The height of the vase is estimated at 35 cm., which corresponds exactly with the average size of an early stamnos with four-figure subjects. As in the case of the British Museum hydria we find b.f. alternating with r.f. ornament—r.f. palmettes above and between the subjects and b.f.

¹ The plates reproduce the fragments at rather more than half of the original size.

palmettes below. The signature, of which only four letters remain intact, was inscribed in the upper right-hand corner of the obverse of the vase. From the fragments we can infer a subject consisting of a central group formed by a male and female, symmetrically enclosed by two flying females, of whom the one on the left is turning her head to witness the spectacle, and holds a stylised flower in her right hand. The subject which immediately suggests itself is the struggle of Peleus and Thetis, and this appears to me to be supported by the following parallel. In the collection of drawings preserved in the library of the Berlin Museum is to be found a drawing (Mappe xxii. 3) of a r.f. hydria of the same form as that here published, in the style of Euthimides. On the shoulder is represented a dance of five youths, each of whom holds a stick in his right hand and has a chlamys rolled round his left arm, in the presence of a bearded man who plays the *βάρβιτον*. The main subject of the vase, however, is the struggle of Peleus and Thetis, without transformations, in the presence of two Nereids who fly in opposite directions. The arms of the three female figures are symmetrically disposed in the upper part of the field: they are clad in precisely the same manner as the female figures of our stamnos, and the outline of the right leg of Thetis is drawn under the clothing, exactly as that of the female on the right of the vase of Phintias.¹ It is true that the position of the male figure as determined by fragment *b* seems to preclude the possibility of reconstructing the usual scheme according to which Peleus clasps Thetis tightly round the waist, while his head appears in front of her breast. That this was not the only scheme, however, is proved *e.g.* by the 'vaso a colonnette' published by Raoul-Rochette, *Monuments Inédits*, II., where Peleus occupies almost exactly the position in which he would appear on our vase. The fact that the female figure on the left holds a flower is quite in keeping with this interpretation—cp. Gerhard *A.V.* 178, 9, *M.d.I.* i. 38. The Thessalian legend may have represented Thetis and her sisters gathering flowers by the sea, a trait familiar from the Sicilian legend of Persephone.

The stylistic affinities of the vase will be discussed in another connection. It may be well, however, to call attention here to the incised outlines of the hair on fragment *d*—even the loose back hair being treated in this way—and to the clothing of the female figures, which was undoubtedly the same as that of Iris on the British Museum cylix signed by Pamphaios, but supposed by Klein to have been painted by Euphronios (Gerhard, *A.V.* 221, 2). The figure of Eos which corresponds to that of Iris on that vase appears to me to show that in the very numerous female figures of this class two garments only are to be assumed, a long chiton with or without sleeves whose folds are represented in the upper portion by wavy lines drawn with thin varnish, if at all, and in the lower part by the so-called 'swallow-tails,' and secondly, a *ιμάτιον* worn in various ways—sometimes thrown over the shoulders, some-

¹ Owing to an error of Overbeck (*Gallerie Heroischer Bildwerke*, p. 181 No. 16) it has been supposed that this was a b.f. vase preserved at München, and it accordingly appears in Graf's

list (*Jahrbuch*, 1886 p. 202) as No. 24, Ov. 16 = München 767? Where the vase may be, I do not know, but it is certainly r.f., and certainly not at München. It was discovered by Campanari.

times arranged so as to pass over the right and under the left shoulder. Both systems may be illustrated from the archaic female statues in the Acropolis Museum. It often seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that the skirts with swallow-tail folds belong to the *πέπλος* which passes under the left shoulder, and this may sometimes be the case. At the same time, the use of short upper-garments arranged in the manner described is proved by more than one Nereid on the Peleus and Thetis deimos *M.d.I.* i. 38, where the under-garments are stiff and decorated, and I therefore believe that we should see a similar garment in the case of the female figure to the right on our stamnos.

The reverse of the vase is occupied by a scene from the palaestra. This distribution of subjects may be very closely paralleled from a vase which I have been unable to trace beyond the Benoit Catalogue, published by Gerhard *A. V.* 22, and described in the text (p. 79) as an amphora from Vulci. It is attributed by Klein to Euthumides and the luxuriance of the inscription certainly speaks in his favour: but the claims of Phintias appear to me to be also worthy of consideration. So far as can be judged from Gerhard's plate at any rate, the figure of Apollo on the obverse resembles the Apollo of the Corneto amphora of Phintias and the Theseus of the Petersburg krater. The figure holding a pole on the reverse of the vase, besides agreeing in scheme with the figure to which fragment *c* on the reverse of the stamnos belonged, presents analogies in drawing to the *ἔφηβοι* of the British Museum hydria, especially in the details of the chest with the curious ladder-like scheme of cross-lines. The peculiar form of wreath worn by Apollo and Tityos on the obverse, and by one *παιδοτρίβης* and one athlete on the reverse is, it is true, found on works of Euthumides (cp. the psykter *A.d.I.* 1870, O,P), but also occurs on the Petersburg krater, and cannot be separated from the stylised branch or flower carried by the Nereid on our stamnos. The circumstance to which I wish to draw particular attention is the fact that a scene from the palaestra is in both cases employed as a reverse to a subject of a kind very popular at this period—the three varieties being (1) Peleus and Thetis, (2) Boreas and Oreithyia, cp. the great vase, Berlin 2165 (Gerhard *Etrusk. u. Camp. Vas.* xxvi.—xxix.), (3) Tityos and Leto; illustrated by the vase under discussion and by the early r.f. krater *M.d.I.* 1856 X.—one of the more developed examples of the series.

Our stamnos—so far as the fragments permit of its reconstruction—forms a worthy counterpart to the Berlin krater (2180 = *A.Z.* 1879 IV.), which is perhaps the best known vase of the kind, and is often attributed to Euthumides; we may also compare the two vases bearing the inscription *Παναίτιος καλός* (*A.Z.* 1878 XI. and *A.Z.* 1884 XVI.), which are somewhat more advanced in style. The interior of the first-named of this latter pair furnishes us with parallels to two of the figures on our stamnos (1) the figure of whom fragment *c* gives us the lower portion, and who must be reconstructed as an athlete holding a balancing-pole,¹ (2) the discobolus preserved in fragments *d* and *e*, a frequently recurring figure on palaestric vases—cp. the

¹ It is less probable that the figure was holding a cord (cp. Gerhard, *A.V.* 271).

Antiphon of the Berlin krater. Further than this the restoration cannot be considered certain. For the figure on the extreme right we have only the head (fragment *a*) and this might belong either to a boxer avoiding the blows of his adversary, or (as Mr. Cecil Smith suggested to me) to a flute-player, who commonly accompanies athletic exercises (cp. *c.g.* Gerhard, *A.V.* 272). If this be accepted we are left with fragment *b* requiring explanation, and the difficulty is increased partly by the fact that we cannot be certain whether four or five figures were represented on this side of the vase, so that the figure may or may not belong to a group, and secondly, by the difficulty of finding a scheme which will preserve the spacing, since the law of *ισοκεφαλία* was no doubt strictly observed. A second discobolus in an attitude different from that of the first seems very improbable, and a leaper quite out of the question. If we could assume that this side of the vase originally contained five figures, a group of boxers might be reconstructed and our fragment might represent one of them falling backwards and attempting to steady himself.¹ I have, however, as yet arrived at no certain restoration. The drawing of this side of the vase is quite in the same style as that of the British Museum hydria, and we need only call attention to the remarkable triple division of the knee-cap on fragment *d*, contrasting the rough way in which the front view of the right foot of this figure is given, for which a parallel may be found on the Corneto amphora.

Besides the two vases here published, the following works of Phintias have been published or described.

C.—Amphora at Corneto, Museo Tarquiniese. *M.d.I.* xi. 27, 8, *A.d.I.* 1881. pp. 78 *sqq.* (Klein).

Subjects:—

- A.* Herakles carrying off the Tripod of Apollo.
- B.* Dionysos and thiasos.

D.—Cylix, München 401, from Vulci. Jahn, *Berichte der k. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-Hist. Cl., 1853 v., vi. (*A* and *B* only), Overbeck, *Atlas zur Kunstmythologie*, xxiv. 2 (*B* only). Both give very bad reproductions.

Subjects:—

- A.* Herakles about to kill Alkyoneus in presence of Hermes.
- B.* Herakles carrying off the tripod of Apollo.
- I.* Silenus with horn.

This vase also bears the signature of the potter Dein[iad]es.

E.—Small Cylix at Athens, Central Museum, from Tanagra. *Δελτίον* 1888 p. 126, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, x. p. 272. The interior contains the representation of a crouching hoplite removing his helmet.

¹ The group might perhaps be reconstructed somewhat similarly to Benndorf, *Griech. und Sic. Vasenbilder*, XXXI. 2a.

F.—Small cylix at Baltimore, from Chiusi, *Röm. Mitth.* ii. 1886 p. 169 (Hartwig). The interior contains the representation of an ἔφηβος making purchases in a potter's shop. Besides the signature it has the inscription *Χαιρίας καλός*.

G.—Upper half of small vase at Athens, Polytechnion 2786, from Eleusis. *Ἐφ. Ἀρχ.* 1885, pl. IX., 10, p. 174 (Philios), *A.Z.* 1884 p. 251 (Meyer). The vase is in the form of a shell, out of which come a neck and mouth like those of a lekythos.

It is perhaps unsafe to lay too great stress on unsigned vases in discussing the style of a painter: at the same time the example of Brygos shows that they may form a necessary element in estimating the work of a particular artist.¹ I shall therefore not scruple to treat as a work of Phintias

H.—Krater at Petersburg, Hermitage 1275, formerly in the Campana collection. *M.d.I.* vi. 34, *A.d.I.* 1859 pp. 267 *sqq.* (Michaelis), *A.Z.* 1879 pp. 9—11 (Petersen), *Archäologisch-epigraphische Mittheilungen aus Oesterreich* iv. pp. 220—222 (Löwy).

