June 1967

No. 8

PEGASUS

University of Exeter Classical Society Magazine

Editors:

C.A.M. Evans R.J.Abbot C.E.Hogarth-Gaute

<u>Contents</u>

1.	Grammar?!?	pg.2
2.	Vera Tragoedia	5
3.	EpigramsF.W. Clayton	11
4.	The Rebellion of Boadicca: The Burnt Layer and the Narrative of TacitusM.A. Scott	12
5.	This is Tibten (By Heinrich Böll) Translated byH.M. Harvey	15
6.	Barrett's 'Hippolytus' - A ReviewJ.W. Fitton	17
7.	The Amphorae and Tablets of the Northern Entrance Passage at Knossos: A query on	
	the dating of the destruction of KnossosR.J. Clark	43
8.	J.A.C.T. Advertisement	49

GRAMMAR ?!?

In schools, at any rate, masters fall over themselves to assure inquiring parents that the study of the classics, at whatever level of education may be from time to time in prospect, does not unfit the student for all other careers except teaching. At universities, I am sure, undergraduates must be often exposed to remarks which imply or state that they have no future outside the academic world. Now it is obviously very important that we should not allow ourselves to weary of the task of asserting that it is not the nature of our subject to be an instrument of torture, from which the majority escape, bruised or even mutilated, benefited in no way, with a bitter memory of boredom and toil and tribulation, and in which the selected few graduate to become themselves demons, having learnt nothing except how to work the grisly machine. However, while we are busy correcting this misconception we may, if we are not careful, become so intent on remembering that it is not the sole function of classics courses to produce classics teachers that we forget that it must always be one of their functions. And it may be that the skills and knowledge which are most desirable in the lay expert, the classics graduate whose career is outside the academic world, are insufficient equipment for a classics school-master. In fact, annoying though it is, I think there is a conflict here, and that classics courses have to reconcile the two objectives. Consider; if you met a classics graduate, schoolmaster or not, who had no idea of the influence of Virgil on later European writers, you would regard it as proof of failure in him or his instructors: but if you met one who did not know how to turn 'Nisi Caesar subvenisset, urbs capta esset' into indirect statement, your emotions would depend entirely on whether he was a teacher or not. In a teacher this is reprehensible ignorance; but in the case of a businessman, for example, so far from deploring this ignorance, you might well feel that knowledge of such technicalities would be an indication of a wrong emphasis in classical instruction.

There may be those among the readers of this piece who doubt whether most teachers will in fact need more than a very simple knowledge of Latin and Greek grammar. I should like to dispel these doubts. No serious course in Latin or Greek can fail to include the reading of the literature, and a start will be made on this work at quite an early age. Now young boys, especially the most intelligent, are not like adults. They cannot easily be brought to satisfy themselves with halfexplanations or vague ideas for the sake of getting on more quickly. If they are to understand a piece of Latin or Greek, an essential condition is that they should know the meanings of all the words and the syntactical links between them. Some members of any class will press their instructors with questions until their minds are clear. It has been a most important merit of classics teaching in the past that this welcome curiosity has been fairly well satisfied by teachers who have been wishful thinking perhaps, but I believe it to be true - remarkable for their confident grasp of their subject. Moreover such a grasp is important to the maintenance of the pupils' respect for their masters. It is not admittedly the most important thing; the teacher's personality in the short run, in the long run his integrity and character are

what will secure the respect and affection of his pupils, as indeed of any other persons in any other sphere. Two things, however, must be remembered; boys are increasingly clear that they are at school to work, pass examinations and get on. They will be disappointed and resentful if their masters appear doubtfully competent. Secondly, until teaching becomes so attractive a career that it draws all the best minds into it, which means never, you will everywhere have some boys sitting under masters whose native ability is inferior to theirs. About the age of puberty they begin to realise this interesting fact. Then, if the master knows what he is talking about, all is still well, but if not, not.

I trust I have established that a detailed knowledge of Greek and Latin grammar is required of the classics teacher. But in the future he will be much less likely to possess such knowledge because, for good reasons on the whole, the grammatical content of university and 'A' level courses is being reduced, and that of '0' level courses no doubt soon will be (odd that the most needed reform should come last; why, after all, do we teach the construction after verbs of fearing at '0' level? You can read pages of Latin and Greek without meeting a case of it, and it is not likely to confuse anyone when it does appear). Let no one suggest that the acquisition of this knowledge may be postponed until the student actually enters the teaching profession. A young teacher has quite enough to accustom himself to in the early years as it is. No extra burden may be safely imposed on him. How, then, do we solve the problem? I think it can be solved in a way which will offer interesting work to all students and produce an actual improvement in the grammatical equipment of teachers. But first let me present a typical classroom conversation in an '0' level form. Xenophon Hellenica I is being translated.

Boy A: (reads) ... λιπόντες στρατηγώ δύο...τοῦ τε χωρίου ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καὶ τῶν ἐκπλεόντων πλοίων... (translates) ... leaving two generals to look after the position and the ships which sailed out...

- Boy B: Sir, that can't be right. The Greeks didn't have an infinitive of purpose.
- Master: Ah, but Xenophon's put one here. After all, what else could the sentence mean?

Boy B: Well, he's wrong.

1

Master: I don't think you should say Xenophon wrote incorrectly. These chaps did break the rules from time to time. And in any case wore + inf. is regularly used of purpose where the action purposed is the natural result of the main action. You can think of this as wore + inf. without the wore.

Boy B: Right, sir, I'm going to use it in sentences. Much easier.

Master: No, you'll lose marks. Quod licet Iovi non licet bovi, you know.

(later)

Boy B: (reads) ... άκούσας Θρασύβουλον έξω Έλλησπόντου ήκοντα τειχίζειν Φώκαιαν...

> (translates) ... hearing that Thrasyboulus had come out of the Hellespont to fortify Phocaea...

- Master: Well that's the sense of it. But you sound as if you think ηκοντα depends directly on ακούσας. It can't because that would make τειχίζειν an infinitife of purpose.
- Boy B: Certainly, sir. We had one only the other day. If you'll look back a page or two...
- Master: Ah. Oh THAT. Yes. No, what you have to remember is that expressions of purpose are not so common in Greek as you might expect. Greek for 'Go to town to buy bread' is 'Having gone to town, buy bread'. This is parallel to that.
- Boy B: And there's another thing. άχούσας ought to have a participle, not an infinitive. If Xenophon breaks one rule, he might as well keep to the others.

And so on. I can assure you that Boy B exists, and I think you will agree that his instructors need more, not less, grammatical expertise than is examplified above. Not only that, it should be expertise of a different kind. Here I come to my solution, which is perfectly simple and obvious, but an innovation for all that. If we are to take less interest in compositions, then we shall no longer need a grammatical training which is directed to the improvement of compositions. That makes room for grammatical instruction whose purpose is to help with the understanding of the writings of the Greeks and Romans, instruction which offers explanations, not rules for use. Woodcock's new Latin Syntax has the approach which is needed. For Sixth-formers this kind of grammar would be a COMPULSORY part of their syllabus, and it would be tested, not by a circus of silly gobbets, nor by impossible questions which demand that the candidate should himself decide what is worthy of comment in a longer passage of Greek or Latin, but by questions such as are sometimes found in Cambridge scholarship papers; for example 'What was the practice of Cicero in selecting the tenses of dependent subjunctives'. The candidate would be expected to illustrate his answer with simple sentences of his own composing. Competence in this work would be essential for an 'A' level pass. The Sixth-former would concentrate on the usage of a single period, chosen for the eminence of its prose writers. As the work was continued at the university a knowledge of the peculiarities of individual authors, both in verse and prose, and, more important, of the development of the language in syntax and, to a lesser extent, word-formation, would be required. Thus taught, grammar need not repel. Language is, after all, man's greatest tool. We ought to be interested in how it is put together.

John Robson

Mr. Robson is Senior Classics Master in Bristol Grammar School.

"VERA TRAGOEDIA"

or

"The Never-forgets forgotton"

"The result has too often been to show that no conclusions are possible, least of all those which have been put forward." (PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE)¹

Many and various are the speculations put forward on the true origin of tragedy, and speculations they must remain. Our evidence is of such a nature that theories supported by the available evidence can get nowhere near the truth; those who ignore the evidence, however, though purely by chance, have to some measure come nearer to the truth. The evidence we have has been widely misinterpreted, and evidence which has a direct bearing on the case has been ignored. The accuracy of the text of our sources must also be considered.

Ever since Aristotle the dithyramb has been associated with tragedy in its earliest form, and the dithyramb with Dionysus. The festival at which the tragedies were presented was called the City Dionysia, and it would be fairly plausible to use this 'evidence' to show that tragedy originated from a dithyramb, a hymn sung in honour of Dionysus. There is, however, one fact about this festival which has been mentioned, but never fully taken into account. This is the date when the festival was celebrated. The Greek month of Elaphebolion. It was during this month that the Grank and Sacred Pan-Hellenic Elephant-Tossing Contest was held. This ceremony, held, I think, in great revelry, varied in venue, being celebrated one year in Athens, another in Sparta.

One of the obstacles in discovering the origin of tragedy is that whereas the dialogue of the extant plays is in the Attic dialect, the chorus is written in Doric, By examining the nature of this festival it will become obvious how this difference occured. It is common knowledge that the Spartans were the tough, virulent race, and the Athenians the more intellectual of the two. Because of this physical and mental difference, and the desire to use bigger and bigger elephants, the Spartans took over almost entirely the tossing of the elephant, while the Athenians were relegated to a mere organizational role. How this influenced the form of early tragedy will be seen from describing the nature of this festival. The evidence is sparse, but properly interpreted it can answer the questions posed.

