

Europe have on occasion very massive complex wooden segmental fellos (as in contemporary Cyprus and Assyria).<sup>15</sup> A quarter-segment felloe would imply eight spokes, as these are normally two to each segment, and this would be perfectly reasonable: one might compare *Il.* v 723. The felloe could be of almost any thickness.

There is, however, a possible alternative wheel form, the cross-bar wheel, first identified and discussed by Hilda Lorimer in connection with Greek vase-paintings of two-wheeled country carts: she drew attention to the Hesiod passage in this context.<sup>16</sup> This type of wheel has recently been shown to have an ancient Near Eastern ancestry. It occurs in prehistoric Europe, where an example has survived from an Italian context of the second millennium B.C. This is constructed with two half-felloes, and it is about 85 cm in diameter.<sup>17</sup> Another example, of the early sixth century B.C., has recently been published from Gordion in Asia Minor, and this appears to have had a felloe in six segments.<sup>18</sup> A normal radially spoked wheel with four felloe segments would, however, fit the Hesiodic dimensions better.

Taking the first three words of line 427, about cutting curved pieces of wood, in relation to the felloe-segments would be perfectly reasonable, as we saw, and an eye for suitably curved timber was part of the traditional woodman's and carpenter's expertise.

S.P.

N. J. RICHARDSON  
STUART PIGGOTT

*Merton College, Oxford*  
*St John's College, Oxford*

<sup>15</sup> G. Kossack in J. Boardman *et al.* (edd.) *The European community in later prehistory* (London 1971) 143–63.

<sup>16</sup> Lorimer (n. 4) 136 ff.

<sup>17</sup> M. A. Littauer and J. Crouwel, *Antiq.* li (1977) 95–105.

<sup>18</sup> E. L. Kohler, in *From Athens to Gordion* (Philadelphia 1980) 89, fig. 32.

### An Unpublished Arula in the Ashmolean Museum: a minor contribution to Hellenistic chronology

PLATES Xb–XII

In 1899 E. Oldfield, Librarian and Fellow of Worcester College, gave a small altar to the Ashmolean Museum, where it joined an already growing collection of fine terracottas.<sup>1</sup> Little is known about its history and how it came into the possession of the donor. Taranto, where such small altars occur most frequently,<sup>2</sup> was thought to be their place of origin, though they have also been found in Greece and Asia Minor, mainly in Hellenistic contexts.

The story of these small altars, which were used for burning incense, is a complicated one. Excavations in the Athenian Agora may have shed some new light on their possible provenance, but no satisfactory conclusion has been reached concerning either their popularity during the Hellenistic period or the choice of subjects

<sup>1</sup> C. E. Vafopoulou-Richardson, *Greek Terracottas* (Oxford 1981) 40–1, pls 42–3, much restored.

<sup>2</sup> P. Willeumier, *Mél. d'arch. et d'hist.* xlvi (1929) 71, pl. 2.1–2; *id.*, *Tarente, des origines à la conquête romaine* (Paris 1939) 435, pl. 41.1–4.

for their decoration.<sup>3</sup> One should add that this class of altars is believed by some to have owed its original inspiration to Attica, whence they were widely exported to be copied in other Hellenistic centres. Their iconography is closely associated with that of relief bowls of a kind which, as recent research has shown, also appeared in Attica during the second half of the third century BC. In 1934 H. A. Thompson proposed a date for the beginning of 'Megarian' bowls of c. 275 BC. The basis for this was an analysis of Hellenistic deposits in the Athenian Agora, one of which (his Group B) he dated on numismatic grounds to c. 275 BC, and another (his Group C containing Megarian bowls with figured scenes) to c. 200 BC, likewise on the basis of numismatic evidence. From that he drew the conclusion that production of the bowls began shortly after 275 BC.<sup>4</sup> This dating is no longer acceptable, for recent studies of the numismatic evidence<sup>5</sup> and of the information to be derived from a study of the stamped amphora handles,<sup>6</sup> seem to suggest that Thompson's Group B should date from around 240 BC. Consequently, the bowls with figured scenes (Group C according to Thompson's classification), which are nearest to our class of altars, appear in the first quarter of the second century BC,<sup>7</sup> but betray signs of a well-established practice. These bowls were copying in clay the forms and effects of metal ware, just as our arula may echo wooden or stone house-altars.<sup>8</sup> However an unpublished arula of this type in Boston (65.1318, PLATE Xb) may suggest an additional source of inspiration. It is said to come from Asia Minor, and it must be Pergamene: both the smoked gray colour of its clay and the hard gray lustre glaze of its surface point in this direction. It is, in fact, this lustrous glaze which gives it such a convincing metallic quality. Could one therefore postulate that just as the bowls were copying metalware these arulae were also cheap imitations of a more delicate and expensive class of objects originally made of metal and most probably of silver?

