

NOTES

Negative Co-ordination in Attic Decrees

In the course of examining the entire corpus of Athenian decrees¹ I have become increasingly aware of certain 'irregularities' in restorations involving negatives. The purpose of this paper is to challenge such restorations.²

I. *A and not B*

In the co-ordination of clauses the orthodox usage is well established: in Attic prose *οὐδέ* and *μηδέ* join only negative clauses, whereas in poetry and Ionic prose they often co-ordinate a positive member with a negative.³ There are exceptions, of course: Thucydides vii 77.1, Lysias xxiv 22, Plato *Laches* 198e and *Laws* 889c,⁴ to which must be added Gorgias *Palamedes* 17 (τῶ δὲ τοιοῦτῳ βίῳ περι(ουσία) κινδύνων τῶν μεγίστων, οὐδ' ἔχει ἀσφάλειαν) and Alcidas *Odysseus* 8 (δεῖ δέ με καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ διελθεῖν ὡς ἔχει μηδ' ἀδίκως οὕτως ἄνδρα σύμμαχον περὶ θανάτου κρίνειν).⁵ In the matter of the restoration of epigraphical documents, however, can one feel justified in ignoring the norm, particularly if no *unrestored* anomalous parallel can be cited in support? For my examination of the decrees shows that there is extant no example of *οὐδέ/μηδέ* co-ordinating a negative with a preceding positive. We shall therefore look with some suspicion upon restorations which embrace the anomaly without comment.

The stele recording the Athenian settlement with Chalcis offers an excellent example of orthodoxy:⁶ the Athenian oath begins thus (vv. 4-12)

οὐκ ἐχσελῶ Χα

5 λκιδέας ἐχ Χαλκίδος οὐδὲ τὴν πόλιν ἀνά
στατον ποέσο οὐδὲ ἰδιότεν οὐδένα ἀτιμ
όσο οὐδὲ φνγεί ζεμίοσο οὐδὲ χσυλλέφσο
μαι οὐδὲ ἀποκτενῶ οὐδὲ χρέματα ἀφαιρέ
σομαι ἀκρίτο οὐδενός ἄνευ τῶ δέμο τῶ Ἄθ
10 εναίον, οὐδ' ἐπιρσεφῶ κατὰ ἀπροσκέτο
οὔτε κατὰ τῶ κοινῶ οὔτε κατὰ ἰδιότο οὐδ
ἐ ἐνός

Cf. also ML n. 40, the regulations for Erythrai:⁷ even in this heavily restored text we have no difficulty in

finding clear evidence both for 'οὐκ *A* οὐδὲ *B*' and for '*A* καὶ οὐ *B*'. I quote vv. 21-29:⁸

βολεύσο ἡος ἄν [δύ]νο[μ]α[ι] ἄριστ[α κα]

[ι] δ[ι]κα[μ]ότα[τα] Ἐρυθραίων τῶι πλέθει καὶ
'Ἀθηναίων καὶ τῶν [χ]σ[τ]

[υ]νμά[χ]ον [κ]αὶ οὐκ [ἀποσ]τέσομαι Ἀθηναίων τῶ
π[λ]έθος οὐδὲ [τ]

[ὄν] χσυνμάχον τῶν Ἀθηναίων οὔτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ
ο[ὔ]τ' ἄ[λ]λοι πε[ί]σομαι

25 [οὔ]δ----- οὔτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὔτ'
ἄλλοι πε[ί]σομαι-----]

[----] τῶν φ [υ]γά[δ]ον [κατ]αδέχομαι οὐδ[ε]

ἡένα οὔτ[-----]

[ἄλλοι] πείσομαι[ι] τῶν ἐς Μέδος φε[υ]γ[ο]ν[το]ν
ἄνευ τῆ[ς] βο[λ]ῆς τῆ[ς]

[Ἀθη]ναίων καὶ τῶ [δέ]μο [ο]ὔδὲ τῶν μενόντων
ἐχσελῶ [ἄ]ν[ευ] τῆς β[ο]

[λῆς] τῆς Ἀθηναίων καὶ [τῶ] δέμο.

