

diminuerait en rien la valeur de son témoignage: il prouve qu'il a existé des trières sans *parexeiresia*; puisqu'il est exclu que de telles trières soient grecques, il faut bien qu'elles proviennent d'une autre région ayant possédé des trières. Je ne vois guère ici, comme candidate possible, que la Phénicie.

Je remarque que M. Lloyd semble à présent admettre que la *parexeiresia* a pu ne pas exister en Phénicie. Toute question de priorité d'invention mise à part, admettre cela suffit, en soi, à ruiner l'idée que la trière phénicienne était 'essentially a Greek hull'.

(2) La différence d'opinion entre M. Lloyd et moi est ici moins considérable qu'il n'y semble: je n'ai nullement exclu qu'un ou plusieurs modèles de trières aient pu être expérimentés en Grèce dès le 7^e s.⁴ Ce dont je doute est que ces modèles aient eu une grande utilité pratique et je ne vois là aucune contradiction, bien au contraire, avec Thucydide, qui nous dit que la trière fut lente à s'imposer en Grèce. Comment devint-elle brusquement (quelques dizaines d'années) l'arme pratique utilisée par toutes les cités grecques? Je ne puis ici qu'adhérer à ce que vient d'écrire M. Lloyd à ce sujet dans ses *Observations*: 'It was probably the conflict with Persia which brought the crucial breakthrough', puisqu'aussi bien je n'ai pas écrit autre chose!

Cette hypothèse suppose nécessairement que les forces navales qui menaçaient la Grèce possédaient de vastes flottes de trières dont le maniement tactique leur était familier, ce qui n'était pas le cas des Grecs, comme le malheureux Dionysios de Phocée en fit l'expérience à Ladé. Cette familiarité des Phéniciens avec la construction en masse de trières et leur maniement est l'un des indices qui me paraît militer en faveur de l'antériorité de la trière phénicienne par rapport à la trière grecque. Mais j'admets volontiers qu'une certitude sur le point de l'invention elle-même est impossible à obtenir, d'autant plus que des tâtonnements ont probablement été nécessaires, tant du côté phénicien que du côté grec, avant d'aboutir à un modèle pratique. Cette question de priorité de l'invention est d'ailleurs, à mon avis, très secondaire, puisqu'il s'agit, en réalité, de l'invention de deux types de navires très différents, qui n'étaient pas entièrement comparables.

(4) M. Lloyd rejette toute présence de charpentiers ou d'architectes navals levantins à *Prw-Nfr* au Nouvel Empire. Toutefois, il semble admettre qu'il y a du vrai dans ma démonstration que les navires *mnš*—probablement le plus grand navire de mer égyptien sous Ramsès II et Ramsès III—sont les produits d'influences levantines.⁵ Je ne me suis pas borné à démontrer ce dernier point, j'ai aussi indiqué pourquoi, sous Ramsès III tout au moins, les navires *mnš* étaient construits en Égypte même. Il est à la rigueur possible que les Égyptiens aient copié leur navire *mnš* sur un modèle syrien, de la même manière que les Romains construisirent leur premières quinquères sur le modèle d'un navire punique capturé,⁶ mais étant donné la sujétion du Levant à l'Égypte sous Ramsès II, il me paraît bien plus vraisemblable que des charpentiers syriens sont venus construire des navires *mnš* en Égypte, ou qu'ils

y sont venus pour apprendre aux charpentiers égyptiens comment les construire.

Bien sûr, nous voilà loin de Nechao. Il reste cependant que, d'après Hérodote, ce sont des Phéniciens qu'il a envoyés autour de l'Afrique. Certes, M. Lloyd ne voit ici que pure légende,⁷ mais même s'il fallait le suivre sur ce point (ce que, pour ma part, j'hésite à faire), l'association d'idée, en matière maritime, Nechao-Phéniciens n'en reste pas moins remarquable.

Cette dernière remarque me semble d'un intérêt mineur à côté du témoignage du modèle d'Erment: c'est en Égypte, et en Égypte seulement, qu'a été découvert le seul modèle de trière dépourvu de *parexeiresia* et correspondant aux représentations des monnaies phéniciennes. S'il datait de l'époque hellénistique, comme le voudrait M. Lloyd, il faudrait en conclure, toujours d'après M. Lloyd, qu'après avoir adopté l'excellente trière grecque dès Nechao (alors que le modèle ne connaissait guère de succès en Grèce même), les Égyptiens s'en seraient détournés après la conquête de leur pays par Alexandre pour adopter un modèle phénicien, alors qu'au témoignage des monnaies, les Phéniciens venaient d'adopter au même moment la *parexeiresia*: une telle conclusion frôle l'absurde.

