

elected *nomothetae*.³ It is likely that on this occasion in the first century the Areopagus too had been empowered to announce a revision of its own which did not have to be validated.⁴

The prefix, then, seems to mean 'previously' without probuleutic implication. The decree of Demeas does not ratify the Peripatetic *nomothesia*, but follows it as a separate step at some interval. The preamble of the decree expresses appreciation of the *nomothesia*, which allegedly gave Athens a true polity like that of Aristotle's first constitution, wherein both rich and poor had a safe refuge, but in its proposals the decree reassures the partisans of democracy. It offers not amendments so much as supplementary guarantees that certain laws will be enforced and certain loopholes closed. The decree, however, may have belonged to the immediate sequel in the archonship of Philanthes (87/6) or even to a much later period of reconciliation in an effort to rally as many supporters of democracy as possible.

The constitution previously created by special *nomothesia* appears to be that connected with the ascendancy of Aristion, but its preparation as in earlier cases required much time. The role of the Areopagus in the revision presumably began well before his ascendancy. It was, I think, the delay of the Areopagus which caused or partly justified a repeated tenure of the archonship by Medeios, who had to have a plausible excuse.

JAMES H. OLIVER

Baltimore, Maryland

³ D. M. MacDowell, 'Law-making at Athens in the Fourth Century B.C.', *JHS* xciv (1975) 62–74; M. H. Hansen, 'Nomos and Psephisma in Fourth Century Athens', *GRBS* xix (1978) 315–30.

⁴ For the *nomophylakia* of the Areopagus and its connection with Solon see *Arist. Ath. Pol.* 8.4.

Notes on Xenophon of Ephesus Book v¹

In some of these notes—v 1.7–8; 4.5; 5.4; 10.3 (1)—I defend readings of the *codex unicus*, F (Laurentianus conv. soppr. 627), in others—v 1.2; 7.3; 10.5; 12.3—I support previous conjectures whose merits seem to me not to have been fully appreciated, and in the rest—v 2.2; 2.7; 7.8; 8.2–3 (*bis*); 8.4; 9.6; 9.9; 9.10; 10.3 (2); 10.8; cf. 6.2—I put forward new proposals of my own. The base-text and apparatus² are those of A. D. Papanikolaou (Teubner, 1973), except for 1.7–8, 4.5, and 5.4, where the text of F is given.

v 1.2 *ἐνταῦθα ὁ Ἀβροκόμης γενόμενος ἔγνω περιμένα τὴν νῆσον καὶ ἀναζητεῖν ἔτι περὶ Ἀνθίας εἴ τι πύθουτο.*

ἔτι περὶ Ἀνθίας εἴ τι εἴ τι περὶ Ἀνθείας Cob., Her.

ἔτι is not really appropriate in sense here: its position puts it most naturally with *ἀναζητεῖν*, and 'he decided . . . to investigate still. . . ' would falsely imply that there was a chance he was thinking of giving up his search for Anthia after this. Moreover, the collocation *ἔτι . . . εἴ τι* itself and the word-order raise a strong suspicion that *εἴ τι* is an intended correction of *ἔτι* (it could not be *vice versa* here)

¹ This article was written during tenure of a Fellowship of the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung. For my notes on books i–iv see *RhM* (forthcoming).

² I have slightly modified the apparatus occasionally.

misunderstood by a later scribe who simply wrote it into the text as well as *ἔτι* in the nearest position that would accommodate it. The balance is further tipped, in my view decisively, by the hitherto uncited v 11.3: *ἀναζητήσοντες εἴ τι περὶ Ἀνθίας πύθουτο.*

v 1.7–8 *τὰ μὲν οὖν πρῶτα ἡ κόρη πολλὰς προφάσεις ἐποιεῖτο ἀναβαλλομένη τὸν γάμον· τελευταῖον δὲ δυνηθεῖσα ἐν ταῦτῳ μοι γενέσθαι συντίθεται νύκτωρ ἐξελθεῖν Λακεδαίμονος μετ' ἐμοῦ. καὶ δὴ ἐστείλαμεν ἑαυτοὺς νεανικῶς, ἀπέκειρα δὲ καὶ τὴν κόμην τῆς Θελεξινόης ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ τῶν γάμων νυκτί. ἐξελθόντες οὖν τῆς πόλεως ἤειμεν ἐπ' Ἄργος καὶ Κόρινθον, κάκειθεν . . .*

Θελεξινόης. ἐν αὐτῇ οὖν τῇ τῶν γάμων νυκτί ἐξελθόντες τῆς π. Her., Da., Pap.