The stones give further eloquent testimony of these phenomena⁹ but neither does space permit nor is it necessary to labour the point. Suffice it to state once and for all that there is no epigraphically surely attested example of '*A* οὐδὲ/μηδὲ *B*' in any Attic decree. Let us therefore consider the texts in which this irregularity has been entertained by modern scholars.

(a) ML n. 65, Athenian relations with Methone and Macedon¹⁰

In the first decree (vv. 16-23) three envoys are to be sent to Perdiccas urging him not to restrict Methone's freedom of movement by sea or land and not to lead his forces through Methone's territory without her agreement. Following *ATL*.^{10a} Meiggs and Lewis read:

εἶπεν δὲ Περδικκάκι ἡότι δοκε[ῖ] δικά] st. 41

[ι]ο]ν εἶναι ἔαν Μεθωναίος τῆι θαλάττει χρεῖσθα[ι μεδὲ]

20 [ἐ]χσ]εῖναι ἠορίσασθαι, καὶ ἔαν εἰσεμπορεύεσθ
[αι καθ]

[ἀ]πε]ρ τέος ἐ[ς] τὴν χόραν καὶ μέτε ἀδικῆν μ[ε]τε

[ἀ]δ[ικῆ]σ

[θαι] μεδὲ στρα[τ]ιὰν διὰ τῆς χόρας Μεθ[ο]ναίων

[διὰ]

[γεν ἀ]κόντομ [Με]θωναίον, κτλ.

Vs. 21 (*unrestored*) illustrates the norm; vv. 19-20, μεδὲ | [ἐ]χσ]εῖναι ἠορίσασθαι, pose the problem. I submit that the restoration should be allowed to stand only if no other possible alternative will fit the stoichedon pattern.

There are 8 available letter-spaces, 5 at the end of v. 19 (one of which is already claimed by the iota of χρεῖσθα[ι]) and 3 at the beginning of v. 20. Of the

⁸ Note that Meiggs and Lewis do not accept the extremely doubtful οὐδέ (connective) + ποτε (vv. 25-6) of *ATL*.

⁹ *Cf.* e.g., ML n. 73, vv. 46 and 54 ff.

¹⁰ i²57 = D 3/6.

^{10a} The restoration originally stems from Kirchhoff, *Abh. Berl. Akad.* (1861) 561 n. 2.

¹ For the purposes of a study of the history of the prescript which I hope to publish elsewhere.

² Apart from abbreviations in normal use I shall employ the following: BM = D. W. Bradeen and M. F. McGregor, *Studies in Fifth-Century Attic Epigraphy* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1973); D = *ATL* II; ML = R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1969). In referring to inscriptions in the *Corpus* I omit the letters *I.G.*: thus i²39 = *Inscriptiones Graecae* vol. I² n. 39.

³ See J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford, 1954) 190 ff.

⁴ All quoted by Denniston, *loc. cit.*

⁵ See K. J. Dover, 'Der Stil des Aristophanes', in *Aristophanes und die alte Komödie* (Darmstadt, 1975) 138-9.

⁶ i²39 = D 17 = ML n. 52. I quote from ML.

⁷ i²10 = D 10.

7 letters thus to be recovered one could reasonably assume that 3 should be allocated to *καί* and that the other 4 should contain a negative. [*ι καί μ*][*ἐ ἐχ*] *ἔναι* would contain one letter too many, but [*ι καί μ*][*εδὲ*] *ἔναι* will solve the problem precisely and neatly. *μεδέ* is here adverbial^{10b} ('and that it should not be permitted to impose boundaries either'), and *ἔναι* stands, as commonly,¹¹ for *ἐχσῆναι*.

