

Neither material would survive long on a roof, and grebes would look pretty silly there. Storks would be better, but surely their habits were too well known for them to figure as man-killers.

Miss Carrington-Smith points out to me that two old maps give a tributary of the Asopos as 'Ὀρνια, but differ in locating the name. If it is the stream that crosses the high road to Stymphalos from Sikyon, coming from the east, it is rather high for Harpe; if it is the branch from the lake, we have the Stymphalian Birds again.

According to Apollonios Rhodios the displaced Stymphalian birds made a murderous attack on the Argo off the Island of Dia, shooting their feathers like arrows. Could this be a reflection of a personal adventure of the poet? A ship on which I was sailing was dive-bombed by Gannets just East of the harbour of Tinos: no doubt they were defending their nests on the cliffs.

May I be allowed to describe an adventure of a professor from an English university visiting Australia? A Magpie incurred his displeasure by feinting at his bald head, so that he pursued it, shouting loudly. The bird bided its time, then dived again, but this dive scored a direct hit.

Before leaving the war-like 'Thrakos', mention should be made of the other warrior who grows ear-flaps, the Ruff, *Philomachus Pugnax* (what a shocking name): *Μεμνονίς ὄρνις*. The Ruff treads himself out a list on which to fight other Ruffs. The legend was that this was a commemorative battle round the tomb of Memnon at the Hellespont. Pausanias (x 31) says that the birds were painted on Memnon's cloak in the Lesche of the Corinthians at Delphi (dating from the fifth century B.C.).

A series of bird battles takes place on fragments from an archaic West Greek kantharos found in Aetos, Ithaca. There are no ear-flaps to be seen, but it was a glorious battle, both families engaged, and blood and feathers flying in all directions. Professor Timbergen tells us that Kittiwakes indulge in family battles, when the birds start moving about *en famille* among their crowded nests, but these birds are not gulls; their legs and beaks are too long and their bodies too heavy. It might be a hearsay picture of the fighting birds.

SYLVIA BENTON

### A Tourist in Athens, 1801

In the *JHS* xxxvi (1916) 162-372, Mr A. H. Smith gives a detailed account of the removal of the Elgin Marbles from the Parthenon in 1801-5 and of their subsequent history; in his *Lord Elgin and the Marbles* (1967), Mr W. St Clair brings this account up-to-date. Both authors describe the happenings in Athens of the last week of July 1801, when Lord Elgin's secretary, the Revd Philip Hunt, was in Athens,

when excavations began and when the first sculptures were removed from the fabric of the temple. There was also in Athens at that time a party of three young Englishmen, Messrs William Gell, Edward Dodwell and Atkins, and there is a contemporary account by Gell now available, which was not known either to Smith or to St Clair; it provides some further information as to the conditions under which Hunt had to work, and of the immediate emotions and reactions of the four Englishmen as they actually watched the first 'Elgin marbles' being removed, as distinct from their later sentiments—and from those of Lord Byron.

It will be remembered that, as he passed through Naples in October 1799, on his way to Constantinople, Lord Elgin had engaged a party of artists and stuccoists, under an Italian artist named Lusieri, but this party did not reach Athens till August 1800. When he visited Athens in the spring of 1801, Hunt found that they were making little progress in their principal task of drawing and modelling the sculptures of the buildings on the Acropolis, because of the obstructionism of the Turkish authorities, and he accordingly went back to Constantinople to obtain some imperial firman to allow the artists to continue with their work (St Clair, *op. cit.* 87).

In October 1800 Gell and Dodwell, both 23 years old and not long down from Cambridge, and Atkins left England for a prolonged tour of Greece; they wintered in Germany, sailed from Venice on 29 April 1801, and rode into Athens at dusk on 10 July. They immediately went to the house of the British vice-consul, Spiridion Logotheti, and were (Gell says) received 'with the greatest politeness and hospitality'. Logotheti arranged lodgings for them in the house of Theodora Mina, the mother of the former Consul, Procopius—in whose house nearly all the British visitors to Athens of the period stayed. Next day the three men walked out to see the sights and to sketch. By the end of the first day, they had discovered the dishonesty of the vice-consul; it is clear from Gell's diary that, unlike Lusieri, the Englishmen were not prepared to be thwarted or cheated.

'The English Agent appeared very anxious to compel us to pay 60 piastres to the Disdar [the military commander] for permission to enter the castle. He seemed very unwilling to present our letter of recommendation to the Waivode [the civilian governor], & observed that when we called on him to present it he was very backward. We found the Disdar, to whom we went without informing the Agent, exceedingly civil and were promised entrance whenever we chose. On returning we mentioned to him that he must have been misinformed for we found the Turks remarkably polite. He put on his cloak and hurried out immediately. We found ourselves refused admittance the next day, and by this means discovered the treachery of our friend.

'It was remarkable that the son of the Disdar

who spoke Greek used the same words as Logothete had used to us the day before. We went in person to the Waivode, who sent for the Disdar and reprimanded his son who came (the father being ill in bed) very severely, and who promised to permit us to do what we chose in the Acropolis, but nevertheless refused us permission to enter without paying 60 piastres, adding that should the Waivode himself come he should pay the same. We told him that we should not pay a single para but would enter in spite of him. He then abated his demand, asking for 20 piastres, to which we replied by a refusal. I believe however he began to fear, for we heard them calling to us and beckoning to return when we arrived at the bottom of the hill.

