brings a prompt awakening (299).[2] The Greeks at Troy, confident in their victory, will pass the night without guard (337 ἀφύλακτον); Clytemnestra speaks of her watchers on Messapion as guards (293 φύλαξι). What marshals (332 τάσσει) Agamemnon's forces in Troy is νυκτίπλαγκτος πόνος (330), producing a τάξις that is random, sprawling, the product of no conscious control on the part of the leader. The sequence of the beacons, in contrast, is intricately organized and precisely linear, a reflection of that man-counseling woman who ordained it (312–13): τοιοίδε τοί μοι λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι, / ἄλλος παρ' ἄλλου διαδοχαῖς πληρούμενοι. And whereas Clytemnestra can speak of her beacons as running a race that has already been won (314), for Agamemnon and his troops the return lap is yet to be run (344).

Clytemnestra's phrase in 332 is part of this larger scheme of contrasts. She has just responded to the chorus' request for a sure sign of Troy's capture by reeling off for them the intricacies of her beacon-relay: they asked for a τέκμαρ (272 τί γὰρ τὸ πιστόν; ἔστι τῶνδέ σοι τέκμαρ;), and she has given them one (315): τέκμαρ τοιοῦτον σύμβολόν τέ σοι λέγω. In contrast to this controlled τέκμαρ of her beacons, she now mentions, with scarcely veiled scorn, the lack of any such control among the Greeks in Troy, using the cognate, τεκμήριον (332): πρὸς οὐδὲν ἐν μέρει τεκμήριον. That her mastery has for the time persuaded the chorus is clear from their response at 351–54, in which they not only naively commend her masculine intelligence (351)[3] but also implicitly recall their own demand at 272 for τὸ πιστόν, for a τέκμαρ (352): ἐγὼ δ' ἀκούσας πιστά σου τεκμήρια. Not yet, of course, does the chorus fully appreciate the extent of Clytemnestra's mastery, nor can they yet foresee what awaits Agamemnon at the end of his return lap (a πιστὸν τέκμαρ indeed!). Full comprehension will begin to dawn only with other τεκμήρια, the last appearance of the word in *Agamemnon* (1366–67): ἢ γὰρ τεκμηρίοισιν ἐξ οἰμωγμάτων / μαντευσόμεσθα τἀνδρὸς ὡς ὀλωλότος;[4]

DAVID H. PORTER
Skidmore College

2. Cf. Clytemnestra's scornful reference to sleep at 275, the watchman's concern to stay awake at 14–15, and Clytemnestra's mention of her wakefulness at 889–94. If ἐγρηγορὸς is the proper reading at 346, it will be part of the same network.

3. The chorus has obviously missed the irony of Clytemnestra's γυναικὸς ἐξ ἐμοῦ at 348, just as they missed the irony of the reference to her husband at 316. Note that the first line of each of their answers (317, 351) pointedly addresses her as γύναι.

4. I wish to thank the Editor and the two anonymous referees of *CP* for criticisms and suggestions that have led to improvements in this article.

THE DESTRUCTION OF CARTHAGE: A *RETRACTATIO*

In his paper "To Be Taken with a Pinch of Salt: The Destruction of Carthage" (*CP* 81 [1986]: 140–46), R. T. Ridley demonstrated that the frequently repeated story of the sowing of the ruins of Carthage with salt after its destruction in 146 B.C. was nowhere attested in the sources. The repetition of the story over the last fifty years had apparently sufficed to guarantee its authenticity to a succes-

sion of scholars but, it now appears, constituted no more than "the spurious authority of a long line of copyists."[1] As one of those named in Ridley's list of the transmitters of the anecdote, I willingly make an unreserved *retractatio* of what I wrote in *Carthage* (London, 1960), page 205. I am doubly embarrassed because the retraction is belated; the true state of affairs became apparent to me in 1981 through the critical acumen of Mortimer Chambers of the Department of History at UCLA. He wrote to me in that year asking what authority I had for my assertion that Carthage had been sowed with salt by Scipio, as he had been unable to find one. A day in the library of the University of Bristol convinced me that the anecdote was a modern invention. My cursory survey arrived at a provisional conclusion which was the same as that reached by Ridley's thorough survey of the historiography: the anecdote appeared to go no farther back than B. L. Hallward's chapter in the *Cambridge Ancient History,* volume 8, of 1930. Obviously I should have published my error—drawn, I believe, from Scullard, following Hallward, rather than from Hallward direct.