(b) BM Chapter II, Regulations for Miletos¹²

Bradeen and McGregor present a very valuable discussion of this difficult stone. At the conclusion of their study¹³ they offer a more ambitiously restored text. For vv. 71–2 they 'envisage a clause along the following lines: [*ἐχσ*]ορκό[*ντων* δ] *ἔ* *χοι* *πέγ*[*τε* *μετά* *τῶν* *χορκοτῶν* *μεδέ* *ὀμόσαι* *τὸς* *ἄλλο* | *ς* *Μιλεσίο*ς] *ἔόντο*[*ν* *πρί*] *ν* *ἂν* *ὀμόσει*[*ι* *ἑκάστος* *τῶν* *πρυτάνεων*].¹⁴ *μεδέ* will once more rouse our suspicions. Where so little is read on the stone, perhaps one should resist the temptation to emend such a substantial restoration. However, assuming that the proposed text is basically along the right lines, one can improve its grammar by substituting *καί μέ* for *μεδέ* and readjusting the spacing by writing *χορκοτῶν*.¹⁵ This would be entirely consistent with Bradeen and McGregor's explanation of the irregularities in the stoichedon pattern of this stone.¹⁶

(c) ML n. 56, Treaty with Samos¹⁷

The second fragment of this document contains the oaths to be taken by Samos and Athens. At vv. 15–20 Meiggs and Lewis follow *ATL* in reading

15 [-----δρ] st. 35
[*ἄσο* *καί* *ἔρῶ* *καί* *βολεύσο* *τοῖ* *δέμοι* *τοῖ* *Ἄθυνα*]
[*ὄν* *ἡ* *οἱ* *ἂν* *δύνομαι* *καλὸν* *καί* *ἀ*[*γ*] *αθόν*,
[*οὐδὲ* *ἄ*]
[*ποστέσομαι* *ἀπὸ* *τῶ* *δέμο* *τῶ* *Ἄθυναίων* *οὔτε* *λ*[*ό*]
[*γοι* *οὔτε* *ἔργοι* *οὔτε* *ἀπὸ* *τῶν*] *χουμμάχων* *τῶν* *Ἄ*
20 [*θυναίων*, *κτλ.*

The immediate problem lies in vv. 17–18, [*οὐδὲ* *ἄ*][*ποστέσομαι*]. The best photographs of this fragment¹⁸ leave no doubt that after *ἀ*[*γ*] *αθόν* there are only 5 letter-spaces available at the end of the line. [*οὐδὲ* *ἄ*] is, therefore, obviously most tempting, fitting snugly into the stoichedon 35 pattern which has been inferred from the restorations proposed for the last two fragments of this document.¹⁹ If, however, the preceding clause is correctly restored as a *positive*, one would expect to find [*καί* *οὐκ* *ἀποστέσομαι*].²⁰ Unfortunately *καί* *οὐκ* is two letters too many.

^{10b} See Denniston, *op. cit.* 194–5.

¹¹ Cf. e.g., ML n. 40 v. 10: *καί* [*μ* *ε*] *σέ*[*ν*] *ον* *ἔ* *να* *βολε*[*ῦ* *έν*]; ii² 558 vv. 19–20: *καί* *εἶ* *ναι* *αὐτῶι* *γράψασθ*[*ι*] *α*, *κτλ.*

¹² i² 22 = D 11.

¹³ *Op. cit.* 63–5.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.* 58.

¹⁵ I opt for 3 letters in 2 spaces rather than 2 in 1 since H and O are both wide letters.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* 31–2.

¹⁷ i² 50 (+i² 102) = D 18.

¹⁸ *ATL* II pl. XI; B. D. Meritt, *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century* (1932) 53 fig. 9.

¹⁹ See Meritt, *op. cit.* 54. The Corpus had assumed a line of 44 letters.

²⁰ As in D 10 v. 23 and D 15 v. 45.

The removal of the preposition in v. 18²¹ would result in a line too short by one letter; nor does it seem possible—at least within the stoichedon pattern as established—to suggest a text with *πλέθος* instead of *δέμο*. Indeed, I am totally unable to recast the text in such a way as to incorporate *καί* *οὐκ* and still retain the sequence of oath items as proposed in *ATL*.

It seems then that we are left with two alternatives, neither particularly attractive: (i) to accept *οὐδέ* as an isolated exception to the 'rule'. Since examples do occur in Attic prose, the possibility cannot be completely ruled out in epigraphical texts; we must always be prepared to meet with, and accept, the unusual in the language of inscriptions;²² (ii) to restore the preceding clause in such a way as to introduce a *negative* there: e.g.