Our altar stands on a plain rectangular plinth, decorated on its top with an egg and dart moulding (PLATES XI–XII). The idea of underlining or framing a composition with a decorative architectural motif was also fashionable among the mosaicists of Delos.<sup>9</sup> All four sides are preserved and decorated with reliefs showing different subjects common to this type of arula: a young girl crowning a trophy; Poseidon, trident in hand, resting his hand on the shoulder of Amynone, who holds a hydria; Leto in the presence of her son Apollo Kitharoidos; and finally a maenad kissing Dionysos, who is supported by a satyr. All these reliefs, technically speaking, despite some blurring of detail, seem to be from early impressions, since they have preserved their original height. Late copies which were made by means of contact impressions in clay, have

<sup>3</sup> G. Siebert, *Recherches sur les ateliers de bol à reliefs du Péloponnèse à l'époque Hellénistique*, BEFAR (Paris 1978) 240–6.

<sup>4</sup> H. A. Thompson, 'Two centuries of Hellenistic pottery', *Hesperia* iii (1934) 311–476.

<sup>5</sup> J. H. Kroll, *AthMitt* lxxxix (1974) 202–3.

<sup>6</sup> V. R. Grace, *AthMitt* lxxxix (1974) 193–200.

<sup>7</sup> K. Braun, *AthMitt* lxxxv (1970) 183.

<sup>8</sup> C. G. Yavis, *Greek Altars* (Saint Louis 1949) 171–5; M. Nilsson, 'Griechische Hausaltäre', *Festschr. B. Schweitzer* (Stuttgart 1954) 218–21.

<sup>9</sup> *Délos* xxvii, pl. 20.

shrunk in baking; the reliefs diminished in size, and therefore awkward mouldings were added to restore the size of the original, as in the case of a small altar from Troy.<sup>10</sup> These panels are surmounted by a taenia which runs all round the altar, and a frieze of dentils above. Finally, a plain border crowns the whole, which also forms a base for yet another border, this time adorned with various motives: spirals, rosettes alternating with palmettes, and at the corners, curls of acanthus leaves joined by a bead and reel moulding. This last decorative element may have been inspired by some Egyptian bronze altars.<sup>11</sup>

The first side to examine is the one showing the young girl decking a trophy (PLATE XIa). She is clad in a long chiton and muffled in a himation leaving the right arm and shoulder free. Her hair is drawn to the back and tied into a bun type of chignon. With her left hand she lifts the folds of her dress, and in her right she holds a crown, with which she is about to decorate a trophy, which stands on a little mound of stones. The trophy is composed of a plain round shield, and a helmet with a high crest, placed on the supporting trunk. On some examples a cuirass is visible behind the shield. Wuilleumier suggested that the subject was inspired by the tropaion which Pyrrhus set up in the early third century BC, after his victory near Herakleia, since this tropaion also appears on coins struck by Pyrrhus in Taranto in 280 BC commemorating the same event.<sup>12</sup> He based this suggestion on his theory that these altars were all of Tarentine origin. However, recent work has shown this to be untrue and it is no longer necessary to connect our example with such a specific, local event.<sup>13</sup>

