

and beauty. Sparta was the city with the loveliest women;²³ and the Eurotas had been the venue for Leda and the swan.²⁴

BARRY BALDWIN

University of Calgary

²³ *Od.* xiii 412; cf. the discussion in *Ath.* xiii 566a.

²⁴ See *AP* v 307 (Antiphilus) on a picture of this episode.

Artemis Eukleia and Euripides' *Hippolytus**

In connection with a temple of Artemis Eukleia at Plataea, Plutarch tells us that Eukleia was commonly identified with Artemis: τὴν δ' Εὐκλειαν οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ καὶ καλοῦσι καὶ νομίζουσιν Ἄρτεμιν (*Plut. Arist.* 20.6). His testimony is supported by Pausanias, who mentions a temple of Artemis Eukleia at Thebes (*Paus.* ix 17.1). Plutarch goes on to tell us that the cult of Eukleia was widespread, at the same time giving us a glimpse of its followers: βωμὸς γὰρ αὐτῆ καὶ ἄγαλμα κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀγορὰν ἴδρυται, καὶ προθύουσιν αἱ τε γαμοῦμαι καὶ οἱ γαμοῦντες (*Plut. ibid.*). He has himself already mentioned Eukleia's temple at Plataea and we may add the festival of Eukleia at Corinth reported by Xenophon.¹ More important perhaps for the present discussion, Pausanias mentions a temple of Eukleia situated in the agora at Athens:² ἔτι δὲ ἀπωτέρω ναὸς Εὐκλείας, ἀνάθημα καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ Μῆδων, οἱ τῆς χώρας Μαραθῶνι ἔσχον. φρονήσαι δὲ Ἀθηναίους ἐπὶ τῇ νίκῃ ταύτῃ μάλιστα εἰκάζω (*Paus.* i 14.5). Moreover, an Athenian tragedian could refer to the link between Artemis and Eukleia and expect to be understood, as did Sophocles:

πρώτῳ σε κεκλόμενος, θύγατερ Διός, ἄμβροτ' Ἀθάνᾳ,
γαιόχομόν τ' ἀδελφεᾶν
Ἄρτεμιν, ἢ κυκλόεντ' ἀγορᾶς θρόνον εὐκλείᾳ θάσσει
(*Soph. O.T.* 159–61).

In Euripides' *Hippolytus* Artemis' role is fundamental, despite the fact that she appears on stage in person only for a short time. Her brief epiphany at the end of the play matches and balances that of Aphrodite, who delivers the prologue; within the play, framed by these two powers, their struggle—or part of it—is acted out.³

At the same time the idea of *eukleia* bulks large: we find *εὐκλεῆς* (47, 489), *εὐκλεεῖς* (423, 687), *εὐκλεᾶ* (717) and *ὑπ'εὐκλείας* (1299); cf. *δυσκλεᾶ* (405) and *ἀκλεῆς* (1028). Phaedra is depicted as preoccupied with her own *eukleia* (489, 687), upon which—as she sees it—depends that of her sons (423, 717). It is her desire to die with *eukleia* that leads her to cast the blame for her death upon Hippolytus. Euripides indicates this at the critical juncture, when Phaedra decides upon her final course of action:

σὺ δ' οὐκ ἀνέσχου· τοιγὰρ οὐκέτ' εὐκλεεῖς
θανοῦμεθ'. ἀλλὰ δεῖ με δὴ καινῶν λόγων
(687–8; cf. 502)

* This note owes much to the generous help of Mrs P. E. Easterling and G. A. Mizen. The responsibility is my own, of course.

¹ *Plut. Arist.* 20.5; *Xen. Hell.* iv 4.2; cf. L. R. Farnell *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford 1896) ii 575 n. 66.

² Cf. J. G. Frazer *Pausanias's Description of Greece* (London 1898) ii 124.

³ Cf. W. S. Barrett (ed.) *Euripides' Hippolytus* (Oxford 1964) 263 *ad* 545–64. I cite Barrett's text throughout. On the goddesses as a frame cf. R. P. Winnington-Ingram, 'Hippolytus: A Study in Causation' in *Euripide: Entr. sur l'Ant. Class.* vi (Fond. Hardt 1960) 172.

and again: *εὐρημα δὴ τι τῆσδε συμφορᾶς ἔχω
ᾧσπ' εὐκλεᾶ μὲν παισὶ προσθεῖναι βίον
αὐτῆ τ' ὄνασθαι πρὸς τὰ νῦν πεπτωκότα.*
(716–18; cf. 764–75)

Just before, at 713–14, the Chorus swears by *Artemis* that it will not divulge what it knows. This mention of *Artemis* and the stress on *eukleia* at this vital turning-point allow us to make the connection, if we will—a connection which an Athenian audience might make, as we have seen.