Löwy compares the vase in style to the works of Enthumides; and the extremely bad illustration in the *Monumenti dell' Instituto* affords little ground for discrimination between styles so superficially similar as those of that artist and Phintias. The resemblance between the head of Theseus on the Petersburg krater and that of Herakles on the Corneto amphora is, however, sufficiently striking even in the illustrations. I have not attempted to identify the subjects, since, as was pointed out by Petersen, with whose results I agree in all important particulars after a careful examination of the vase, by far the greater portion of the representation is in each case due to an exceedingly clever restorer, who, however, betrays himself in figures such as that of the Maenad on the reverse.

It might be possible to add several other vases to this list, *e.g.* certain of those which are connected with *F* by the appearance of the love-name Chairias. Before the appearance of Hartwig's *Meisterschalen*, however, it would be rash to assume the connection of these vases with Phintias; moreover, the small cylix, Berlin 4040, and the fragment of a b.f. hydria, Berlin 1909, both of which bear the inscription *Χαιρίας καλός*, cannot in my opinion be attributed to Phintias on grounds of style.

Before discussing the position of Phintias in the history of vase painting it is as well to state that the spelling of the name here adopted is based on the fact that the Attic form Philtias is found only on the München cylix, whereas the Western Doric forms Phintias or Phintis (cf. Pind. *Ol.* vi. 22) are either certain or probable in all other cases. Meyer² is therefore probably right in assuming that the artist was not a native of Athens. It would be unsafe, however, to base on this fact alone the theory (in itself possible) that, like the charioteer celebrated by Pindar, he was a Sicilian, and to connect this with Dümmler's similar suggestion as to Hieron,³ Sikelos, and Sikanos.

¹ See Dümmler, *Bonner Studien*, pp. 70-77.

² *A.Z.* 1884 p. 251.

³ *Bonner Studien*, p. 89.

The list of vases given above enables us to treat of Phintias less summarily than has hitherto been the case. Klein's article accompanying the publication of the Corneto amphora assigns to him a position between Andokides and Euthumides in the series of amphora-painters, and rates his originality at a somewhat low standard. It may be admitted that in point of invention, and especially in interest of subject, our artist does not take a high rank when compared *e.g.* with Euphronios. If, however, the Petersburg krater is rightly included among the works of Phintias, there would be reason to modify this view, while on the other hand the admirably conceived genre-scene from the interior of the Baltimore cylix displays a gift of a different order. The Athens cylix is a piece of admirably fine and careful drawing. The appearance of these small but carefully executed vases beside those of large size finds its parallel in the case of Euthumides, in the list of whose works stands (at present in isolation) the Pinax of the Museo Bocchi (iv. 2 Schöne). This work reminds us in subject—a stooping warrior holding his helmet in his right hand—of the Athens cylix of Phintias, and certainly belongs to the same period. The Museo Bocchi also contains a small cylix (vii. 2 Schöne) with the representation of a youth reclining and playing the *βάρβιτον*, bearing the inscription *Χαιρίας καλός* which may with great probability be attributed to Phintias, and with certainty to a contemporary artist of his school. The series—an extremely numerous one—of pinakes or small cylices with representations only in the interior, is of course a continuation of the tradition of Epiktetos himself, who leads the way in the case of the last-mentioned subject by two cylices which, it is true, also have external representations, Nos. 9 and 10 in Klein's list, both with the love-name *Ἰππαρχος*, to which we shall have to return. It is important to insist on the appearance of the names of Phintias and Euthumides in this connection as a bar to any too pronounced separation of painters of amphorae &c. from painters of cylices.

Bearing this in mind, let us pass on to the larger works of Phintias. Klein,¹ in discussing the Antaios-krater of Euphronios, justly called attention to the appearance of a series of large vases, chiefly kraters of calix-form, at the period of Euphronios' career, and characterised their style as 'eine Steigerung des gleichzeitigen Schalenstiles.' From the kraters of this class it is impossible to separate the few existing psykters,² and various forms of the amphora, such as the Kroesos vase in the Louvre and the Boreas vase in the Berlin Museum. Apart from the evidence of style, the period to which the greater part of these vases belong is fixed by the signatures (Euphronios, Euthumides, [Euxi]theos, Duris) and the love-name Leagros, which occurs on four vases of the class. It is into this circle that we must admit Phintias, who will take his place with the first three artists named as representing an earlier, more severe stage than Duris, in whose psykter

¹ *Euphronios*,² pp. 117 f., 129, &c.

² I have in my possession a small psykter said to come from Tanagra, which has no figure-

subjects, but may be inferred from the ornamentation to belong to this period.

Dümmeler¹ has traced the influence of Brygos. Brygos himself will find a place in the list, if, as I believe to be the case, he was the painter of the great Danae-krater in Petersburg (Hermitage 1723), which deserves a more accurate publication than it has received in Gerhard, *Berliner Winckelmanns-programm*, 1854, from which are derived Welcker, *A.D.* v. pl. XVI., XVII., and Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, 448. The resemblance of this krater to the work of Brygos is apparent from these illustrations, and the attribution is confirmed by an examination of the vase. More particularly I would call attention to the fact that on the *ἰμάτιον* worn by Danae as she sits on the couch I found the rows of small, almost imperceptible dots, suggesting stitches, running in a direction at right angles to the folds of the dress, to which Dümmeler² has called attention as a practice of Brygos, as also to the form assumed by the black edge of the *ἰμάτιον*. Brygos, again, almost entirely gives up the palmettes under the handles of his cylices, and it is quite in keeping with this that the Danae-krater has no ornament above the handles, whereas *e.g.* the Petersburg krater, which I have attributed to Phintias, shows an elaborate system of large palmettes in that place, recalling the krater in Berlin (2180), published by Klein *A.Z.* 1879 pl. IV. and attributed by him to Euthumides. The same use of a luxuriant system of palmettes is found on the stamnos-fragments here published, although unusual in the case of *στάμνοι*, and reminds us of the overgrown palmettes found on early r.f. cylices.

It will thus be seen that a parallel development to that of the painting of cylices went on in the region of the krater, psykter, amphora, &c., to trace the history of which the materials are not sufficiently accumulated. That it was furthered, however, by the same artists in both cases may be seen from the recurrence of the names Euphronios, Duris, Brygos. Perhaps an exaggerated importance has been attached since the appearance of Klein's, *Euphronios* to the development of the cylix. That the krater, for example, is an offshoot of the cylix, as Klein appears to think,³ is a very questionable proposition. An examination of the early r.f. kraters shows that we start with a comparatively heavy form (*Furtwängler* 40 = Berlin 2180), in which the lines of the walls are quite straight, with no curve at all, while the handles take their rise from a very prominent swelling below the decorated surface. Instances of this are the Berlin krater mentioned above and the Petersburg krater, which I attribute to Phintias. The Antaios-krater of Euphronios I have not seen, but the untrustworthy illustration *M. d. I.* 1855 V. is at least not inconsistent with the fact of its possessing a similar form. The Danae krater is somewhat lighter in form and measurably lighter in weight, but the curve is still scarcely perceptible. A series might easily be formed, showing how the graceful calix-form of *e.g.* the Niobid-Argonaut krater from Orvieto was reached.⁴ Now there is at least one

¹ *Bonner Studien*, p. 75 note 11.

² *Bonner Studien*, p. 75.

³ *Euphronios*, pp. 117, 267.

⁴ Cp. forms 194, 5, 6 in Stephani's *Hermitage-catalogue*, Pl. IV.

instance known to me at present of a b.f. krater of the older form—Petersburg 49. Moreover the signed vases of the class (except the psykter of Duris) all belong to the Leagros-period, *i.e.* to a period immediately succeeding the transition of styles; and, in particular, the krater and psykter of Euphronios belong to *his* Leagros-period, *i.e.* to the time before he became a really great cylix-painter. That Phintias belongs to the same period is proved not only by his stylistic affinities, but by his use of the love-name Megakles, which he shares with Euthimides.

The occurrence of a stamnos among his signed works is of great importance as furnishing a link in the history of that vase-form, a history which has yet to be written. Klein¹ remarks that the love-names connect the painters of stamnoi with the great cylix-painters, and it would not be difficult to trace the development of the stamnos through the same stages of style as *e.g.* the krater. I have, it is true, seen no black-figured stamnos. In the collection of drawings, however, preserved in the library of the Berlin Museum there are contained two b.f. vases described in the inventory as stamnoi. The first (Mappe xi. 73) is a vase formerly in the Canino collection. The decoration consists of a series of twenty-four figures, engaged in the exercises of the palaestra. There is no drawing of the form of the vase, and the representation appears to be unbroken by handles, so that the vase may perhaps be a *deinos*—the form from which the stamnos is immediately descended. The second vase (Mappe xiv. 17) might, indeed, be described as a stamnos, if we may trust the drawing, evidently very badly executed. Only one side is represented. On the right is a column with white capital. A youth wearing a band in his hair and a *chlamys* (with white edge) thrown over his shoulders is running to leftwards, looking back at the column. He holds an axe in his right hand. The drawing is quite styleless, and the whole seems to me not above suspicion. In any case it would not be safe to assume that the vase is really archaic. We may therefore treat the existence of b.f. stamnoi as problematical, and proceed to consider early r.f. specimens of the class. The only signatures are those of Pamphaios, whose vase is somewhat exceptional in shape, and Phintias. We do not meet with signed stamnoi again until the time of Hermonax, Polygnotos, and Smikros—who should be placed here if the unsigned vase at Arezzo (*M. d. I.* viii. 6) is really characteristic of his style. Although, however, signatures are absent, the gradation of styles can be traced as clearly as in the case of the krater. The fragment in Berlin (2181) is rightly described by Furtwängler as being ‘in the style of the first period of Euphronios.’ The Orestes vase, on the other hand (Berlin 2184, Gerhard, *Etrusk. Camp. Vas.* xxiv.), shows the distinctive marks of the school of Brygos, although it is not certainly attributable to that master’s own hand. We may remark the form of Orestes’ helmet, which resembles that of the giant on the reverse of the Gigantomachy cylix (Berlin 2293), where Furtwängler rightly calls attention to the forehead-piece apparently formed so as to express the wavy contour of the hair underneath it. This cylix, although unsigned, may with complete