15 [-----οῦ]
[*δράσο* *οὐδέ* *ἔρῶ* *οὐδέ* *βολεύσο* *οὐδὲν* *τοῖ* *δέμο*]
[*ι* *τοῖ* *Ἄθυναίων* *εἰ* *μέ* *καλὸν* *καί* *ἀ*[*γ*] *αθόν*, [*οὐδὲ* *ἄ*]
[*ποστέσομαι*

This would have the virtue of removing all doubt about the later restoration, but no parallel for the negative form of this item of the oath is forthcoming.

Perhaps indeed it is wasted effort to attempt a detailed restoration of this fragmentary text until some further evidence comes to hand. The problem of the negative should, however, be borne in mind.^{22a}

II. Confusion of *οὐδέ* and *οὔτε*

(a) ML n. 56. Treaty with Samos²³

At v. 19 of this document we read *οὔτε ἀπὸ τῶν* *χουμμάχων*. This is manifestly in error for *οὐδέ ἀπὸ τῶν* *χουμμάχων*, the co-ordination being with (the assumed) *οὐδέ ἀποστέσομαι ἀπὸ τῶ* *δέμο* *τῶ* *Ἄθυναίων*, not with *οὔτε λόγοι οὔτε ἔργοι*.²⁴

(b) D 10, Regulations for Erythrai²⁵

Exactly the same error appears here in a parallel formulation of an oath of loyalty to Athens and her allies. At vv. 71–2²⁶ the text should be altered to read *οὐκ ἀπο*[*στ*ε] *σομα*[*ι*] *Ἄ*[*θυναίων* *τῶ* *πλέθος* *οὐδέ*

²¹ As in D 15 v. 45.

²² See Section III below.

^{22a} A more radical approach to the problem would be to reject the (inferred) 35 letter line from this section of the inscription. H. Wankel (*ZPE* xv [1974] 249–54), in arguing against the restoration of the formula *καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν* in epigraphical texts of the fifth century, is forced to the same conclusion (p. 253): 'wird wahrscheinlich die Frage der Zeilenlänge und der Ergänzungen in Z. 15 ff. . . überhaupt neu überdacht werden müssen.' (Wankel does not touch on the problem of the negative at the end of v. 15.)

²³ i² 50 (+i² 102) = D 18. See quotation under I (c) above.

²⁴ *οὐδέ* is correctly restored by Meritt in *Athenian Financial Documents of the Fifth Century* 54.

²⁵ i² 12/13a. See now H. Engelmann and R. Merklebach edd., *Inchriften griechische Städte aus Kleinasien I: Die Inchriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai* (Bonn, 1972) Part I n. 4.

²⁶ I am not concerned here with the problem of whether or not this fragment belongs to the same settlement with Erythrai as i² 10. (See ML *op. cit.* 92–3.)

τῶν χυμμάχων τῶν Ἀθεν[αίω]ν,²⁷ as indeed we find earlier in the text at vv. 23-4.

(c) D15, Treaty with Kolophon²⁸

At vv. 42-8 *ATL* offers a version which is syntactically impeccable²⁹:—

ὄμοσ[άντων δὲ Κολοφόνιοι τάδε· δράσο καὶ ἐ]
ρῶ καὶ βολεύσο[δ, τι ἂν δύνομαι καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν πε]
ρὶ τὸν δέμον τ[ὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ περὶ τὸς ξυμμάχος
αὐτ]

45 [σ]ν καὶ οὐκ ἀποστ[έσομαι τῷ δέμῳ τῷ Ἀθηναίων
οὔτε]

[λ]όγοι οὔτ' ἔργ[οι οὔτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ οὔτ' ἄλλοι
πέσομαι]

[κ]αὶ φιλέσο τὸ[ν δέμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων καὶ οὐκ
αὐτομο]

[λ]έσο κτλ.

In Bradeen and McGregor, however, we read:³⁰ 'the general sense of the restorations in *ATL*, II, D15, is correct. Perhaps the allies were not mentioned in line 44, as Meiggs and Lewis maintain, but their argument that they cannot be included in the following negative clause will not stand. Line 46 could well have read [λ]όγοι οὔτ' ἔργ[οι οὔτ' ἀπὸ τῶν χυμμάχων τῶν Ἀθηναίων], the same wording as that in the Samian oath' (my italics). As we have seen above, however, D18 is a faulty model: if it is to be added at all, it must be in the form οὐδ' ἀπὸ τῶν χυμμάχων.