•

(P

In order to toss the elephant it was necessary to get the elephant onto a large blanket. This presented quite a problem even to the Greeks, but their plastic mind soon found an answer.

'σημειωσάμενοι τὰ δένδρα, οἶς εἰώθασι προσαναπαύεσθαι, προσίοντες ἐκ θατέρου μέρους τὸ στέλεχος ὑποκόπτουσιν°

έπὰν οὖν προσιὸν τὸ θηρίον ἀποκλίνη πρὸς αὐτό, πεσόντος τοῦ δένδρου πίπτε καὶ αὐτό, ἀναστήναι δὲ μὴ δυναμένου διὰ τὸ τὰ σκέλη διηνεκὲς ὀστοῦν ἔχειν καὶ ἀκαμπές·' (STRABO)

'Noting the trees against which the animals usually lean, they approach from the other side and cut the trunk (of the tree) at the base. When, therefore, the elephant approaches and leans against it, the tree falls, and also the elephant; and the elephant cannot get up, as its legs have only a continuous and unbending bone.'

The elephant is now lying on the blanket and is unable to escape. The specially chosen athletes approach and, holding the edge of the blanket, toss the elephant into the air several times. It is to be noted that there is also anthropological proof to support this quote from Strabo. Even to this day it is customary to toss into the air one celebrating a birth-day.

After the tossing the tossers collapse with exhaustion. To aid the timing of the tossing they sang songs, and after the tossing they sing songs of lament. They not only lament their tired limbs and torn hands, but also the elephant, which is still unable to rise, but has been bruised by the tossing. Here is the reason for the two dialects in extant tragedy. The Spartans, being the tougher of the two races, performed the ritual tossing, and so the songs were theirs, and, naturally, they sang them in the Dorian dialect; the Athenians, on the other hand, who organized the contest, were left with the dialogue, as they gave the commands to the tossers.

The elephant came to be worshipped in this connection, and priests were elected to supervise at the ceremony, and also to care for the elephants between tossing-ceremonies. The elephants had to be looked after during the eleven months when there was no ceremony, and the care of the elephants was entrusted to these priests. A record of their hierarchy is preserved for us.

έπι δὲ τῶν ἐλεφάντων ὁ μὲν ἑνὸς ἐλέφαντος ἄρχων ζψαρχος ὀνομάζεται, ὁ δὲ δυἕιν θήραρχος καὶ τὸ σύστημα θηραρχία, ὁ δὲ τεσσάρων ἐπιθήραρχος καὶ ἐπιθηραρχία τὸ σύστημα, ὁ δὲ τῶν ὀπτὰ ἰλάρχης, τῶν δὲ ἑξπαίδεκα ἐλεφαντάρχης, κεράρχης δὲ ὁ τῶν δύο καὶ τριάκοντα, ὁ δὲ τῶν διπλασιόνων φαλαγγάρχης, καὶ ὁμωνύμως τὸ σύστημα καθ` ἑκάστην ἀρχὴν κεκλήσεται (ASCLEPIODOTUS)³ 'About the elephants, the ruler of a single elephant is called an Animalruler, the ruler of two a Beastruler, and his realm a Beastdom, the ruler of four an Archbeastruler, and his realm an Archbeastdom, the ruler of eight an Hostruler, or sixteen an Elephantruler, or thirty-two a Wingruler, and of double this number a Cohortruler, corresponding names will be given to each realm.'

The ceremony of Elephant-Tossing became notorious in its own day, and the physical strain was wont to send the participants into a trance. This was known as 'elephantasia'. This trance-like state was the main attraction for the elephant-tossers, and it was said that in this state a whole new world opened up before them, like an elephant. At first this was not realised to be a concomitant occurence with the actual elephanttossing, though its importance was later realised.

Φίλων ὁ ἰατρὸς διεβεβαιοῦτο τὴν καλουμένην ἐλεφαντίασιν οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ πάνυ χρόνου γνώριμον γεγονέναι· μηδένα γὰρ τῶν παλαιῶν ἰατρῶν τοῦ πάθους πεποιῆσθαι λόγον, εἰς ἕτερα μικρὰ καὶ γλίσχρα καὶ δυσθεώρητα τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐνταθέντας (PLUTARCH)⁴

'Philo the Healer maintained strongly that the disease 'elephantasia' had only just become fully known, For none of the older Healers had reckoned with this affliction. being eager for other small and quibbling things, incomprehensible to many.'

The 'Healer' in this context is the man who tries to perfect literary form. There were many things in literary forms which were not properly explicable, and the effects of 'elephantasia' not being known, other theories for the intense feeling communicated in tragedy were found. These other theories are the 'small and quibbling things, incomprehensible to many.' Now that the full effects of 'elephantasia' are known, the tragic drama of the Greeks can be put into its proper context. The elephant-tossing ceremony was not known in Rome, but its existence elsewhere was appreciated, though, in their usual morbid way, the Romans referred to this transport of delight (the elephant) as a Morbus..

'Ignotus autem paene in Italia, frequentissimus in quibusdam regionibus (religionibus?) is morbus est, quem έλεφαντίασιν Graeci vocant.' (CELSUS)⁵

'The affliction which the Greeks call 'elephantasia', whilst almost unknown in Italy, is very frequent in certain regions (religions?).'

However, at a late stage it was once staged again. The ceremony was revived by no less a person than Pompey himself, though it seems from the account that the beauty of the ceremony did not manifest itself.

Πομπήζος δὲ τὸ θέατρον ἀναδείξας ἀγῶνας ἦγε γυμνικοὺς καὶ μυσικοὺς ἐπὶ τῆ καθιερώσει, καὶ θηρῶν ἀμίλλας... ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τὴν ἐλεφαντομαχίαν, ἐκπληστικώτατον θέαμα, παρέσχεν.! (PLUTARCH)⁶

'Pompey opened his theatre and held gymnastic and musical contests at its dedication, and furnished strife of wild beaste ... and above all, an elephant struggle, a most terrifying spectacle.'

This revival of the ancient practide is very interesting. It will be noted that not only is the ceremony of elephant-tossing connected with the dedication of the theatre, but also the gymnastic and musical contests which accompanied it show that physical exercise, music and religion were closely bound together. That the original beauty of the elephant-tossing did not survive the centuries shows how mysterious this rite was, and helps to explain why so many searchers for origins have overlooked it.

That the elephant was a native of Greece in its earlier ara is easily demonstrated. The earliest culture is that of the Minoans of Grete, and especially the palace of Minos at Knossos. The stories of the labyrinth have been explained by the bull. The symbol of the bull - the representation of the horns - has a long time been accepted, but that . . . this really represented the tusks of an elephant has been ignored. The crude state of art at the time had confused the form of the creature, though at that time there was not a great deal of difference in size and general shape as can be seen in Strabo.

άλλ' έλέφαντε μάλλον μέγεθος δ' έστι ταύρου' (STRABG)

'But rather that of the elephant, it is the size of a bull.'

There is also a similar similarity in the vases of mainland Greece. A problem which has faced many seekers or origins in the fact that although we expect satyrs to be like goats they are also like horses and fat men. The satyrs have caused trouble ever since they were mentioned by Aristotle, who was also unaware of the true origin of tragedy.

'ord to ex saturnov μ etabalet ' (ARISTOTLE)⁸

'Progressing beyond satyric drama,'

What exactly was this satyric drama? Was it performed by goats, horses, or fat men? It has been a difficult task to sort out what these various creatures represent, but by now it has become obvious - the elephant. As in Knossos, so in mainland Greece, the form of the elephant was forgotten once it had left those shores, and so artists of a later period were unable to decide what was represented on the ritualistic objects. Some ignored the matter entirely and painted either goats or

horsees, but others, trying hard to copy their original, painted fat men. The etymology of the word satyr is seen from 'satur' - full or fat, and this is obviously the epithet given to the elephant.

One question may legitimately be asked. Why is it that the elephant is not mentioned in literature which we possess? It was seen even at early times that this was a grave omission.

' δηλοτ δὲ Ομηρος, ὃς βασιλεῦσι κλίνας μὲν καὶ οἰκίας τοτς εὐδαιμονεστέροις αὐτῶν ἐλέφαντι ἐποίησε κεκοσμημένας, θηρίου δὲ ἐλέφαντος μνήμην οὐδεμίαν ἐποιήσατο· θεασάμενος δὲ ἢ πεπυσμένος ἐμνημόνευσεν ἂν πολύ γε πρότερον ἐμοὶ δοκετν ἢ Πυγμαίων τε ἀνδρῶν καὶ γέρανων μάχης.' ΡΑυSANIAS⁹

'This is proved by Homer, who describes the couches and houses of the more well-to-do kings as decorated with.ivory, but never mentions the animal; but if he had seen or heard of it he would, I reckon, have been much more likely to mention it than the battle between the dwarfs and cranes.'

This, however, is a very narrow view to take. Admittedly the Greeks, notably Homer, were not averse to mentioning their gods in tones of mirth and asbestos laughter, but to mention in this context a ritual beast such as the elephant would be unthinkable. This is why comedy has an entirely different origin from tragedy. The Elephant was never mocked.

