

Vergina frieze are Xenophon's Indian hounds, but rather than these holding dogs are of a specialized physical type which would be of similar ability and usefulness. There is no way of knowing what the 4th century BC Macedonians called these Vergina holding dogs, or for that matter what they called the tracking hounds we have come to know as the Laconian. However, the five tracking hounds in the frieze are of one particular physical type, each like every other in every perceivable detail.⁸ The three holding dogs comprise a second type. These eight examples represent two specific types of dog, each of which has been bred with a different purpose in mind.⁹

The dog throughout history has served man in many and varied ways. In the world today, there are hundreds of recognizable types of dogs marked by certain physical characteristics. These characteristics give them the ability to perform certain specific tasks. It is not my purpose to attempt to identify direct antecedents of modern breeds of dogs in ancient examples. There are, however, modern dogs of the same physical type and with capabilities similar to those of the two types of dogs in the Vergina hunt frieze. The tracking dog has many current counterparts in different parts of the world, since hunting is a widespread joint endeavor of dog and man. Some of these tracking dogs are larger, some are smaller, but all are of a generally similar physical type. There are close parallels in use and type in certain dogs seen commonly in Europe and the United States, and these are the Pharaoh Hound and the Ibizan Hound.¹⁰ The holding dog has present day parallels in the Karelian Bear Dog of the Soviet Union, the Rhodesian Ridgeback, and the Japanese Akita.¹¹ These powerful canines still perform important baying functions in the hunts for large game in Asia and Africa.¹²

In examining the details of the hunting frieze at Vergina, we can see two canine members of the hunting roster of 4th century BC Macedonia. These are the long-familiar tracking dog, and the new holding dog. At present we can only wonder what other types of dogs may have been in use in that time and place, and what their abilities and assigned tasks may have been.

LINDA COLLINS REILLY

*Department of Classical Studies,
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA
The American School of Classical Studies, Athens*

⁸ The colour of the tracking dogs varies, but their color is not related to their physical capabilities. On the color of hounds, see Xen. *Cyn.* 4. 7-8.

⁹ On this point see J. K. Anderson, *Hunting in the ancient world* (Berkeley 1985) 93. He says, 'Hounds were, as in Xenophon's day, essentially of two types, with the light, keen-scented Laconian, or Spartan, hound used to track the quarry, and a heavier mastiff to bay it'. It is exactly these two types of dogs which are represented in the Vergina hunt scene.

¹⁰ On these two modern breeds, see *The complete dog book* (New York 1985) 239-242 for the Pharaoh Hound, and 223-226 for the Ibizan, both with photographs.

¹¹ On these dogs, see G. Pugnetti, *Guide to dogs* (New York 1980). The Karelian is #127, the Rhodesian #174, and the Akita #87, all with photographs.

¹² For an example of dogs used in recent times in a large game hunt, see R. B. Lee and I. DeVore, eds., *Man the hunter* (Chicago 1968) 294-5.

Two choruses of frogs?

In September 1991 I came across two parties of frogs in the bulrushes on either side of a still little pool at the Ain Qilt, some ten miles east of Jerusalem. The two parties were calling to each other in turn, as though singing antiphonally. The remarkable fact which struck me was that each group had a different chant, the one distinctly chanting only βρεκεκεκέξ, while the other replied equally distinctly with a consistent κοάξ, κοάξ. I observed this phenomenon for some ten minutes, but was not able to ascertain other differences between the two groups, such as sex, age, or temperament; but I thought that this fact, whatever its explanation, might be a significant contribution to field-research on Aristophanes.

HENRY WANSBROUGH

*St. Benet's Hall
Oxford*

Kleisthenes and Athenian nomenclature

In the course of discussing Kleisthenes' reforms, the author of the *Athenaion Politeia* makes the following statement:

καὶ δημότας ἐποίησεν ἀλλήλων τοὺς οἰκόντας ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῶν δήμων, ἵνα μὴ πατρῶθεν προσαγορεύοντες ἐξελέγχωσιν τοὺς νεοπολίτας, ἀλλὰ τῶν δήμων ἀναγορεύωσιν· ὅθεν καὶ καλοῦσιν Ἀθηναῖοι σφᾶς αὐτοῦς τῶν δήμων.
Ath. Pol. 21.4¹

And he made those who were currently living in each of the demes demesmen of one another, so that they would not examine the new citizens by calling out their patronymic, rather they would announce them by demes; and from this practice, the Athenians call themselves after their demes.

From the first, commentators on the *Ath. Pol.* have interpreted this passage to mean that Kleisthenes legislated a change in Athenian nomenclature from the patronymic to the demotic in an effort to promote equality among the citizens. F.G. Kenyon advanced this interpretation as early as 1891 in the second edition of the *Ath. Pol.*: 'Kleisthenes introduced a large number of new citizens by enfranchisement of emancipated slaves and resident aliens, and he made their reception into the community easier by altering the official mode of designation.'² Wilamowitz, while concurring in general

¹ Aristoteles, *Athenaion Politeia* ed. M. Chambers (Leipzig 1986). All citations from the *Ath. Pol.* are taken from the Teubner text. I do not wish to enter into the thorny problem of the authorship of the text. The other two Greek writers who discuss Kleisthenes' reforms are Herodotos v 69 and Isocrates vii 6. Only the passage in *Ath. Pol.* has anything on nomenclature. I would like to thank Professors George Huxley, Stephen Tracy, John Traill, and A.G. Woodhead, as well as the anonymous referees, all of whom have read and commented on this article in various drafts. Of course, any errors which remain are my own.

² F.G. Kenyon, *Aristotle on the constitution of the Athenians*³ (Oxford 1892) 69.