K. Woelcke had, moreover, already shown that this coin die was a favourite in the mints of Magna Graecia, and we can see it represented on coins from Capua, Syracuse, Bruttium, and Herakleia.<sup>14</sup> Moreover, the style of the girl's himation does not necessarily point to the particular date suggested by Wuilleumier. This himation, which reaches the ankles, wrapping the figure very closely without revealing too much detail of the forms of the body beneath, may reflect an original of the second quarter of the fourth century BC. This may have been a Kore type which, according to B. Ashmole, may have been set up in Eleusis.<sup>15</sup> The type seems to have been remodelled, possibly in Attica, at some later date, and thus continued to inspire artists down to the late second century BC.<sup>16</sup>

In addition, the subject appears to have gained immense popularity in another sphere: Athenian (and Delian) relief bowls. Two examples are from Eretria: one, a bowl of the Athenian type showing a decoration of egg and dart, with spirals round its mouth and

probably dating to the second half of the third century BC, recalls in treatment some of the subsidiary decorations of our arula;<sup>17</sup> the other, of Delian type, shows the decorative motives in registers—egg and dart, bead and reel, favourites of the Delian sphere and once more fairly close to those on the arula. This last example is dated somewhere in the late third and early second century BC.<sup>18</sup> Eretria has yielded no bowls with figured decoration but its decorative motives seem to show a common source with the ones on our arula.

The works of both F. Courby<sup>19</sup> and W. Schwabacher<sup>20</sup> have helped greatly in the identification of these figure representations and their relationship to the small altars. The latter has shown that eleven out of the sixteen known bowls showing this theme were made in Attica, and since he also lists eleven examples on small altars, he suggests that one should try to see their origin here as well. This possibility has been confirmed by the finds in the Athenian Agora<sup>21</sup> and other places where Attic influence and commerce were flourishing.<sup>22</sup>

The impression on the second side (PLATE XIb) is rather poor, and the features blurred. It appears to have been stamped twice for clearer results, unsuccessfully. On this panel Poseidon and Amymone are represented. On the right stands the figure of the god, in profile, wearing a himation round his hips with one edge over his left shoulder, leaving his torso bare. By his left side he holds his trident, and his right hand rests on the left shoulder of the young girl, who wears a high-girt peplos with a deep apodygma. She is shown frontally with a jug, possibly a hydria, in her right hand. Once again the iconography appears to be Attic.<sup>23</sup> Of the twenty eight examples on relief bowls, twenty one are from Attica. Stylistically, the Amymone type recalls the Athena of the Museo Mussolini<sup>24</sup> and the Athena on the relief decree of 294 BC<sup>25</sup> in the Acropolis Museum, reinforcing the argument for its Athenian inspiration, convincingly put forward by W. Schwabacher and more recently argued by S. I. Rotroff.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Eretria ii, pl. 22, 1a.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pl. 27, 4.

<sup>19</sup> F. Courby, *Les vases grecs à reliefs* (Paris 1922).

<sup>20</sup> W. Schwabacher, 'Hellenistische Reliefkeramik im Kera-meikos', *AJA* xlv (1941) 185–93.

<sup>21</sup> D. B. Thompson, 'Three centuries of Hellenistic terracottas', *Hesperia* xxxi (1962) 259, pl. 91.

<sup>22</sup> Eretria: S. Besques, *Catalogue raisonné des figurines et reliefs en terre cuite grecs, étrusques et romains* iii (Paris 1972) pl. 84.

Olbia: E. H. Minns, *Scythian and Greeks* (Cambridge 1913) 364; *AA* 1909 173, fig. 31.

Delos: *Délos* xviii 386, fig. 451, pl. 111, 977.

Delphi: Boston Museum oo.325 (unpublished): fragment showing the Dionysiac scene. Bought at Athens and said to come from Delphi.

Callatis: V. Canarache, *Masks and Tanagra figurines made in the workshop of Callatis* (Constanța 1969) 62, 33; 64, 38; 65, 39–40.

Corinth: *Corinth* vii pt iii 163 ff., pl. 68, no. 807; no. 814; *Corinth* xii pl. 65, no. 889.