It has been seen that the Elephant-Tossing ceremony gave rise to a literary form with song in Doric dialect, and dialogue in Attic, with laments included. The song of the tossers during their performance and after gave rise to those choral odes which we all admire in the works of the extant dramatists and the organizing injunctions of the referees to the dialogue.

This seems very well, but how does this tie in with tragedy as we know it and with the existing theories and speculations? We shall start with the cult names given to the beast. The elephant is known for its loud trumpeting noise, and because of this was given the name $Bpo\mu loc_{,}$ the Thunderer. Because of its size it was given the name $\Delta l \theta \upsilon \rho \alpha \mu \beta o c_{,}$ the divine being as big as two doors. However, when the elephant left the shores of Greece, a substitute was needed to be the object of the cult. The fact that the elephant was a mythical beast was a cause of concern to later generations, and so a substitute was found in a new god - Dionysus. That he was not a member of the Union of Olympian Gcds shows that he was a later accretion. The epithets of the elephant were transferred to this god with no alteration, and this is why the epithet $\Delta \iota \theta \dot{\upsilon} \rho \alpha \mu \beta o \varsigma$ has caused a certain amount of trouble in interpretation. When Aristotle says

.... των έξαρχόντων τον διθύραμβον.... (ARISTOTLE)¹⁰

1.... those who led out the 'dithyramb'

he is referring to the hymn, but the source he was using obviously referred to those leading out the elephant.

The change-over from the celebrations of the elephant to those of Dionysus is shown in Herodotus.

τὰ τε δη άλλα οἱ Σικυώνιοι ἐτίμων τὸν ἐλέφαντα καὶ δη πρὸς τὰ πάθεα αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσιν ἐγέραιρον[•] τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον οὐ τιμῶντες, τόν δ' ἐλέφαντα Κλεισθένης δὲ χοροῦς μὲν τῷ Διονύσῷ ἀπέδωκε, τὴν δὲ ἄλλην θυσίην μελανῷ ἱππῷ! (HERODOTUS)¹¹

'The Sicyonians honoured the elephant in other ways, and especially they honoured its sufferings with tragic choruses; not honouring Dionysus, but the elephant. Cleisthenes gave the choruses away to Dionysus and the rest of the ceremony to the black horse.'

From this time onwards Dionysus was associated with the literary form, and the dithyramb was sung in his honour. From this point everyone knows how it developed (though this does not imply that they <u>agree</u>).

This account of the true origin of tragedy explains why differing theories have originated. Theories such as the hymn of religious cult (dithyramb), and the more serious origin (mysteries) and the dirge-theory, can be easily explained by the songs sung during the tossing, the mystical element is the 'elephantasia' and the lament over the pain of the elephant and the tossers. It can now be clearly seen that the greatest literary form of all was created from the primitive ceremony of tossing the elephant, the symbol of power. To this day the rest of the ceremony - general revelry and enjoyment - are still to be seen where Cleisthenes put them, in the Black Horse!

RON ABBOTT

SOURVES

 PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE apud B.A. Honours Examination in Classics Part II Literary Form (A) Monday 16 May 1966 9.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. (University of Exeter, England).

- 3. ASCLEPIODOTOS THE TACTITIAN IX.
- 4. PLUTARCH (c. A.D. 46 c. 120) MORALIA 731.
- 5. CELSUS DE MEDICINA III 25.
- 6. PLUTARCH LIFE OF POMPEY LII.
- 7. STRABO ON GEOGRAPHY 16 4 15.
- 8. ARISTOTLE ART OF POETRY 1449a20.
- 9. PAUSANIAS DESCRIPTION OF GREECE (2nd c A.D.) XII 4.
- 10. ARISTOTLE ART OF POETRY 1449all.
- 11. HERODOTUS V 67. It is to be noted that in the texts currently in vogue the proper names Adrastus and Melanippus have invaded the text, replacing 'elephant' and 'black horse'.

EPIGRAMS

English Original:

On Mrs. Tofts, a celebrated opera-singer

So bright is thy beauty, so charming thy song, As had drawn both the beasts and their Orpheus along; But such is thy avarice, and such is thy pride, That the beasts must have starved, and the poet have died.

ALEXANDER POPE

Greek Version:

αύτον έφέλχεσθαι σύν θηρσί τον 'Ορφε' έμελλες,

τοΐον ἕχουσ εἶδος, τοΐον ἱεΐσα μέλος. καὶ τὸν μὲν λύμη κτείνειν, τὰ δὲ κνάδαλα λιμῷ^{*} φειδωλὴ γὰρ ἔφυς, πλὴν ὕβρεως, Κινάρα.

F.W.C.

THE REBELLION OF BOUDICOA THE "BURNT LAYER" AND THE NARRATIVE OF-TACITUS

Tacitus' description of the rebellion of Boudicca is one of the most dramatic and most memorable pieces of writing in literature, and it is of considerable historical value. Without it, our knowledge of the revolt would be scanty indeed, for the other literary sources tell us little but what Tacitus has said, and do not tell it half so well. Archaeology, for its part, could not alone supply the historical context, though it can produce evidence of the fire, in the burnt layers at Camulodunum (Colchester), Londinium (London) and Verulamium (St. Albans); date it, by the stratification of coins and pottery, with reasonable precision; note its extent; and conjecture, from the occurrence of weapons and metal-working of a military character within the burnt layer at Camulodunum, that the conflagration there at least was violent and deliberate, rather than accidental. There is some evidence of looting, but not much. An example is the bronze head of Claudius, of mid. First Century date, hacked from its statue, and apparently carried off and then dropped, perhaps in a moment of panic, and found in modern times in the River Alde in Suffolk. A guess might connect such looting with the conflagration. Another guess, based on the discovery that the defences of the fortresses at Lincoln and Great Casterton appear to have been strengthened about this time, might suggest that the violence was caused by a native rising rather than Roman aggression. Some idea of the advanced state of Romanization of the area devastated could be gained from the burnt layer. For instance, the houses at this level, though still simple timber-framed structures, were rectangular and partitioned, unlike the round huts of the British, and were lined up with the street, and fronted by a colonnade of timber posts, with room for shops. The rectangular street grid itself - and this is most evident at Verulamium testifies to Roman influence. A store of pottery of mid-First Century date, mainly the red glossy "Samian" ware imported from Gaul, and of fine glass-ware - the pottery blackened and much of the glass fused by intense heat - was found at Colchester in 1927, and in the same year another pottery shop, with fire-blackened Samian of the same period, was discovered; and finds like these bear witness to the demand for luxury goods, and to a flourishing import trade. But further than this archaeology cannot take us without literary corroboration. If we did not have Tacitus' narrative, we could hardly know of the Iceni and their early good relations with Rome and privileged status; of the settlement at the British "capital", Camulodunum, of a colony of veterans, and the establishment there of an imperial cult; of the status of "municipium" already achieved by Verulamium (Annals XIV 33.4, where Tacitus appears to be using the word advisedly, is our only source for the existence of a municipium in Britain at all); nor could we know of the rapidity of Londinium's growth as a centre of commerce and communications (at the time of the conquest there was no town there); of Roman rapacity and British grievances, of the events that sparked off the revolt and the action taken to suppress it; nor even of Boudicca herself.

Yet the Boudiccan revolt is generally singled out as the stock example of Tacitus' failings as an historian. Mommsen' complains:

"A worse narrative than that of Tacitus concerning this war, Annals XIV 31-39, is hardly to be found even in this most unmilitary of all authors. We are not told where the troops were stationed, and where the battles were fought; but we get, instead, signs and wonders enough, and empty words only .too many." But Mommsen fails to observe that the "signs and wonders" were undoubtedly engineered by the British to weaken the morale of the Roman settlers. Further, his criticism is wrong on points of detail. He continues, that it is unintelligible why Paulinus, "if he wished to sacrifice Londinium should march thither on that account. If he really went thither, he can only have appeared there with a personal excort, without the corps which he had with him in Mona - which indeed has no meaning." But, first, it is only natural that Paulinus should travel swiftly ahead of his main corps, with a small escort, in order to get to the scene of the trouble as quickly as possible; besides, he was expecting to be joined by the IInd legion, from the south-west. And secondly, he did not go to Londinium "wishing to sacrifice it". Tacitus makes is quite clear that he waited until he had arrived there and reviewed the situation, before deciding that he must abandon it to save the rest of the province. In any case, the quickest route from North Wales to the disaffected area was the line of Watling Street, direct from Wroxeter (Virocinium) to Londinium.

It is true that Tacitus shows no definite knowledge of the causes of the revolt, and in view of the fact that he must have heard about the war in detail from his father-in-law (Agricola was a junior officer under Suetonius Paulinus; Agricola v), his narrative is vague and disappointing when we look for facts of military strategy. The main difficulty is the discrepancy between the narrative of Annals XIV 31 and 32, where it is stated that Camulodunum was unfortified and that its scanty garrison, relying on the protection of the temple, was stormed within two days, and Agricola 31.5, where Tacitus makes Calgacus say: "Brigantes femina duce exurere coloniam, expugnare castra, ac nisi felicitas in socordiam vertisset, exuere iugum potuere." But too much store cannot be set by this assertion. There is no indication elsewhere that the Brigantes took part in the rising of the Iceni, other than that Tacitus speaks of it as "rebellio totius Britanniae" (Agricola 18.4). Casting off the yoke hardly applies to the Brigantes, who were a client-kingdom, not yet part of the province, and they are probably mentioned here in error. The whole sentence is too vague to be taken seriously as a reference to a camp at Camulodunum, particularly in the absence of archaeological evidence for any such fortifications at this period.

