

engraved the epigram. In conclusion we may say that, if the ten trenches can indeed be connected with Pausanias' memorial for the casualties at Drabeskos, this would be the first of Athenian polyandria securely located within the *Demosion Sema*.

CHRISTOPH CLAIRMONT  
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

### A Lost Peisistratid Name

The family of Peisistratos did not indulge in strikingly uncommon names but it is noteworthy that all but one of them also appear in Chios. Neleus or Neileus (e.g. c. 150<sup>d</sup>, *SEG* xvii 381 A I.2), Hippokrates (c. 420<sup>d</sup>, *RE* s.n. 14), Hipparchos (s. I<sup>a</sup>, *BSA* lxi [1966] 199 no. 3.15), Heges[istratos?] (e.g. s. IV<sup>a</sup>, *NC* xv [1915] 430), Peisistratos, Hippias and Thessalos (see below): only Iophon is certainly missing. Their occurrences cover many centuries and no long filiations can be established, nor is there any positive argument that they all belonged to the same family, but for the late fourth and third centuries there is a hint. Chian social units had a family-based molecular structure. A catalogue of one of them gives us about 70 names c. 300<sup>d</sup> with an average of two additions *p.a.* thereafter (*BSA* lv [1960] 181–7 = *SEG* xix 580). On it there is a Hippias of the later fourth (father of the named member) and a Thessalos of the later third century. At least one Hippias appears on coins of the later fourth (*NC* xv [1915] 430) and another (or the same) on a subscription list of the mid third as father of the subscriber (*SEG* xix 578.12). A Chian Peisistratos dedicated in Rhodes in the second century (*IG* xii.1 113), a Peisistratos son of Peisistratos made a patriotic subscription in the later third (*BCH* xxxvii [1913] no. 27. 18–19), a Chian Peisistratos, grandson of Peisistratos, is given *proxenia* at Delos in the mid third or a little earlier (*IG* xi.4 598), a Peisistratos put his name on coins belonging to the same chronological group as those of Hippias (*NC* xv [1915] 430). That the Hippias-group and the Peisistratos-group were somehow related is put beyond doubt by the name which one fourth-century Hippias and one fourth-century Peisistratos gave to their sons. Given what we know of the Athenian family's ties with Argos, Argeios Peisistratou (*IG* xi 598) and Argeios Hippiou (*SEG* xix 580) are no accident.

There are three possibilities. That an otherwise unattested Neleid family in Chios was tempted to import names from its Athenian cousins; that antiquarianism prompted fantasy; that the Athenian family established some real connection, by marriage or emigration, with Chios. The first is improbable. The second is made attractive by two other antiquarian names, Pindaros Hippiou (*SEG* xix 578. 12) and Lykourgos Argeiou (*ibid.* line 21), but antiquarianism is a third-century rather than a fourth- or fifth-century failing: we have a fifth-century Hippokrates and for that matter a fifth-century Hippias (*NC* xv [1915] 430) lurking in the background. Some real connection must be the most likely guess—the Peisistratidai of Hdt. viii 52.2 will have had to settle somewhere.

But in any case we are left with the problem of Argeios. Was he a real sixth-century Peisistratid? Or

was it another *παρωνύμιον* (of Iophon)? Or what? I prefer to leave it as a question.<sup>1</sup>

W. G. FORREST

New College, Oxford

<sup>1</sup> As in all things I am grateful to the generous genealogical genius of J. K. Davies.

### A Note on the Chrysanthina of Sardis

The periodic festival known as the *Χρυσάνθινα* celebrated at Sardis in the late Imperial period is known already from numerous inscriptions, noted below. This note concerns an unpublished letter of the year 1838, which contains a brief allusion to an inscription, apparently now lost, in which the festival is mentioned.<sup>1</sup>

In 1838 Henry Wentworth Acland,<sup>2</sup> aged at the time 23, and an undergraduate of Christ Church, visited the Troad from H.M.S. *Pembroke*, in which he was cruising in the eastern Mediterranean for the sake of his health, to study the topography of that region. This study resulted in the publication in 1839 (Wyatt, Oxford; the sketch republished by Stanford, 1873) of *The Plains of Troy*, a panoramic sepia sketch of the Troad drawn from Üvecik Tepe ('Tomb of Aesytes') with an accompanying text. It is a far cry from this booklet describing the ringing plains, dedicated to Dean Gaisford, to Acland's next work, *Letters from a Student on some Moral Difficulties in his Studies* (1841), to say nothing of slightly later works, occasioned by more topical studies: *Memoir on the Cholera at Oxford in the Year 1854, with considerations suggested by the Epidemic* (1856), and *Notes on Drainage, with especial reference to the Sewers and Swamps of the Upper Thames* (1857), and the later production of his very distinguished medical career. The work on the plains of Troy is not of any archaeological importance,<sup>3</sup> and contains no texts of local inscriptions. But a long letter (Acland was, or was to become, a profuse correspondent) 'On board the Fevzie, Capladan Pasha's ship—near Sestos and