The rearrangement of the text found in the last three editions has nothing to be said for it. I cannot see any fault in F: 'we set about our elopement on the very night of her projected marriage'. On the other hand the altered text is unsatisfactory: it gives the impression that the night of the elopement might have been later than the time of *ἐστείλαμεν* and *ἐπέκειρα* (and of course Thelxinoe did not go around Sparta for any time dressed as a young man and with cropped hair), and these verbs in turn need *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ . . . νυκτί* to mark sufficiently their distinction in time from *συντίθεται*, the plot having preceded its execution by some period (*νύκτωρ*, with *ἐξελθεῖν*, clearly looks forward to a later time, and note the pattern *νύκτωρ . . . καὶ δὴ . . . ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ τῶν γάμων νυκτί* in the transmitted text).

v 2.2 *Αἰθιοπῖαν μὲν κατέλιπεν, ἥει δὲ ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον τε καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ ἐνενόει Φοινίκην καὶ Συρίαν πάλιν·*

<εἰς> Φ. . . πάλιν <ἐλθεῖν> Zag. coll. v, 4, 2

Here *ἐνενόει* introduces Hippothous' intention and it has to be furnished with an infinitive expressing that intention (cf. ii 9.2; iii 1.2; cf. i 4.5). In this connection, without regard to what exactly the infinitive should be, v 4.2, in which the partly completed, partly intended itinerary of Polyidus, commander of the Egyptian force sent against Hippothous, is given, is a very good parallel: *ἀνέπλεε τὸν Νεῖλον καὶ τὰς πόλεις διηρέυνα καὶ ἐνενόει μέχρις Αἰθιοπίας ἐλθεῖν*. But there are two mutually corroborative objections to Zagoiannes' conjecture: it involves the assumption of two lacunae; and in any case Hippothous' intentions certainly went beyond merely *going to Phoenicia and Syria*. He and his pirates had left Ethiopia in search of bigger game (v 2.1–2, *ἔγνωσαν δὲ ἀπαίρειν Αἰθιοπίας καὶ μείζουσαν ἤδη πράγμασιν ἐπιτίθεσθαι. οὐ γὰρ ἐδόκει τῷ Ἰπποθόω αὐταρκες εἶναι ληστεύειν κατ' ἄνδρα εἰ μὴ καὶ κώμαις καὶ πόλεσιν ἐπιβάλοι*), and with this in mind and remembering the initial motivation of their original southward journey (iii 10.5, *ἔγνωσαν τὴν ἐπὶ Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης ληστεύοντες ἵέναι*) and the account of their activities in the area in question (iv 1.1–2; their deliberately civilised behaviour in Laodicea, *ibid.*, being exceptional) we can tell what kind of infinitive is needed with *ἐνενόει*. As for the actual word, I regard *καταδραμεῖν* as the prime candidate: cf. iv 1.2, *ἐδόκει γὰρ αὐτοῖς (i.e. τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ἰπποθόου) καταδραμεῖν Αἴγυπτον*. Except for where it is in an emphatic forward position in direct speech (iii 8.6 *bis*; v 4.6), *πάλιν* follows its verb in Xen. (see esp. ii 12.1; iii 1.2; iii 8.6; iv 2.8; v 10.3). Even though the infinitive could

have been lost slightly more easily from after *πάλιν*, the word-order should, therefore, probably be *ἐνενοίει Φοινίκην καὶ Συρίαν <καταδραμεῖν> πάλιν*.