‘On informing Logothete he observed, “I told you so; the Waivode has no power over the citadel.” We should have informed the Waivode, and without doubt he would have displaced the Disdar, had not the secretary of the English Ambassador at Constantinople arrived that very night with a Reis Effendi of the Grand Signior, and sufficient firmans to arrest the Disdar for similar offenses by order of the Grand Signior.

‘It seems that the agent had paid immense sums to the Disdar for permission for [Elgin’s] artists to enter the fortress, a circumstance so perfectly absurd at the time that the English were positively the only prop of the Turkish Empire, as could only proceed from Greek artifice. Lord Elgin had during two years paid dearly through the hands of the Agent, though in fact nothing was necessary.

‘The Disdar’s son was brought before the Waivode to answer for this conduct. On hearing what had been answered to us at the gate of the Acropolis, the Waivode told him he was banished from Athens at least for his impertinence. The Agent observed, “What a fool the Disdar must be, when everyone knows it is within the Waivode’s power to create a new Disdar any time with a few strokes of his pen.”

‘The old Disdar died in a few days and the whole was forgiven upon a promise of amendment. The son was made Disdar in a short time, but he was given to understand that only our entreaties had saved his head.<sup>[1]</sup> We enjoyed afterwards a free entrance, an advantage never possessed during the last 40 years by any travellers. During the whole business we found the Waivode very polite and very friendly, always saying, “Do not be angry; I will settle the affair for you.”’<sup>2</sup>

Philip Hunt reached Athens on July 22nd, bringing the firman and accompanied by a senior official, and all difficulties were at an end, both for Lord Elgin’s

<sup>1</sup> Hunt’s account of this interview is in Smith, *art. cit.* 195–6. He says that an official hinted to the Disdar’s son that he would be sent to the galleys on any further complaint.

<sup>2</sup> University Library, Bristol, D.M.7, p. 96.

party and for the casual visitors. Henceforth all were to have free access to the Acropolis during the hours of daylight. Gell was able to study the buildings at leisure (he gives a detailed description of them in his ‘Diary’) and to sketch to his heart’s content; in the book which he used that summer, and which is now in the British Museum, there are seventeen drawings of the buildings of the Acropolis and the Propylaea. He watched a gang of labourers digging at the west end of the Parthenon, to recover fragments of the sculptures of the pediment which had fallen after the explosion of 1687, and he wrote:

‘When we were at Athens [these marbles] were dug up from the place where they fell and sent to England by the Ambassador.’<sup>3</sup>

Within a week the fateful decision was made, and approved by the Voivode, to remove certain sculptures that still formed part of the fabric of the Parthenon. At that time five pillars at the east end of the south colonnade were standing, with the architrave, seven metopes and eight triglyphs and parts of the cornice; after that came a gap. The seventh metope from the corner, doubtless already loosened and easy to move, was lowered to the ground on July 31st; the one next to it came down on the following day. Sketch 76 in Gell’s book (plate 3 in Mr St Clair’s book) shows the south-east corner of the Parthenon in the evening light; the seventh metope is gone, but the sixth is still in position, with scaffolding in front of it. A block of the cornice is resting on it, and it must have been necessary to throw this down before the metope could be lifted from its place. Gell’s drawing is most meticulous and detailed, and it would appear certain that this drawing was made late in the afternoon of July 31, 1801. By August 22nd, these metopes (and the fragments from the pediment) had been shipped from the Peiraeus, for Gell writes:

‘Two of the most perfect [metopes] have been since taken to England by Lord Elgin, and the rest must be left to the chance of encountering greedy antiquaries, or the more slow but not less certain ruin which must follow from the avarice of the Turks, who daily throw down what they are able, to procure the lead by which the marbles are joined.’<sup>4</sup>

It may be assumed that Gell knew how many heads and other small pieces had been broken off by casual travellers as souvenirs, all trace of which would be lost; a serious collector, such as Lord Elgin, was not to be included in the term ‘greedy antiquaries’. More metopes and other sculptures were in fact removed later in the autumn and in the following two years, but Gell cannot have seen this or known of it when he wrote up his ‘Diary’.

Mr St Clair shows (p. 95) that Hunt realised at the

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 64.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 64.

time that the terms of the firman were being exceeded and that the Voivode was being pressed beyond his better judgment, but he must have kept his scruples to himself. There is no suggestion in Gell's account that any of the four Englishmen present felt the slightest doubt as to the propriety of what was happening; they were saving precious sculptures from destruction and making them available for study in London, to the lasting benefit of British scholarship and taste. The passage in Dodwell's *Tour through Greece* (1819), quoted by St Clair at p. 102, combines inaccurate recollection of facts (he did not see 'several metopae taken down in 1801', or 'the south-east angle of the pediment thrown down', though he did see, in 1805, that these things had happened subsequent to his first visit) and hindsight sentiment. There is no sign that in 1801 he felt 'inexpressible mortification' at the damage, though he may well have felt this four years later.

