

century. As regards the use of the luckless *hyperetes*, a turn of events somewhat akin takes place in Euripides' *Cyclops*, 581–9, when Cyclops fastens on Silenus. The comic juxtaposition of military prowess and homosexuality is exploited by Aristophanes at *Frogs* 45–67 (Dionysus' service under Cleisthenes, or aboard the Cleisthenes).²¹ This motif, but in an epic setting, appears in a fragment of Eubulus that deals with the diet of the Greeks during the long siege at Troy, and which, although a century later, makes a good caption for the scurrilous vignette:²²

οὐδ' ἑταίραν εἶδέ τις
αὐτῶν, ἑαυτοῦς δ' ἔδεφον ἑνιαυτοῦς δέκα·
πικρὰν στρατείαν δ' εἶδον, οἴτινες πόλιν
μίαν λαβόντες εὐρυνρωκτότεροι πολὺ
τῆς πόλεως ἀπεχώρησαν ἧς ἔλλον τότε.

G. FERRARI PINNEY

Bryn Mawr College

²¹ Stanford (n. 18).

²² Hunter (n. 19) 75 no. 120.

The Old Platform in the Argive Heraeum

In his recent article 'The Old Temple Terrace at the Argive Heraeum', J. C. Wright discusses the date of the platform supporting the remains of the earliest Argive Heraeum—in other words, the uppermost terrace of the Hellenic (*viz.* Classical) Heraeum.¹ Is it itself a Classical structure, or a late Bronze Age platform re-used to accommodate the first peripteral temple of the seventh century BC? Wright would connect both the platform and the temple upon it with the first stages of proper Hellenic culture, in the eighth and seventh centuries BC. On pp. 191 ff. he denies that I can possibly be right in following the oldest investigators and assigning this platform to the Bronze Age. But I must confess that his arguments, however learned, have so far failed to shake my conviction.

In the first place, as Wright readily concedes (192), the great blocks of this terrace are masses of conglomerate. They are just as big as those of Mycenae and Tiryns. And the whole wall-face, like much 'Cyclopean' work on many sites, is apparently full of gaps and cavities, and generally loose-jointed. This, I think, is a general characteristic of Bronze Age 'Cyclopean' work. Sometimes, of course, this just resembles enormous stones irregularly piled, presumably with the clay 'cement' and perhaps 'garretting stones' washed away in the course of ages. Take, for instance, the famous 'Cyclopean' Bridge at Lissa (on the road from Navplion to Epidaurus), or the rear, easterly portions (so far the least infected by 'anastylotes') of the Acropolis at Mycenae.² Or else, where a Mycenaean conglomerate façade has weathered, like the upper part of the façade of the Treasury of Atreus, the even, horizontal courses of large, dressed conglomerate blocks closely approach the state of the blocks in our Heraeum terrace.³ Nor are the horizontal courses of the so-called 'causeway' in the valley south of the Acropolis at Mycenae very different, to my eye,

from those at the Heraeum.⁴ I suppose that, at times, conglomerate naturally splits into more horizontal blocks—which would of course help the local Mycenaean masons.

A famous Mycenaean building, almost a terrace, the curtain-wall, with its 'casemates', around the south end of Tiryns, is made of large blocks, actually in 'coursed polygonal', but with large irregular gaps. It is well shown in Dörpfeld's drawings.⁵

In all these cases we have large blocks, for the most part loosely compacted, and put together in a way quite unlike the later Hellenic walls. Sometimes they are of enormous limestone blocks, rough-hewn (as in the normal stretches of the curtain-wall round the Acropolis of Mycenae), sometimes of dressed conglomerate (as in the Barbicans, or in the façades of the finest beehive-tombs). Terraces, in any case, are rare: and I shall suggest that that of the Argive Heraeum may not have started life as a real Terrace. But the Heraeum does use the Mycenaean material, conglomerate.