¹ *Vasen mit Lüblingsinschriften*, p. 6.

certainly be attributed to Brygos, and the formation of the helmet described above is, so far as I know, only found on vases resembling the work of Brygos in style.¹ Moreover, the manner in which 'Verzeichnung' is employed is that of Brygos. Whereas in the work of Euphronios, Phintias, &c., the preliminary sketch with the blunt point was made with great care, so that a careful inspection is often necessary in order to determine whether a given vase shows traces of the practice, the vases of Brygos and his school, and among them the Orestes vase, display a free use of the blunt point, which at times is so marked as to suggest the idea that shading was intended *e.g.* on a convex surface like that of the leg, where we often find two or three lines on each side drawn in this manner in the soft clay.² To the same period as the Orestes stamnos will belong that which bears the same love-name, Nikoskratos, at Palermo (1503), figured in Inghirami, *Vasi fittili* 77. 78, while the Medea stamnos (Berlin 2188) is of somewhat more advanced date. Enough has been said to show that the history of the stamnos runs strictly parallel to that of the cylix, and that there is no reason to suppose any division of the branches of industry in the case of vase-painting. To trace the same continuity in the case of the 'Nolan' amphora, 'vaso a colonnette' and pelike would lead us too far from the immediate subject, as we have no signed vases of Phintias belonging to any of these classes. The results of a study of such vases, however, would certainly not militate against the principle here laid down, viz. that in the history of early r.f. vase-painting the development of the cylix cannot be treated in isolation.

We have, then, established the position of Phintias in the group of 'severe' r.f. vase painters of which Euphronios and Euthymides are the leading figures. The first-named is the most versatile member of the circle, as he is also the most original of Greek vase-painters. Euthymides, so far as we know him at present, only departs from the practice of painting large vases in the case of the pinax in the Museo Bocehi, which is, however, of importance as establishing his relations with the Epiktetan circle; while Kachryllion, whose connection with the group may be traced in his use of the love-name Leagros, and in the fact that he made a vase painted by Euphronios, seems to have confined himself to the cylix and pinax. The (fragmentary) signature of [Euxi]theos on the Louvre krater with *Λέαγρος καλός* furnishes a link of connection between our group and that of the 'hieratic' cylix-painters Oltos and Sosias, to the first of whom Euxitheos furnished cylices for painting. An even more direct connection is given by the fragments in the Acropolis Museum published by Winter³ and apparently signed by Euphronios, which treat the legend of Pelcus and Thetis quite in the 'hieratic' manner. The characteristic phenomena of this class of vases are well known. In the first place, we have traces that the artists had not

¹ Cp. the unsigned vase of Brygos *Archaeologia*, xxxii. 8, 9, 11, which also shows the rows of dots.

² An interesting parallel to the Danae-krater

is furnished by the Danae-stamnos (*M.d.I.* 1856 viii.), in the developed style of Hieron and Brygos.

³ *Jahrbuch*, 1888, ii.

yet freed themselves from the restraints of b.f. technique. The use of the incised line is the best known of these indications. Phintias, Euthimides and Kachrylion use it commonly to represent the outline of the hair, &c., Klein, it is true, states¹ that Euphronios never employs it. He attributes, however, to that artist the external decoration of the British Museum cylix signed by Pamphaios, where the incised hair-outline more than once occurs, while it is found on a recently-discovered fragment of the Peleus-Thetis vase from the Acropolis. The use of purple, as Schneider pointed out,² is also a survival from b.f. painting. A characteristic instance may be noted in the case of the Antiopcia cylix of Kachrylion in the British Museum, where the drawing is of the most developed r.f. style, showing the influence of Euphronios, while the tails of two of the horses attached to Theseus' chariot remind one of similar horse-tails on b.f. vases. They are filled in, in the one case with purple, in the other with white, and the outlines are incised.

The second notable characteristic of our group is a marked conventionality, not to say stylization, which shows itself (1) in the drawing of garments with severely geometrical 'swallow-tail' folds, (2) in a highly elaborated and conventional system of drawing the nude, in order to indicate muscles, ribs, &c. This is usually executed with thin varnish. Among conventional devices may also be classed that of representing curly hair by rows of raised points laid on in black varnish, the so-called 'Buckellöckchen.' The extraordinary care with which these were formed is well illustrated by the Petersburg krater which I assign to Phintias. A break runs through the back of the head of Theseus, and the restorer has been forced to imitate the 'Buckellöckchen,' but has entirely failed to lay on the black varnish with the certainty of touch of the original artist. On holding the vase to the light the superior regularity of the small raised cones in the original parts of the head is manifest, and was rightly used by Petersen as a criterion for denying the genuineness of the head of the fallen warrior, otherwise a marvellously clever piece of imitation. A masterpiece of this conventional art is the Antaios-krater of Euphronios, which combines in one the stylised drawing of the nude illustrated by the British Museum hydria of Phintias, and the geometrical garments to be seen on the obverse of his stannos.

In respect of technical skill we must assign a high place to Phintias among the exponents of this system of drawing. Both in his larger vases such as the Corneto amphora and in such a small gem as the Athens cylix the resources of the school are displayed to the full. Details such as the eyelashes, the down on the cheek, and the circle of dots representing the hair on the nipple of the male breast are carefully put in, and the contours are drawn with an admirable firmness of touch. Except when looked at under the technical aspects, however, the art of Phintias is not entitled to a high degree of admiration. Originality of conception and inventive genius are not qualities which can be attributed to him. He remains at the standpoint of the earlier works of Euphronios, and does not appear to have been carried away by the influence

¹ *Euphronios*,² p. 271.

² *Jahrbuch*, 1889 p. 199.

of the superior originality of that artist as shown in his later productions. Like Euphronios in his earlier days, Phintias treats by preference the current subjects from the myths of Herakles which formed the staple of b.f. vase-painting. Twice he gives us the contest for the Delphic tripod, a subject in the treatment of which he seems to be under the influence of Andokides, although in each case he shows a slightly differing type, as indeed the type of this scene was, it would seem, one of the most unfixed in the *répertoire* of the b.f. vase-painters. It is unfortunately impossible to identify with certainty the subject of the obverse of the stamnos and those of the unsigned Petersburg krater: the latter, if complete, would no doubt show an advance in respect of originality. The main subject of the British Museum hydria is a somewhat ingenious variation of the scene so common on later b.f. hydriæ, where a procession of maidens is represented in the act of drawing water from a fountain. The change of sex gave the artist an opportunity for displaying to the full his powers of drawing the nude; while on the shoulder of the same vase we have one of the long series of scenes from the symposion which suddenly make their appearance at this epoch—a scene exactly similar to that which Euthumides considered sufficient decoration for his hydria now preserved at Bonn.¹ In the palaestric scene on the reverse of the stamnos Phintias is again drawing on the common stock of his contemporary artists and produces a picture worthy to take its place beside the well-known krater in Berlin (2180) already referred to, generally attributed to Euthumides.

We may now consider what the period was of which Phintias is so characteristic a representative. I have called it above the Leagros-period, from the love-name which is most characteristic, and which links together the largest number of artists. From our present point of view, however, it might with equal justice be called the Megakles-period, since the name of Megakles, which we find on the British Museum hydria, forms a link between Phintias and Euthumides. The question is, Do these names furnish us with any external evidence, and if so, of what nature, towards determining the date of the vase-painters who employ them?

Since Studniczka's article in the *Jahrbuch* of 1887 there has been a widely-spread tendency to push back the date of the transition of styles into the end of the Peisistratid period. Klein, in the introduction to his *Vasen mit Lieblinginschriften*, has tried to counteract this theory. His treatment of the evidence centres on two main points of importance.

(1) The chronology of Leagros and Glaukon, whose names mark the beginning and end of the career of Euphronios. Leagros was killed when commanding in Thrace in 467 B.C., Glaukon commanded the Athenian fleet in 432 B.C. Assuming them to have been youthful knights about twenty years before those dates, we should get 490—450 as the period of the activity of Euphronios, and the beginnings of r.f. vase-painting would be thrown back to a period shortly before the Persian wars.

¹ A.Z. 1873, ix.

(2) The pinax in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford with the inscription *Μιλτιάδης καλός* and the representation of a 'Persian rider' is an advanced work of Epiktetos, stylistically parallel to his two signed vases bearing the inscription *Ἴππαρχος καλός*. It was painted, according to Klein's theory, under the inspiration of Marathon and must be dated about 488 B.C. This being the case, the Hipparchos whose name appears on the vases of Epiktetos cannot be the son of Peisistratos, as Studniczka would have us believe. It is not as a matter of fact true that the name Hipparchos disappears from Athenian history after 514 B.C. The name of the archon of 496 B.C. is sufficient to disprove this.

It appears to me that Klein's argumentation on these points is in some details open to criticism. I write on this subject, however, with much diffidence, as the subject is shortly to be treated by Studniczka. Nevertheless, as I stated some portion of the argument in a paper read at Athens in March immediately after the publication of Aristotle's treatise *περὶ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας*, I shall restate my views shortly in this context. Firstly, as to the Miltiades pinax. That the rider is necessarily a Persian from the army of Darius is in no way proved. Klein compares the painted statue now in the Acropolis Museum. Even the sex of this latter figure is not certain, and it has frequently been held to be an Amazon. That the figure belonged to a monument in memory of Marathon seems quite inconsistent with its style, which can scarcely be placed later than the close of the sixth century. There is therefore no reason why the Oxford pinax should not represent *e.g.* a Scythian horseman. As to Miltiades, the question as to his whereabouts between 512 B.C. and 496 B.C. has, as is well known, never been answered. But is there any reason to suppose that he may not have spent at least a portion of that time in Athens? If the Epiktetos pinax be rightly referred, as I believe, to that period, a date will be arrived at which I should consider more in harmony with facts and with the time necessary for the development of vase-painting than the dates either of Studniczka or of Klein. To uphold Studniczka's date we should almost be forced to assume that the Miltiades mentioned was the elder of that name, killed in 515 B.C. and this seems very improbable, whereas the assumption that the victor of Marathon is the person named, and that the painting of the Scythian rider refers to his adventures in the north, creates no difficulty.