<sup>1</sup> My attention was first drawn to this letter by Mr John Sparrow, but I owe the opportunity to study it, and ready agreement to publishing the relevant passage from it, to Dr H. C. Harley, who is preparing a full-scale study of Sir Henry Acland, based on the Acland papers in the Bodleian Library. I must also thank the Keeper of Western MSS of the Library for permission to publish the passage (MS Acland d. 23, fol. 39).

<sup>2</sup> Later Regius Professor of Medicine at Oxford (1857–94), and Fellow of All Souls College from 1840 to 1847. For a summary of Acland's life (1815–1900) see *DNB* Suppl. (1901) s.v.

<sup>3</sup> Acland heads the alphabetic list of discarded sources in J. M. Cook's authoritative survey of the Troad, *The Troad* (Oxford 1973) 15. I am not here concerned with Acland's opinions on Trojan topography, and may refer readers not familiar with the 'Problem of Troy', as it was before Schliemann's excavations, to Cook 14 ff., and, for Troy itself (Asarlık) to Cook 91 ff. Both in the letter quoted and in *The Plains of Troy* 36 ff., Acland accepted the current identification (Lechevalier's) of the Homeric Troy with Bunarbashi (mod. Pınarbaşı), S. of the Menderes river (for which see Cook 123 ff.) and rejected that with Tchiblak (mod. Çiplak) (for which, as the wrong nomenclature for the actual site at Truva/Asarlık, see Cook 93). Acland's sketch gives a good panoramic view of the plain down to the foothills of Mt Ida to the south, and including the offshore islands. The best detailed map of the plain is behind vol. ii of Dörpfeld's *Troja und Ilion* (Athens 1902) Taf. I (after Spratt); Cook's maps suffer a little from lack of contrast.

Abydos, Nov<sup>r</sup> 13th 1838', describing his travels and impressions, to his Tutor at Christ Church, Henry George Liddell,<sup>4</sup> is not without interest to the historian as containing a reference to the Sardian festival.

Acland writes (f. 39):<sup>5</sup>

... I remained some time on the plain of Troy, and at Alexandria Troas. You know the question of the [f]or]mer well. So I indeed (*sic*) not repeat it. . . . The Gymnasium at ATroas I had no time to make a plan of. It exists tho' of course. Should you fall in with Ionian Antiquities *cheap* at Wire's or elsewhere will you keep it.<sup>6</sup> On the plain I found a stone ANENEΣΣΕΙΚΑΙ| also wh. I cannot understand ΔΕΙΧΡΥΓΑΝΘΙΝΑΑΓΕΝΙΤΑΝΒΡΑΤΙΟΝ.

Above this inscription are 2 roses & below the same. At what I believe is the Apollo Thymbrius is an inscription given in Chevalier (*sic*), *Η Ατταλις φυλη* etc.<sup>7</sup> also one which is not—about Tiberius and Germanicus Caesar etc.<sup>8</sup>—I went hence to Smyrna. Visited Clazomenae, and took a plan of its piers and harbour—and then went to the 7 churches in Asia, which I was able to do through a firman of the Cap.P. It took 10 days making no delay. . . .<sup>9</sup>

Acland says that he copied the text given above in majuscules at some point in the plain of Troy and not at Alexandria Troas or 'the sanctuary of Apollo Thymbraeus',<sup>10</sup> but the exact location where he saw it is not

<sup>4</sup> Then no doubt preparing, with Robert Scott, the first edition (1843) of 'Liddell and Scott' (in which the *Χρυσάνθηνα* did not at that stage appear). For Liddell (1811–98) see *DNB Suppl.* (1901) s.v.

<sup>5</sup> The text of the letter is reproduced as written, except that (i) the main group of Greek letters (that with which we are concerned) has been standardised to a normal capital fount (which is fairly close to Acland's majuscules); (ii) in the word *πανκράτιον*, Acland omitted the AN, and inserted them above the line with the comment 'this omission is my mistake'; for typographical reasons these letters have been inserted into the line; (iii) Acland copied the kappa of *πανκράτιον* as an angular beta, closed at the top, and with a long stroke nearly, but not quite, closing the lower loop; I have printed this as a beta, which is clearly how Acland regarded it (hence, perhaps, his comment 'wh. I cannot understand'); (iv) I have omitted four fragmentary letters, given as AP below the alpha and theta of *Χρυσάνθηνα*, and ^ below the last alpha of *Χρυσάνθηνα* and the first alpha of *ἀγεν*.