- v 2.7 *ἐπιβάντες ἔπλεον ἐπὶ Σχεδίαν, καὶ * * κἀντεύθεν ἔκβαντες παρὰ τὰς ὄχθας τοῦ Νείλου διώδεδον τὴν ἄλλην Αἴγυπτον.*
post καὶ lacuna quinque vel sex litterarum capax

The comma before καὶ (also in Hir., Her., Da.) is unwarranted. In the lacuna clearly a place-name is required, and it is almost certainly *Ἐρμούπολιν* (perhaps *Ἐρμούπολιν τῆς Αἰγύπτου*). Hippothous and his band are now retracing (on Xen.'s somewhat weird map of Egypt) their journey of iv 1.3 . . . καὶ τῷ ποταμῷ τῷ Νείλῳ πλεύσαντες εἰς Ἐρμούπολιν τῆς Αἰγύπτου καὶ Σχεδίαν, . . . and the place-names there are now reversed. Compare the reversal of names from iii 10.5, *ἔγνωσαν τὴν ἐπὶ Συρίας καὶ Φοινίκης ληστεύοντες ἰέναι* (referring to the plans for the initial stage of the robbers' southward journey), to v 2.2, *ἐνενοίει Φοινίκην καὶ Συρίαν πάλιν* (see my note on this passage above).

- v 4.5 *ἔρασθεὶς δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἐπειράτο πείθειν μεγάλη ὑπισχνόμενος· τελευταῖον δὲ κατήσασεν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ὡς δὲ ἐγένοντο ἐν Μέμφει, ἐπεχείρησεν ὁ Πολύιδος βιάζεσθαι τὴν Ἀνθίαν·*
κατήσασεν εἰς ἀλεξάνδρειαν ὡς δὲ ἐγένοντο ἐν μέμφει
F: *ὡς κατήσασεν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐγένοντο δὲ ἐν Μέμφει* Peerlk.: *ὡς κατήσασεν εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐγένοντο τε ἐν Μέμφει* Pap.

The transmitted text is perfectly sound here (except that I would read a comma after *Ἀλεξάνδρειαν*): '. . . but in the end they began the journey down to Alexandria, and when they got to Memphis, Polyidus tried to have his way with Anthia by force'. There is no need to rearrange the text so as to link *τελευταῖον δὲ* more closely with *ἐπεχείρησεν . . . βιάζεσθαι*. The perfectly plausible implications of F are that Polyidus hung around in Coptus for a while courting Anthia (he would not have wanted to return straightway to Alexandria where, as Xen. has pointed out to us, v 4.5, he had a wife) and then in the end, when he was getting nowhere, decided to start for home (*κατήσασεν* is inceptive). On the way (in Memphis, suited by its temple to be the scene of the action) his passion got the better of him.

- v 5.4 *κελεύει ἐμβιβάσαντα εἰς ναῦν ἀπαγαγόντα εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἀποδόσθαι πορνοβοσκῶ τὴν Ἀνθίαν.*
καὶ post ναῦν add. Pap.

There is no need whatever for *<καὶ>*, since the two participles are not to be seen as being on a par: it is best to regard *ἀπαγαγόντα* as representing an infinitive coordinate with *ἀποδόσθαι* and *ἐμβιβάσαντα* as expressing a preparatory action subordinate to both *ἀπαγαγόντα* and *ἀποδόσθαι*. For similarly unconnected participles in Xen. cf. e.g. iii 8.3, *ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον καὶ ἀναρρήξαντες τοῦ τάφου τὰς θύρας, εἰσελθόντες τὸν τε κόσμον ἀνηροῦντο καὶ . . .*; v 10.3 (a remarkable accumulation).