III. ii²416: a possible instance of μήτε . . . δέ?

The honorary decree for [.....]das of Kos³¹ presents a somewhat different complex of problems. I quote from the *Corpus*, retaining the line numbering for convenience:

[οἱ ἔ]μποροι οἱ[Ἀθηναίων καὶ ὁ δῆ] st. 25³²
5 [μοσ] ὁ ἐν Σάμῳ καὶ οἱ[ἄλλοι οἱ πα]
[ρ]ατυγχάνοντες Ἀθη[ναίων καὶ τ]
[ῶ]ν ἄλλων ἀποφαίνου[σιν Πραξιά]
δαν τὸν Κῶιον τῶν τε [ἐμπόρων κα]
ὶ τῶν ναυκλήρων ἐπι[μελούμενο]
10 ν ὅπως ἂν σίτος ὡς ἀφ[θονωτάτως]
εἰσπλεῖ τῶι δήμῳ τ[ῶι Ἀθηναίων]
ν καὶ μηδεὶς μήτε κ[ωλύηται τῶν]
Ἀθηναίων μηδ' ὑφ' ἐνό[ς ἀδίκως μη]
δὲ κατὰγεται καὶ τᾶ[λλα ἐνδείκ]

²⁷ Note that in the *Corpus* Hiller correctly restores with Kirchhoff's οὐδέ.

²⁸ i²14/15 = ML n. 47.

²⁹ Meiggs and Lewis, *loc. cit.*, who offer a less ambitious text, show basically the same approach to the co-ordination of the passage.

³⁰ *Op. cit.* ch. V pp. 97-8.

³¹ I deliberately refrain from describing this text as a proxeny decree for Praxiadas of Kos, since the two fragments tentatively published together in the *Corpus* do not belong together. Michael Walbank, who examined the stones in 1971, informs me *per epistulam* that there are differences in the stone on which these two fragments are cut and perhaps also in the treatment of the backs (if both are original). Doubtless, however, the honours involved an award of *proxenia*.

³² The stoichedon pattern is rigid (iota always occupying a full space). The length of line is easily determined from vv. 10 and 11, where the restorations are certain.

15 νυται τῶι ἀεὶ παραγ[ιγνομένοι]
[Ἀθ]ηναίων εἴνοιαν

The inscription is dated in the *Corpus* c.330, although it would perhaps be more accurate to indicate a date in the range 331-324. For this text is one of the numerous extant examples of Attic decrees passed in honour of individuals who won Athens' gratitude for services performed relative to the serious grain shortage of that period. One such proxeny decree was found as recently as 1970;³³ other decrees of a similar nature are ii² 360, 363, 398, 400, 401, 407, 408, 423 (?), 479 and 499; also *Hesperia* viii (1939) 27-30, n. 7 and ix (1940) 332-3, n. 9.

It can be seen immediately that the text offered by Wilhelm cannot stand. My own autopsy³⁴ shows that the inscribed letters are, without exception, correctly reported, but the restorations are perhaps a trifle cavalier. One could conceivably put ὡς ἀφ[θονωτάτως] (v. 10) down to a printing error,³⁵ but one will certainly take issue with the article with Ἀθηναίων (v. 12)³⁶ and feel some qualms about the late postponement of the restored abverb ἀδίκως (v. 13).

Clearly in v. 10 we should read ὡς ἀφ[θονωτάτος], as in the new proxeny decree (vv. 9-11)³⁷

καὶ π[ρ]άτταν ὅπως ἂν ὡς ἀ[φ]
10 [θ]ονωτά[τ]ος Ἀθήναζε κομίζη
ται σίτ[ο]ς

Also we shall simply excise τῶν from v. 12 and so reckon with a lacuna of 10 letters beginning either μήτε κ[or, perhaps, μήτ' ἐκ[- - -].

