

both these scholars maintain.<sup>12</sup> The context is manifestly quite different and, if we are correct in assuming that Aphrodite is the subject, the emphatic word then seems to be the adjective *πολυσπερέων*.<sup>13</sup> The fish reveal by their fertility the activity of Love among them. The import of this quotation is correctly given by Philinus as:

αὐτῶν δὲ ζῳῶν οὐδὲν ἄν χειρσαῖον ἢ πτηρὸν εἰπεῖν  
ἔχοις οὕτω γόνιμον ὡς πάντα τὰ θαλάττια.

(*Quaest. conv.* 685F.)

Empedocles, in fine, is here simply seeking to illustrate Love's activity by an appeal which subsequently becomes a poetical cliché with our own Elizabethan poets.<sup>14</sup>

JAMES LONGRIGG

*University of Newcastle upon Tyne*

<sup>12</sup> There is no preposition; nor should it be assumed that *ἄγουσα* must bear the meaning of 'leading' or 'conducting' to a place as has been generally supposed. This verb frequently carries the meaning of 'carry off as captive or booty', cf., for example, *Iliad* I 367, IX 594, and Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 945. There is an interesting parallel in Sophocles' famous choral ode upon human inventiveness in the *Antigone*, where Man is invoked in his capacity as a hunter, *Ant.* 341 ff.:

κουφοῶν τε φύλον ὀρνέθων ἀμφιβαλῶν ἄγει  
καὶ θηρῶν ἀγρίων ἔθνη πόντου τ' εἰναλίαν φύσιν  
σπείρασι δικτυοκλώστοις,  
περιφραδῆς ἀνήρ.

It is noteworthy, too, that this verb is also used in a metaphorical sense to describe the activity of *ἐπιθυμία*, cf. Aristotle *E.N.* 1147a34.

<sup>13</sup> It might be objected that Empedocles in B74 could be using *πολυσπερέων* as a purely ornamental epithet. But in view of the fact that he has deliberately given a different sense to an adjective borrowed from Homer (cf. *Iliad* 2.804 and *Odyssey* 11.365), this seems most unlikely.

<sup>14</sup> Cf., for example, Milton in *Comus*, who describes fish as:

'Thronging the Seas with Spawn innumerable'  
and Spenser in *Garden of Adonis*:

And all the fruitful spawn of fishes' hew  
In endless ranks along enranged were,  
That seem'd the ocean could not contain them  
there.'

#### Note on the Chronology of the reign of Arkesilas III

Professor I. Noshy, in a paper read to the 1968 conference of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Libya and published in its proceedings,<sup>1</sup> has

<sup>1</sup> 'Arkesilas III', *Libya in History*, pp. 53-78.

re-formulated Chamoux's view of the chronology of the reign of Arkesilas III,<sup>2</sup> to which I proposed an alternative in *JHS* lxxxvi (1966) 99-103. Noshy upholds Chamoux's view that Arkesilas' appeal to Samos (Hdt. iv 162-3) was made to Polykrates before 525 (when he medized during Cambyses' Egyptian expedition (Hdt. iii 13 and iv 165), after which, according to Noshy (p. 73) he could only have appealed to his Persian patrons). He attempts to reduce the awkwardly long interval between these events and Arkesilas' murder by updating Aryandes' Libyan expedition, which followed the murder, to 519. Like Chamoux, he connects Aryandes' rebellion against Darius and his execution with the visit of Darius to Egypt, recorded by Polyainos (vii 11) and fixed to 518 by the date of the death of the Apis bull which Darius mourned.<sup>3</sup> In Noshy's view, Aryandes' Libyan expedition was not authorised by Darius, whose impending visit caused him to recall it before the wider purpose of subduing the Libyan tribes was accomplished (pp. 64-5). He suggests further, that, contrary to the testimony of Herodotus (iv 164.4-5.1), Arkesilas' sojourn at Barka, which he places between 525 and 519, was by his own choice, with the object of subduing aristocratic revolt in western Cyrenaica, and that he never had to take refuge there, but was able to return to Cyrene between expeditions, only handing over the government to Pheretima while he was away on campaigns (p. 69). During this period, Noshy supposes that he founded Euhesperides to serve as an outpost in western Cyrenaica (pp. 70-1).