Another line of argument converging on the same result is furnished by the information given in the Aristotelian work *περὶ Ἀθηναίων πολιτείας* as to the ostracism of Hipparchos, Megakles, and Xanthippos. From the eighteenth chapter of this work we obtain the following series of dates:—

- 488. Ostracism of Hipparchos, son of Charmos.
- 487. Ostracism of Megakles, son of Hippokrates.
- 486. Ostracism of Xanthippos, son of Aripbron.

As is well known, *ὄστρακα* used on the two latter occasions are preserved to us:—

(1) the *ὄστρακον* published by Benudorf, *Griechische und Sicilische Vasenbilder*, xxix. 10, inscribed *Μεγακλῆς Ἴπποκράτους Ἄλωπεκῆθεν*, which

confirms the statement of Aristotle as against those of the Orators, who refer the ostracism to the maternal grandfather of Alcibiades, who was the son of Kleisthenes, and first cousin of Megakles the son of Hippokrates.¹

(2) the *ὄστρακον*—a fragment of carelessly painted b.f. work—published by Studniczka in the *Jahrbuch*, 1887 p. 161, inscribed *Ξάνθειππος Ἀρρίφρονος*.

The identification of Megakles the son of Hippokrates with the person celebrated by Phintias and Euthumides is accepted as at least probable by Klein, and it seems to be supported by the polychrome pinax in the Acropolis Museum published by Beudorf (*Εφ. Ἀρχ.* 1887 VI.), where the name *Μεγακλῆς* has been erased and *Γλαυκύτης* substituted. The style of the drawing is not at all dissimilar to that of the two artists mentioned. It may very well be a work of Euthumides.

I should further identify the Hipparchos celebrated by Epiktetos, not, as Studniczka does, with the tyrant, but with his brother-in-law, the son of Charmos.² Studniczka³ argues that both this individual, having been the first person ostracised after the expulsion of the tyrants, and the (possibly identical) archon of 496, would have been in the flower of their youth while the Peisistratidae still reigned. It is, however, unnecessary to suppose that the epithet *καλός* was applied only to *ἔφηβοι*. No doubt the name of any politician or prominent personage who happened to enjoy a passing popularity might appear in the same formula. And in the light of the information derived from the newly discovered treatise of Aristotle, which shows us that Hipparchos remained in Athens until 488 B.C., the history of vase-painting may be placed on a satisfactory chronological basis by the assumption that the career of Epiktetos and the popularity of Hipparchos and Miltiades fall within the closing decade of the sixth century, while the period of Megakles' fame will be placed some years later and abruptly terminated by his ostracism in 487 B.C., at which date his name had probably stood for no long period on the Acropolis pinax from which it was erased. The name of his father, Hippokrates, the brother of Kleisthenes, appears, as might be expected, on b.f. hydriæ, while that of his son Euryptolemos occurs on cylices in the advanced style of Duris.

Our final result, then, occupies an intermediary position between the chronologies of Studniczka and Klein, and is attained by taking as a starting-point, not the Leagros-Glaukon chronology of the latter, which could without great difficulty be harmonised with the dates given above, nor the Hipparchos chronology of the former, which is based on a confusion of persons, but the chronology whose fixed point is the ostracism of Megakles, who is celebrated on the hydria of Phintias.

H. STUART JONES.

¹ *Lys. c. Alc.* 1. 39. *Pseud.-Andoc. c. Alc.* 34. *Hist. Grec.* i. p. 364).

² Kleitolemos *op. Ath.* 609 c. (*Müller, Frag.* ³ *Jahrbuch* 1887, p. 166.

THE NORTH DOORWAY OF THE ERECHTHEUM.

MR. SCHULTZ in his paper upon the above subject, published in the last number of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, pointed out some interesting facts which had not been hitherto noticed, and also advanced several new theories. My object in writing the following notes is to draw attention to one of the theories put forward by him and which I do not think he has proved. And I do this the more willingly as Mr. Schultz at the close of his article expressly states that he gives his theories in order to open up further discussion on the subject. The point I refer to is the contention that the present door-jambs are not contemporary with the rest of the building, and that the decorations of the original doorway were much simpler.


Towards the end of the article, classed under points of miscellaneous evidence, mention is made of some iron cramps 'the principal use for which would have been to steady the jambs, not actually to tie them back.' Now these cramps, which Mr. Schultz considers of such slight importance, appear to me to be the main evidence as to whether the present jambs are original or not, for if it can be proved that the cramps have been in any way altered, or if they are not fulfilling the purpose for which they were placed in the wall, then we have certain proof that the jambs are later.

Fortunately part of the second course of the walling on the east side of the doorway is broken away, which enables us to examine one of these cramps (see photograph, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. xii. Plate 1). When examining and taking measurements of this cramp I discovered that the tail-piece in the jamb still retains some of its lead fixing, and this lead could only have been *run in* to the mortise-hole *before* the third course of walling was laid, and so on for each successive cramp, or in other words the jamb stone must have been hoisted up into position before the walling was built, and then as each course of stone was laid the cramps were fixed, first the T-shaped end into the wall, and then the lead *run in* to the tail-piece in the jamb and the 'slightly wider and downward turn of the holes' was *not* to allow the jambs to be adjusted into position, but was necessary for the lead to run down and form a key, and also to enable the tail-end of the cramps to be placed in the jamb before the T end could be put in the block of the wall, as otherwise it would not have been possible to fix the cramp at all. (See Plan and Section.) This then to me is conclusive evidence that the jambs as they exist are original and contemporary with the building.

The use of these cramps was certainly to tie back the jambs and *not*, as Mr. Schultz says, simply to steady them. The rebating of the jamb on to

the wall (A on plan) would prevent any lateral movement towards the interior, but the inclination inwards of the jambs at the top would certainly necessitate the use of such cramps to tie them back to counteract any tendency of falling in.

As far as I can understand from Mr. Schultz's article the reason he ascribes for the present jambs being later is that, 'when the first lintel was broken they found it practically impossible to cut out the whole of the lintel and replace it as it stood, so they altered the arrangement and design of the door by putting in new heavy jambs in one stone strong enough to support the new lintel, and so did away with the necessity of again resting and tying it into the wall on each side'; but surely this is very slight evidence upon which to base such an assertion, for when the building was being erected the natural way would have been to tail in the lintel stone, however strong the jambs



were, and afterwards when the first lintel was broken the simplest and most practical way of repairing the damage would be not to tail in the ends of the lintel, but to support it on the jambs, provided they were strong enough, and the fact that the present jambs are strong enough is no reason that there were earlier ones that were not.

Mr. Schultz also calls attention to the fact that the ornament on the jambs differs considerably from that of the rest of the building, and seems to assume from this that the present jambs must be later, although at the same time he says the detail is quite equal to any of the other decorations for delicacy and refinement of execution. In answer to this the question naturally arises, Why should not the decoration of such a special feature as this doorway differ from the other parts of the building?

If then it can be proved by the existence of the cramps that the present jambs are original, the theory put forward by Mr. Schultz and also by Mr. Ernest Gardner that the *θύραι* of the inscription were jamb stones belonging to this doorway falls to the ground, and the question as to the meaning of the terms *θύραι* and *ζυγά* remains still undecided.

Mr. Gardner on page 15 speaking of Michaelis' interpretation as representing the leaves and rails of a door says, 'There are serious difficulties in the way of such an interpretation, especially since a door with marble leaves seems very improbable.' There is certainly no existing example as far as I know of such a door belonging to classic times, though many stone doors still remain in Syria and there are two examples of marble doors of Byzantine times, probably following Greek tradition, one in the gallery of S. Sophia, Constantinople, and another pair of doors, now used as wall panelling in the *Μονὴ τῆς Χώρας* also at Constantinople, a drawing of which was published by Prof. Aitchison in the *Builder* of February 28th 1891. The sizes of these latter doors agree very nearly with the dimensions given in the Erechtheum inscription.

There is also another point about the inscription I would mention, though perhaps not much value can be attached to it, and it is that the dimensions given are $8\frac{1}{4}$ feet high by $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet broad with no third dimension for the depth or thickness, an omission which might well be allowed in describing a thin slab of marble like a door, where it is the superficial area which is wanted, but not at all likely to be omitted in giving the dimensions of a door-jamb where it is the cubical area which is required.

If I may be allowed to add another theory to the many which have already been advanced as to the position of these four *θύραι* in the building, it is that they formed two pairs of doors, connecting the two aisles with the western part of the building—and the sizes of which would be $8\frac{1}{4}$ feet high by 5 feet wide. The two openings in the western cross-wall as shown in Mr. Penrose's plan of the Erechtheum (*Principles of Athenian Architecture*, 2nd edition) are exactly this width, namely 5 feet, though as Mr. Penrose says, 'The width of these aisles shown in the restored plan is derived from the doorways which lately existed in the western wall, but their exact original position must be considered indeterminate because the whole interior of the temple, including the western cross wall appears to have been much altered.' If one allows that the *θύραι* were doors, then, according to Mr. E. Gardner's interpretation of the inscription, the difficulty about the *ζυγά* is at once explained, by taking them to be the rails of the doors into which black stones were inlaid as decorations; and as the features of a marble door would in all probability be borrowed from a wooden one, so would these names also be borrowed from the same source. This method of inlaying different materials as decorations we know was used elsewhere in the Erechtheum, as for instance the inlaid centres of different coloured glass or stone in the interlacing ornament round the capitals of the north portico.