Yet Ridley's analysis may be expanded and a possible source of Hallward's error suggested. Apart from the legendary accounts of the sowing and salting of Padua by Attila and of Milan by Barbarossa referred to by Susan T. Stevens ("A Legend of the Destruction of Carthage," *CP* 83 [1988]: 39–41), sober history does in fact record the plowing and the sowing with salt of a captured city in medieval Italy. In 1299 Pope Boniface VIII was in the final stages of his crusade against the Colonna family, of whom Palestrina (ancient Praeneste) was the last stronghold. The city surrendered but was destroyed and, as Boniface says in a bull, "ipsam . . . aratro subjici ad veteris instar Carthaginis Africanae, ac salem in ea etiam fecimus seminari ut nec rem nec nomen aut titulum habeat civitatis."

Boniface did not of course invent the example of Carthage as a city put under the plow, and evidence for this part of the anecdote is better than Ridley allows, as the references listed by Stevens show, in particular Modestinus in the *Digest* (7. 4. 21), the only passage in which Carthage is named. The other references to plowing a captured city (no names are given) in Horace, Propertius, and Seneca are noted in R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard's commentary on Horace without discussion.[2] But the fact that such an action is applied to the capture of Troy in Propertius and is used as a literary or moral exemplum by Horace and Seneca seems to hint at a well-known anecdote in the background. Perhaps after all it was in Livy and thence reached Modestinus. Admittedly, the authority of the third-century jurist cannot be high for a historical detail, but he must be the source followed by Boniface, known as a man of culture and specifically an expert in Roman law. The sowing with salt is another matter; and as Ridley argues, the example followed by the pope must be the story of Abimelech (Judges 9:45). It is interesting to note that Boniface chose to deploy a learned reference when telling of the plowing of Palestrina; but in 1299 a pope—perhaps—had no need to refer explicitly to the fate of Shechem. It was presumably the fate of Palestrina that inspired the somewhat later legends about Padua and Milan.

1. The phrase is that of H. M. Gwatkin, *Studies in Arianism* (Cambridge, 1883), p. 98, referring to church historians of the fifth century A.D.

2. *A Commentary on Horace: "Odes," Book 1* (Oxford, 1970), p. 213.

Another reference may be mentioned for the sake of completeness. The early Byzantine church historian Sozomen, writing shortly after A.D. 440, tells a hagiographical anecdote (*HE* 2. 14) about a Persian city that, in the 340s, rejected the preaching of a prominent Christian. Subsequently, it offended the Persian king, who sent an army that τὴν πόλιν κατέστρεψαν καὶ οἷα ἄρουραν γεωργήσαντες ἔσπειραν. This of course is sowing with seed, not salt. The Byzantine writer may have read about Carthage, but more likely he, or the original author of the anecdote, thought of Jeremiah 26:18: "Zion shall be plowed like a field."

The actions of Boniface are narrated at length in Gregorovius' *Rome in the Middle Ages* (vol. 5.2 [London, 1900], pp. 551–56 in the English translation), a book doubtless more widely read fifty years ago than it is today. It seems possible that Hallward had read the work and remembered this passage when he came to write his chapter in the *Cambridge Ancient History;* consciously or unconsciously he then associated the plowing of the site, which actually occurred (if we believe Modestinus), with the sowing with salt, which did not. This at least would be a more scholarly error than reliance on the travelogue of L. Bertrand discovered by Paolo Visonà ("Passing the Salt: On the Destruction of Carthage Again," *CP* 83 [1988]: 41–42). As for Bertrand's source, it seems hardly likely that an earlier, scholarly writer on Carthage will emerge. Perhaps he simply transposed to Carthage a detail from the better-known legends about Padua and Milan; and it must be admitted that Hallward could have done the same independently.

However that may be, before Hallward wrote in 1930 recognition of the usefulness of the anecdote as a piece of symbolism or of narrative adornment had been a long time coming. Gregorovius himself did no more than make the obvious comparison of the destruction of Palestrina with the destruction of Praeneste by Sulla. But once the story of the plowing and salting of Carthage had been properly launched, its force was considerable, as is made evident by the number of "authorities" listed by Ridley, and indeed by the incredulity with which distinguished scholars have greeted my own retraction when made verbally: surely (they have implied) it *must* have happened.

B. H. WARMINGTON
University of Bristol