The events of Arkesilas' reign recorded in Hdt. iv 162-5 are admittedly difficult to date. The only certain points are his medism in 525 and the expedition sent by Aryandes to avenge his murder. The latter, despite Noshy's arguments (pp. 60-6), can hardly be dissociated from the year of Megabazus' operations in the Hellespont to suppress the rebellion which broke out there after Darius' Scythian expedition (Hdt. iv 145.1).<sup>4</sup> He was left there by

<sup>2</sup> *Cyrène sous la Monarchie des Battiades*, c. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Posener, *La Première Domination Perse en Égypte*, no. 5 (pp. 36 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. George C. Cameron, *JNES* ii (1943) 307-14, 'Darius, Egypt, and the "Lands beyond the sea"'. Cameron's argument, based on the lists of Persian subject-peoples (see Roland Kent, *ib.* pp. 302-6) is supplementary to Herodotus and accepts the synchronism. Noshy (pp. 55-6) objects that Kushiya (northern Ethiopia) is absent from the Behistun and Persepolis lists but present on the Egyptian canal stelae as well as Putaya (Libya) and denies that any conclusion can be drawn that Libya submitted c. 513 (the date of both lists), before the result of the Libyan expedition was known at Persepolis (where the Thracians (Skudra) who submitted after the Scythian expedition are recorded, though they are absent from the canal list). His own explanation, that both Kushiya and Putaya were part of the

Darius on his return, so his campaign must fall either at the end of the same year as the Scythian expedition or at the beginning of the following year, i.e. late in 514 or early in 513. Herodotus does not simply make a schematic connexion between the whole Scythian and Libyan expeditions, as Noshy thinks, because of the parallelism of the two events and the geographical opposition of Scythia and Libya: it would have been characteristic of him to do so, though hardly with as long an interval between the two as Noshy requires. But in this case, the method of parallel presentation is supported by a real synchronism between specific events, not a loose hypothetical one between the two Persian actions as a whole. Presumably he had a good source (probably a Persian one) for the activities of Megabazus in the Hellespont.

There is then no alternative but to accept *c.* 513 as the right date for the Libyan expedition and to give a separate account of Darius' visit to Egypt in 518.<sup>5</sup> Here Polyainos' note (vii 11.7) makes

Egyptian satrapy and so only recorded locally, will not explain their presence at Naksh-i Rostum on the list on Darius' tomb. It is possible that they, like the Libyans, had submitted earlier to Cambyses (Hdt. iii 97.1, *cf.* iii 13) but made a further submission to Darius after the building of the canal and the movement of Persian ships through the Red Sea (Kent, *Old Persian*, DZc, pp. 111 and 147), i.e. at about the same time as the Libyan expedition. The allegiance of subjects to the Persian king was personal and arrangements tended to be confirmed with each new monarch (*cf.* the Argive embassy to Sousa to find out whether their standing vis-à-vis Artaxerxes was the same as it had been with Xerxes (Hdt. vii 151)). In spite of Noshy's doubts about the effectiveness of the Libyan expedition (pp. 57-9), the most natural time for some of the Libyan tribes to have submitted to Darius would surely have been after the Persian army had reduced Barka and advanced as far as Euhesperides.

<sup>5</sup> See Wade-Gery's comprehensive note on the chronology of the Scythian and Libyan expeditions and Aryandes' revolt (*Essays*, 'Miltiades', p. 159 note 2) and Cameron's discussion in the article cited in the previous note.

J. M. Balcer (*HSCP* lxxvi (1972) 99-132) raises the date of the Scythian and Libyan expedition to 519, rejecting the date of the Tabula Capitolina for the Scythian expedition and identifying it with Darius' successful campaign against some Sakai (whose king Skunkha he captured) in his third year, recorded in *BI* col. v. This preserves Herodotus' synchronism but raises other difficulties: (1) It gives a very compressed chronology for the early years of Darius' reign, when he seems to have been too active in the eastern part of his empire to have led an expedition into Europe. (2) It results in a surprisingly high date for the Greek tyrants who went with Darius to the Danube. Histiaios,