But what of the apparent co-ordination μήτε . . . μηδέ? Admittedly the drafter of this document was capable of a somewhat loose syntax: he slips easily from ἀποφαίνουσι + accusative and participle to the rather blunt finite verb ἐνδείκνυται (vv. 14-15).³⁸ This then may have encouraged Wilhelm to contemplate the unorthodox³⁹ co-ordination he posits. However, if the construction before us is in fact a 'neither . . . nor' co-ordination, we would have every reason to expect the regular μήτε . . . μήτε. If μηδέ is to appear in the text, it has almost certainly been employed *in error* (perhaps under the influence of the preceding μηδ' ὑφ' ἐνό[ς]).

A further factor, however, in our analysis of this

³³ Published by John McK. Camp II, *Hesperia* xliii (1974) 322-4, 'Proxenia for Sopatros of Akragas'.

³⁴ During the summer of 1975. My best thanks are due to Dr D. Peppas-Delmousou and her assistant, Miss Ch. Karapa, for their great helpfulness in enabling me to examine this stone, *inter alios*, in the Epigraphical Museum.

³⁵ Though the paroxytone militates against such a charitable assumption.

³⁶ See my article in *CQ* n.s. xvi 2 (1966) 295-6. Note that Wilhelm correctly eschews the article in vv. 6, 11 and 16.

³⁷ See note 33 above. Cf. also ii²407 vv. 7-8: ὅπως ἂν σίτος ἀφι[κ]νήτα[ι ὡς π]λε[[ίτος] Ἀθηναί[ε].

³⁸ The transition is made easier by pointing with a semi-colon after κατὰγεται.

³⁹ Not elsewhere (to my knowledge) attested in Attic decrees, but not absolutely unparalleled in Attic prose: see Denniston, *op. cit.* 193.

passage must be the doubtful position of the adverb *ἀδίκως* (v. 13). With Wilhelm's text *ἀδίκως* belongs, rather belatedly, with *κωλύηται*. Indeed, whatever is restored in the lacuna before *μηδέ* must of necessity belong in the first half of the co-ordination. This leaves *κατάγηται* completely on its own without qualification: it must be interpreted as a *passive* ('be brought to port', i.e. forced to come into port and discharge one's cargo), but the context is perhaps not sufficiently explicit for the verb to convey by itself the full meaning required.⁴⁰

Bearing all these points in mind let us now attempt an alternative restoration. One will hardly doubt that in the first half of the co-ordination we need a verb in the passive (or 'virtual' passive). The clause seems to be emphasising by means of accumulated negatives that the honorand has been at pains to see to it that 'none of the Athenians (*sc.* in Samos, that is to say the Athenian *ἔμποροι* and *ναύκληροι*) may be . . . by anyone at all.' The lacuna could be filled out, for example, with

καὶ μηδεὶς μήτε κ[ακῶς πάσχη]
Ἀθηναίων μηδ' ὕφ' ἐνό[ς],

'in order that none of the Athenians may be badly treated by anyone at all.'

I suggest that there should be a pause after *ἐνό[ς]*: certainly one does not expect an adverb appearing at this late stage. But the necessary consequence of placing a comma after *ἐνό[ς]* is that the co-ordinate *μηδέ* can now no longer stand: for it cannot appear 6 spaces after the assumed break at *ἐνό[ς]*. On the other hand, a *positive* clause introduced by *δέ* could be fitted into the structure and the lacuna filled with an adverb (or equivalent) of 8 letters. With such a structure *κατάγηται* would be taken in its common *middle* meaning ('come to port') and the whole clause would express some appropriate sense in contrast to *κακῶς πάσχη*. The sense would be satisfied by something like 'but may come to port unforced/unhindered.' Although either *ἀβιάστω* or *ἀκωλύτω* would fit the available space, there is perhaps a slight preference for the former in view of the possible ambiguity of the latter.