Next, we should reflect that, according to many authorities at the present day, Bronze Age sites in Greece might lie derelict for some period before the Classical builders approached them and employed them for their own structures. Serious building was apparently resumed at a considerable interval after the end of the Bronze Age.⁶ But it would seem, from a natural interpretation of the few remains of the seventh century, that the first Hellenic buildings were small and crisp and nervous, with an over-conscious, over-conscientious approach to the need for hair-joints on elevations, ever afterwards the hallmark of Hellenic masonry. We find a similar obsession with visible hair-joints in the first Egyptian stone buildings, at Sakkarah.⁷ Also, when I visited Minoan Crete, I remember seeing something of the sort there; e.g. in the north wing of the Palace of Hagia Triada. But in the first Hellenic buildings such an outlook is everywhere apparent; in the seventh-century temple of Thermon, and even more in its precursor, in the Temple of Artemis Knakeatis, in the first temple of Hera on Samos and in the Argive Heraeum itself. As late as c. 600 BC the Heraeum at Olympia still embodies the tradition of such craftsmanship, which Beazley might have called 'spruce and fine'.

I do not really think that the history of the famous city wall of Old Smyrna invalidates my point. Nicholls' description,⁸ elaborate and cautious as he has made this, appears to contend that before Alyattes' capture of Smyrna in the early sixth century the *enceinte* of the little city on the hill of Bayraklı had passed through three distinct phases. It was first built in Geometric times, and was twice rebuilt before its capture.⁹ First, of course, we must remember that on this outlying site necessity might be the mother of invention, that overwhelming Cimmerian or Lydian threats would be very real, and even the mere hinterland might prove uncontrollable. From Nicholls' drawings, as from his text, one gathers

⁵ H. Schliemann, *Tiryns* (London 1886) 319, 320, pl. III.

⁶ See A. M. Snodgrass, *The Dark Age of Greece* (Edinburgh 1971) 394–8, a discussion of which, to do him justice, Wright shows himself perfectly conscious (193 n. 33).

⁷ See S. Clarke and R. Engelbach, *Ancient Egyptian Masonry* (London 1930).

⁸ *BSA* liii–liv (1958–9).

⁹ See esp. Nicholls (n. 8) 118–19.

¹ *JHS* cii (1982) 186–201.

² See A. J. B. Wace, *Mycenae* (Princeton 1949) 22 and pl. 109.

³ Wace (n. 2) pl. 40a.

⁴ Wace (n. 2) pl. 38a.

that the wall, in its third phase, was given a footing and a facing (each still only one course deep) of much bigger blocks, approaching in size those of our Argive Platform. But this, of course, was around 600 BC, when serious Hellenic architecture, like Hellenic sculpture, was at last improving by leaps and bounds. And in any case all the Smyrniote walls were still structures mainly of mud brick.

Taking the Hellenic Age, one finds that many items of the Mycenaean builders' stock-in-trade were never to reappear—for instance, the reverse taper of the columns or, even more significantly, the placing of door-leaves on the thresholds, or the elegant H-Plan of the door jambs between them. And the new Hellenic buildings, down to a date well down in the sixth century, nearly all appear to me very flimsy. As for the lightness of the structures built in the 'interregnum' between Mycenaean and Classical Greece, I feel my opinions reinforced, if anything, by the recent discoveries of Mervyn Popham at Lefkandi.

I am strangely perplexed, I confess, by the complete silence of Blegen on the nature and even the find-spots of the Geometric sherds which he says he found. To quote p. 20 of his *Prosymna*: 'Our fourth and fifth holes, however, yielded some Geometric fragments at so great a depth from the face of the terrace, that it seemed to me impossible that they could have reached their place after the making of the wall.' Despite, I suppose, its loose jointing and wide cavities. Amazingly, there seems to be nothing else in the book, or even a clear diagram showing the trial-holes.

Therefore, I still like to believe that at the Argive Heraeum there was a considerable interval between the actual platform, on the one hand, and the earliest Hellenic temple built upon it. Perhaps, too, the pavement of flat stones, which surrounds the temple, should be associated with it, rather than with the platform. But here I am open to persuasion. Finally, it seems possible that the platform is built as a massive front wall, retaining a fill behind it. In such a case, it would resemble the Mycenaean wall round the Acropolis of Athens. And then, too, it could have been filled with a packing of loose materials, including sherds, some time before the first Hellenic Heraeum was built on top of it.

