

In conclusion it may be noted that, as Madame de Romilly stresses, Brasidas is presented as the Liberator, and in the Amphipolitans' eyes regarded as Saviour. The relevant passage in Thucydides (V 11.1) marks the first use in preserved Greek of *Σωτήρ* for an historical person. Yet, already in his *Oedipus the King*, Sophocles had assigned the antagonist the role of Saviour as well as Liberator. The play has been widely held to reflect in some sense the political and intellectual position of Athens in the years immediately following Pericles' death, even if not the character and fate of the Athenian leader himself. It is partly against the background of this play, which had just restored the old myth to wide currency, that this unprepossessing cup assumes an import not altogether trivial as contemporary graphic testimony of the fiercely anti-Cleonian animus felt—it is fair to suppose—by many outside Athens but previously documented in the history and comedy of the internal opposition alone.<sup>24</sup>

E. L. BROWN

*University of North Carolina,  
Chapel Hill*

Thucydides has given him a place of honour in his work. . . .': J. de Romilly, *Thucydides and Athenian Imperialism*, transl. by P. Thody (Oxford 1963) 43.

<sup>24</sup> My warm thanks are due Professor Kenneth Reckford for very helpful comments on a draft of this paper. Naturally, responsibility for the ideas presented and the errors uncorrected rests solely with the author.

#### A Further Note on Sea-Birds

In a 'Note on Sea-birds' [*JHS* xcii (1972) 172–3] Miss Sylvia Benton comments on Mr J. K. Anderson's preceding Note, *Θραξ, Δυτίνας, Καταράκτης*. But if we are to identify the species to which ancient names refer we must limit ourselves to those species which are now, or can be shown to have once been, present in Greece, and for this both accuracy of observation and a knowledge of the literature on the ornithology of Greece seem desirable. Miss Benton says: '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'. But the Gannet (*Sula bassana*) is a bird of the North Atlantic which does not now nest, if it ever did, in the Mediterranean nor indeed south of 51° N. on the eastern coasts of the Atlantic, so that these dive-bombers, whatever they were, could hardly have been Gannets. There are only two authentic records of Gannets in Greece at all, in May 1853 and in April 1965 (A. Kanellis: *Catalogus Faunae Graeciae; pars II Aves* ed. W. Bauer, O. v. Helversen, M. Hodge, J. Martens. Thessaloniki, 1969).

*Δυτίνας*, Miss Benton says, 'must refer to a bird diving from the surface like our divers, the commonest of which is our Little Grebe (*Podiceps ruficollis* [*sic*

for *ruficollis*]), but of course the term could include all ducks'. Leaving aside for the moment the implication that a grebe is some kind of duck, a term which denotes diving from the surface could not include all ducks since many species, including about half of those found in Greece, do not normally dive at all: hence the common differentiation between 'surface-feeding' (or 'dabbling') and 'diving' ducks.

Then as for the birds on the Middle Minoan jug from Palaikastro, Miss Benton says that 'according to the *Guide to the Birds of Britain and Europe*, there appear to be two birds, but I can only find one name, *Colymbus Arcticus* [*sic*, for *arcticus*]'. In Roger Peterson, Guy Mountfort and P. A. D. Hollom's *Field Guide to the Birds of Britain and Europe*, 1954, and in Bertel Bruun's *The Hamlyn Guide to Birds of Britain and Europe*, 1970—it is not clear to which of these Miss Benton is referring—the four European species of *Colymbidae* are illustrated and each, of course, provided with its own scientific name. *Colymbus arcticus*, the Black-throated Diver, is a regular winter visitor to Northern Greece but is rare in the south. (The Great Northern Diver, *C. immer*, has never been recorded in Greece.) However, as Miss Benton rightly says, 'divers do not dive from rocks, nor stand upright on stones' (or anywhere else). The birds on the Palaikastro mug are not painted in a realistic manner, and might, perhaps, be intended for Cormorants (*Phalacrocorax carbo*) or Shags (*Ph. aristotelis*) which can stand upright and which, on the water, can easily be mistaken by the inexpert for Divers of the genus *Colymbus*. Both species are known from Crete.

Mr Anderson's identification of *Θραξ* with the Great Crested Grebe (*Podiceps cristatus*) can be further supported by the fact that the bird breeds now on the Stymphalian lake (Bauer *et al.*: *op. cit.* p. 24); it may well have done so in the time of Dionysius. But it is difficult to understand why Miss Benton thinks that any name appropriate to a grebe 'would apply more obviously to the Pin-tail Duck'. The Pintail (*Anas acuta*) is a surface-feeding duck which can stand and walk perfectly well, since its legs are not, like a grebe's, placed far to the rear (*πυγόςκελις*). Neither is it possible to give any meaning in ornithological terms to the remark that the bird *Θραξ* 'is said to be near to a duck, but presumably not an actual duck'. A duck is a duck, and a grebe is a grebe and, taxonomically, 'never the twain shall meet'. It is also untrue to say that 'no duck has a long thin beak': both the Merganser (*Mergus serrator*) and the Goo-sander (*M. merganser*), of birds known in Greece at the present day, have long, thin, red beaks; they also, incidentally, have crests.