Phaedra's death leads to the death of Hippolytus, upon which *Artemis* appears (1283 ff.) and explains the truth of the matter to Theseus (1296 ff.): she says that she has come to give this explanation so that Hippolytus may die with *eukleia* (ὡς ὑπ'εὐκλείας θάνῃ, 1299), as he duly does (1462–6). The idea of *eukleia* is thus of central importance⁴ to the play as it progresses and unfolds to give depth to Aphrodite's prophetic statement in the prologue:

ἢ δ' εὐκλεῆς μὲν ἀλλ' ὄμως ἀπόλλυται
Φαίδρα.
(47–8)

Does the potential identification of *Artemis* and *Eukleia* add anything to our appreciation of the *Hippolytus* beyond the possibility that the idea of *Artemis Eukleia* may be lurking rather aimlessly behind the drama? It may do. We have seen that Euripides portrays Phaedra as preoccupied with *eukleia*. But this is a particular characteristic of *Artemis*. In a sense, therefore, Phaedra can be said to be preoccupied with *Artemis*. Her preoccupation with *Artemis* must recall that of Hippolytus. *Both* characters can thus be seen as preoccupied with her, although we must immediately allow the objection that they are preoccupied in different ways and to differing degrees. Nevertheless the parallelism, however we may choose to mitigate it, is there.

Further, with this manifestation of Phaedra's preoccupation with *Artemis* we may link the language used by her earlier at 208 ff., when, in a frenzy inspired by Aphrodite, she longs to go hunting—the particular pursuit of *Artemis* and her devotee Hippolytus; indeed, in this frenzy Phaedra explicitly invokes *Artemis* (228 ff.). We find the same interrelationship of Aphrodite and *Artemis* when we see *Artemis* in her capacity as *Eukleia*: under the influence of Aphrodite, Phaedra is made to insist upon her *eukleia*—the particular attribute of *Artemis*. The intimate association of *Artemis* and *Eukleia* can now be fitted into the larger pattern of complexities wherein the spheres of Aphrodite and *Artemis* tend to merge, for all their mutual opposition, to form a whole:⁵ to worship one and ignore the other is to make too clear-cut a distinction. This is Hippolytus' mistake.⁶

We may perhaps go a little further. Plutarch tells us that prospective brides and bridegrooms sacrificed to *Artemis Eukleia*.⁷ This is particularly apposite in this play in which

⁴ On the central importance of *eukleia* in this play cf. B. M. W. Knox, 'The Hippolytus of Euripides', *YCS* xiii (1952) 17–18; also Winnington-Ingram (n. 3) 177, 179–81, 184; B. D. Frischer, "'Concordia Discors' and Characterisation in Euripides' Hippolytus', *GRBS* xi (1970) 85–100; C. P. Segal, 'Shame and Purity in Euripides' *Hippolytus*', *Hermes* xcvi (1970) 278–99.

⁵ So C. P. Segal, 'The Tragedy of the Hippolytus: the Waters of Ocean and the Untouched Meadow', *HSCP* lxx (1965) 159; cf. Winnington-Ingram (n. 3) 172; B. D. Frischer (n. 4).

⁶ Cf. Segal (n. 5) 123–5.

⁷ *Plut. Arist.* 20.6 (cited above); cf. L. R. Farnell (n. 1) ii 568 n. 45, 575 n. 66.

the forces of celibacy and sexuality are in conflict, for prospective brides and bridegrooms can readily be seen as poised between the two, the marriage ceremony being a rite of passage from the one to the other. In this connection we may note that at the end of the play Artemis prophesies a cult of Hippolytus in which brides-to-be would dedicate their hair to him (1423–30).⁸ Less explicitly, Hippolytus himself dedicates a garland from Artemis' uncut meadow to that goddess (73–87): as Barrett notes elsewhere, luxuriant vegetable growth and hair are commonly interrelated metaphorically.⁹ In a sense, then, Hippolytus dedicates 'hair'. It becomes tempting to suggest that the audience is expected to be aware not only of the cult *title* of Artemis Eukleia but also of the *practice* of her cult, concerning which we are all but totally ignorant today.

D. C. BRAUND

Churchill College,
Cambridge

⁸ With Barrett *ad loc.* and 3–6; *cf.* lines 1140–1.

⁹ *Ad* 210: *cf.* Segal (n. 5) 122.

The Athenian Treaty with Samos, ML 56

PLATE IV

There have been several recent discussions concerning the text of the Athenian Treaty with Samos (*IG* 50+102, ML 56, *IG* i³ 48) and the reconstruction of its fragments.¹ The discussions have dealt largely with inadequacies of the restoration offered '*exempli gratia*' by Wade-Gery in 1931,² but too little attention has been paid to the stones and the evidence they offer the historian. Three of the four stones associated with the Treaty were edited in *IG* i² 50+102; the fourth was there mentioned but not identified until Wade-Gery's article.³ Wade-Gery's transcription of the stones has become the foundation of all recent discussion and only Bradeen and McGregor⁴ have contributed observations on the stones themselves.