Other points of detail cause more difficulty. Camulodunum, Verulamium, and Londinium, are named, but otherwise the sphere of action is only roughly indicated by tribal names. (Tacitus' habitual vagueness about place names is partly excused by the fact that his readers would have no maps and no detailed knowledge of so distant a part of the Empire, and excessive detail would be confusing, boring, and irrelevant to his narrative, however useful to modern historians). Again, leaders are more important to him than strategy. He does not state where the IX th legion started from (we know from the archaeological evidence that it was stationed at Lincoln at this period), nor where it fought its disastrous battle (though presumably it must have been somewhere along the line of Ermine Street, the most direct route to Camulodunum from Lincoln). Nor does he tell us anything about Suetonius' march to Londinium. When the general leaves Londinium, he does not say in which direction he goes, nor where he makes his stand. Yet he makes clear the wise choice of locality, and reasonably clear the forces and their disposition, and stresses the importance of the struggle by the speeches of the leaders.

Tacitus' presentation of Suetonius Paulinus is prejudiced. In his admiration for Paulinus' soldierly qualities and inspired generalship, he underrates the fact that Paulinus had no business to be looking for military glory in Anglesey while he left his province insufficiently garrisoned; that he ought, as governor, to have known of the corrupt and oppressive measures on the part of the Romans that helped to cause the revolt; that his final victory, however glorious, was won at the cost of Londinium, Verulamium and Camulodunum, to say nothing of the losses to Cerialis' troops, and would have come too late if the rebels had been better organized and not distracted by looting; and that his measures against the rebels were so excessively harsh as to prolong the resistance. His replacement was by no means the injustice Tacitus makes it out to be: fine general though Paulinus was, he had made a grave mistake. Nor was the inactivity of his successors, Turpilianus and Trebellius Maximus, deserving of the scorn with which Tacitus mentions it. The province had been ravaged in the war, and badly needed a time of stable government and quiet in order to recover itself economically, and it was during this period of real advance in Romanization that southern England began to be a province in the full sense, and not just a sphere of military conquest.

As a whole, Tacitus' account of the revolt is more impressive for its vivid, dramatic narrative, than for clarity of detail. Yet it is more than just a good story: in general outline, the account is historically valid.

ANNE SCOTT

Notes

1 Theodor Mommsen, The Provinces of the Roman Empire, Vol I ch.v.

For the relevant archaeology, see

C.F.C. Hawkes and M.R. Hull: Camulodúnum (1947) M.R. Hull: Roman Colchester (1952), with introduction by I.A. Richmond R.E.M. Wheeler and

T.V. Wheeler: Verularium: A Belgic and Two Roman Cities (1936) D.R. Dudley and G. Webster: The Rebellion of Boudicca (1962) S.S. Frere: Interim reports on Excavations at Verulamium, in Antiquaries Journal 1956-62.

S.S. Frere: Verulamium: Three Roman Cities - Antiquity 1964.

THIS IS ITBTEN

by Heinrich Böll

Some people are so lacking in feeling that they do not understand how I can put so much dedication and humility into an occupation which they consider beneath me. My occupation may not match my standard of education, nor did it figure in the numerous songs which were sung at my cradle, but it provides me with assusement and my daily bread: I tell people where they are. To my fellow-men, who of an evening climb into trains at their local stations and are borne to distant regions, who then in the night wake up in our station, gaze out, confused, into the darkness, wondering if they have overshot their destination or are not yet at their destination or possibly have actually reached their destination (for our town contains curiosities of many kinds and attracts many tourists) - to all these people I announce where they are. I switch on the loudspeaker as soon as a train has drawn in and the wheels of the locomotive have stopped turning, I speak hesitatingly into the darkness: "This is Tibten - you are in Tibten! Passengers wishing to visit the tomb of Tiburtius should alight here!" and from the platforms the echo reaches me in my cabin, a dark voice from the dark, a doubtful-sounding announcement, although it speaks the plain truth.

Many passengers then tumble out hastily with their luggage onto the feebly-lit platform, for Tibten <u>was</u> their destination, and I see them go down the steps, pop up again on platform 1 and hand their tickets to the sleepy official at the barrier. Only rarely do people with business ambitions come at night, travellers hoping to meet their firm's requirements at the Tibten lead-mines. They are mostly tourists, attracted by the tomb of Tiburtius, a Roman youth who committed suicide 1800 years ago on account of a Tibten beauty. "He was still a boy" is inscribed on his tombstone, which may be admired in our local museum, "but Love overcame him!" He came here from Rome, to buy lead for his father, who was a contractor to the army.

It is true that I need not have attended five universities and acquired two doctorates in order to announce night after night into the darkness: "This is Tibten! You are in Tibten!" And yet my occupation fills me with satisfaction. I speak my piece softly but in a way which, while not waking those asleep, will not be missed by those awake, and I put just enough insistence in my voice for those dozing to pull themselves together and consider whether Tibten was not their destination.

Then late in the morning when I wake from sleep and look out of the window, I see those travellers who in the night yielded to the enticement of my voice advancing through our little town, armed with leaflets which our publicity bureau generously sends out all over the world. They have already read over breakfast that the name Tibtan, originally the Latin Tiburtinum, has been worn down to its present form in the course of the centuries, and now they advance on the local museum, where they admire the tombstone erected to the Roman Werther 1800 years ago: in reddish sandstone is chiselled the profile of a youth, vainly stretching out his hands after a maiden. "He was still a boy, but Love overcame him. . ." Indicative of his youth are also the objects found in his grave: figurines of ivery-coloured material, two elephants, a horse and a dog, which - as Brusler maintains, in his <u>Conjectures concerning the Grave of Tiburtius</u> - may be presumed to have been used in a game similar to chess. But I have doubts about this theory, I am sure that Tiburtius just played with these things. The ivery objects look exactly like the free gifts one gets when purchasing half a pound of margarine, and they answer the same purpose: they are for children to play with.

Perhaps at this point I should make a reference to the excellent work of our local writer Volker von Volkersen, who wrote an excellent novel under the title <u>Tiburtius</u>, the story of a <u>Roman</u> fate consummated <u>in our town</u>. However, I consider Volkersen's work misleading, because he too supports Brusler's theory about the purpose of the toys.

I myself - and here I must at last make a confession - am in possession of the original figurines which lay in Tiburtius' grave; I stole them from the museum, replacing them with the ones I got as a free gift when purchasing half a pound of margarine: two elephants, a horse and a dog; they are white, like Tiburtius' animals, they are the same size, the same weight, and - what seems to me the most important thing - they answer the same purpose.

So travellers come from all over the world, to admire the grave of Tiburtius and his toys. Posters inscribed "Come to Tibten" hang in the waiting-rooms of the Anglo-Saxon world, and when in the night I make my announcement: "This is Tibten! You are in Tibten! Rassengers wishing to visit the tomb of Tiburtius should alight here. . . " I entice from the trains those of my fellow-men who yielded in their home railway stations to the seduction of our poster. Certainly they see the sandstone slab, of which the historical authenticity is beyond dispute. They see the touching profile of a Roman youth, who was overcome by Love and drowned himself in a flooded shaft of the lead-mines. And then the eyes of the tourists glide over the little animals: two elephants, a horse and a dog - and this is just where they could pick up some of the wisdom of this world, but they don't. People from home and abroad, deeply moved, heap roses on the grave of this boy, peems are written; even my animals, the horse and the dog (I had to consume two pounds of margarine to acquire them!) have already been the subject of lyrical efforts. "Thou, like us, didst play with dog and horse. . ." runs the line from the work of a lyric poet of no mean reputation. So there they lie: free gifts from Klüsshenner's Margarine Co. Ltd., on red velvet, under thick glass in our local museum, proof of my consumption of margarine. Often before I go on duty of an afternoon I visit the museum for a moment and contemplate them: they look genuine, tinged with yellow and completely indistinguishable from the ones lying in my drawer (for I have thrown the originals in among the ones I get on purchasing Klüsshenner's margarine, and find it impossible to pick them out again.)

Then, thoughtfully, I go on duty, hang my cap on the hook, take off my jacket, put my sandwiches in the drawer, lay out my cigarette-paper, tobacco and the newspaper, and when a train draws in I make the announcement I am duty-bound to make. "This is Tibten! You are in Tibten! Passengers wishing to visit the tomb of Tiburtius should alight here. " I speak it softly, but in a way which, while not waking those asleep, will not be missed by those awake, and I put just enough insistence into my voice for those dozing to pull themselves together and consider whether Tibten was not their destination.

And I cannot see why anyone should consider this occupation beneath me.

Translation H. Harvey February 1967 (Herr Böll, who is one of the leading writers of post-war Germany, has kindly given permission for this translation to be published in <u>Pegasus</u>)

Euripides Hippolytus edited with introduction and Commentary by W.S. Barrett (Fellow and Tutor of Keble College Oxford) published Oxford University Press 1964

Barrett's Hippolytus was eagerly awaited - there was the general lack of a good edition for this play, also the feeling among scholars that nothing of note was to be said on this play (recognisably a great one) till Barrett's verdict was heard. It is a work which grew from lectures in Oxford, Barrett tells us in the preface; it clearly went on growing right up to the time of publication - Addendis Addenda followed Addenda. Larger than the usual Oxford Euripides it represents a long process of hard work and refinement, though it seems bombastic of the book jacket to say 'it attempts to pass over no point (whether of language, subject-matter or dramaturgy) where the undergraduate may look for guidance or the scholar for a discussion.'