AN INSCRIPTION FROM EGYPT.

ΘΕΑΜΕΓΙΣΤΗ
 ΕΙΣΙΔΙ ΕΝΜΑΛΑΛΙ
 ΕΙΣΙΔΩΡΟΣ
 5 ΠΙΑΘΡΗΟΥΣΚΑΤΕΣΚΕΥΑΣΕΝ
 ΕΚΤΟΥΙΔΙΟΥΕΥΣΕΒΕΙΑΣΧΑΡΙΝ
 ΕΠΑΓΑΘΩΙ
 ΛΙΘΑΥΤΟΚΡΑΤΟΡΟΣΚΑΙΣΑΡΟΣΤΙΤΟΥ
 ΑΙΛΙΟΥΑΔΡΙΑΝΟΥΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΟΥΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ
 ΕΥΣΕΒΟΥΣ'/// ΦΑΩΦΙ

θεᾷ μεγίστη
Εἰσιδι ἐν Μαλάλι
Εἰσίδωρος
Πιαθρηῶς κατεσκεύασεν
ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου εὐσεβείας χάριν
ἐπ' ἀγαθῶι
Λιθ̄ αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτου
Αἰλίου Αδριάνου Ἀντονίνου Σεβαστοῦ
Εὐσεβοῦς. φαωφί.

A rectangular slab of marble, measuring 14½ in. × 12 in. × nearly 1¼. Brought from Egypt in 1890 by Prof. W. Robertson Smith, now in the library of Christ's College, Cambridge; said to have been found in the neighbourhood of Memphis.

Dated the nineteenth year of Antoninus Pius, A.D. 157.

The letters are not all of the same size or shape, being squarer in the upper part of the inscription, 1-3, as \square , and in the rest, especially the last three lines, approaching to the shape of written characters, as ζ , ϵ , λ , δ . They have been coloured red, and many of them still are so.

(2) *Μάλαλις*, (4) *Πιαθρηῶς*: I can find no trace of these places. The second, Prof. W. R. Smith suggests, may be the Place of Hathor.

(6) Iota adscript kept in this old formula, although it is omitted in (1).

W. H. D. ROUSE.

ARCHAEOLOGY IN GREECE.

1890—91.

THE season which is to be recorded in the following pages has been marked by a persevering and wide-spread activity, both on the part of the Greek Government and the Archaeological Society, and also among all the foreign schools established in Athens. This activity has been rewarded by results which are in many cases very interesting; but at the same time there are no discoveries to record so fortunate and brilliant as those which gave us last season the gold cups of Baphion or the great group by Damophon at Lycosura. One fact, however, is of higher importance than any single discovery. The long-postponed excavation of Delphi has at last been formally conceded to the French School. Those who have heard of the complicated negotiations which have been going on about this matter for the last few years may be surprised to hear that the original draft of the contract, which was published last spring, bears the date 1887. But it did not receive the Royal assent and so become law until 13/25 April, 1891. The chief features of the agreement, which follows the same lines as that made with the Germans about Olympia, are as follows. Right of compulsory expropriation is given, as in the case of roads and railways; all land thus acquired becomes the property of the Greek Government, as also do all antiquities of any kind which may be discovered. On the other hand the right of excavation is given to the French for ten years, and also the exclusive right of copying, photographing, and publishing all antiquities discovered for five years from the date of discovery in each case. The expropriation of the village of Castri is a difficult and tedious process; but it is to be hoped that work will actually begin upon the site of Delphi during the coming season. All will await its results with the highest interest, and with confidence that the French School, under the able direction of M. Homolle, will carry out the excavations with the same high efficiency that has marked its other undertakings.

The excavation of the Acropolis at Athens had been completed before my last report; but one or two inscriptions, which though previously found had neither been pieced together nor published, call for notice. In referring to these, as for much other information, I am indebted to the official *Δελτίον*, edited by M. Cabbadias. Dr. Lolling's publications and notes upon inscriptions in this periodical are of the highest interest; and the descriptions

and plans of recently discovered monuments, which take a more prominent place than before, add greatly to its scientific value. It is only to be regretted that, in conjunction with this higher efficiency, a greater punctuality in the production of the monthly numbers cannot be attained. The difficulties in the way of such an improvement are obvious, but the gain would certainly be proportionate.¹

The most important of the inscriptions has been pieced together out of forty-one fragments, nine of them already published in the *Attic Corpus*, and is published by Dr. Lolling in the *Δελτίον*, and discussed by him at greater length in the *Ἀθηνᾶ*. It is concerning a temple described in the inscription as the *Hecatompedon*; it seems nearly certain that the two slabs on which the inscription is cut formed part of the anta of this temple itself. Thus we have it proved that at the time when the inscriptions were cut—probably in the last quarter of the sixth century, and certainly long before the present Parthenon was built—there existed a building with the name *hecatompedon*; its relation to the Parthenon, and the manner in which its name became transferred, if it was so transferred, to the cella of the later building, are matters of controversy which cannot be touched here; but it must be acknowledged that *τὰ οἰκήματα τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἑκατομπέδῳ* is a description fitting remarkably well the plan of the temple just south of the Erechtheum. Dr. Lolling's attempt to connect all later inscriptions that mention the *Hecatompedon* with this early temple, and not with the Parthenon, seems open to much graver doubts, and will hardly meet with universal acceptance.

Another short inscription is worth quoting in full; it runs:—

*τήνδε κόρην ἀνέθηκεν ἀπαρχὴν . . . λοχος ἄγρας
ἦν οἱ Ποντομέδων χρυσοστραίων ἔπορει.*

Here it seems that we have a help in the difficult problem of the identification of the female statues found in such numbers on the Acropolis—or rather a warning against any attempt to identify them, since the dedicator himself was content to call his offering ‘a maiden’; we have also a warning against drawing any conclusions from the nature of the offering as to the sex or character of either deity or worshipper, since the one is Poseidon in this case, the other a fisherman. Other inscriptions which were found on the Acropolis contain dedications to Zeus *καταιβάτης*, Zeus *Ναῖος*, Dione, and Zeus *Polieus*.

A good many very interesting discoveries have resulted, as was to be expected, from the extension of the Piræus Railway. The line taken by the new cutting proceeds parallel to the *Hermes Street* across the district north of the *Theseum*, and then it bends at right angles, and proceeds along the *Athena Street* to the *Place de la Concorde* (*Ὁμόνοια*). On a spot which lies upon a straight line drawn from the *Theseum* to the *Dipylon Gate*, several inscriptions were found *in situ*, which have a special interest from the record

¹ For many of the facts recorded in this paper I am indebted to this invaluable journal; and I wish to express once more my obligation to it throughout.

they contain that they were set up in the temenos of the Demos and the Charites. It was known before, from a throne in the theatre and other evidence, that a common cult of these divinities existed; but its seat is now ascertained for the first time. Unfortunately Pausanias does not mention their temenos by name, or we should have gained a valuable point in the much-disputed topography of his route; but it is suggested with much probability that it was among the *ἱερά θεῶν* that he speaks of as adjoining one of the porticoes that led from the gate to the Ceramicus. In any case, the contents of the inscriptions, which are mostly in memory of public and political services, seem to imply that they were set up in or near the Agora, the centre of public life; and thus we have a distinct gain in the evidence as to the most difficult of all problems in Athenian topography. Another discovery, made only about 40 yards east of these inscriptions, is in itself of still higher interest, for it gives us one more work which, if it cannot be reckoned as an original from the hand of one of the great masters of antiquity, may at least be a subordinate part of his design. It consists of a square basis, surmounted by what appears to be the base of a circular pedestal; on each of three sides is represented a tripod and a figure of a horseman, in relief; on the fourth side is the inscription:—

Φυλαρχοῦντες ἐνίκων ἀνθιππασία
 Δημαινετος Δημέου Παιανεύς,
 Δημέας Δημαινέτου Παιανεύς,
 Δημοσθένης Δημαινέτου Παιανεύς.
 Βρύαξις ἐποίησεν.

It is clear, as Dr. Lolling remarks, that the victories in the contest of the *ἀνθιππασία*, or cavalry manœuvres—as described by Xenophon in his *Hippiarchicus*, iii. 11 *sqq.*—must have been won by Demaenetus and his two sons at different times, when they successively held the office of Phylarch. What the offering was is not clear; it may have been a tripod, but it appears from the mention of the artist's name to have been some other more sculptural work. In any case it was probably an early work of Bryaxis, before he was associated with Scopas in the sculptural decoration of the Mausoleum, and was probably dedicated about the middle of the 4th century. The reliefs upon the basis may well be considered as bearing as close a relation to Bryaxis as the Mantinean reliefs, from the basis of the great group of Leto Apollo and Artemis, bear to Paraxteles. But it must be confessed that, judged by this standard, the new reliefs are disappointing, though of course the subject offers no very great scope for originality. The horse is well designed, but is mechanically repeated upon all three sides; and the execution in detail does not rise above artisans' work. It is natural to compare at once the horses in the Mausoleum frieze; and some points certainly do seem to show resemblance: the result of a more careful investigation and comparison will be interesting. The basis has now been placed in the National Museum.

Another inscription found in the railway cutting tells us of the evil days of Athens; it belonged to an honorary statue set up by the Athenians to C. Carrinas Secundus, the envoy sent by Nero to ransack Greece for statues to fill the gaps made by the great fire at Rome. By this honour, and by making him eponymous archon, as we learn from this inscription, the Athenians seem to have tried to induce him to spare the art treasures of their city.

Two inscriptions mentioning the temenos of Artemis Soteira have been found in the excavations near the Dipylon Gate. Hence it would appear that she had a shrine in this region, possibly the same as that mentioned by Pausanias as 'on the way to the Academy.'