- v 6.2 *διέγνω οὖν ἀποπλεύσας ἐκ Σικελίας εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἀνελθεῖν κἀκεῖθεν . . .*
ἐκ Σικελίας edd.: *εἰς σικελίαν* F

At very least the apparatus should have 'fort. ἐλθεῖν'. The prefix of *ἀνελθεῖν*, in my view very probably a dittograph of the preceding *-αν*, is in itself semantically suspect (if anything, a *κατα-* compound would be appro-

priate: cf. v 8.1, *ἀπὸ τῆς Σικελίας ἐπαναχθεὶς καταίρει μὲν εἰς Νουκέριον τῆς Ἰταλίας*; v 9.3, *ἐπαναχθεὶς* [i.e. from Tauromenium in Sicily] *κατήρην εἰς Ἰταλίαν*). For the use of the simple verb cf. v 1.1, *εἰς αὐτὴν μὲν τὴν Ἰταλίαν οὐκ ἔρχεται*; v 6.3, *ἦει τὴν ἐπὶ Ἰταλίας ὁδὸν* (i.e. the voyage of v 6.2, the passage under discussion); v 13.6 *εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἰόντι* (i.e. from Sicily) *αὐτῷ*. Elsewhere Xen. uses *ἀνέρχομαι* only at v 15.3, of 'going up' to Ephesus from the temple of Artemis. Here (v 6.2), in view of *ἀποπλεύσας*, *ἀν-* could not express the notion of putting out to sea. Finally it is worth noting that a scribe in the tradition (not necessarily the scribe of F, at whose door too much is sometimes laid) was prone to error at this point: F has *εἰς σικελίαν εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἀνελθεῖν*. Hemsterhuys too suspected *ἀνελθεῖν*, but the prefix of his *ἀπελθεῖν* is not attractive and would be especially awkward after *ἀποπλεύσας*.

- v 7.3 *ὡς δὲ ἦλθε καὶ πρόστη, πλήθος ἐπέρρει τῶν τεθναμακότων τὸ κάλλος, οἳ γε πολλοὶ ἦσαν ἔτοιμοι ἀργύριον κατατίθεσθαι τῆς ἐπιθυμίας.*
γε| τε Cob., Her.

τε must be read: without a connective particle the passage is simply ungrammatical (asyndeton, with stronger punctuation after *κάλλος*, would be unthinkable abrupt).

- v 7.8 *ἦν μὲν ὀφθῆναι φοβερός, φωνὴν δὲ πολλῶ εἶχε χαλεπωτέραν·*
πολλῶ Cob.: *πολλὴν* F

For *πολλῶ* read *πολὺ*, the invariable form elsewhere in Xen. with comparatives (i 1.4; i 5.4; i 10.1 *bis*; iii 12.3; iv 6.6). The error is one of iotacism/assimilation. 'Lege *πολὺ* vel *πολλῶ*', Hemsterhuys.

- v 8.2-3 *αὐτὸν ἀπεμίσθωσε τοῖς τοῖς λίθους ἐργαζομένοις. καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ τὸ ἔργον ἐπίσπον, οὐ γὰρ συνείθιστο τὸ σῶμα οὐδὲ αὐτὸν ὑποβάλλειν ἔργοις εὐτόνοις ἢ σκληροῖς·*
οὐδὲ αὐτὸν οὐδ' ὀτιοῦν Heyse οὐ δυνατὸν ὄν Schmidt || *ἐντόνοις* Cast., Da. *συντόνοις* Schmidt

(1) 'not . . . his body nor himself' can hardly be let stand. Schmidt's proposal is feeble, but Heyse's seems to me to be very much on the right track. The beautiful Ephesian youth (his person and his pursuits are described at the beginning of the romance) had not accustomed his body to toil, not even to the least extent. However, mainly on palaeographic grounds (basically an uncial error?), I should prefer *οὐδ' ὀλίγων*.

(2) To my mind it is highly likely that the semantically unsuitable *εὐτόνοις* (even if it could mean something like 'requiring energy', it would surely be too positive a word here, especially with *σκληροῖς*) conceals a *-πος* compound in this context. *ἐπιπόνοις* again?