Thessaloniki: M. Vickers tells me of the existence of an Attic West Slope ware pyxis from Thessaloniki also in the Ashmolean (1976.71; see *AA* 1981, 549–50) which has on the lid the Dionysiac scene. The same scene appears on a bowl from Sidi Khrebish, Benghazi (F 1478) of the mid-second century BC (information from P. Kenrick).

<sup>23</sup> See now also E. Simon, *LIMC* i.1 s.v. 'Amymone'.

<sup>24</sup> R. Horn, *Stehende weibliche Gewandstatuen* (Munich 1931) 12, pl. 2, 2.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, pl. 2, 3.

<sup>26</sup> S. I. Rotroff, *Megarian Bowls in the Athenian Agora* (Thesis Princeton 1976) 38–41.

<sup>10</sup> D. B. Thompson, *Troy*, Suppl. Monograph iii (Princeton 1963) 142, pl. 57, no. 293.

<sup>11</sup> C. C. Edgar, *Greek Bronzes* (Cairo 1904) pl. 15, 27.813, 27.814; P. Perdrizet, *Bronzes grecs d'Égypte de la collection Fouquet* (Paris 1911) pl. 40.

<sup>12</sup> Wuilleumier, *Tarente* (n. 2) 389, 436.

<sup>13</sup> U. Hausmann, *Hellenistische Reliefbecher aus attischen und böotischen Werkstätten* (Stuttgart 1959) 107 n. 99.

<sup>14</sup> K. Woelcke, 'Beitrage zur Geschichte des Tropaions', *Bonner Jb.* cxx (1911) pls 11–12.

<sup>15</sup> B. Ashmole, 'Demeter of Cnidus', *JHS* lxxi (1951) 25–8, pl. 10d.

<sup>16</sup> F. Eckstein, 'Weibliche Gewandfigur in Brüssel', *Ant. Plast.* iv (1965) 47 ff., pl. 27a and fig. 5.

The scene on the third side (PLATE XIIa) shows a figure, presumably Apollo, seated on a rock with part of his garment hanging over it, his torso left bare. In his left hand and resting on his left thigh is a kithara; in his right hand he probably held the plectron. In front of him stands a female figure, clad in a chiton and a himation worn as a veil. Her left arm is muffled in her dress, with the hand hanging along the side. The right is free and rests on a sceptre. This may possibly represent Leto. The style and treatment of her dress recalls very closely that of Poseidon, and it is probable that they both derive from fourth-century originals despite the fact that their proportions belong to a later period. This is supported by the evidence of the stele of Ameinokleia from the middle of the fourth century BC, on which the standing maid is draped in a similar fashion.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, the stance of Leto, with the weight on the right leg, the left leg flexed and the upraised arm resting on the sceptre, recalls very closely another sculptural type: that of the figure of Hera as it appears on a mould from Corinth, which was used to stamp vases with relief appliquéés.<sup>28</sup> In a study of this class of vases Züchner suggested that they began to be made only in the mid-fourth century or later,<sup>29</sup> a date which agrees well with the style of Hera's drapery, which in turn is closely related to that of the Eirene by Kephisodotos.<sup>30</sup> This style of draping the himation enjoyed a great popularity for a long time, as is attested by a fragment of an oinochoe in faience dating from the late third century BC.<sup>31</sup> Unfortunately the features of both the figures on our little altar are very worn, as is Apollo's musculature. Both these scenes are known on nine small altars, where they always occur together.

By far the most popular scene in this group of four is the Dionysiac (PLATE XIIb). Here we have a young Dionysos, naked except for a pair of tall boots with the tops turned down. He is being supported by a satyr, who appears to be also naked. A young girl, probably a maenad or Ariadne, holds his head in both her hands and approaches to kiss him. She wears a chiton with a high belt directly under her breasts, and a himation draped round the lower part of her body, with one edge falling down over her left shoulder and by her side. Her hair is treated in the melon hair style, with very fine divisions, and is drawn at the back into a small wiry bun-chignon. The facial features of the figures are rather blurred. This scene is known on thirteen altars and on forty-five relief bowls, of which twenty-nine are certainly from Athens or Attica. Therefore one should perhaps again seek the prototype in Attica and not, with Wuilleumier, in Magna Graecia.