Si le modèle date de la première moitié de 4^e s., il faudrait en conclure que le modèle grec de trière adopté par Nechao avait cédé le pas au modèle phénicien pour un motif et à une date ignorés. Serait-ce à la suite de la conquête de l'Égypte par Cambyse, ou sous le règne de Darius? Une telle explication, que M. Lloyd n'a d'ailleurs pas proposée, me semble bien alambiquée et il me paraît préférable (rappelons que nous sommes ici dans le domaine de l'hypothèse) de voir dans le modèle d'Erment un indice supplémentaire d'une influence plusieurs fois séculaire de l'architecture navale levantine sur celle de l'Égypte, influence, je le rappelle, parfaitement connue d'Euripide.⁸

LUCIEN BASCH

Avenue Armand Huysmans, 206-Bte 9
1050 Bruxelles

⁷ A. B. Lloyd, 'Necho and the Red Sea: Some Considerations', *JEA* lxxii (1977) 148 et suiv.

⁸ Basch (n. 4) 10, n. 99.

A Peripatetic Constitution

An Athenian inscription, engraved with letters suggestive of the first sixty years of the first century B.C. and published by D. J. Geagan, *Hesperia* xl (1971) 101-8 with photograph, contains a decree proposed to the *demoi* by Demeas son of Demeas to strengthen a revision of the city's constitution. On its publication it struck me that the revision was democratic and that Geagan's date 84/3 B.C., reached via the uncertainties of the secretary cycle, could not stand. Since repercussions from what was occurring at Rome to Sulla's arrangements might well have been felt in Athens, a different date, equally compatible with the assumed secretary cycle, 70/69 B.C., came to mind, but in the meanwhile the assumed secretary cycle itself has disappeared.¹

¹ On p. 188 of B. D. Meritt's 'Athenian Archons 347/6-48/7 B.C.', *Historia* xxvi (1977) 161-91.

⁴ L. Basch, 'Trières grecques, phéniciennes et égyptiennes', *JHS* xcvi (1977) 7.

⁵ L. Basch, 'Le navire *mnš* et autres notes de voyage en Égypte', *Mariner's Mirror* lxxiv (1978) 99-123.

⁶ Polybe i 20.13. Cf. aussi la construction de 200 quinquères sur le modèle du navire punique d'Hannibal le Rhodien: Polybe i 59.8.

With the help of the photograph and of a squeeze kindly placed at my disposition by Geagan, I have made some new readings (in lines 12–13) and even restorations, expanding and incorporating or rewording those of Geagan. The subject of a badly mutilated public document is usually, if at all, recognized from familiar formulas. Here certain epigraphical formulas do assist one, especially to restore lines 6, 16 and 17, but for lines 13 and 18–20 the best support comes from the *Politics* of Aristotle and the Vatican fragments of Theophrastus.² This is rather interesting and, I think, significant.

Omitting the heading, which has problems of another sort, we offer in the following text merely the proposal.

- 6 Δημέας Δημέ[ου Ἀζηνιεύς εἶπεν vacat ἐπειδὴ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων
ἐν δημοκρατίαι κ[ατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς νόμους καὶ τὰ ἐπιτάγματα]
τῶν κληρωι καὶ χειροτονία ἐκλεγομένων πολιτεύεσθαι βούλεται
καὶ χάριν διδομέν[-----]
- 10 τὰς δὲ κληρωτὰς [...]ΙΣΗΕ[-----]
τινὲς δὲ διὰ κακοτ[ρό]πων πα[λαιοὶ νόμοι-----]
τοὺς προαιρουμέν[ο]υς συνη[γόρους -----]
ἐξ [ὧ]ν συμβαίνει κ[ο]ινῆς καὶ [μέσης πολιτείας αὐτοὺς τετυχεῖ
να[ι εὖ]ρους κατὰ τ[ὸ ὅ]μοιον περὶ τ[-----] ἐσο
- 15 τιν πᾶσιν Ἀθηναίοις ἤδη ποτὲ [ποιεῖσθαι τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις γε]
γρ<α>μμένων π[ρ]όνοιαν vacat Ἀ[γαθῆ] Τύχη δεδόχθαι τῶι δῆμωι]
[τὰ] μὲν προνομοθετημέ[ν]α σὺν Ἀθηναίοις? ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς τῆς
[ἐν Ἀ]ρείῳ κύρια εἶναι vacat ὑπαίτιον δὲ μὴ κληροῦσθαι]
[ἀλλ]ᾶ ἐξ εἶναι το[ῖς] ἄλλοις Ἀ[θηναίοις] λ' ἔτη γενοῦσιν με]
- 20 [τιέν]αι τὰς κληρωτὰς ἀρχά[ς] vacat εἶναι δὲ τὸν ἐπιχειροῦντα]
[ὄν δῆ] ποτε οὐδὲν τρό[π]ον καταλ[ύειν τινὰ τῶν κληρωτῶν ἀρχῶν]
[ἄτιμο]ν καὶ ἐπάρατον vacat ὧ[ιτιν]ι δὲ -----]
[ἀρχή] ἐσο[τι] κληρωτή, τινα[-----]
[-----]HEN[-----]
[-----]