- v 8.4 *καὶ εἰ μὲν εἶχόν τινα ἐλπίδα εὐρήσειν σε καὶ τοῦ λοιποῦ συγκαταβίωσασθαι, τοῦτο πάντων ἁμεινόν με παρεμυθεῖτο·*
σε Hemst.: *τε F || ἁμεινόν* ἂν τῶν δεινῶν Hir., Her.

The absence of *ἂν* from *παρεμυθεῖτο* in this unreal apodosis is in my judgement wholly unacceptable; on the other hand *πάντων ἁμεινόν* ('better than anything') is faultless. Read *τοῦτο <ἂν> πάντων ἁμεινόν με παρεμυθεῖτο*. Cf. iii 5.7, *εἰ μὲν ἦν . . . , περὶ τούτων ἂν ἐβουλευόμην*.

- v 9.6 *Ἀἴγυπτον οὐκ οἶδας οὐδὲ λησταῖς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ*

περιπέπτωκας οὐδὲ ἄλλο τι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ γῇ
πέπονθας δεινόν; εἰπέ θαρσοῦσα, γνωρίζω γάρ σε
ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῷ χωρίῳ.'

ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ χωρίῳ del. Her., Da.

ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ χωρίῳ should not merely be deleted: 'for I recognise you' on its own is no sufficient explanation of why Hippothous should be asking so particularly about Egypt. But neither is the text sound: 'for I recognise you in that place (i.e. Egypt)' is nonsense. We must either supply a participle after χωρίῳ (<ἰδὼν> Locella, with which sc. σε) or read γνωρίζω γάρ σε ἐξ ἐκείνου τοῦ χωρίου (taking it that the prepositional phrase was assimilated to the preceding ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ γῇ): cf. v 12.1 τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ῥοδίων ἐγνώριζον τὰ ὀνόματα ἐκ τῆς προτέρας ἐπιδημίας; for the local use of ἐκ cf. Ach. Tat. v 7.3 ἦν δέ μοι γνώριμος ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου γενόμενος.

v 9.9 τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ γενομένων ἀναμνησκει καὶ τὸν
ἑαυτοῦ πλοῦτον διηγείται καὶ τὴν φυγὴν.

πλοῦτον| πόλεμον Schmidt

The φυγή in question is Hippothous' escape from the battle in Egypt in which his band of robbers was all but annihilated (v 3.2–3), and this preceded his acquisition of wealth in Sicily (v 9.1). The order Αἰγύπτῳ . . . πλοῦτον . . . φυγὴν is therefore very strikingly awry (especially since φυγὴν, separated from Αἰγύπτῳ, is in no way defined), and this is uncharacteristic of Xen. Schmidt's conjecture was designed to meet this problem, but it is patently feeble. Hippothous recalls for Anthia (largely, no doubt, as proof of his identity) the events in which they had both had some share in Egypt (τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ γενομένων ἀναμνησκει) and then he goes on to tell her of his subsequent fortunes, presumably in the right order: καὶ τὴν φυγὴν καὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πλοῦτον διηγείται (for the sentence shape, with διηγείται at the end, see the next sentence in the text, quoted at the head of my next note). A scribe skipped from one καὶ to the other, omitting τὴν φυγὴν καὶ, and then added καὶ τὴν φυγὴν (in effect the omitted words) at the end.

v 9.10 ἡ δὲ ἤπειτο συγγνώμην ἔχειν καὶ αὐτῷ
ἀντεξηγεῖτο ὅτι Ἀγχιάλον ἀπέκτεινε μὴ
σωφρονούντα, καὶ τὴν τάφρον καὶ τὸν
Ἀμφίνομον καὶ τὴν τῶν κυνῶν πραότητα καὶ
τὴν σωτηρίαν διηγείται.

ἀντεξηγεῖτο Struve: ἀπεξηγεῖτο F ἀντιδιηγείτο
Cob. διηγείτο Her.