The tombs of Athens and Attica have during the past season been carefully investigated, chiefly by M. Stais on behalf of the Greek government; and a systematic excavation of them has given us valuable information about a period for which evidence has hitherto been strangely wanting in Greece—that which comes between the so-called Mycenaean civilisation and the earliest historical remains. Meanwhile the cemeteries of Athens too have continued to yield results of all periods. The tomb-reliefs near the Dipylon Gate have received the addition of another sculptured stela with a maiden holding an oenochoe—a very graceful figure: it was discovered in the excavations directed by M. Mylonas for the Archaeological Society. Further out, in the outer Ceramicus, the Government has been examining a very interesting cemetery—in the same neighbourhood where the great Gorgon vase, now pieced together and preserved in the National Museum, was discovered in the spring of 1890. In the more recent excavations, in the spring of 1891, three cemeteries have been found, one above another. The earliest of these belongs to the seventh century: in it we find burial, not burning, customary. Here many large and small vases of the Dipylon type have been found; and it is recorded that in some cases large Dipylon vases have actually been discovered *in situ*, set up as monuments over tombs; thus what has long been surmised is now finally proved. The date of this cemetery is fortunately proved by two small lions of Egyptian porcelain, with hieroglyphic inscriptions; these are of a fabric known to belong to the seventh century.¹ In the same tomb was also found an ivory female statuette. The second cemetery is pre-Persian; in it the corpses were burnt, and in one case was an air-channel to facilitate burning in the grave itself, as at Bourbá (see below, and this *Journal*, 1890, p. 212). Here we find also the same system of graves covered by tumuli, and in some cases by tombs of unburnt bricks. The third cemetery consists of graves dug in these tumuli; the bodies are not burnt, and some are in stone coffins; these burials are not earlier than the fourth century B.C.

The tumuli at Belanideza and at Bourbá were excavated in the season 1889-90, and I referred to them briefly in my last report. But since then full descriptions (by M. Stais) and plans of them (by M. Kawerau) have

¹ Mr. Petrie, who examined these with me, concurs in this statement; it is made also by M. Cabbalias in the *Δελτίον*.

been published in the *Δελτίον*, and it is therefore now possible to describe them more accurately, and to correct some errors in my previous account.

Belanideza, which preserves, in its meaning, the name of the ancient deme *Φήγους* (*Βελανιδιά* = oak-tree), is the place where the stela of Aristion was discovered; but it is unknown whether it came from the same tumulus: fragmentary inscriptions from some early stelae were found in the excavation. In the tumulus is a double enclosure; the outer consisting of square blocks of 'porus' or rough limestone alternating with baked bricks, the inner of baked bricks only. Without counting later tombs, there are nineteen of about the same period within this enclosure; but all are not contemporary, as is proved both by their position and their contents. Two graves in the middle have a common monument of rough stones built over them; this was evidently meant to be seen, and must therefore be earlier than the tumulus. The tumulus was probably piled up when the third grave was made; and then all the later ones were excavated in it round the edge, the middle, where the three earlier graves were, being respected. The two earliest tombs have the hollowed air-channel now often found in early Attic tombs, to facilitate burning the corpse in the grave, and were actually full of ashes. The third tomb, and some others, contained traces of a wooden coffin in which the corpse was buried; this was sometimes let into a narrower hollow in the bottom of the grave itself, which is coated on the sides with clay. These graves contain black-figured vases, and seem to belong to the sixth century. Later graves in the same tumulus (of the fifth and fourth centuries) contain white and red-figured lecythi; these have no coffins. Then again there are burials, apparently of Roman period, in which stone coffins are found.

Similar tumuli have been excavated elsewhere in the same neighbourhood. At Petreza was another tumulus with central and surrounding graves; and in the earliest of these was a black-figured vase with a sixth century inscription. But the largest and most interesting of all is the tumulus at Bourbá, of which also a full description and plans, by the same authors, have been published in the *Δελτίον*. Here, in addition to later graves, excavated in the tumulus, there are three tombs which must have been built before the digging of the open grave over which it was piled, and there was also a monument, consisting of a statue (of which the feet only are preserved) upon a basis consisting of four steps: on the top step is a sixth century inscription...*φίλης παιδὸς κατέθηκεν καλὸν ἰδέϊν, αὐτὰρ Φαίδιμος εἰργάσατο*. The most interesting of the tombs is one which has an oblong monument of unbaked bricks built over it; the roof of this monument is of clay, and on it lay fourteen large stones, irregularly disposed. In this grave the body had been burnt, and the usual air-channel is found, as in the other early graves here. The two other built tombs consist of rough stones. Near the brick tomb is a furrow dug in the earth, evidently as a place for offerings to the dead; it contained broken vases of archaic period, and bones of birds. The statue above spoken of was at the corner of the mound away from the earliest tombs: it may perhaps belong to a slightly later one; but it was

not near any: the basis and feet have now been removed to the National Museum.

The tumulus of Marathon has also been excavated by M. Stais. After some insufficient investigations that had previously been made a report was spread that the tumulus was prehistoric, and had nothing to do with the battle. But it now proves that the 'soros,' as it is usually called, is certainly of the grave of the 192 Athenians who fell at Marathon. Beneath the tumulus was found a stratum about 85 feet long by 20 broad, consisting of a layer of sand, above which lay the ashes and bones of many corpses, together with lecythi and other vases of the style which prevailed at the time of the Persian wars. In the middle was one large vase, of strange technique, containing ashes. It is conjectured, not without probability, by M. Stais that this may have been the burial urn of one of the Athenian generals who fell. But in any case there can be no more doubt that we see in this tumulus the monument of those who fell in the first great victory of Greece over Persia, and that modern scepticism must for once give way to an identification hallowed by all the associations of the spot.

But the list of tomb-sites in Attica explored during the past season is not yet exhausted. At Thoricus a domed tomb of 'Mycenaean' period has been discovered; the unique peculiarity of this tomb lies in the fact that it has also a vaulted 'dromos.' Near it was a small building containing fragments of vases—doubtless a pit for offerings to the dead, like the trench found at Bourbá. At Thoricus also was found an inscription, ὄρος ἱεροῦ Διὸς Ἀντιῆρος (on the stone Δ is cut by mistake for the first Α).

At Bari, which has long been known to contain many ancient cemeteries, some exploratory digging has been done, but it does not seem to have led to any very important results, chiefly because almost all the tombs, being easy to distinguish and to excavate, have fallen a prey to speculative tomb-robbers. The tombs at Bari seem to fall into three classes—tumuli such as those found elsewhere; square-built tombs like those at Eretria, with earlier burials beneath the original surface of the ground, and later ones in the heaped-up earth; and common cemeteries. In one large mound, which contained many tombs but has not yet been completely cleared, was found a portion of an archaic female statue, doubtless once belonging to a monument like that at Bourbá.

Though the chief energy of the Government has been directed to excavations in Attica, other sites have not been neglected. At Lycosura, where the great group by Danophon was discovered, and where the heavier portions of that group still remain, awaiting the construction of a road to bring them down to Athens, the excavation of the temple has been completed, and a plan by M. Kawerau is promised. On the authority of the same architect it is stated that two periods of construction can be recognised in the building; the foundations and the lower course of large stones have no lime mortar, but only clay, used in their construction. I may add that all the details of the work bear the strongest resemblance to what is almost certainly fourth century building at Megalopolis; so that there is no difficulty

in reconciling the architectural evidence with the date of the sculptor Damophon. There was a reconstruction in Roman times, and later too the building was used for other purposes; but of course vicissitudes like this, which have come to most of the temples in Greece, do not in any way affect the evidence as to the original purpose and period of the building.

At Rhamnus, where M. Stais has been excavating for the Archaeological Society, some very interesting statues and reliefs have been discovered. The investigations conducted here by the Society of Dilettanti at the beginning of this century must have been very slight, or they would hardly have left the best of the harvest to be reaped by later hands. In the larger temple, which all have recognised as the temple of Nemesis mentioned by Pausanias, were found many fragments of small figures in half-relief, which doubtless come from the basis of the great statue made by Phidias or Agoracritus. Some of the figures from this basis were recognised by Leake when he visited Rhamnus. The fragments now discovered consist of two female heads, and a portion of another, a head of a young man, and a head of a horse; also of a male and a female torso, the legs of a male figure, and others. Some of these may be identified with probability or even certainty from the description of Pausanias, who says that the relief carved on the basis represented Leda bringing Helen to Nemesis, and Tyndareus and his sons and a man with a horse called Hippus; and also Agamemnon, Menelaus, and Pyrrhus the son of Achilles, and other figures.

In the smaller temple even more works of sculpture have been found; and three inscribed bases too, together with the statues belonging to them. These have all been now transported to the National Museum at Athens, where they nearly fill a special room. They were found *in situ* at the west end of the cella; and they confirm the evidence already given by the two chairs, dedicated one to Nemesis and the other to Themis, which stood on each side of the door of this temple. These chairs alone were enough to show, as Leake observed, that the temple continued in use after the construction of the larger one, although it belonged to an earlier period originally: but the later discoveries show that it was still used, at least to house statues in, until Hellenistic or even Roman times. It will be remembered that the English excavators found a draped female figure of archaic style here, which they supposed to be the temple statue. The finest of the statues found by M. Stais probably represents the goddess Themis herself; it is a figure over life size, and is a good specimen of Attic fourth century work. It shows considerable breadth of treatment and dignity of conception, although the proportions and modelling of the body are somewhat clumsy. Still, no one who sees the statue mounted in its place can fail to be impressed by the excellence of its general effect. The inscription on the basis of this statue runs as follows, in characters of the end of the fourth or the beginning of the third century: Μεγακλῆς Μεγακλέους Ῥαμνούσιος ἀνέθηκεν Θέμιδι, στεφανωθείς ὑπὸ τῶν δημοτῶν δικαί | σοῦνης ἕνεκα ἐπὶ ἱερείας Καλλιστοῦς, καὶ νικήσας παισὶ καὶ ἀνδράσι γυμνασιάρχων καὶ | κομφοδοῖς χορηγῶν. The last two words are added below at the right hand of the line; at the left end is

another addition *καὶ Φειδοστράτης Νεμ. τεῖ ἱερέας*. In the middle of the plinth is the artist's signature

Χαιρέστρατος Χαιρεδήμου Παμνύσιος ἐποίησε.