HUGH PLOMMER†

Cambridge

New ΝΙΣΥΠΙΟΙ from Physkos (Marmaris) (PLATE 1e)

In April 1983, the inscription published below was seen outside a house among the cafes along the harbour quay in Marmaris, Turkey, near the Customs House. The block had disappeared in September 1983, and it seems therefore unlikely that the inscription will be published elsewhere.

The inscription is carved upon a square block which was either of the distinctive grey Rhodian stone, *Lithos Lartios*, or else of a very similar local stone found in the area of Marmaris: height c. 0.25 m, width c. 0.275 m, depth c. 0.28 m. The text, read with difficulty from stone, squeeze, and photograph (PLATE 1e) is carelessly

carved in three lines with irregular letters and uneven spacing. Date: second to third centuries AD.

Μενεσθε<υ>ς Ξίνιος Νισύριος
'Αριστάριον Μενεκλείδα 'Αρ--
'Αθαναγόρας Μενεσθέου Νισύρ[ιος]

Line 1 Μενεσθέου lap.: Μενεσθεύς Rice

(Here lies) Menestheus, son of Xeinis, Nisyrios, Aristarion, daughter of Menekleidas, Ar-- , Athanagoras, son of Menestheus, Nisyrios.

Some of the readings are less than certain owing to the bad quality of the carving and the worn surface of the stone. Since the names at the beginning of the second and third lines are in the nominative case, one would expect a nominative in the first line as well, especially given the unmistakable nominative demotic *Νισύριος*. However, in line 1 the termination *-εου* seems clear, and we are left with the reading *Μενεσθέου*, which creates two problems. The first is the genitive form *Μενεσθέου* in place of *Μενεσθέως* or *Μενεσθέος*, correct genitives from the common name *Μενεσθεύς*. I am not aware of an example of a name *Μενέσθεος* which would produce the genitive *Μενεσθέου* which appears here. The patronymic in line 3 provides no clarification, since although it appears to be the same name in the same case, its reading is only inferred from certain prominent letters, and the ending is not at all clear. Despite the incorrect genitive form, the frequency of the name *Μενεσθεύς* over the anomalous *Μενέσθεος* suggests that the former name is to be understood here; the error in inflection may be attributed to the late date of the inscription. The use of the genitive case for the name in line 1 is itself the second problem. After a genitive in this position, the article *τοῦ* and the demotic *Νισυρίου* would be expected. The omission of the article before the patronymic after a name in the genitive case is nevertheless not uncommon at this late date, and it appears that the lapicide began to carve in the genitive case but switched to the nominative by the end of the first line. The demotic at the end of line 2 cannot be read beyond 'Αρ-- . Because of the uneven line length, there is probably room for either the demotic 'Αρία (a deme of the Rhodian city Kamiros) or 'Αργεία (a deme of the Rhodian city Lindos).

The trochilos moulding and anathyrosis on the top of the stone show that the block is a square base for a cylindrical funerary altar.¹ Cylindrical altars on square bases are the most common Hellenistic funerary monuments on the island of Rhodes;² they are also common throughout dependent Rhodian territory in the late Hellenistic period.³ This monument conforms to the more usual type in that the inscription is carried on the base, not on the altar itself.

The inscription commemorates a family (probably father, mother, and son, or, less likely, father, son, and wife), whose male members were demesmen from the

¹ For a discussion of this type of funerary monument, see P. M. Fraser, *Rhodian Funerary Monuments* (Oxford 1977) 25 ff., figs 59(c), 60(a-c). The epigraphical publications mentioned in n. 5 below are explained *ibid.* 83.

² Fraser 25.

³ Fraser 33. Fraser, *ibid.* and n. 183, mentions that neither he nor G. E. Bean was aware of any published examples of these cylindrical altars from the Peraea, and it is therefore particularly unfortunate that the altar belonging to the Marmaris base has disappeared.