The introduction introduces us first to the legend (45 pages) then to the history of the text (44 pages), not to Euripides or the meaning of his play. The reader if daunted by this would be well advised to get on with text and commentary and consult the introduction later - although he must first master Barrett's MSS nomenclature and grouping. The main value of the work lies in the commentary and the recension and reporting of MSS readings.

In the commentary, the style is pungent, the words weighted and often abbreviated; only the conviction that Barrett does know what he is talking about can reassure us as we grope trembling through a galaxy of Greek, English, MSS signs, dashes, brackets and scholars' names. Through it all runs a coherent impression of the author's personality --

disgusted with wild ideas (he forbears to mention Murray's fantasy on page 308), anxious not to stray outside the facts, yet now and then showing a feeling for poetry and exuberance of imagination (unfortunately he seems to use this faute de mieux in difficult choral passages). Most important, Barrett genninely loves his Euripides; perhaps this could'be regarded as a failure in impartiality but even those who think Euripides inclined to slapdash methods will want to see what can be said to defend him by a sympathetic editor. It is odd that Barrett retails the unsympathetic view on Euripides' signatism (accumulation of sibilants p. 432; cf. p. 283); surely the comic poets were attacking Euripides' melodramatic use of hissing noises, not Euripides' unawareness of making them?

The level of appreciation aimed at by Barrett is student's and upward; definitely upward. Much too baffling for a schoolboy, and students are schoolboys to start with; a heady mixture below lecturer's level. This is not because the problems are difficult to grasp; rather it is the presentation - e.g. the use of Greek to explain Greek - the knots in amongst the pith.

Barrett is very good at worrying things out. He retrieves MSS readings from the fumblings of previous editors. He sorts out spelling (Trozen p. 157 l l2); differentiates words ($\delta \epsilon t / \delta \delta \epsilon t , \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} / \chi \rho \tilde{\eta} \nu$ pp 179, 244) - his discourse 23 lines on $\delta \gamma \gamma \circ \nu \circ t / \delta \kappa \gamma \circ \nu \circ t$ (p.241 l.447) shows the diligence of a Prodicus; his definition of $\pi t \tau \nu \lambda \circ \zeta$ (l l464 pp 418-9) is a veritable flood.

Syntax and grammar are intelligently explained: Barrett tries to see what the author is at instead of reaching for the book of rules. Sometimes owing to the general space-saving there is a cryptic note. Presumably brevity is the excuse for appearing to imply (p 224 1 347) that λ éyouotv $\dot{\alpha}\nu$ θρώπους έραν is normal classical Greek for "they say people are 'in love' ".

The study of syntax is lumbered with antique metaphysics and legalistic rigmarole. Barrett decides 'accusative in apposition to the sentence! (p 307) is an unfortunate name. He settles a common prejudice about questions beginning with $\mu \eta(p 314 1 794)$ perhaps based on a false antithesis between $O\dot{v}$ and $\mu\eta$. But what about this explanation of άπέπτυσα (1 614 p. 274)? 'The speaker, in voicing a sudden emotion, thinks of the moment (just past) of the access of that emotion and so uses the aorist! (instead of the present). This is an explanation which couched through it be in impressive sounding and erroneous psychology does not explain. Why sould a person under the stress of emotion become unusually meticulous about timing the access of his emotion? In fact Barrett correctly translate 'pah'. The verb does not refer to a thought, it performs a rejection - 'pah'. Similarly űµωξα performs a (sharp) exclamation; expired performs 'No thanks'. The aorist is nontemporal. Similarly the aorist participles used with aorist verbs, discussed by Barrett on p 214, are non-temporal; and the term 'coincident' implying a synchronising is incorrect. In such a clause as φυτεύσας άπώλεσας (Or 585) the begetting was not before the destruction, nor was it coincident with it: the begetting was the destruction.

In the opening lines of the play Barrett does not really face up to $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \eta$ µέν. The complete construction would be $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \eta$ µέν έν βροτοίοι $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \eta$ δ' έν θεοίζ ; the power of sexual attraction works for both men and gods, but the second limb of the parallel is minimised as being irrelevant (or perhaps in view of Athena and Artemis more easily controvertible?) and we have ούρανοῦ τ' ἔσω . cf Aes Aga 1. πάλαι µèν 8 και νῦν. At 1 471 εί τὰ πλείω χρηστὰ τῶν κακῶν ἔχεις is accepted as a 'confusion'. The parallels Soph Ant 313f Oed T 796 are not valid, since there the articlesis in the right place. Perhaps read ἀλλ' εί πλείω τủ χρηστὰ τῶν κακῶν ἕχεις ; if this scansion ofπλείω is possible, it may have been emended by an editor who thoughtπλείω must be metrically long.

His acuteness in construing Greek is bracing, though his construes have more value for people who know the meaning already and who will nod approvingly at reat 'turns'. At least B sees the problem, as at 1465-6 where there seems to be a conspiracy of evasion among scholars (perhaps read $\tau \omega \nu \gamma d\rho$ $\mu \epsilon \gamma d \lambda \omega \nu d \xi_{LG} \pi \epsilon \nu \theta \eta^{\circ}$ $\phi \eta \mu a \ell \mu d \lambda \lambda o \nu \kappa a \tau \epsilon \chi o \nu o \ell \nu$

: 'great men get their due mourning - the tales about them have more of a hold !). Sometimes his earnestness becomes contorted as in ' $\lambda\lambda\omega G$: this, meaning that her feflections were purely general ones, conceived without ref. to any problem of her own, at once implies (what is essential) that they do in fact apply to her own case! (1 375 p 227). True but obscurely put. Barrett goes through the Greek words one by one and his English translations follow the Greek word order. But if this is to be done, supplementary words are needed to memain intelligible; and we must remember Headlam's point about the differences between Greek and English sentence structure. As it stands Barrett's translations are not free and rounded, nor yet a good crib for the learer. Thus for 545f we have 'the Oichalian filly unyoked abed' (strange phrase) 'manless before and unwed, she' (ambiguous) 'yoked from Eurytos' house and like a running Naiad or a bacchant amid blood, amid smoke, in. a body bridal gave her' (by this time we have lost the construction if we ever had it), 'did the Cyprian, to Alkmene's child; oh unhappy in your' (whose?) bridal!' Oh unhappy in your rendering! The closeness of the translation congeals with the oddity of would-he poetic phrasing to form an incomprehensible pudding.

Barrett compiles a great store of information on linguistic usage. Merely as a reference work it will be of great use: thus - 'does anastrophic tmesis occur in tragedy? consult Barrett on Hipp 548-9'. He is deft in his adjustment of the editor's triangle - whose sides are Eule, Exception and Emendation, the configuration depending on policy and outlook. I would have liked an explanation of 1 324 &v &o out $\lambda e\lambda e & \psi$ $\psi o \mu a b$. On 11 407-9 are such Germanesque phrases as 'the first instance of a $\tau o \pi o \zeta$ ' really helpful? Presumably $&\zeta o \lambda o t \tau o \ldots \pi t c \ldots \pi p \\ is an echo of popular speech like the English 'the man who first...ought$ to be shot.'

COMMENTARY: INTERPRETATION

121. What was the 'water of Okeanos'? Barrett rightly rejects the inept explanation of 'Qxeavov by Hom II 21 196f (Okeanos the source

of all waters), and decides that it was a spring fed subterraneously from Okeanos the stream encircling the earth, i.e. really a spring with a perennial flow; Barrett identifies this with Chrysorroas in Paus 2 31. There is in fact nothing to support the idea that a Greek would say a perennial stream came from the circumambient Okeanos; the Greeks connected e.g. Arethusa with an actual river Alpheios. The circumambient Okeanos is an idée fixe of modern scholarship and will come under increasing criticism; L. Pocock argues that Okeanos is the water through the Straits of Gibraltar - dyoppoog with backwards swell (not, stupidly, 'returning on itself'). My own view is that Okeanos is a river-throughthe-gorge; i.e. the name was applied to rushing rivers, and travellers used the name at Gibraltar. In Paus 1 35 7 we learn that in upper Lydia a torrent was called Okeanos which ran past rock carvings of a seated man; the Lydians gave Hyllos as the alternative name of the river. In Paus 2 32 we learn of a river near Trozen called Hyllikos (usually identified with the modern Kremastos the chief river of Trozen); of the rock of Theseus, alter of Zeus Sthenios, sanctuary of Aphrodite Nymphia by the road leading from Trozen through the mountains to Hermione; we learn also that a spring or source of the river was here. Both the rock carvings in Lydia and the mythological associations of Theseus' rock point unmistakeably to a Hittite origin. I would infer that the 'water of Okeanos' was so called because the Trozenians called their main river Okeanos. Since spring and rock are found both in Euripides' description and in Pausanias', I take it that the place is the place where the spring issued from the rock, not the Chrysorroas, which as Frazer thought is probably one of the brooks feeding the Kremastos.