Previous attempts to emend the unique and unacceptable compound ἀπεξηγεῖτο have started from the belief that a verb of narrating is required. But the ὅτι clause reports not part of a narrative but an apologetic explanation of why Anthia had killed Hippothous' man in Egypt. I would read ἐπεξηγεῖτο, 'she added the explanation that . . .' (ἐπεξ- having become ἀπεξ- probably by assimilation to ἀπέκτεινε). LSJ cites this passage (alone) under ἀπεξηγέομαι, wrongly saying that the verb is a conjecture and giving it the sense 'narrate'.

v 10.3 καὶ ὁ μὲν ὀλίγα ἔχων τὰ ἐπιτήδεια ἀναγόμενος καὶ
διανύσας τὸν πλοῦτον τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἐπὶ τῆς Σικελίας
ἔρχεται καὶ εὐρίσκει τὸν πρότερον ξένον τὸν
Αἰγιαλέα τεθηγκότα.

ἀναγαγόμενος Her.

(1) The aorist ἀναγαγόμενος is tempting, but the temptation should be resisted: the present participle is similarly

used at v 1.8 κἀκείθεν ἀναγόμενοι ἔπλευσαν εἰς Σικελίαν; and Xen. always uses the passive form of the aorist of ἀνάγομαι/ἐπανάγομαι (v 10.3; iii 5.11; v 3.3; v 8.1; v 9.3; so also of κατάγομαι i 11.6; i 14.6; i 15.2; v 1.1; v 5.7; v 6.1). At i 10.6 (μελλούσης δὲ τῆς νεῶς ἐπανάξασθαι) ἐπανάξασθαι is an impossible form. There we should probably read ἐπανάγεσθαι or ἐπαναχθήσεσθαι (ἐπανάξασθαι Hemst., but in the only place where Xen., who seems to have treated the verb as exclusively passive, uses the future, it is ἀναχθήσεται: ii 7.4). Note that in i 10.6 there is extensive corruption in the context (three lacunae); ἐπανάξασθαι may well be somebody's makeshift reconstruction of a damaged word.

(2) In view of διανύσας τὸν πλοῦτον the words ἐπὶ τῆς Σικελίας ἔρχεται would have to mean 'he comes to (arrives at) Sicily' and I have a strong suspicion that ἐπὶ τῆς Σικελίας (properly 'towards Sicily') should be ἐπὶ τὴν Σικελίαν (for ἐπὶ with acc. of arrival see v 10.2; v 10.8; so probably, with ἔρχομαι, iv 1.4; iv 3.1). Hercher too suspected ἐπὶ τῆς Σικελίας: in his *Adnotatio critica* (p. LX) we find 'An τὴν ἐπὶ Σικελίας ἔρχεται?' But that too founders on διανύσας τὸν πλοῦτον: that this phrase should, as one would in any case expect, be followed by an expression of arrival rather than of travel is shown by e.g. i 11.2; i 14.6; v 6.4.

v 10.5 περιεῖη τὴν πόλιν ἀλύων, ἀπορία μὲν τῇ κατὰ τὴν
Ἀνθίαν, ἀπορία δὲ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων.

ἀπορία| ἀθυμία B | τῇ B, Lo.: τῶν F

The double ἀπορία jars, and note that the transmitted text (ἀπορία μὲν τῶν . . . , ἀπορία δὲ τῶν . . .) contains assimilation, this type of error being one of its characteristics, at this point in any case. The error went further than Papanikolaou's text allows, and the suggestion in B (on B see Papanikolaou's edition p. ix and M. D. Reeve in *JHS* xcvi [1976] 193 n. 4) is almost certainly right. ἀθυμία and ἀπορία are companions elsewhere in Xen.: iii 2.14 ἀπορία βίου καὶ ἀθυμία τῆς συμφορᾶς ἐπέδωκα ἑμαυτὸν λησστηρίῳ; v 6.1 ἀθυμία ἐμπίπτει καὶ ἀπορία δεινή.

v 10.8 εἰ δὲ αὕτη ἡ στήλη τῶν συντρόφων τῶν ἡμετέρων
ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρων τὸ ἀνάθημα, τίς οὖν γένωμαι
μόνος; ποῦ δὲ τοὺς φιλάτους ἀνέρω;