An examination of the fragments conducted in June 1978 and in April 1979⁵ uncovered in Wade-Gery's transcription an error which served as the basis for his reconstruction of a list of generals attributed to the year 439/8 B.C. The incorrect reading is the next-to-last letter of the word presumed to be *Κεκροπίδ)ος* in line 31 of the ML text. Wade-Gery presented in his article first a dotted *omicron* in that space and later an undotted one; in his commentary he stated 'The first letter in line 2 [line 31 *cf.* fragment *d* in the ML text] is almost certainly *O*'.⁶ He did not mention that this contradicted the readings of both

editions of *IG*,⁷ nor did he state any grounds for deciding the letter to be *omicron*. Bradeen and McGregor placed the *omicron* in brackets, thus disagreeing over whether the letter had ever been readable on the stone, but they retained Wade-Gery's restoration, presumably to declare their approval.⁸

There is no trace on the stone of an *omicron* before the *sigma* (see PLATE IV*a*). There is preserved, however, the right part of a horizontal stroke at the bottom of the letter space. The mark in question is faint but appears best in PLATE IV*b*; it is deemed to be a stroke on account of its straightness and regularity, its depth, colour, and position. In the first publication of the stone Lolling⁹ showed a horizontal stroke at bottom with the beginning of a vertical rising on the left; this vertical stroke may have been on the stone but was perhaps confused with a pit in the broken edge, visible in the photographs, which angles upwards from the horizontal stroke and away from the face of the stone. Epigraphically the horizontal stroke may belong to *epsilon* or *zeta* or, if misplaced, to *sigma* or *lambda*. Of these possibilities *epsilon* alone is likely since the letter precedes a *sigma* at the end of a word.

The change required in the transcription of the stones shows that Wade-Gery's reconstruction of the strategic list relied upon false evidence and must be rejected; it lends weight to the linguistic arguments against his restorations to the oath included in the Treaty.¹⁰ With Wade-Gery's strategic list challenged, the relation between the two stones presumed to belong to the bottom of the Treaty once again becomes an issue. One should note that the join alleged in ML¹¹ to exist between two fragments of the document is in fact the 'textual join' restored by Wade-Gery between the bottom two stones.

C. W. Fornara has recently called into question the relation of the four stones attributed to the Treaty.¹² He attacked the association of the bottom two pieces (fragments *c* and *d* in ML) with the top two (*a* and *b*) on both historical and epigraphical grounds: 'The board of generals, *per se*, does not belong in the decree . . . On the other hand, tribal designation of the *strategoí* makes some sense in a purely internal document, where the affiliation retained local significance.'¹³ He also stressed the differences in punctuation and letter shapes between *a-b* and *c-d*.

Fragments *b* and *d* must, however, belong to the same stele. The similarity of the stone of the fragments, of the traces of chiselling on their preserved sides, of their lettering and stoichedon patterns, and of the wear on their damaged backs¹⁴ indicates a probable connection between them; and the pattern of fractures shows the connection to be close. The bottom right edge of *b* continues the top left edge of *d*, and the bottom left of *b*

¹ C. W. Fornara, 'On the chronology of the Samian War', *JHS* xcix (1979) 14–18; A. S. Henry, 'Negative coordination in Attic decrees', *JHS* xcvi (1977) 156; H. Wankel, 'Zu Eidesformeln in athenischen Urkunden des 5. Jh.', *ZPE* xv (1974) 250–4.

² H. T. Wade-Gery, 'Strategoí in the Samian War', *CPh* xxvi (1931) 309–13.

³ *IG* i² 50: '*d non vidi*'; *cf.* Wade-Gery (n. 2) 309.

⁴ *Studies in fifth-century Attic epigraphy* (Norman, Okla. 1974) 120–1.

⁵ My sincere thanks go to Mrs D. Peppas-Delmouzou and to Mrs Ch. Karapa-Molizani for their assistance and hospitality in the Epigraphical Museum in Athens, as well as to the capable technicians Panayiotis Diakoumis and Takis Diakoumis; I am grateful to Prof. E. Vanderpool, Prof. C. N. Edmonson, J. S. Traill, and J. McK. Camp for examining the stones with me and offering their opinions. They bear no responsibility for the views expressed in this paper.

⁶ *Op. cit.* (n. 2) 310.

⁷ *IG* i suppl. p. 125 no. 557 line 2; *IG* i² 50 *fr.* a line 2.

⁸ Letters once certainly read, such as the last three in line 33 of the ML text, but now disappeared through subsequent damage stay unbracketed; Bradeen and McGregor did not see fit to bracket them.

⁹ *IG* i suppl. *loc. cit.* (n. 7).

¹⁰ Henry (n. 1); Wankel (n. 1).

¹¹ ML 56, p. 151.

¹² Fornara (n. 1).

¹³ *Ibid.* 15.

¹⁴ Wade-Gery referred (311) to the 'distinctive and identical' appearance of workmanship on the backs of *b-d* which he considered, with the identity of letter-spacing, as conclusive evidence for the association of the stones (312 n. 1). Though he erred in thinking the backs original (a conclusion absolutely ruled out by Epigraphical Museum technicians; *cf.* ML p. 152), he correctly inferred from the markings on the backs that the stones belonged with each other.