The decree either ratifies or supplements or reinstates a constitution that has been approved by the Areopagus or by some consultant or board acting through or with the Areopagus. With its emphasis on law the decree purports to unify the city around a constitution that is neither oligarchic nor, like Aristotle's fourth type of democracy (*Pol.* iv 1292a4–30), excessively democratic. In the fourth type, says Aristotle, κύριον εἶναι τὸ πλῆθος καὶ μὴ τὸν νόμον . . . , συμβαίνει δὲ τοῦτο διὰ τοὺς δημαγωγούς. His first type (*Pol.* iv 1291b30–38) is the type κατὰ τὸ ἴσον, in which neither the poor nor the rich dominate but are equal (ὁμοίους ἀμφοτέρους). Equality, he says, exists particularly when all share in the constitution on a similar basis (κοινωνούντων ἀπάντων μάλιστα τῆς πολιτείας ὁμοίως). After two centuries of lectures on political theory the first type had much greater acceptance as an ideal. For instance, the second type of democracy, that with census classes (listed by Aristotle 1291b39–41), was already rejected by Theophrastus B 18–26 as 'too old-fashioned'.

While the phrases ἐν δημοκρατίαι in line 7 and κατὰ τὸ ὅμοιον in 14 lead one toward political theory, the emphasis on sortition as a means of filling offices forces one to think of Aristotle, *Pol.* vi 1320b13–14, τὰς μὲν κληρωτὰς ὅπως ὁ δῆμος αὐτῶν μετέχη, τὰς δ' αἰρετὰς ἵνα πολιτεύωνται βέλτιον. Sortition reassured the poor. That may be the reader's main thought, but a few words on specific restorations will not be out of place.

² These fragments, probably from the *Laws* of Theophrastus, are cited by the writer's edition, 'The Vatican Fragments of Greek Political Theory', *GRBS* xviii (1977) 321–39.

10: [ἐφ' α]ἴ[ς] ἢ E[-, e.g. ἐ[κκλησία], would be possible.

13: Neither the squeeze nor the photograph quite supports Geagan's reading of two final letters. For the phrase κ[ο]ινῆς καὶ [μέσης πολιτείας (Oliver) see *Arist. Pol.* iv 1294a41, κοινὸν δὲ καὶ μέσον τούτων (oligarchic and democratic usage) . . . , διὸ καὶ πολιτικόν. As for the word συμβαίνει see J. Day and M. Chambers, 'Aristotle's History of Athenian Democracy', *CPCHist* lxxiii (1962) 43–50.

17: E. Badian, 'Rome, Athens and Mithradates', *AJAH* i (1976) 104–28 identified the constitution as that of Athenion. Indeed the phrase σὺν Ἀθηναίοις fits the space exactly, and the fact that Athenion was a Peripatetic

would explain echoes of Aristotle. Surely even so radical a reformer as Athenion is represented by his enemies might wish to give his reform a traditional or moderate appearance, but the phrase restored in line 17 does not have to be this with the name of Athenion, and one could still interpret the new polity as something in between the democratic constitution of Athenion and the oligarchic constitution supported by Sulla, i.e. as a post-Sullan compromise. The Peripatetic colour of the thought, however, favours the attribution to Athenion.

18: ὑπαίτιον δὲ μὴ κληροῦσθαι is restored in contrast to the following statement that all other citizens should have access to the sortition of offices. The word ὑπαίτιον is not imposed for the limitation but something like it occurs in Theophrastus B 254 ff., τὸν ἐπαυτώμενον ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεως.

19: For the reference to the age requirement in conjunction with that of not being under investigation by the city see Theophrastus B 249–53, ὧς <δ' ἀρχὴν μετιόντες οἱ> λόγον ἀποδιδόντες τριακονταετείς δεχθήσονται ἐφ' ᾧ διατ<ε>ίνωσι ἂν, and the commentary.

One important question must be asked. Does the phrase τὰ προνομοθετημένα in line 17 refer to a batch of statutes that have just been announced by the Areopagus as a restored constitution or could these laws have been those of an earlier revision? For Demeas, who does not refer to them as τὰ νενομοθετημένα, the prefix had significance. Does the prefix make the participle a synonym for προβεβουλευμένα, and if so, why replace the usual word? Moreover, the *nomothesia* of a board of *nomothetai* did not have to be enacted by the assembly in the fourth century B.C.; rather the assembly entrusted the final decision to the

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 *Αἰθιοπίαν 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 μείζουσιν 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