perfectly good sense: Egypt revolted because of the harshness of Aryandes; Darius later visited the province himself and conciliated the Egyptians by exhibiting the religious tolerance for which the Achaemenids were noted with a gift of 100 talents for the mourning of the Apis bull. Probably the revolt was over before Darius' arrival (Polyainos does not say that Aryandes was actually expelled, though Noshy assumes this). Aryandes' arrogant behaviour described by Herodotus (166.2) in minting 'Aryandics' instead of Darics is a digression about what happened to Aryandes later, after the Libyan expedition. This is clearly indicated at 166.1 (*ὅς ὑστέρῳ χρόνῳ τούτων*) and 167.1 (*τότε δε*). If his arrogance had been shown in undertaking the Libyan expedition without authority, as Noshy thinks (p. 64), and he had been punished soon afterwards, there would have been no need to mark off the digression in this way. Aryandes' recall of the expedition suggests, on the contrary, that he was not behaving arrogantly but keeping within the official policy of Darius. I agree with Noshy that Egypt was not in revolt continuously from the beginning of Darius' reign until 518, as Olmstead thought,<sup>6</sup> but there could have been some trouble at Darius' accession (as the Behistun inscription indicates)<sup>7</sup> and a more serious outbreak in 518, put down ruthlessly by Aryandes.

The political events of Arkesilas III's reign must be explained on the basis of the later dating of the Libyan expedition. The events of Hdt. iv 164-5 (Arkesilas' return with Samian aid, the burning of his enemies in Aglomachos' tower, his refuge in

Miltiades and Aiakes were all active in the 490's and Strattis of Chios till at least 480 (Hdt. viii 132). (3) The chronology of events in Samos from the death of Polykrates to the Persian capture of Samos (Hdt. iii 120-149) would also be tight, since Aiakes has succeeded Syloson before the expedition. (4) The Herodotean expedition did not result in the subjection of a Scythian chief and his tribe, as did the action of *BI* col. v. 5. Darius' commanders in the west have changed by the time of the Scythian expedition: Otanes the conspirator captures Samos (Hdt. iii 149) but Megabazos, Otanes son of Sisamnes, and Artaphernes are on the scene during or soon after the Scythian expedition (Hdt. v 25-6). Generally, without placing much weight on the Tabula Capitolina or even Hippias' marriage-tie with Lampsakos after Hipparchos' murder (Thuc. vi 59), the Scythian expedition seems to belong to a later context than the events of Hdt. iii. which are grouped around the accession of Darius.

<sup>6</sup> Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 113 and 142.

<sup>7</sup> Egypt is listed among the provinces which revolted from Darius (Kent, *Old Persian*, DB I col. ii para. 21, where Egypt is restored in the OP from the Elamite version) but appears in the list of peoples subject to Darius in DB I col. i para. 6.

Barka with Alazeir, their murders and Pheretima's appeal to Aryandes) are inter-connected, and, in my view, fairly close together. An appeal to Samos, not during the reign of Polykrates but probably to individual Samians who were suffering under Syloson, would provide a chronological context not more than 2–3 years before 513. It may be that Noshy is right (pp. 71–2) in that there should be a shorter interval between Arkesilas' murder and Aryandes' response to Pheretimas' appeal than I suggested (*JHS* lxxxvi [1966] 103), but the upper limit cannot be far removed from 513. Since Arkesilas was on the throne before 525, there is a lacuna somewhere in Herodotus' account, and there may be a concealed interval at 162.2 (*ἐντεῦθεν στασιάζων*). I would suggest that Arkesilas' flight to Samos was the result of opposition which could have been building up for several years after he reversed the constitutional arrangements of Demonax. It was perhaps slowed down by the same fear of Persian attack from Egypt (unrealised in the event), which led Arkesilas to make his gesture of medism to Cambyses in 525. An appeal by Arkesilas to the Samians during the reign of Syloson would not be an affront to Darius (Noshy p. 73), since Samos was now under Persian control, and Arkesilas was on the same side, though more on the fringe of the Persian empire politically. The recall of the Libyan expedition in 513 shows that the Persians did not want extensive military commitments there. So why should they not have waited to see whether Arkesilas could survive with Samian aid? Noshy's view (pp. 73–4) that he could not have asked for help from any non-Persian source after his gift to Cambyses in 525, and that, since he did not get Persian aid, he did not need any, takes little account of military demands or Persian competence. How could Cambyses have spared troops before Egypt was conquered? He oddly explains Arkesilas' inadequate gift in 525 (distributed by Cambyses to the troops) as the result of the expenses of his appeal to Samos and his exile, denying any reluctance on Arkesilas' side or disappointment on that of Cambyses (p. 76).