176ff. A vital scene for our understanding of Phaedra's trouble. Barrett translates 236-8 'Much divination does this need, to know that god it is that pulls you back and sends your mind awry'. But how can άνασειράζει mean 'rein in'? σειραί are traces not reins. The verb seems to be used here nautically: Suidas s.v. άνοχωχεύειν. άναχωχεύειν παρά Σοφοκλεϊ τὸ <math>άνασειράζειν καὶ ἀνοχωχεύειν τὸ ἐνπελάγει χειμῶνος ὅντος στειλαντας τὰ ὁθόνια σαλεύειν cf Soph El 732 κἀνοχωχεύει παρείς. The general sense is not as editors sleepily take it 'I don't know what god has sent you off course' but 'I don't know why you are holding back, lying doggo'; Phaedra's desires are more restrained than before. ἀχυμάντοις 235 fits - literally of a landlocked bay (cf. Iph Aul 122 ἀχλύσταν), also suggesting calm.

451. How would a slave woman know what is in learned works? Barrett should not argue on the strength of Arist Poet 1451b25f that the stories were not widely known; contrast Antiphanes fr 191 K. The Greeks did not have to go to a book to learn of Semele's affair with Zeus (454). Barrett fails to see that the nurse's argument is a rhetorical (todot $\mu \epsilon \nu$..todot $\delta \epsilon$.) appeal to learned authority. 'Those who make it their special subject will bear me out'. The value of this irrelevance lies in the paralogism: 'learned people say this happened to Semele; learned people support the conslusion I am drawing from the story of Semele'.

590 ff. What are the $\varphi(\lambda \tau \rho \alpha$ mentioned in 1 509 by the Nurse?

What is Phaedra persuaded to do? These are fundamental questions for deciding the character of Phaedra. Barrett takes the speech of the Nurse 509-515 as fraught with ambiguities; really she is talking of a love charm, but Phaedra thinks she means an antaphrodisiac. The keystone of Barrett's case is 1 516 'This drug of yours - which is it, a salve or a draught?' Barrett argues that Phaedra can only asks this question if she understands the Nurse to be speaking of something applied to herself, and thus 'necessarily' a cure for love (not a measure aimed at winning Hippolytus). This stipulation and the 'necessary' inference are equally false. A magic salve could well be applied to Hippolytus directly since anointing and washing went together (something could be added to Hippolytus' oil); indirectly through clothing (at Medea 789 such a salve is used). Moreover, even if Phaedra were to apply the remedy to herself (not have it applied to Hippolytus), it could still be, and in fact would most probably be, an offensive weapon. Then as now women thought that cosmetics could make them irresistible (cf the story of Phaon). A comparison of 1 509 θελκτήρια έρωτος with previous words used by the Nurse (λόγοι θελκτήριοι 478) make it clear that the Nurse is talking about the same thing - offensive measures and not 'antaphrodisiacs'. It should also be remembered that for the Greek in the audience there would be all the sinister atmosphere of female $\phi a \rho \mu a \varkappa \epsilon \epsilon a$, and if there was any obscurity he would jump to exactly the opposite conclusion to the one Barrett wants him to jump to. Barrett just cannot believe that sweet little Phaedra could stoop to erotic magic, but what sort of coma are we to cast upon Phaedra if she is not to get the point of the Nurse's words? No, Phaedra is not pure, but respectable.

At 507-8 Barrett gives a long note attempting to prove that the Nurse must here with the words ε t tot $\delta \circ \varkappa \varepsilon t$ oct appear to Phaedra to be changing her mind. The words mean compliance, the point is whether anything more than token compliance is meant, cf Ar Lys 903-4: Myrrine says $\eta \nu \delta \circ \varkappa \eta$ but does not comply in fact. The tot moreover indicates impatience - 'let's get on with it', not submission.

525f Having been told that 'the thought of .. administering an ointment is merely ludicrous' we are surprised to find that the opening lines of the following Stasimon are about Eros administering an ointment to the eyes of his victims. The theme here is far more specific than Barrett suggests: courtship. Hippolytus is to be courted with φάρμαχα; we hear of the effects Eros has on people - shattering: είσάγων 526, έπιστρατεύση 527, βέλος 530, ίησιν 531 suggest warfare. This force however does not lie in our hands, it lies with 'the son of Zeus' Eros. Barrett says on 11 530.534 'the passage is not to be explained in terms of the inflammatory or detructive effect of fire and Eros: the stars, which notoriously neither inflame nor destroy, could have no part in such a comparison'. This is the voice of the 20th century AD not the ancient world. The sun was an dotpov; such adjectives as $\eta\lambda\iota\delta$. βολος, ήλιόπληξ also the phrase ήλιόομαι την κεφαλήν remind us of his violent effects. The words αστρον ύπέρτατον occurred in Pindar, applied to the sun; and actpov UREPTEPOV here may be an echo. Another violent αστρονwas the dogstar: αστροβόλητος according to Hesychius meant 'struck by the dogstar'.

732f Comments on this ode are not at all helpful. The flying away theme is a 'commonplace' of tragic lyric - presumably needing no explanation; 'but the wish is so elaborated.. that for the moment we half forget the reasons for their' (the chorus!) 'flight'. This looks like rather a feeble attempt to disguise a failure to see rhyme or meason in the ode. Barrett's impression is roughly: strophe 1 - escape, 2 marriage of Zeus and Hera, 3 - marriage of Phaedra. Barrett is completely wrong about the subject of 2; but in any case what is the link between 1 and 2? The chorus start by expressing the desire to be a shaman. This is the essential starting point of any analysis. $\eta\lambda\iota\beta$ άτοις ὑπό κευθμώσι the opening words are not just romantic haze; this is the cave of transformation, as used by Epimenides and Zalmoxis. The transformation into a bird is the most usual miracle of the shaman (e.g. Aristeas Herod 4 15; Pliny NH 7 174) Why do the chorus wish to fly to the Western Isles (stanza 2)? The point is that this is a description of paradise for the elect (read $\theta \varepsilon \tilde{l} \delta \iota \zeta$ for $\theta \varepsilon \delta \tilde{l} \zeta$ in 1 751); and as is made clear by M Eliade Myths Dreams and Mysteries in a full discussion of shamanism, the shaman's flight is an attempt to re-enter the paradisiac state.

970 tò ò' ắρσεν αὐτοὺς ὡφελεῖ προσχείμενον B: 'but the sex that is his stands him in good stead' i.e. a man is given a certain leeway in sexual affairs, a woman not. But tò ἕρσεν is maleness and strength; tò θῆλυ femaleness and weakness. In Xen Lac 3 4 5 tò ἕρρεν φῦλον καὶ εἰς tò σωφρονεῖν ἰσχυρότερόν ἐστι... the argument is that males are stronger and are accordingly (καἰ) stronger in self restraint than females. This is the argument that is being rebutted in Hipp 970: males are stronger, and this gives them an added (nkw προσχείμενον has point) ability to carry out escapades.

996f H's declaration of principles - why the involved language in 997-9? Most probably because H is trying not to let out the secret about Phaedra (at 983f he was fighting for utterance). B does not see that H in 996 f is using the language of Unwritten Laws: H first of all reveres the gods - Law no 1 (Xen Mem 4 4 19); he then goes on to another Unwritten Law which can be summed up in Xenophon's word $d\nu \tau \epsilon \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \tau \epsilon \nu$ (Mem 4 4 24; the word $d\nu \theta \nu \pi \circ \nu \rho \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ 999 is similar; note also $\chi \rho \omega \mu =$ $\epsilon \nu \circ \iota \zeta$ 999 is found in the Xenophon passage). In defining what his treatment of $\theta \ell \lambda \circ \iota$ is, H stumbles because he cannot make a general statement about doing good turns for $\theta \ell \lambda \circ \iota$, - Phaedra was $\theta \ell \lambda \eta$ ($\theta \iota \lambda \circ \zeta$ indicates in-group rather than feelings) and he did not do her the favour requested. So he defines the $\theta \ell \lambda \circ \iota$ as those who have enough $a \ell \delta \omega \zeta$ (scruples) not so send immoral messages, as Phaedra had done.

1010f How could Hippolytus 'inherit' the throne by marrying Phaedra? The simplest answer not mentioned by B is that in early Trozen the kingship went with the female line, i.e. via the Queen or Queen's daughter. I think many legends of dynastic succession, incestuous marraige point to an attempt by Greek males to accomodate themselves to distinctly non-patriarchal conditions. This is no place to argue about this. I think also the story of Hippolytus originally tells of an interrex who becomes king by marrying the Queen and is then sacrificed. Horeover the Artemis Arollo cults seem to indicate a connection between Trozen, Delos and other places with Caria and Lycia, both definitely matrist, the latter shown by inscriptional evidence to be not patrilinear. At any rate it is quite inexcusable to assume that early Greek kingship was just like modern systems; thus we should not be surprised if we find that Pittheus at Trozen or Laertes at Ithaca had been kings but were no longer - this means that kingship lasted as long as the vigour of its owner. Incidentally B might have mentioned that Bellerophon (parallel to Hippolytus in being tempted by the Queen) was promised the royal house in Euripides (New Ch Gk Lit 3.pl33).



1198ff. H's chargot ride. B's main discussion on pp 382-4. At least B takes Euripides' geography seriously here as elsewhere in the play (esp. pp 184-5). To find out what H's route was we have to collate ancient and modern reports on the area, to chedk on the latter by a visit (which alas I have not done), bearing in mind what an ordinary Athenian would be expected to know of Trozen (see B pp 184-5: Trozen was occupied c 456-446, had been harried by the Athenians in 430). Certainly the Trozen Euripides is talking about is the Trozen that his audience were familiar with, not some legendary fastness; and I imagine that his stress on the closeness of Athens and Trozen (1158, 1161) is a bit of wartime propaganda ('hands across the sea to our friends in Argos').