We see from this that there must have been some confusion in the relation of the cults of the two goddesses, since the name of the priestess of Nemesis is inserted as an afterthought, perhaps in consequence of a protest on her part. Another basis, which records the dedication of the statue of a priestess of Nemesis, Aristonoe, is dedicated to Themis and Nemesis in common. On the whole, it seems that there is no sufficient reason for rejecting the old view that the smaller temple was especially sacred to Themis, though her position in the sacred precinct of Nemesis implied a constant recognition of that goddess also in dedications. The statue of Aristonoe is a fair specimen of Hellenistic work; its period, from the inscription, is about the second century B.C. Her figure is almost entirely enveloped in a himation, and she holds a patera in one hand. A third statue, with inscribed basis of the end of the fifth century, represents a youth; it is about half life size, and is of the common style of the period. Several statues of very peculiar form have also been found in the excavations; they are of square shape below, like hermae, but above they are worked as ordinary draped statues; one or two of these are of considerable artistic interest from their execution; they are mostly of later period.

At Epidaurus, the Archaeological Society has resumed excavations in the great square building approached by the great propylaea; this proves to be surrounded by a Doric peristyle. Within this building, in later Roman times, an Odeum was constructed; the walls of the earlier building were utilised and even columns *in situ* are built in. The Odeum, of which auditorium and stage are well preserved, has now been cleared, and a mosaic pavement has been found in the orchestra. A systematic exploration of what still remains buried at Epidaurus is promised, and interesting results are still to be expected.

The same Society has also continued its work at Mycenae, under the direction of M. Tsountas. In the Acropolis foundations of houses of the 'Mycenae' period have been found; in a chamber in one of these was a number of bronze implements, axes, knives, &c. A steep road has also been discovered leading up from the Lion Gate; it consists of alternate layers of large and small stones; a small bronze male statuette was also found. Two tombs outside the Acropolis were decorated with pilasters that were painted and ornamented with polychrome rosettes—a new and instructive addition to Mycenaean architecture. The tomb commonly known as the treasury or tomb of Clytemnestra, which was partially excavated by Mme. Schliemann, has now been completely cleared. The door of this tomb had the fluted base and a part of the fluted shaft of a semi-column preserved on one side of it; within the tomb itself and along the dromos was a strongly built water channel.

At Abia, south of Calamata, M. Tsountas has excavated another vaulted

grave of 'Mycenae' type; but no important discovery was made except two lead figures, of a man and a woman, in 'Mycenaean' dress; the figure of the man, which is the better preserved, is about five inches high.

In Melos, during the summer of 1891, a statue has been found which is a very valuable addition to the series of archaic 'Apollo' statues. The new figure is on the whole in remarkably good preservation. All that is lost is one foot and the other leg from the knee. But one leg is complete down to the ankle, and thus the Melos statue has an advantage in this respect over almost all other early 'Apollo' statues, except the Apollo of Tenos. The modelling of the knee is certainly the most careful piece of work in the whole statue, and, though not beyond criticism, it compares favourably with the hard and exaggerated treatment of the knee-cap and surrounding muscles in the Apollo of Tenos. The upper muscle, in particular, is treated with much more truth to nature, and the roll of flesh above the knee-cap, visible in some other early figures, is avoided. The calf is large and heavy, and seems out of proportion to the thigh. In general proportions, and in treatment of hair and face, the new statue resembles, as was to be expected, the Apollo of Thera more than any other of the series; but the shoulders are broader and squarer, and the arms and adjacent parts of the sides are cut away obliquely, not squarely. There are some signs of an attempt to indicate in the treatment of the abdominal muscles the different tension of the two sides, owing to the advance of the left leg. This Melian statue is in every way among the most interesting of the numerous series to which it belongs. Melos has always, since the discovery of the Aphrodite now in the Louvre, been famous for the sculptures it has yielded to the excavator; and recently several of the most prominent works in the National Museum at Athens have come from this island.

The foreign Schools in Athens have also contributed their share, as usual, to the work of the season. The French School, in view of its intended excavations at Delphi, has not attacked any new site of first-rate importance; but the excavations at Thespieae and at Troezen have been continued. At Thespieae various sites have been explored in the valley of the Muses and its neighbourhood; the results are several inscriptions and a peristyle temple of Apollo in the river bed about two hours distance from the sanctuary of the Muses, and south-west of the town of Thespieae. In the town itself there were found, built into a later wall, many inscriptions and a sarcophagus with the labours of Heracles; and the foundations of a temple were also discovered. The chief product of the excavations at Troezen is a statue of Hermes Criophorus, life-size. Here we have a variation of the type; the god is standing, and raises the ram from the ground by its horns. This statue has been transported to the National Museum at Athens.

I cannot conclude my mention of the work of the French School without referring to the change in its Director which has taken place during the past season. In M. Foucart, who has been transferred to Paris, Athens has lost an archaeologist of the highest ability and distinction; his masterly handling of the inscriptions found both by the French School and others will be greatly

missed. But the continued excellence of the work of the French School is sufficiently assured by the appointment of M. Homolle as his successor; it seems peculiarly fitting that one whose name will always be associated with the discovery and the admirable publication of the statues and inscriptions of Delos should take command of the work projected at Delphi also. It is also a great gain to all in Athens that under M. Homolle the French School now holds open meetings at which the work done by the members of the School is made public; this practice, already customary among the three younger Schools in Athens, tends to produce harmony in their work, and to prevent waste of energy such as might well occur if each went on its way quite independently.

The German School has made no excavations in Greece during the past season. Its excavations at Magnesia have had very interesting results, which, however, cannot be recorded here. In the theatre was found a vaulted passage leading from the region of the scena to the middle of the orchestra; similar passages have now been discovered at Eretria, at Sicyon, and elsewhere; they are difficult to explain, and certainly form an item which will have to be included in all future discussions of the ancient theatre. But it would be premature to say any more about them till more evidence as to the date and position in each case is published.

The American School, under the direction of Dr. Waldstein, has devoted its chief energies to Eretria, where the theatre and the tombs have divided the attention of the excavators. I need not here do more than mention the tomb which, as Dr. Waldstein has suggested, may perhaps be that of Aristotle. The evidence both for and against the identification has already been published very clearly by him, in a form accessible to English readers. As to the theatre also I can only speak in a general manner, as it is not yet published; but I may at least say that it certainly supplies very valuable evidence upon several disputed points in connection with the Greek theatre, and that when published it will take a prominent place in all future discussions of the subject. A preliminary account by Dr. Waldstein has appeared in the *Δελτίον*. The chief features of the theatre at Eretria are an orchestra and auditorium of which but few seats remain, and scena buildings apparently of two or three different epochs; the greater part of these are built upon a low mound, some twelve feet above the level of the orchestra; a massive terrace wall serves to separate the two levels; and in front of this at the usual distance, is the foundation of a proscenium with columns. A vaulted passage leads from the orchestra right under the foundation of the scena buildings, and ends in a flight of steps leading to the level of the ground behind them. There is also another subterranean passage, leading from within the proscenium to the centre of the orchestra. Until the theatre is published, and material is available for deciding the period and relation of all these parts of the structure, it is clearly impossible to draw any conclusions from them, especially as to disputed points. But it is evident that they will offer many problems of high interest to the student of theatrical antiquities. The walls of the ancient town of Eretria have also been surveyed.

At Plataea, Mr. Washington, of the American School, has continued the exploration of the site commenced by Dr. Waldstein last year; he has found the foundations of a large oblong building, probably a peristyle temple; this he conjectures to be the Heraeum. If so, an important point is gained for the topography of the battle of Plataea.

I need not speak here in detail of the excavations of the British School at Megalopolis. In view of the complication of the evidence with which we have had to deal, we have found it inadvisable to prepare our final publication in time for the present number; but we hope, without fail, to have it ready for the spring number of this *Journal*. The results of the last season's work have already been described in the Annual Report of the British School at Athens; as to our final conclusions I am not yet in a position to speak. Complete plans of the theatre are now being prepared by Mr. Schultz, and with their help we shall be able to publish the whole of the evidence in a form that will enable even those who have not seen the site to judge for themselves as to the correctness of our conclusions. This seems most desirable in a case where it is probable that the views of those most competent to decide seem likely to differ widely from one another as to the inferences to be drawn from the architectural evidence. As to the facts on which these inferences are based, I do not now think that there will be any room for difference of opinion; and so it is most desirable that they should be placed before the public in an intelligible form.

The preliminary plan of the theatre, which we published in this *Journal* last year, has been shown by a more complete excavation of the site to be in some respects misleading; we wish to acknowledge the help of Dr. Dörpfeld, in pointing out this fact during his visit to Megalopolis last April while our excavations were going on. It now appears that the wall with the three thresholds resting upon it is of later construction, and has bases corresponding to the bases of the portico built into its foundations; it cannot therefore have been the back wall (*scena*) of the original stage. The broad foundation in front of this was a stylobate, and probably carried the columns and entablature of which fragments are lying about. This structure consists of five steps, the two upper ones having actually been discovered; but the three lower ones are not part of the original plan. The inferences from these facts are very important, but it seems better to reserve them for the present; without the evidence upon which they are based, they could only awake controversy without offering materials for its decision. The orchestra of the theatre, the seats as far as they are extant, the *scena* buildings and the *parodi* and *scenotheca* have all been cleared as far as possible, and the theatre now offers a most attractive site to students and visitors. The building at the back of the theatre, supposed by us to be a great *stoa*, proves to be almost filled with rows of column bases; it must have been a great roofed hall, something like that at Eleusis; and can hardly be anything but the *Thersilion*, or senate-house of the 10,000 Arcadians, mentioned by Pausanias as near the theatre. On the other side of the river the plan of the *Agora* has made considerable progress. We have now not only the *stoa* of Philip—

identified by its inscribed tiles—and the temenos of Zeus Soter, but two other buildings which form the east boundary of the Agora and the east end of the north side, adjoining the stoa of Philip; these can hardly be anything but the stoa Myropolis and the Archives, according to the description of Pausanias. We intend to publish these, together with the inscriptions and plans of Megalopolis, in a future number of this *Journal*.