Noshy's picture of a successful period in Arkesilas' reign, after he had subdued his enemies in Cyrene and Barka and their surrounding territories and possibly in Tauchira as well, receives no support from Herodotus, as he admits (p. 68). Herodotus plainly says that Arkesilas kept away from Cyrene voluntarily because he feared death, which the Delphic oracle had predicted (164.3). Whether the oracle is genuine in part or entirely *post eventum*, as Noshy thinks, and whether 'the bull' really refers to Alazeir or not is irrelevant to the fact that Arkesilas took refuge in Barka. Indeed, if the oracle is entirely *post eventum* it is even more likely that the facts it was invented to explain happened as Herodotus describes them. Noshy's suggestion that Arkesilas founded Euesperides during this period is contradicted by archaeological finds at Benghazi,

where the earliest sherds show that it was in existence before 575 B.C.<sup>8</sup>

The position of Arkesilas in Barka while Pheretima remained in Cyrene is surely not as incredible as Noshy thinks (p. 67). The population of Cyrene must have concealed enemies (he was murdered by 'Barkans and some Cyrenaean exiles' (164.4)), whereas Barka, ruled over by his father-in-law Alazeir, would have appeared safe. He must normally have been protected in Alazeir's castle, since his enemies murdered him *καταμαθόντες μιν ἀγοράζοντα*. He had evidently under-estimated the danger and the unpopularity of Alazeir, since the whole city was willing to share responsibility when the herald arrived from Aryandes (167.2). The position of Pheretima in Cyrene is understandable, since there would have been no advantage for his enemies in murdering her while Arkesilas himself remained alive. A king in danger of being assassinated, then as now, rules until the moment of his assassination. That he should have taken refuge in Barka without abdicating, while Pheretima acted formally for him in Cyrene,<sup>9</sup> is not surprising if his life was in danger. Noshy's reconstruction of a successful and victorious Arkesilas in Barka leaves the murders unexplained and he puts them down to Arkesilas' harsh treatment of Barka and 'over-weening confidence inspired by his achievements' (p. 77). This departs entirely from Herodotus' account, which still appears to me to be more credible.

Leaving the chronological problem aside, the most interesting part of Noshy's paper seems to me to be his discussion of the Persians' behaviour during the Libyan expedition (pp. 56–9). He is surely right in accepting Herodotus' opinion (167.4–5) that the expedition, besides reducing Barka, was also intended to subdue recalcitrant Libyan tribes, especially those in the hinterland and neighbourhood of the Greek cities. This explains the otherwise incomprehensible Persian advance as far as Euesperides. This was a vaguer mission than the punishment of Barka and would have to be interpreted by the commanders on the spot. It may explain, as Noshy suggests, why they were tempted to make Cyrene their base, contrary to instructions. While I do not agree that the expedition was as unsuccessful as Noshy thinks, or that Aryandes was forced to recall it prematurely because of Darius' impending arrival in Egypt, desert warfare against the Libyan tribes was bound to be open-ended and in the long run inconclusive.

<sup>8</sup> Boardman, *BSA* lxi (1966) 155–6. Dr M. J. Vickers, in an article to be published in *Libya Antiqua* vi, which he has kindly shown me, gives a full publication and discussion of the Benghazi material. He corroborates Boardman's early sixth century date for the foundation of Euesperides and dates the earliest sherds to the first quarter of the century.

<sup>9</sup> Hdt. iv 165.1: *ἢ δε εἶχε αὐτῆ τοῦ παιδὸς τὰ γέρεα ἐν Κυρήνη καὶ τᾶλλα νεμομένη καὶ ἐν βουλή παρίζουσα.*

This would have been clear to Aryandes (and is in my opinion a sufficient reason for his recall of the expedition), but was perhaps not so apparent to the two commanders, who were tempted to try and achieve more than a show of force against the Libyans. Though Noshy includes the discussion to draw the uncertain inference that the Libyan expedition could not have resulted in any submission of Libyan tribes to Persia around 513, it throws some light on the relations of Cyrene and the other Greek cities with the Libyans, a most important factor in the history of Cyrenaica.

B. M. MITCHELL

*St. Anne's College, Oxford*

### A New Cup by the Villa Giulia Painter in Oxford\*

The Ashmolean Museum has recently acquired a fragmentary, but none the less attractive Attic cup.<sup>1</sup> The interior is decorated in the white-ground technique, but the artist has used red-figure on the exterior. The internal and external decoration do not differ merely in technique, however, but also in mood: the central tondo bears a cool, restrained scene of a girl pouring a libation, whereas outside we have a mildly drunken rout—a *komos*.