The principal mistake made by B and others in tracing H's route is to get the starting point wrong; also B does not listen to what the Trozenians said about the place of H's death; thirdly B does not reckon with the ordinary Athenian's contact with Trozen.

In the first place H goes down to the sea (1179). The assumption followed by B is that H goes N from the town to the shore near the lagoon (the Saronic Limne) i.e. around the modern Psifta; the ancient name for the sea here was $\psi \iota \varphi \alpha \iota \alpha$ (Paus 2 32 10). This is a mere assumption, and leads to difficulties. It is difficult to say what the 'natural' route from town is, as we do not know the extent of ancient Trozen; but we can guess that there was a well worn route to the East coast (Limin Porou) from Trogen. The main harbour of Trozen was on the East Coast at Pogon (a curling peninsula near the modern Vidhi; this was where the Greek fleet assembled before Salamis: Herod 8 42). Then as now the ordinary traveller to Trozen from Athens came by sea and appreached the town from the East Coast (nowadays the ships go nut to Vidhi but to Poros opposite Balatas). An Athenian in Euripides' audience would assume that a Trozenian going to the sea would travel towards Pogon. Euripides has only two words to describe H's starting point άκτής κυμοδέγμονος (1173) which means 'a wave-receiving headland' an apt description for Pogon on the East Coast, inept for the sedgy Limne area. This was probably the route followed by Pausanias: in 2.32.9 the scene changes from upper Trozen to the harbour at Kelenderis (by Pogon).

After seeing the harbour, Pausanias carried on to the Psiphean Sea, where he saw a wild olive, scene of Hippolytus' chariot crash. The Psiphean Sea must be the North coast ('Today the coast from the lagoon to the plain of Lesia is called Psiphti and this appears to be the genuine survival of an ancient name; the name has been corrupted and it is popular not official (unlike Sphaeria or Dryopis) - R Liddell Aegean Greece London 1954 p 82). This route from East to North coast must have been something like the present main highway running past Vidhi (from Galatas) to Lesia. This was the route taker by H on his death ride.

Coming from Pogon H takes the left turn for Argos and Epidaurus (1197) instead of the right turn to Methana; he strikes waste land perhaps the barren salt-flats where the lagoon is dry during the summer (1199); hears a rumbling from an Akte which lies beyond Trozen ($\tau o b \pi$ έκεινα τῆσδε Υῆς)towards the Saronic Gulf (πρός πόντον ἤδη Σαρωνικόν 1200). B correctly explains the η̃ôη is 1200 as implying a contrast between the Saronic Sea and another sea; but has difficulties finding another sea, ends up lamely contrasting one part of the Bay of Methana with another (p 383). On our view the contrast is the natural one between E and N coast, the Limin Porou and the Ormos Methanon. The Akte beyond must be the western tip of Methana and it lay beyond the Trozen-Methana border which we happen to know the Athenians were interested in (Thuc. 4.45.2.) There is nothing in the words of Euripides to imply that H is near the Akte, much less riding along it. From this Akte comes the rumbling noise (1201-2): a suitable noise from Methana since it is volcanic and earth movements are common. Then the towering wave appears - another local touch: Strabo mentions a wave 400 feet high in the Saronic Gulf (1.3.18). By now H has reached the area of Psifta; on this view the geography of 11.1209-10 is fully understandable; Psifta is due South of the eastern end of Sciron's Cliffs, and Asclepius' rock and part of the Isthmus could be seen across the bay.

Note (as B does not) that Eur carefully distinguishes between the blotting out of Sciron's Cliffs (ἀφηρέθη) and the obscuring of the other two places (ἕκρυπτε). The wave would have to cover the whole of the Bay of Methana to blot out these places.

The place where the Trozenians said H was killed was near the lagoon and the sanctuary of Artemis Saronia (Paus 2.32.10) This has been identified by a modern traveller. 'Most of the shore of Psiphti is level, but about a kilometre and a half from the causeway at the mouth of the lagoon, between the 14th and 15thkilometre stones on the road from Galata (and nearest the latter) is a place called Karamouza and also Kaki Scala ("ill harbour") Here the road rises, and circles a rock: there is an almost sheer drop into the sea, and olives grow above and below the road ... after this the road runs inland, and there is no more rough coast road until after Lesia! (Liddell op cit p 83). This sounds like the spot that the Trozenians referred to, and the rocky place of Euripides! narrative. Since we do not send H traipsing along the road to Cape Nisiza, we can agree with the Trozenians and Euripides that H met his death here. On general grounds, B's idea of going to Cape Nisiza does not square with Euripides' words 'the road to Argos and Epidauros', since no one would go to Argos from Trozen via Cape Nisiza, B in his liscussion pp 382-3 seems to have some fixed idea about going along the coast and 'striking inland' - an idea without any basis in our text.

1219f Treatment of H's charioteering has been casual and B does not really face up to the problems. H is said to grab the reins (1220) and drag the $\kappa \omega \pi \eta$ like a sailor man(1221). This is the natural rendering of 1221: but editors have H pulling the reins like a sailor pulling the oar - a confused parallel. I take xwith to be the same as the egel? referred to Hom II 24 270 - a handle by the chariot rail, to which the ζυγόδεσμα running from the yoke were attached. The handle would be an emergency brake: pulling on it would choke and arrest the horses. This could be described as a clever manoevre (1220) - merely yanking the reins would be a tiro's response. The comparison (1221) would be with the sailor pulling on his 'handle' - perhaps of the steerman's oar. At 1227 otaxes thought metaphorical by B (p 338) were actual parts of the harness - the rings guiding the reins (as used in Homer, and the form olnxecpace B may be right - an epicism). At 1234 there are many objections to taking σύριγγες to mean wheel-hubs. (As usual Verrall saw the problem JHS 5 1884 pp 364ff though his solution is impossible). A σύριγξis a pipe or cylinder (of many sorts) - an inappropriate word for a hab (such a word as $\pi\lambda\eta\mu\nu\eta$ suggests a bucket shape, cf.Latin 'modiolus!). Second, it is highly suspicious that $\sigma i \rho \iota \gamma \xi$, $\pi \lambda \eta \mu \nu \eta$, χοϊνιξ, χνόη are all taken to mean 'hub': why so many words? Third, the ancient testimony on wheels (esp Eustathius Iliad sec. 598, Pollux I 145) is muddled and inconsistent. Thus sometimes the linch pins are said to be driven into the XOTVIE-OUPLYE; so XCTVIE-OUPLYE cannot here mean 'hub' or the wheel would be jammed on the axle! In the Hippolytus passage we would not expect the wheel hub to fly off by itself a surely the battered wheel would spin away. I suggest oup of was a cylindrical wheel-stop at the end of the axle with the linch-pin driven through it.

TEXT.

B's text is laid out neatly. In lyric passages B resists the tempsation to chop up Aeolic into handy glyconics when this runs against the natural phrasing (e.g. in 545f: contrast Murray). At the bottom of the page2 there is a wealth of information about MSS readings; it has more detail often and always more accuracy than Murray's Oxford text, but does not loom oppressively; and the somewhat hieroglyphic impression is soon assuaged after reference is made to the scheme of abbreviations pp 91-94. Undoubtedly B's text will be the standard source of reference from now on for scholars' discussions. Some of the punctiliousness does not appeal to me: I do not care greatly whether xxiiopa or xxii.opa is written at 1 808, I just find κληιθρα more strange. I don't know whether there is some rule about dividing words between lines, but there is a ridiculous effect at pp 143-4; at the bottom of one page sudxntov at the top of the next θ dluppov ent nov . The reading is corrupt, but B accepts εύάχητόν and takes it with $\pi \delta \nu \tau \sigma \nu$. Surely a phonetic rule should not override the basic aim of intelligibility?

The introduction on MSS tradition is massive, and will no doubt give scholars something to chew over for years. This was ajjob worth doing, and we whould be glad that it was done so well. But there is the risk that such a $\times \widetilde{\nu}\mu'$ obpa $\nu \widetilde{\omega}$ other $\widetilde{\omega}$ other $\widetilde{\omega}$ may obscure our view of the Hippolytus: why should it practically monopolise the introduction to a play? Also there seems little doubt that this stemmatology of MSS becomes something of a professional pastime for scholars. What is badly needed is not more and more refined stemmata but a scientific and exhaustive investigation of MSS errors and insertions (particularly intrusive glosses). In practice B does not pay obsessive regard to MSS. One 11 992 B says 'the second (reading) is so obviously superior that no mass will induce me to believe that Eur preferred the first'. A conspiracy of MSS - especially in producing half-sense (e.g. Hipp 468-9) or vague poeticism (e.g. Hipp 136) - generally points to an Alexandrian 'improvement'. By MSS and scholia alone it is virtually impossible to get further back than the Alexandrians.

B's virtues as textual editor are: general sanity, willingness to explain (e.g. 1 135, 548) corruptions, command of MSS readings (he frequently corrects Murray's apparatus) tidying up of small points. He gives a plausible defence of 42, tackles a generally unnoticed oddity in 541, argues strongly for excisions at 634-7, has a good emendation for 552, a thorough discussion of 840f. Despite all the scholarship, however, I cannot feel that B has succeeded in establishing a really good text. There are too many corruptions left and defended, unsolved problems, and incorrect solutions.