This scene was also popular on the vases with relief appliquéés mentioned above. A hydria in Würzburg shows us this very scene.<sup>32</sup> The vase was dated by E. Langlotz to the third century BC, but Züchner suggested

<sup>27</sup> K. F. Johansen, *The Attic grave reliefs* (Copenhagen 1951) fig. 7.

<sup>28</sup> S. S. Weinberg, 'Corinthian relief ware', *Hesperia* xxiii (1954) pl. 33c-e.

<sup>29</sup> W. Züchner, 'Von Toreuten und Topfern', *JdI* lxxv-lxxvi (1950-51) 175-205.

<sup>30</sup> C. M. Robertson, *A History of Greek Art* (London 1975) pl. 125a.

<sup>31</sup> D. B. Thompson, *Ptolemaic Oinochoai and Portraits in Faience* (Oxford 1973) 143, pl. 20, 58.

<sup>32</sup> Weinberg (n. 28), *Hesperia* xxiii (1954) pl. 32b, 33a; see now E. Simon et al., *Martin von Wagner Museum Antikenabteilung* (Mainz 1975) 186, L908 (where it is suggested that this group of vases may have originated in Alexandria).

instead a date in the second half of the fourth century BC. All the evidence for the 'models' of the four scenes points to a common date in the second half of the fourth century.<sup>33</sup> From then on, they are widely used on relief figured bowls which according to G. R. Edwards first came on the market in Athens and Corinth sometime in the last quarter of the third century BC<sup>34</sup> but whose best extant examples should now be dated in the middle of the second century BC.

New evidence supports this view of the proposed chronology of the arula. First, we now know that the production of Megarian bowls started in Athens during the 230s when four major types of Megarian bowls were being manufactured. This production continued down to 150 BC when a new influence introduced the long-petal bowl, which then became the standard type and most probably continued to be produced till Sulla's sack in 86 BC.<sup>35</sup>

We can safely conclude, therefore, that the peak of production of figured bowls falls somewhere between 190 and 150 BC. This is also indicated by the finds in Corinth, where the relevant mythological subjects on figured bowls appear between 200 and 146 BC, the date of Corinth's fall.<sup>36</sup> P. Callaghan in a study of a certain class of these bowls, 'the shield bowls', dates their introduction to 150 BC with Corinth as the centre of invention and *διασπορά*.<sup>37</sup> This type of bowl appears to have survived at least into the very late second and early first century BC, at which point production of figured bowls seems to have lost impetus.

The picture which emerges from Delos is slightly different. Here we are told that production started after 167-6 BC when Athenian cleruchs settled the island. A. Laumonier, who recently published a monograph on this relief ware, has divided the vast material into a series of workshops. It is interesting to notice that the bowl decorated with the Macedonian shield pattern, whose introduction Callaghan has dated to 150 BC, does not figure in any of Laumonier's first three workshops.<sup>38</sup> But surprisingly enough the familiar figure scenes continue not as we have known them in Athens and Corinth, but rather in isolated instances. Both the Dionysiac group<sup>39</sup> and the girl decking the trophy are shown on the early ware, but disappear quickly from the range after 150 BC. This surely follows the pattern of the other two centres. Could this mean that the Athenians who settled Delos after 167-6 BC brought with them a type familiar to them from home, which subsequently was displaced by the incursion of the Macedonian shield device?

In conclusion we can say that the evidence we have examined perhaps strengthens the case for an Attic

<sup>33</sup> G. Siebert (n. 3) 70, pl. 24, M.11-M.12; pl. 44-45, Co. 1, Co. 2, also p. 179, where Siebert comes to the same conclusion for the Peloponnesian workshops: 'On constate dans l'ensemble que le répertoire se rattache tantôt à l'art classique du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle, tantôt semble-t-il, à l'art contemporain ou immédiatement antérieur. Certains ateliers péloponnésiens sont plus "classiques" que d'autres, mais la plus part puisent par des emprunts indirects aux mêmes sources anciennes'.