The interior (PLATE XVIIa) is mostly white. There is a broad black band around the edge, at some distance in from which is a dilute brown line which circumscribes the tondo itself. This is decorated with a scene of a girl standing between two altars, over one of which she pours a libation. She faces towards the left and much of her body is seen in three-quarter view. Unfortunately her face is damaged, but enough remains to show that it was once pretty and appealing. On her head she wears a broad cloth band through which her back-hair emerges in a kind of chignon. She wears earrings. A himation edged in red is thrown loosely over her left shoulder and hangs down to well below her knees. Beneath, she wears a flimsy chiton which is pulled revealingly tight over her right breast and is buttoned at the elbow. Bracelets in the form of snakes adorn her wrists,<sup>2</sup> and in her right hand she

holds an oinochoe. This last, in common with the bracelets, buttons and earrings, is rendered plastically (i.e. in relief), and was perhaps originally gilded.<sup>3</sup> To her left, a rod or sceptre leans independently, while on either side can be seen parts of two altars, which, if identical, consisted of two plain, swelling mouldings, somewhat archaic in character, above a row of ovolos, and beneath on the sides, a metope between two dark strips.<sup>4</sup> Some preliminary sketch is visible. Much of the detailed drawing is done in relief line, reinforced around the edges of the garment and on the altar with applied red. Dilute paint is used for the hair, the hem of the chiton and the decoration immediately above it, and for the triglyphs (if that is what they are) of the altars.

Outside, as has already been said, there is a *komos* scene in red-figure technique. Three figures are visible on the best-preserved side (PLATE XVIIIa). To the left we have the lower limbs of a *komast* probably the worse for drink, pulling himself along with the aid of his walking stick, his empty cup hanging from his hand. His spreading cloak, edged in black, forms a backcloth. In the middle is a youth playing the double flutes. Behind and above his head can be read  $\kappa\alpha\lambda[\omicron\varsigma]$ . His cloak is slung over one shoulder and rests over the other arm. In front of him is the best preserved of all the figures, a tipsy youth wearing a garland on his head and looking back at the others. He holds his arms out to steady himself and his cloak is draped across his arms. The first figure on the left on the other side (PLATE XVIIIb) is almost completely missing, apart from his toe and the tip of his walking stick. Then comes another musician, this time playing the cithara; he finds the notes with one hand and holds a plectrum in the other. Beyond him a companion scampers away. The subsidiary ornament consists of rather roughly drawn palmettes beneath the handles, and, on each side of the latter, the tips of ivy leaves are preserved. The independently leaning walking sticks to the right of each scene could almost rank as subsidiary ornament; they clearly do not belong to any of the figures. Again some preliminary sketch is visible and relief line is employed for major anatomical details and the drapery. Some muscles are delineated with dilute paint.

The cup is by the Villa Giulia Painter and seems to belong to a series of cups attributed to him by

\* *Acknowledgements*: I should like to thank Dr Dietrich von Bothmer, Professor C. M. Robertson, Mrs C. Sourvinou-Inwood and Mlle A. Waiblinger for discussing the cup with me. Dr von Bothmer and Professor Robertson kindly read through the manuscript; any remaining mistakes are my own. Access to the Beazley Archive was granted by Professor Robertson; my thanks are due to Dr D. C. Kurtz for her kind co-operation.

<sup>1</sup> Accession number 1973.1. Presented by Mr N. Koutoulakis in memory of Sir John Beazley. Diameter: 24.5 cm. Restored height: 10.7 cm.

<sup>2</sup> For snake bracelets, cf. e.g. R. A. Higgins, *Greek and Roman Jewellery* (London, 1961) 172.

<sup>3</sup> For gilded relief vases, see J. V. Noble, *The Technique of Attic Painted Pottery* (London, 1965) 63–4, figs. 218–19. At the suggestion of Dr von Bothmer the surface of the oinochoe was analysed. Dr Robert Hedges of the Oxford Archaeological Research Laboratory carried out the analysis by means of X-ray fluorescence, and reports that the surface was plated with tin.

<sup>4</sup> For an altar with similar metopes, see the volutekrater no. 269 by the Niobid Painter in Bologna, beneath the handle to the right of side A: *CVA Bologna v*, pl. 102, 4.