In her final paragraph Miss Benton writes: 'Professor Tinbergen [*sic*, for Tinbergen] 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'. Kittiwakes are gulls. They do not move about among their crowded nests, which are placed on the narrow ledges

of cliffs where such activity would be disastrous. And Professor Tinbergen confirms that in any gull species known to him 'there is no question of "family battles".'

JOHN BUXTON

*New College, Oxford*

### The Dating of the Aegina Pediments

The sculpture of the East pediment of the Temple of Aphaia on Aegina is usually dated between 490 and 480 B.C. This seems to me too late, to judge by the torsion of the fallen soldier of the left corner and of the stooping youth from the middle of the right side (PLATE XVIb-c).<sup>1</sup> In the youth there is a small turning at the waist and this is managed competently by an organic twist. In the fallen soldier, where the torsion is much greater, the change of direction is made not by a twist but by an abrupt swivel; and though the waist was partly masked by the right arm, generally the sculptors who carved this pediment did not neglect those parts of their figures which could not be seen. From this it should follow that at that time they were acquainted only partially with the revolutionary innovation of organically twisting anatomy.

In vase painting the organic twisting of the torso was mastered during the last ten or fifteen years of the sixth century. So too in relief sculpture, notably in the Ball-players relief.<sup>2</sup> In free-standing sculpture symmetrically frontal poses still remained normal, but that does not mean that it was simply retarded; and pedimental figures, though in the round, generally followed the rules for reliefs, anyhow before the Parthenon. Yet the Acropolis Theseus with its bold, but not very successful, twisting of the body is accepted by comparison with vase paintings as a work of about 510 B.C. or even a little earlier,<sup>3</sup> and it does not look anatomically much older than the figures from Aegina. There is also the fragmentary soldier, probably from Daphni (PLATE XVIa),<sup>4</sup> and

here organic torsion is exhibited with an exaggeration which implies that it was then something new: for that reason its date, again through comparison with vase paintings, should not be later than the 490's.

That in its torsion the fallen soldier from Aegina is less advanced than the soldier from Daphni cannot easily be disputed.<sup>5</sup> Nor is it reasonable to object that the sculptor of the Aegina figure may have been backward compared with his contemporaries who worked in Attica. Not only was the Aegina sculptor obviously sensitive and accomplished, but Aegina cannot be considered remote from Attica and even in Cos, which was remote, the new anatomical systems arrived quickly. There a small and clumsy relief of a drinking party is in a style generally similar to that of the Ball-players relief and so confidently dated about 500 B.C.<sup>6</sup>

These arguments lead to the conclusion that the sculpture of the East pediment of Aegina was carved not appreciably later than 500 B.C. Whether the date of the sculpture of the West pediment should be shifted still further back may be doubted. The extra figures and acroterion in the style of the West pediment look as if they had been intended for the East pediment, but it does not follow that they were ever put in place there and the present figures of that pediment might have been commissioned before the first set was completed. If so, the apparent temporal difference may be rather the difference between a more modern and a more old-fashioned master working at the same time.

So far as I can see, this higher dating of the Aegina pediments has no serious consequences for the dating of most other sculpture of the late sixth and early fifth centuries. The reason may perhaps be that students of the last seventy years, preoccupied with a third pediment, have tended to feel that its replacement must somehow be connected with Persian activity across the Aegean and so have not trusted enough to stylistic judgment when giving their dates to the Aeginetans.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge*

<sup>1</sup> These photographs, for which I am grateful to Mr E. E. Jones and Dr A. F. Stewart, are of casts respectively in the Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge and the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. I have not recently had the opportunity of studying the other relevant figures of this pediment, either in the original or through casts, but to judge by published photos most of them are presented without torsion (A. Furtwängler, *Aegina*, pl. 95; B. S. Ridgway, *The Severe Style*, fig. 8).

<sup>2</sup> Athens, N.M.3476: G. Lippold, *Griechische Plastik*, pl. 28.2.

<sup>3</sup> Athens, Acr. 145: Lippold, *op. cit.*, 79, pl. 22.2; H. Payne and G. M. Young, *Archaic Marble Sculpture*, 44, pls. 105-6; H. Schrader, *Die Archaischen Marmorbildwerke* 281-2, pls. 155-7.

<sup>4</sup> Athens, N.M. 1605: K. Neugebauer, *AA* 1915, 274-8, figs. 1-2; E. Buschor and R. Hamann, *Die Skulpturen des Zeustempels*, 10 and 28, fig. 8. (My

illustration, for which I am indebted to Mr E. E. Jones, is of a cast in the Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge.) Buschor's date for this fragment was 500-480 B.C.; Payne considered it rather later than the Theseus, but still in the Archaic period, i.e. 510-480 B.C. (*op. cit.*, 44); Lippold chose the 470's, to make it later than the Aegina East pediment which he put in the 480's (*op. cit.*, 109 and 99). The Daphni figure may well be pedimental too: Neugebauer's objection is hardly valid, that its style is too Aeginetan to be from an Attic pediment.

<sup>5</sup> Exceptionally Neugebauer asserted that the Daphni figure was earlier in style than the figures of the East pediment, though later than those of the West (*op. cit.*, 277).

<sup>6</sup> Cos: *Clara Rhodos* ix, 73-80, figs. 46-8, pl. 6; C. Karusos, *AM* lxxvii, 121-9, Beil. 35.