During their stay, Gell and his friends paid a visit to Eleusis, and saw the colossal bust of Ceres, of which Gell wrote:

'The inhabitants have yet retained some notion of the gifts of this Goddess, for they affirm that the fertility of the land will cease if the statue be taken away. As it seems to be in no danger of further mutilation, I hope the poor people will never be undeceived.'<sup>5</sup>

Less than three months later, Dr E. D. Clarke came with levers and oxen and shipped it to the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge.

Gell and Dodwell left Athens on September 15th and cruised for three months in the Aegean; they explored the Plain of Troy and reached Constantinople about December 10th, when Lord Elgin invited them to stay at the Embassy. In the following four weeks Gell wrote up, from his daily journal, a connected account of his travels since he had left England; his story must have been completed before January 12, 1802, when Dr Clarke arrived at the embassy, for Gell could not have written what he did of the Eleusinian Ceres had he known that it was no longer in place. On his death in Naples, in 1836, he left all his papers to his friend Keppel Craven, who gave thirteen sketchbooks, including the one in use in 1801, to the British Museum, but the great bulk of Gell's papers passed on Craven's death in 1851 to his Italian secretary. One collection, of eleven notebooks, was found in Naples by Dr Ashby of the British School at Rome, and is now divided between the Schools at Athens and at Rome; a second collection reached the London market in 1926. This included Gell's 'Diaries' for the winter of 1800-01 and for 1801; they are now in the Library of Bristol University and extracts are here printed by the permission of the Librarian. Other pieces from the same collection are in the Bodleian and the Gennadios Library at Athens.

M. R. BRUCE

<sup>5</sup> University Library, Bristol, D.M.7, p. 84.

### More Astronomical Misconceptions

It seems clear from an article by C. H. Kahn in *JHS* xc (1970) 99-116 that there are still prevalent numerous misconceptions concerning early Greek astronomy. To attempt to correct all these in detail would require a lengthy exposition of elementary points which would be extremely tedious for the discerning reader. There are, however, two matters a lack of understanding of which leads to such erroneous conclusions that one may perhaps be forgiven for a final attempt to clarify the issues.

The first concerns the passage in the Hippocratic treatise *On Airs, Waters, Places* (ch. 11) which warns against giving drastic medical treatment at certain times of the year; the passage (in which *ισημερία* is Heringa's certain emendation of the MSS *ισημερναί*) lists these times as follows: *μέγισταί δέ εἰσιν αἶδε καί ἐπικινδυνόταται ἥλιον τροπαί ἀμφοτέραι καί μᾶλλον αἱ θεριναί, καί αἱ ἰσημερία νομιζόμενα εἶναι ἀμφοτέραι, μᾶλλον δὲ αἱ μετοπωρναί*. Kahn (113 n. 51) finds 'unintelligible' my comment (*JHS* lxxxvi [1966] 33 n. 38) that the equinoxes, as a less familiar concept than the solstices, require the additional qualification *νομιζόμενα εἶναι* (literally, 'as they are considered to be'—I now think, *pace* my original note, that the German 'sogennanten' or the Loeb 'so reckoned' are both adequate translations), and himself translates 'both of which are generally believed to be dangerous (*νομιζόμενα εἶναι* sc. *ἐπικινδυνόταται*)'. This is an extraordinarily strained interpretation, which not only entails the mistranslation of a superlative but also runs counter to the style of the whole work. There is a certain fullness of expression in the Greek of the *Περὶ ἀέρων* which makes ellipsis comparatively infrequent and the insertion of the copula normal, when it might commonly be omitted in other Greek; see, for example, ch. 4.24-29 (three-fold repetition of *γίνεσθαι* and *ἰσχυρός*—reference by chapter and line of the Loeb edition), ch. 8.23 ff., and the invariable expression of *ἐστί* or *ἔχει* with words like *εἰκός* and *ἀναγκή*. In keeping with this tendency, it will be found that a predicate adjective with *νομίζω* or *νομίζεσθαι* is in this treatise always expressed and not merely understood (*cf.* 3.28; 4.15; 7.48; 7.97; 23.13; 23.24); so *εἶναι* must here be taken on its own in the sense of 'to be', 'to exist', 'to occur', 'to take place', without a predicate. Thus Kahn's designation of my comment as 'unintelligible' merely reveals his own lack of familiarity with the Greek. The language of the *Περὶ ἀέρων* also affords another indication that the concept of equinoxes was not as yet well known, in that the situations of cities and the directions of winds are always described with reference to the sun's *solstitial* risings and settings and never the equinoctial ones. In fact, we find periphrases used (such as *τὰ μεταξὺ τῶν δυσμέων τῶν θερινῶν καὶ τῶν χειμερινῶν*, 7.75, and *τοῦ ἡλίου ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀνατολέων*, 12.15; *cf.* 5.4) instead of *ισημερινή* *δυσμή* or *ἀνατολή*, 'equinoctial setting' or 'rising', to indicate due west and due east (first attested in Aristotle, *Meteor.* 363a-b).