<sup>6</sup> I read this name as 'Wire's', or (less probably) as 'Wise's', but I cannot find a bookseller of either name in contemporary trade- and street-directories of either Oxford or London. Others may have more luck.

<sup>7</sup> This inscription was originally published by Lechevalier, *Voyage dans la Troade*<sup>3</sup> (Paris 1802: for further details about the publication of Lechevalier's work see Cook 22) iii 301, no. II (a good transcription), whence *CIG* 3616, and now, after intermediate editions, *Die Inschriften von Ilios*=IGSK 3 (Bonn 1975) no. 121. It is one of a group of three (or four) inscriptions in honour of Sex.lul.Philon, passed by different tribes: *ibid.* nos 121–4.

<sup>8</sup> It is impossible to identify this inscription with certainty, in the absence of a text, but it may well be *Inscr. Ilios* 88, first published by Bailie, *Fasc. Inscr. Gr.* ii (Dublin 1846) 196, no. ccvi (*IGR* iv 206; *ILS* 8787).

<sup>9</sup> Acland subsequently, in his old age, published an album of nine drawings of which seven are of the sites of the Seven Churches (Oxford 1897: no text).

<sup>10</sup> For the difficulties as to the location of this site (also wrongly regarded as the site of a city called Thymbra), see Cook 64 ff., 117 ff. Lechevalier, whom Acland followed, regarded the large Necropolis with many ancient stones in it at Halileli (Halil-Eli, Acland), north of the Dümrek Su (see Cook fig. 6, p. 110) as the temple of the

given. That however is not of great importance, in a region that in any case has seen very considerable movement of stones since antiquity.<sup>11</sup> Although the first group of majuscules cannot yield any significant sense, the reference in the second group to the *Χρυσάνθηνα* is quite clear, and we may reconstruct the context without difficulty: that of an agonistic honorific decree or dedication in which, particularly in the Imperial period, the victories of the honorand were recorded in the familiar formulaic manner.<sup>12</sup> In such inscriptions the name of the city where the victory was won is placed either in the accusative or genitive, or in the dative preceded by the preposition *ἐν*. Since Sardis was the seat of the *Χρυσάνθηνα* and *Σάρδεις* is a plural form, we may restore either [—*Σάρ*]δει(ς), assuming Acland to have misread a square sigma for a gamma—a venial fault—or alternatively [—*ἐν Σάρ*]δε(σι), assuming him to have misread the two last letters. In view of his errors of transcription further on in the line either supposition would be legitimate, but I prefer to adopt the former as involving slightly less change. [—*Σάρ*]δει(ς), then, followed by *Χρυσάνθηνα*, followed by a reference to the Youths' pancration, in which the honorand had been victorious: *ἀγεν(είων)* [the last four letters either abbreviated, or omitted by the lapicide or (as later in the line) by Acland; all equally possible suppositions] *π*(Acland's *IT*)*ανκράτιον*. So much we may make of this single line. We may further note that Acland states that there were two 'roses' above and below the line. Evidently, then, as was frequent in such inscriptions in the Imperial age, the single victories were separated by decorative markers, here apparently rosettes.<sup>13</sup>

The *Χρυσάνθηνα*, known only to have been celebrated at Sardis, and in the late Imperial period, especially the third century A.D., was probably celebrated in honour of Demeter (who seems to have been regarded at that time as the *poliouchos* of Sardis)<sup>14</sup> or of Kore (or perhaps both). Its name reflects either the cult-title *Χρυσάνθη*, attested already in the fourth century B.C. by a dedication from the Latmian Gulf, or the golden flowers that Kore was in the act of picking, when, as represented on an Imperial coin of Sardis,

Thymbraean Apollo, and it is to this that Acland is referring here. The stones were no doubt largely from Ilios (Cook 69).

<sup>11</sup> See Cook 389 ff.

<sup>12</sup> See the useful selection of these published by L. Moretti, *Iscrizioni agonistiche greche* (Rome 1953), henceforth 'Moretti'. The conventional type of inscription, with long lists of victories won by the honorand in games throughout the Greek world, begins with the Roman conquest (nos 51 ff.), and reaches its peak in the later Empire (nos 66 ff.). There is no full-scale treatment of the evolution of the games and their Imperial recognition etc. in the Roman period, but apart from the discussions of individual games a good deal can be extracted from the texts and commentaries in Moretti; see also the brief sketch in Jones, *The Greek City* (Oxford 1940) 231 ff.