<sup>34</sup> *Corinth*, vii pt iii, 152.

<sup>35</sup> Rotroff (n. 26) 65.

<sup>36</sup> *Corinth*, vii pt iii, 163-168.

<sup>37</sup> P. Callaghan, *AAA* xi (1978) 53-60.

<sup>38</sup> P. Callaghan, *BSA* lxxv (1980) 42.

<sup>39</sup> *Délos* xxxi pl. 20, 3247.

rather than South Italian origin for these arulae. The choice of subjects for decorating them is more difficult to explain, and remains puzzling. They were obviously used as incense burners in household shrines, but why there should be this sudden burst of popularity all over the Greek world<sup>40</sup> remains obscure. The only thing which is clear is that the same class of artisans did work on both the relief bowls and altars, and they therefore drew upon a single repertory of scenes for both.

C. E. VAFOPOULOU-RICHARDSON

*Jesus College, Oxford*

<sup>40</sup> See above n. 22.

### The Arabic version of Galen's *De Elementis Secundum Hippocratem*

The following notes are the outcome of a study of Hunain's translation of Galen's treatise *De Elementis Secundum Hippocratem*.<sup>1</sup> As we have remarked in connection with the translations of the *De Sectis ad eos qui introducuntur*, *JHS* xcvi (1978) 167, and of the *Ars Parva*, *JHS* ci (1981) 145, we have found Hunain's versions in general very accurate. The most important apparent divergences from the Greek texts of Helmreich and of Kühn are set out below, the most interesting being, perhaps, the reference to Diodorus as well as Leucippus in ch. 2, where Galen contrasts the theory he ascribes to the followers of Epicurus (that atoms are unbreakable because of their hardness) with that which he attributes to the followers of Leucippus (in the Arabic version to Diodorus and Leucippus), namely that the atoms are indivisible because of their smallness.

*Abbreviations:* H: Helmreich; K: Kühn; abbreviations for codices as in Helmreich.

Book i

- H 1.15 f., K 414.6 *εἰς τὰς ἰάσεις* omitted from Arabic version.
- H 2.3, K 414.14 *τοῖς ἀετοῖς* omitted from Arabic version.
- H 2.25, K 416.3 After the sentence that ends *καὶ τὴν δύναμιν*, the Arabic adds 'and he has simply aimed at the destruction of what is claimed concerning the business of the element [which is] one in form and power'.
- H 4.2-4, K 417.15 ff. H square-bracketed *ὅπερ τοῦνομα*. But Arabic has 'and it [the essence] is what he calls the thing in truth'. This suggests that Hunain had a text in which some explanation of the term *ἔτεῆ* was given (though his version attempts no rendering of the etymology of *ἔτεῆ* from *ἔτεόν*).
- H 4.8 ff., K 418.4 ff. Arabic adds explanations: 'for he called the indivisible bulks "one thing" because they all, in his opinion, are of one form; and he called the void the absence of the one, because it is also not an existing thing.'
- H 4.12, K 418.9 Arabic has *σύμπαντα*, square-bracketed by H.

<sup>1</sup> We wish once again to express our warmest thanks to Dr Malcolm Lyons of Pembroke College, Cambridge, who has again most generously offered his invaluable advice on many points of interpretation. Needless to add, any errors that remain are entirely our own responsibility.

H 5.2, K 419.1 Where the Greek text has *οἱ περὶ τὸν Λεύκιππον* alone as exemplification of those who believed the atoms to be *ἀπαθῆ* on account of their being indivisible because of their smallness, the Arabic has 'as was claimed by Diodorus and Leucippus'.