We must surely mark a lacuna after ἀνάθημα: the apparently apodotic οὖν, unique in Xen., is telltale, and how can the question 'what then is to become of me on my own?'³ follow from the conditional clause 'if this pillar is the offering of our companions on behalf of both of us'? The thought of the missing apodosis would have been something like this: 'then that means that they have both come back here and have not found you either'. This makes Abrocomes all the more disheartened in his own search and leads naturally to his despairing question.

v 12.3 ἐλθόντες δὲ ὄρωσι τὴν Ἀνθίαν καὶ ἦν μὲν ἔτι
ἄγνωστος αὐτοῖς, συμβάλλουσι δὲ πάντα, <τὸν>
ἔρωτα, <τὰ> δάκρυα, τὰ ἀνάθημα, τὰ ὀνόματα,
τὸ εἶδος. οὕτως κατὰ βραχὺ ἐγνώριζον αὐτήν.
<τὸν> ἔρωτα, <τὰ> δάκρυα B, Da. ἄμα, τὰ δάκρυα
Lo., Her. ὁμοῦ, τὰ δάκρυα Ja., Wif.

I agree with those who believe that <τὸν> ἔρωτα has no place here: Anthia was sitting in lamentation by the offerings, and there was nothing to put anything about love into the heads of observers who had not yet recog-

³ Xen. uses the masculine pronoun in this type of expression also at ii 4.6, ἡπόρει ὅστις γένηται.

nised her. F's text should be seen as . . . πάντα ἤρωτ, τὰ δάκρυα, . . . If either ἄμα or ὁμοῦ is right, ἄμα is to be preferred to ὁμοῦ (which does not occur in Xen.); cf. i 10.7, πάντων ἄμα ἐν ὑπομνήσει γενόμενοι, τοῦ χρησμοῦ, τοῦ παιδός, τῆς . . . ; with πολλά at iii 5.2; iii 12.4; v 13.3. But one can hardly feel that ἄμα is particularly appropriate with συμβάλλουσι (how else can one συμβάλλει?); and for πάντα introducing a list without ἄμα see ii 5.5; ii 13.1; iii 10.4.

JAMES N. O'SULLIVAN

Göttingen

A Greek painting at Persepolis

In his magnificent report on the American excavations at Persepolis E. F. Schmidt published a fragment of a stone plaque found in the Treasury (frag. 2 on FIG. 2).¹ This plaque bore a sketch of a human torso, which G. M. A. Richter considered to be Greek work of about 500 B.C. : she identified the figure as 'Heracles wearing a chiton with a lion's skin over it which is knotted on the chest'.² This fragment was lost when the ship in which the finds from Persepolis were being transported to America was sunk by submarine action during the Second World War.³ But recently Giuseppe Tilia discovered further fragments in a storeroom at Persepolis, which he recognised as probably belonging to the same plaque;⁴ and from these Prof. Boardman has been able to determine that the original scene was of a contest between Herakles and Apollo (FIG. 1).

Three of these fragments (1, 3a and 3b) joined the published fragment. Two other fragments (4a and 4b) join and show parts of the heads of two figures in the top right hand corner of the plaque. The final fragment (5) comes from the middle of the right hand edge and shows part of the backside of the right hand figure.

Frag. 2 with the torso of Herakles was found in courtyard 29 of the so-called Treasury building on the citadel terrace at Persepolis.⁵ According to E. F. Schmidt fragments of 'four dark gray limestone slabs of similar nature' were found in the nearby columned hall 73.⁶ These fragments were not illustrated nor were their registration numbers given, but Schmidt's description suggests that these are the fragments discussed in this article.

¹ E. F. Schmidt, *Persepolis* ii (1957) pl. 31.2. FIG. 1 is drawn by Marion Cox, based on Schmidt, pl. 31.2, and on tracings and photographs of the fragments at Persepolis made by M. Roaf. While every effort has been made to make the drawing as accurate as possible the processes of tracing and of redrawing have, because of the fineness of the detail of the original, led to some minor distortions. The condition of the stone being either eroded or encrusted has made the incision impossible to record, especially on frag. 1 and on the right hand edge of frag. 4a. Furthermore, a few of the lines on the drawing may be accidental scratches on the stone and not part of the original design.