<sup>13</sup> See e.g. *BMI* 605 (Ephesus); 615 (Ephesus); *IG* ii<sup>2</sup> 3170 (Athens); *IG* xiv 1102 (Moretti 79; Rome); *CIG* 3208 (Smyrna); etc. It is regrettable that Moretti's publication does not note these decorative dividers; his work would have been much enriched by photographs.

<sup>14</sup> See Apoll. Tyan. *Ep.* 75 (Hercher; J. G. Pedley, *Anc. Literary Sources on Sardis* [Camb. Mass. 1972] no. 217), reproaching the Sardians for an outburst of violence: *Ἐρινύων νομίσει ἂν τις τὴν πόλιν εἶναι, καὶ οὐχὶ Δήμητρος. ἡ δὲ θεὰ φιλόανθρωπος: ὑμῖν δὲ τις οὗτος ὁ χόλος*. Mr E. L. Bowie points out to me a newly discovered and published letter of Apollonius (Penella, *HSCP* lxxix [1975] 305 ff.), which contains a similar reference, in the same context, to the role of Demeter as *poliouchos* (p. 308).

Pluton bore her off in his chariot.<sup>15</sup> The festival is referred to in numerous inscriptions of the third century.<sup>16</sup> One, from Sardis, seems to indicate that it was inaugurated by Septimius Severus, i.e. after A.D. 195, though that is uncertain since the reference may only be to a characteristic elevation of the rank of the festival by the Emperor.<sup>17</sup> The festival is perhaps

<sup>15</sup> Various deities have been claimed for the *Χρυσάνθηνα*. Demeter was clearly an important deity of Sardis in Imperial times, as the passage quoted in n. 14 shows; and Demeter appears on the Imperial bronze coinage of Sardis in the act of searching for Kore: see *BMC, Lydia* 257 no. 138, and pl. xxvi, 10; cf. 265 no. 70. Kore, too, is represented on the coinage (*ibid.* 249 no. 89, and pl. xxvi, 1—her ravishment by Pluton), and there was a festival of the *Κόρη* also: see *JÖAI* xxx (1937) Beibl. col. 214. 16, *Κόρη ἐν Σάρδεσιν*; cf. L. Robert, *RevArch* 1934 59 n. 6 (= *Op. Min. Sel.* ii 1023 n. 6); id. *R Phil* (1958) 20 n. 3; Moretti 221. Head's explanation (*BMC, Lydia* cx) that 'these games were named after the golden flowers which Kore was picking when Hades ravished her' has then much to commend it, whether we refer the festival to Demeter or to Kore. It is further possible, with Guarducci, *Epigr. Gr.* ii (1969) 681, to see a reference in the festival to *Χρυσανθίς*, the Argive maiden who, according to Pausanias i 14. 2 informed Demeter of the rape of her daughter: λέγεται οὖν ὡς Δήμητρα ἐς Ἄργος ἐλθοῦσαν Πελασγὸς δέξαιτο οἴκῳ καὶ ὡς Χρυσανθίς τὴν ἀρπαγὴν ἐπισταμένη τῆς Κόρης διηγῆσαι. The case, then, for the festival being one of Demeter and/or Kore seems strong. However, in publishing a fourth century B.C. dedication from the Latmiac Gulf, *IDid.* 125 (*Berl. Abh.* 1911, Anh. I, *Siebert. Vorber. Milet* 65), Παρωὺ Ἀθηναίου γυνὴ εὐχὴν, ἢ ὑπὲρ Ἑστυαίης Χρυσάνθη, Wiegand said that the epiklesis *Χρυσάνθη* 'deutet offenbar auf einen Aphroditekult der auch in Sardis existierte', clearly referring to the *Χρυσάνθηνα*. (Rehm, in republishing the inscription, *loc. cit.*, said that the reference to Aphrodite 'scheint mir nicht ganz gesichert', with which one can only agree.) Buckler and Robinson, *ISardis* 82–3, maintained that the festival was named 'either after the marigold (*χρυσανθές*), sacred to Artemis, or more probably, after *Χρυσάνθη*, a cult-name of the goddess (with reference to Wiegand's dedication, *BMI* 615 [not 614], etc.)'. But here again, as with Aphrodite, there is no specific link with Sardis, and the identification by way of the *χρυσανθές* or *ἐλίχρυσον* seems very thin: the word is found only in *Nic. fr.* 74.69, and there the *χρυσανθές* appears in the company of *Λείρια*, which 'fade upon the tombstones of the dead', which seems more appropriate to Demeter than to Artemis. P. Herrmann, *Wien. Denk.* lxxx (1962) 17 no. 13, publishing a dedication from Saittai by *Χρυσάνθηνοι φίλοι* also expresses doubts as to the link with Artemis (cf. also *Bull.* 1963 169 no. 234 on no. 13). For *Χρυσάνθη* as a proper name see e.g. Peek, *GVI* 1778 of the first half of the 4th century B.C. (Attica).