The extensive repairs found necessary for the preservation of the mosaics of the dome at Daphne are now being carried out. The process used is worth recording. First a cloth is glued close to the mosaics themselves; then it is backed, in sections, with plaster until a solid block is formed, fitting the curved surface of the dome exactly. The plaster in which the mosaics are set is next gradually chipped away, leaving the mosaic adhering to the plaster block, which can be safely removed and stored until it is wanted. All the mosaics of the dome have been treated in this way, and now the structure of the dome, which had been condemned as unsafe since the recent earthquakes, has been rebuilt and is nearly ready for the mosaics to be restored to their original position. In case of accidents, a complete and very good series of photographs was taken before the mosaics were moved. It is fortunate that Mr. Schultz and Mr. Barnsley also made their series of drawings of these mosaics last year. It is to be hoped, however, that the experiment will be completely successful, and that this magnificent series of Byzantine works will now be preserved from the danger which has so long threatened them.

In the administration and arrangement of antiquities in Athens the past season has again been a very busy one. The Acropolis Museum remains as it was last year; the almost endless labour of sorting and cataloguing the vase fragments discovered in the excavations is being carried on by Dr. Wolters and Dr. Gräf; they have now nearly finished the black-figured vases. The National (formerly Central) Museum is continually being enriched by new discoveries; the most prominent this year are the Apollo from Melos, a whole room from Rhamnus, and the Bryaxis base. But a protest may well be raised against the extensive restorations (only in plaster, and so not irrevocable) which are being made of broken statues. Surely this is a practice going out of use in all Museums which are under scientific direction, and so is least of all to be expected in Athens. And it seems particularly useless in the case of an archaic statue like the Apollo from Melos. Such a work as this can never be attractive to the public, and to the archaeologist its appearance is greatly impaired by the modern feet. But this is only a suggestion, and in no way detracts from the thanks which are due for the untiring energy of M. Cabbadias. In the court of the Museum the inscriptions are being arranged round the walls by Dr. Lolling, and will be covered by a roof to protect them from the weather. The Egyptian collection, presented by M. Demetrius, has been transferred from the Polytechnic to the rooms on the right of the door in the National Museum—a doubtful advantage, considering the amount of room constantly required for new acquisitions. A still less desirable change is the transference of the Mycenae collection, now excellently arranged and housed, to the National Museum. This is officially

announced in the last *Δελτίον*. In addition to new discoveries, the Museum has been enriched by various gifts, including the interesting Busiris vase published in Dument and Chaplain, *Céramiques de la Grèce*, I. pl. xviii. The catalogue of this Museum is said to be nearly ready, and the old one is practically useless owing to the change of arrangement and numbering; meanwhile a small catalogue in French has been published, and is very useful for ascertaining at least the provenance of many works. A new and interesting feature in the building is offered by the central gallery, which is being decorated in the Mycenae style from the designs of M. Kawerau.

The collection of coins has at last been taken in hand, and is now accessible to students. It is temporarily housed in the Academy, pending the provision of a room for it in the new National Library now in course of construction, and is in charge of M. Svoronos, who has already made considerable progress with its arrangement and catalogue. M. Svoronos has in his charge not only the old National collection, but also all the coins found in the excavations conducted by the Government and the Archaeological Society, and thus, under his able management, it bids fair to attain in time unrivalled completeness, at least for the districts now in possession of Greece.

The periodical issued by the 'Επιστημονική Έταιρία in Athens, called the 'Αθηναίη, is now in its third year. There has been a distinct need for such a periodical since the cessation of the 'Αθηναίων. It contains articles and discussions of a scientific character, rather than new publications, for which the 'Εφημερίς 'Αρχαιολογική is peculiarly adapted, and has already published several very useful and interesting articles.

On the whole, during the past season, though the new discoveries have not been so brilliant or numerous as in some recent years, the amount of material available for students has been greatly increased; and so Athens has even further increased its claim to be an indispensable place of study for archaeologists.


E. A. G.

November, 1891.


CORRIGENDUM.

Vol. XII. p. 30, ll. 13, 19, 23, for '428-425' read '328, 325 B.C.'






THE NORTH DOORWAY OF THE



THE NORTH DOORWAY OF THE ERECHTHEUM




DETAIL C



A SECTION THROUGH UPPER PART OF LINTEL

A SECTION THROUGH UPPER PART OF LINTEL






ROSETTE

OLD CENTRE

DETAILS AT A B AND C

FIG. 4






1. SAND SITE. THE EAST COLUMNS FROM THE NORTH.




2. SAND SITE. THE WEST COLUMNS FROM THE SOUTH.



THE SITE AND NEIGHBOURHOOD
OF
SALAMIS

SCALE.
0 100 200 300 400 500 600 700 800
1/4 mile
800 yards
1/2 mile


J.A.R.M. sc




PLAN OF THE SITE AND NEIGHBOURHOOD,
OF
SALAMIS

SCALE
1 : 1000
JARM. 1891

· SALAMIS · SITE · A · THE · COLUMNS ·




· SITE · B · ZEVS · TEMENOS ·





LINE OF WESTERN WALL A B SHOWING RELATIVE HEIGHT OF VARIOUS PARTS

SALAMIS · EXCAVATIONS · ON · THE · SITE · OF · THE · LOUTRON · & · AGORA ·

----- SHOWS LINES OF TRENCHES.




· SITE · F ·




F

H.A.





Diameter 2' 11"


IN OF N. WALL BASE.



Height 11 3/4"




·SALAMIS· ·SITE· E· THE· CAMPANOPETRA·




HAT

·SITE· F·



·SITE· H·




P.W.S.



TERRACOTTA FROM CYPRUS.

1. PLAN OF PREPARED BY ARCHITECT
 2. RELATION TO LINES OF INTEREST




X T S R Q P O N M L K J I H G F E D C B A Y


(Window)

(Door)


(Staircase)

SCALE OF FEET





MOULDED BLOCK (LIMESTONE) SITE B E WALL FIG 1
LIMESTONE BLOCK WALL OF WEST COLONNADE AGORA FIG 2



MARBLE BLOCK (LIMESTONE) OLIVE PRESS AGORA FIG 7




FIG 8. SITE OF LIMESTONE BASE IN CORNER OF COLONNADE.
FIG 9. PLAN OF N WALL BASE.
FIG 10. PLAN OF S WALL BASE.
FIG 11. ATRIUM BASE IN POSITION.
FIG 12. Moulding of the Corniciopetra.






FIG 13. DETAILS OF THE ORDERS SITE B.
FIG 14. LIMESTONE BASE OF ZEUS TEMPLE S.E.



AGORA BASE OF COLUMNS OF ORDER FIG 3



MARBLE MOSAIC BASE AND PODIUM BUILT INTO N.E. WALL AGORA FIG 4
LIMESTONE BASE FROM OLDER BUILDING OF ZEUS TEMPLE USED AS FOUNDATION FOR N.W. WALL FIG 5



THE LOUTRA S.W. PLAN FIG 6



FIG 10. SITE S.W. WALL OF INNER WALL.
FIG 11. LIMESTONE BASE OF FINE GRAINED LIMESTONE BUILDING SITE A.






FIG 15. SITE B. S.E. WALL BASE ON E. WALL.



3.





2.



1.

BONE TABLETS FROM SPARTA.






2

3

FRAGMENTS OF PAINTED TERRACOTTA STATUES
FROM CYPRUS.




VASE FROM CYPRUS.




VASE FROM CYPRUS.







57.



& 66.






DISTRICT OF OLBA
PART OF CILICIA TRACHEIA
ASIA MINOR

Explored by M. J. Thornton-Bent.
 April, 1893



Scale of Miles
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

160
 200



PEDESTAL
OF

EXISTING FOUNDATIONS

ROCK

WEST


IN FRONT OF PARTHENON


50 100

ENGLISH FEET


CUT ROCK FACE

WALL







TOMB 16




TOMB 57.




TOMB 37



TOMB 65 & 66



TOMB 46.



TOMB 75






FIG. 10
SHOW VI





AKYATID -
ORTICO -

14730

51 110
45 310

12 560

10 560

12 560

10 560

12 560

10 560

12 560

10 560

12 560

10 560

12 560

10 560

12 560

10 560

12 560

10 560

12 560

FIGURE 1 IS A PLAN SHOWING THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE ARCHAIC TEMPLE RESTORED AS OCTASTYLE OF THE IONIC ORDER ~

FIGURE 2 IS PART OF THE SAME PORTION OF THE TEMPLE SHOWN AS IT WOULD HAVE BEEN IF RESTORED AS HEXASTYLE DORIC USING THE EXISTING REMAINS ~



SCALE OF FEET

BLOCK OF STYLOBATE IN SITU

4 820


5 310

5 730

15 084

3 265

FIG. 2



SECTION OF BLOCK IN SITU

FIG. 3

TWO SLABS ONCE FORMING PART OF THIS STYLOBATE, NOW PLACED NEAR THE PARTHENON



FIG. 4

TOTAL LENGTH ON UPPER STEP 69 987

FIG. 1 - SIDE A - 3 135


9 240 9 240

TOTAL WIDTH ON UPPER STEP 69 987

FIG. 1











VASE BY PHINTIAS.



VASE BY PHINTIAS (A).



VASE BY PHINTIAS (B).

GETTY CENTER LIBRARY



3 3125 00131 4513

THE J. PAUL GETTY MUSEUM LIBRARY

JAN 22 1979