H 6.20, H 421.12 Where the Greek has *ὁ τραωθείς* (presumably the individual who has been pierced, although previously this had been referred to simply as *ζῶον*, H 6.7, H 420.15, K 6.15, H 421.6, and cf. H 8.1, K 423.14), the Arabic has 'the two [viz indivisible particles] are immune from feeling and from pain'.

H 7.16, K 423.5 *ἢ τίς τοῦτο προσιέται λογισμός*; is omitted from Arabic version.

H 8.18 f., K 424.15 ff. There is no trace of *οὔκουν οὐδ' ἐξ ἀπαθῶν θ' ἄμα καὶ ἀναισθήτων ἐγχωρεῖ στοιχείων εἶναι τὸ αἰσθητικόν* in the Arabic version. In the Arabic it is only composition from elements that are *ἀπαθῆ* but that are sensible that is ruled out, i.e. H 8.19-20, K 424.17 ff.

H 8.25, K 425.6 Where the Greek has *τὰς ὁμοιομερείας*, the Arabic version has 'identical indivisible parts' (Galen is dealing with atoms here, not Aristotelian homoeomeries).

H 9.5, K 425.12 H square-bracketed *χρῆ* (in K). Arabic has 'must'.

H 10.14, K 428.1 Arabic has 'by experience and reason' where Greek has only *τῷ λόγῳ*.

H 11.13, K 429.7 One Arabic MS supports *λευκά* (K), the other *πυρρά* (H).

H 12.15 f., K 430.15 f. The Arabic appears to take *δι' ὄλων* with *κεραννυμένων* (as in K) rather than with *ἀλλοιουμένων* (as in H) and has one word ('transformed') for *μεταβαλλόντων* (or *μεταβαλλομένων*) and *ἀλλοιουμένων*.

H 16.1 f., K 435.9 f. Arabic omits *καὶ πίστιν τὴν δέουσαν παρασχέσθαι τῷ λόγῳ*.

H 16.16, K 436.8 After *προὔκειτο*, the Arabic adds—what may be intended as an alternative—'no less than the exposition of the first by the method of demonstration in (all) clarity'.

H 17.16 f., K 438.1 Arabic appears to read *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* square-bracketed by H.

H 18.18, K 439.7 Arabic appears to read *ἀλλήλοις* deleted by H.

H 19.1, K 439.8 Arabic appears to read *τὸ ἐν τε καὶ τὸ πᾶν* deleted by H.

H 19.4, K 439.10 f. Arabic has nothing corresponding to *μῶνον / μόνον*—nor at H 20.3, K 440.6, though it has it at H 19.10, K 439.16.

H 19.13, K 440.3 f. Arabic appears to read *ἐν ἐόν* (with K) rather than *ἔνεον* (with H).

H 21.6, K 441.7 Where the Greek has 'neither air . . . nor fire', one Arabic MS omits 'nor fire', the other has 'nor water'.

H 21.9 ff., K 441.10 ff. The Arabic has the same lacuna after *χρέεσθαι / κεχρησθαι* as in the Greek MSS, where H restores after Hippocrates.

H 22.12, K 442.9 Arabic adds 'in spite of their obscurity'.

H 24.8, K 445.6 f. Like K, the Arabic reads *λέγουσι δὲ οὐ τὰ αὐτά* here as well as at H 24.6, K 445.4 f.

H 25.7, K 446.8 Arabic appears to read *ὄτι* (with K) rather than *ὅτε* (with H).

H 28.5, K 450.7 f. Arabic adds 'or earth': 'man is not in his totality of air or earth by itself'.



(b) Terracotta altar from Asia Minor, 1st century AD (Courtesy, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Edwin L. Jack fund).



(a) Red-figure hydria, Boston 13.200, Gallatin Painter (Courtesy, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Francis Bartlett donation).

PERSEUS BECOMES ERICHTHONIOS (a)  
ARULA IN THE ASHMOLEAN MUSEUM (b)



(a) Girl crowning a trophy.



(b) Poseidon and Amymone.

ARULA IN THE ASHMOLEAN MUSEUM





(b) Maenad, Dionysos and satyr.



(a) Apollo Kitharoidos and Leto.