<sup>16</sup> See Moretti nos 75.2, 7; 79.33; 81.20; (82.17); 84.16; 87.17; 90.23 (all, except perhaps no. 75, of the third century: see n. 17); *ISard.* 77–9 (79=Moretti no. 84); *BMI* 615.15; *CIG* 3208.16; *FD* iii.1 550 line 20.

reflected in the name of Chrysanthios, the noble pagan Sardinian who was the teacher of Eunapius, and was eulogised by him.<sup>18</sup>

P. M. FRASER

#### All Souls College, Oxford

<sup>17</sup> The *Χρυσάνθηνα* are named on some Sardinian issues from Septimius Severus onwards: see *BMC, Lydia* cix, and 260 no. 150; 271 no. 192; *SNG Von Aulock, Lydien* 3156, 3159; *Inv. Waddington* 5267; cf. L. Robert, *RevArch* 1934 59–61. The issues show a prize crown standing on a base inscribed *Χρυσάνθηνα*, or a wreath so inscribed (*BMC* 271, no. 196). On the identification of the object as a crown, and not as a prize-urn see Robert, *RPhil* 1958 20 n.3 (who in this connection suggests that the festival derived its name from the prize of a crown of golden flowers: 'c'est de leur prix particulier qui devaient tirer leur nom l'ἀγών περιπόρφυρος de Sidon . . . et les chrysanthina de Sardis, en l'honneur de Koré, qui fut enlevée par Plouton alors qu'elle cueillait des fleurs.'). See also *ISard.* 77, in honour of an *agonothetes* [τῶν πρώτων ἀγῶνων Χρυσανθίνων ἐρωτῶν εἰσε]λασ[τ]ικῶν [τῶν εἰς τὴν οἴκο]υμένην, κ.τ.λ.), referring to the Emperor Septimius Severus. It is, however, possible that Septimius had simply elevated an already existing festival. Moretti on no. 75 (*Ephesos* ii no. 72) argues that that inscription is earlier than Commodus and Septimius because there is no mention of *Κομμόδεια* or *Σεουήρεια*. If that argument is sound, then Severus must have elevated an already existing festival, since the *Χρυσάνθηνα* appear in 75 lines 2 and 7.

<sup>18</sup> This point was already made by Hicks in his commentary on *BMI* 615. For Chrysanthius's eulogy see Eunap. *VS* 500–5. For a Christian instance see *IG* xii.1 674: *Χρυσάνθιος ἀναγνώστης* (Rhodes).

#### The Technique of the Erbach Griffin-Protomai

In his publication of the six griffin-protomai formerly in the Erbach collection U. Jantzen<sup>1</sup> notes how closely they agree in height not only among themselves but also with three other protomai of identical type, two in Munich<sup>2</sup> and one from the Samian Heraion.<sup>3</sup> By the kindness of their present owner I have recently had an opportunity of taking detailed measurements of the Erbach set; and Dr Michael Maas, to whom I am greatly indebted, has supplied me with the corresponding dimensions of the Munich pair. The results are compared in the table.

<sup>1</sup> *Arch. Anz.* 1966 129.

<sup>2</sup> Staatliche Antikensammlungen Inv. nos 35, 36; U. Jantzen, *Griechische Greifenkessel* (Berlin 1955) pl. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Samos B 440; Jantzen (n. 2) pl. 22, 1; *AthMitt* lxxiii (1958) Beil. 34, 1.2.

Measurements (in cm)	ERBACH						MUNICH	
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	35	36
Max. h. as preserved*	19.9	19.5	20.4	19.5	19.2	19.5	20.0	20.0
W. across back of beak	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5
W. between globular ear-bases	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7
Max. w. of neck	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4
Tip of beak to base of neck	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.3	9.4	9.7
Top of head behind knob to palate	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.15	3.4
Diam. of r. spiral	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Diam. of l. spiral	1.6	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.55
Inside w. of r. eye	1.4	1.9	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.6
Inside w. of l. eye	1.5	2.0	1.7	1.9	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.7
H. of knob	2.1	1.9	2.1	1.85	2.1	1.9	2.2†	2.3

\* The variations in overall height are of course due to the differing states of preservation of the protomai.

† Incomplete.