Two further points require comment: (i) *μήτε* . . . *δέ* would appear to be the acceptance of one anomaly after the condemnation of another. However, a critical analysis of the total passage does seem to indicate that some change is needed, and the degree of anomalousness is perhaps marginally less.⁴¹ I may add, however, that I do not believe that the

⁴⁰ *κατάγειν* is treated by G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (1972) 47 and especially Appendix VIII, p. 314. (I owe this reference to Dr D. M. Lewis). It is perhaps significant that in almost all the examples he quotes the voice is *active*: 'A *κατάγει* B's vessels', where there can be no doubt that B is acting under coercion. But when the verb is used in the *passive*, 'A *κατάγεται*', surely a little more is required to show that A is being *forced into port*, not landing of his own accord. Cf. ii²360 vv. 35-6 (315/4): *ἐπειδὴ δὲ καταχθεὶς | ὑπὸ Ἡρακλεωπῶν πλέων Ἀθή|ναζε παρεῖρη τὰ ἱστία ὑπ' αὐτῶν*. Wilhelm may well have felt that the force of *μηδ' ὕφ' ἐνό[ς]* *ἀδίκως* carried over into the second half of the co-ordination.

⁴¹ See Denniston, *op. cit.* 511 and K-G. II ii 292.

drafter consciously embraced this construction: rather I feel that he carelessly⁴² allowed himself to become confused by the preceding multiple negatives, which resulted in a structure which second thoughts might well have inclined him to abandon; (ii) *ἕκαστος* (or *πᾶς τις*) has to be understood from the preceding *μηδεὶς*. This is a common enough feature of classical Attic cf. e.g. Thucydides iv.10 *μηδεὶς ὁμῶν ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ ἀνάγκῃ ξυνετός βουλέσθω δοκεῖν εἶναι*-----, *μᾶλλον δὲ* (*sc.* *ἕκαστος βουλέσθω*) -----; Demosthenes xviii 199 *μηδεὶς θαυμάσῃ μου τὴν ὑπερβολὴν, ἀλλὰ χωρῆσαι μετ' ἐνοίας δὲ λέγω θεωρησάτω*.⁴³

Vv. 12-14 may therefore now read, *exempli gratia*

καὶ μηδεὶς μήτε κ[ακῶς πάσχη]
Ἀθηναίων μηδ' ὕφ' ἐνό[ς], ἀβιάστω
δὲ κατάγηται.⁴⁴

ALAN S. HENRY

Monash University, Australia

⁴² Drafters of inscriptions seem frequently to have been careless. But no doubt less accuracy was demanded of them than of their modern counterparts.

⁴³ See K-G. II ii 566-7: 'So ist aus *οὐδὲ εἰς, οὐδεὶς* der Begriff von *εἰς, ἕκαστος* oder *πάντες* zu entnehmen.'

⁴⁴ I have to thank Professor K. J. Dover and Mr A. G. Woodhead for sharing with me the frustrations of this seemingly innocent stone. I have profited greatly from discussion with them on this text in particular and on epigraphical negatives in general. They are, of course, in no way responsible for the views put forward in this paper.

The Death of Talos

In *Clio Medica* 7 (1972) 1 ff. D. Gourevitch published an article (which I have not seen) on 'Les représentations des soins donnés a Philoctète'. Among these the author included the picture on an Attic red-figure column-krater in Salerno. The next year Albin Lesky republished the pictures with a new interpretation: the death of Talos, the brazen giant who guarded Crete and was destroyed by the Argonauts with Medea's help.¹ It has since been published again, for the first time officially, by the excavator, G. d'Henry, who gives the correct provenance: Montesarchio (the ancient Caudium), near Benevento.² He reverts to the interpretation as Philoctetes on Lemnos. I know the vase only from these publications, none of which illustrates or describes the picture on the back of the vase, but it is not likely that this is iconographically relevant or interesting. One detail as well as the general view of the main picture is given by Lesky (after Gourevitch).

On the spectator's right a bearded man, larger than the other figures, leans backwards, seeming to collapse as he struggles against two youths who hold his arms and support him. A third youth kneels in front and does something to the bearded figure's right foot which is stretched forward; his left leg is doubled under him. Behind the kneeling youth stands a woman, bending forward, a bowl in her left hand, her right extended forward and down and

¹ *AA* (1973) 1115-19 figs. 1-2.

² *SE* 42 (1974) Scavi e scoperte 508, pl. 82,b.