² G. M. A. Richter, in Schmidt, *Persepolis* ii 67.

³ Schmidt, *Persepolis* i (1953) 5 and ii 155.

⁴ I am grateful to Giuseppe Tilia for drawing my attention to these fragments and to Dr Shahbazi, the Director of the Institute for Achaemenid Research at Persepolis, for giving me permission to publish them.

Fragment	1	2	3a & 3b	4a & 4b	5
Field no.	PT 6-476	PT 6-595	—	PT 6-476	PT 6-476
width in cm	6.5	7.1	11.9	14.0	4.1
height in cm	4.1	10.3	7.8	8.4	4.8
thickness in cm	3.5	3.1	3.4	3.2	3.2

⁵ Schmidt, *Persepolis* i 189.

⁶ Schmidt, *Persepolis* i 196, ii 67-8.

Assuming that all these fragments belonged to a single rectangular plaque with only three standing figures (and this is confirmed by Prof. Boardman's study of the iconography), the plaque was originally 18 cm high, about 38 cm wide, and between 3 and 3.5 cm thick. The stone has not been examined by a geologist, but in appearance it is like the dark grey limestone found in the neighbourhood of Persepolis. The back is roughly dressed with a pointed tool, the sides have been smoothed with a toothed tool and occasionally with a flat chisel, and the front has been polished smooth so that no tool marks are visible. On this surface the design has been lightly incised with a sharp point. If it had been intended to carve the stone in sunken or raised relief, it is unlikely that the surface would have been so highly polished. Presumably therefore the sketched design was a guide for painting the plaque. Similar lightly incised sketches were made on the Persepolis reliefs and in a few cases the paint was preserved above the guide lines.⁷ The fragments of the rectangular plaque, however, are eroded and encrusted and no traces of paint are visible now.

It is generally assumed that the objects kept in the Treasury building belonged to the royal Achaemenid treasure and so we may ask how such a very Greek object as this plaque became the Greek King's property. It is improbable that the king himself should have commissioned the plaque, for the scene would have had no significance for the Persian monarch. The style suggests a date of about 500 B.C., which would preclude the possibility that it was made for the Macedonian invaders. Furthermore if the stone is local Persepolitan stone, the plaque was not an import but was actually made at Persepolis. Probably then the plaque was made for a Greek by a Greek. Perhaps it was commissioned by one of the many Greeks who sought refuge or employment at the Persian court, and when he died or fell out of favour, this plaque together with the rest of his possessions entered the king's treasure.

(M.R)

The plaque reconstructed by Dr Roaf was decorated with three figures—we shall see that there is no reason to suspect a fourth, or more, in the missing part. At the left is Herakles, recognised by Miss Richter in the Persepolis publication from the one fragment then known. He is striding left wearing a short chiton beneath his lionskin, which is knotted over his chest and belted. It may be the tail or a leg that we see behind his left thigh. He is carrying his club in his right hand and the traces below his right arm are almost certainly from his quiver. He was looking back to the second figure who must be Apollo, bare-headed, a fillet over his long hair, holding a strung bow. Behind him stands his sister Artemis wearing a 'polos' headdress decorated with two rows of roundels, and a chiton of which we see part of the sleeve on her outstretched left arm and part of the skirt.

The group is a familiar one in Archaic Greek art and depicts Herakles' struggle with Apollo, usually over the tripod, occasionally over a deer. The tripod would have been shown held by Herakles, and probably by Apollo also, but there are no certain traces on the stone and various schemes are possible. In one which appears on Athenian vases Herakles shoulders the tripod, but here

⁷ See e.g. P. Roos, 'An Achaemenian sketch slab and the ornaments of the royal dress at Persepolis', *East & West* xx (1970) 51-9.