143 The chorus here cannot be suggesting that Phaedra is having a bout of $\varkappa o \rho \upsilon \beta a \nu \tau \iota o \mu \delta \zeta$ because this was attended by violent physical movements and Phaedra is prostrate and immobile. Possibly Phaedra is paralysed after being possersed? If so $\varphi o \iota \tau \tilde{q} \zeta$ is the wrong word; B says it is used 'of mental wendering not physical' but in fact these words for wandering are used to indicate violent random movements (in

fact the Greek conception of madness is behaviouristic: $\mu\alpha\nu\alpha$ means maniacal behavious, and when the insame person was still he was $\ddot{\epsilon}\mu\phi\rho\omega\nu$ - Or 44). Perhaps read $\ddot{\eta}$ $\sigma\epsilon\mu\nu\omega\nu$ Kopuβάντων $\ddot{\eta}$ oupelac $\mu\alpha\tau\rho\delta\varsigma$ $\dot{\epsilon}\phi\circ\tau\alpha\varsigma$; which retains the form oupelac(B does not mention in his note that this is the reading) and position of $\phi\circ\tau\alpha\varsigma$ (etc) in the MSS. ($\phi\circ\tau\alpha\lambda\dot{\epsilon}\circ\upsilon$ in the MSS may derive from a marginal adscript on the synizesis $\ddot{\eta}$ ov .) In 141 the opening of the sentence is in doubt; but surely one must take $\sigma\dot{\upsilon}$ yàp MSS 141 with $\sigma\dot{\upsilon}$ δ' MSS 145 (\mathbb{B} emends one and leaves the other daggered); wilful alterations must have taken place. Perhaps $\mu\dot{\eta}$ yàp ... $\mu\dot{\eta}\delta'$ - altered by an officious scholar to $\sigma\dot{\upsilon}$ yàp ... $\sigma\dot{\upsilon}$? The question $\mu\dot{\eta}$...; would indicate the tentative tone we need.

i.e. the sandbar! B. The 'dry element of 149 ' χέρσον. πελάγους the sca! seems a weak and untidy phrase. Read χέρσου ··· πελάγους. B says about Wilam's $\chi \epsilon \rho \sigma o \nu \dots \pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha \gamma o \zeta$ 'what Greek ever thought of a sandy shore as "dry sea"? '. Dry sea is SALT, not sand; salt deposits are common by lagoons in Greece, and we know on inscriptional evidence that would not be a there were salt works near Trozen. χέρσου πελάγους particularly bold expression: cf χερσόνησος ; χερσαλμη (salt-encrusted land). Euripides then is referring to the salt flats by lagoon here. The rest of this sentence in 148-50 looks pretty suspect to me, particularly poith yap xai 148. There is in fact (cf B's note on 148) no evidence that the lagoon at Trozen was called $\Lambda_{b}\mu\nu\eta$. Perhaps φοιτά γάρ καί (suspicious after φοιτάς or what have you in 143) conceals the name $\Phi_{0i}\beta\alpha_{i}\alpha$ which Pausanias says (2 30 6) was applied to the lagoon.

166-9 'I called for Artemis, and she comes with the gods' - i.e. B thinks, with the approval of heaven. But Artemis is herself a $θε\delta ζ$ a ridiculous expression. Try συμφέρουσα (Φ for Θ) 'hearing the pangs with me, sharing the pain'. In 168 πολυζήλωτος ties B up. Surely translate 'with much zeal' = πολύ ζηλῶσα i.e. without hesitation. The common idea that the verbal adjective in -τος is passive is wrong; cf πολυ-ηχητος, -φροντιστος, -φορτας, -τμητος, -πλαγκτος, -μνηστος, -κτητος, much.sounding, thinking, producing, cutting, wandering, remembering, owning.

191-7 B mulls over $\delta v \sigma \delta \rho \omega \tau \epsilon \zeta$ 193, makes the best of it p 196-8, but on p 199 is not satisfied with the logic and really wants to excise this passage. B thinks $\delta v \sigma \delta \rho \omega \tau \epsilon \zeta$ cannot mean 'irrationally in love with' but 'very strongly'; the Nurse cannot be arguing that it is irrational to love the here-and-now since she is trying to persuade Phaedra to live. B's objections seem to have very little real weight. 1. The nurse here is not having a philosophical debate (although $d\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \sigma \sigma \delta \nu \eta \nu$, $d\pi \delta \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \iota \nu$ may be philosophical terms); she is musing wistfully about the paradoxes of living. Similarly in frag 813 (partly quoted by B) someone is commenting on the paradoxes of a blind man's life - before he was blind he would have decided such a life was not worth living; but this is not an argument that blind men should be killed! 2. B's idea that the Nurse must be pro-life because she is going to persuade Phaedra

228 B rightly rejects Schwartz' attempt to account for i CORÉOUin the schol's paraphrase as a gloss on $d\lambda i a \zeta$. Perhaps it comes from a gloss on, or reference to, $\delta a \pi \delta \delta \circ i \zeta$ in 230. $\delta a \pi \delta \delta \circ i \zeta$ (B: 'ground, floor') means a <u>level</u> surface. We would then have no need to postulate a (stupid) variant $\delta \mu a \lambda \tilde{a} \zeta$ in 228.

271. B is gloomy about the text here. But ἐλέψχους perhaps is used legalistically for slave-torture (not too cryptic cf. Isaeus frag 2 φεύγειν τοὺς ἐλέγχοψς). 'I don't know what kind of Third Degree you can try on me, because she won't tell' i.e. 'no matter how hard you press me, I can't tell you because she is keeping quiet'.

428 'Bad men are shown up sooner or later by time, which sets a mirror before (whom?) as before a young girl'. A mirror of truth or a mirror of vanity? (I find B's antithesis 'self' and 'other-revealing' confusing;) Time as setting up a mirror to reveal the truth about one man to another - that is reasonable. But why 'before a young girl'? The idea of revelation is now inept. B retains 429 as an 'odd confusion'. Delete 429 as an actor's flower from another play.

468-70 is obelised in Murray, but is largely, with adjustment, accepted by B, following Hadley's interpretation - 467 People should not refine life; 468-9 'for no more would you make fine and accurate the roof with which a house is covered; 469-70 when you have fallen into such a plight, how do you think you can swim out of it?'. But 1. the phrase for 'roof' is banal. 2. Is it true that a Greek builder did not care to make his roof accurately? ἀχριβώσαις refers (though B's translation attempts to gloos over it) to accuracy, and it is ludicrous to think a builder would take less care over measurements etc. (it would fit B's view if $\dot{\alpha}_{\kappa\rho\iota\beta}$ referred only to appearances but it just does not). Also house roofs were used for entrance and exit, and on a Mediterranean hillside would be distinctly visible. In general, a weird and ill chosen precedent. 3. τύχην... ὄσην lit 'so big a fortune' a strange phrase. 4. The sudden change of images - tumbling and swimming after housecraft. Very few scholars will be happy about this jumble, which is a fairly screaming example of Alexandrian half-sense. The clues to emendation are: 1. xathpegets 468 is used of overshadowing objects (trees, rocks) 470 might mean 'duck out of the way'. Something like 2. ÉXVEVOAL

ούδ.... κατηρεφείς δόμοι,

καλώς άκριβώσαις άν, εί πετρα τύχοι

πεσούσ', όσον σύ πώς αν έκνεύσαι δοκεζ. would perhaps be less of an insult to Euripides. 'Nor in the case of a house that's overhung, would you be nicely calculating (matters), if a rock happened to fall, so much as how you think you could duck out of the way.'

514 $\pi\lambda\delta x \circ \nu$ is a specious emendation of $\lambda\delta\gamma\circ\nu$ which B calls

'absurd'. How could the Nurse catch a word from Hippolytus? But the Greeks were closer to primitive feeling here - thinking of words as physical (winged etc), spreading pollution, and folk tales tell us of disaster caused by the dropping of stray words.

649 Obelised In B. The main error made by editors is the attempt to preserve the antithesis $\ddot{\epsilon}\nu\delta\sigma\nu/\ddot{\epsilon}\xi\omega$. $\ddot{\epsilon}\nu\delta\sigma\nu$ $\delta\rho\ddot{\omega}\sigma\iota\nu$ is obviously a corruption in accordance with the sense - the contrast between plotting inside the house, and exporting the plots outside is intended, but Euripides coes not have to bang it in with a hammer. Perhaps $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\delta\ell\delta\sigma\iota\epsilon\nu$ $\ddot{\alpha}\nu$ (give the key note) or $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\delta\rho\epsilon\delta\sigma\upsilon\iota\nu$?

664-8 Suspected by B as a bad, sententious peroration. Yet it rounds off the speech (after the particularities of 651-663), emphasises that H's hatred of women is a permanent feature (with sadistic components - $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\mu\beta\alpha\ell\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ in 668 usually translated 'trample' could be interpreted in a Freudian way, as it is used of animals covering). Also σωφρονεΐν 667 cf the scene-ending σωφρονεΐν 731. B does not realise Euripides' use of such Leitmotiven.

670-1 B adjusts the MSS to τίνας νῦν τέχνας ἔχομεν ἡ λόγους σφαλεῖσαι κύθαμμα λύειν λόγου But the repetition λόγους/λόγου howls corruption, and κάθαμμα λόγου 'the knot of the word' is stupid. Read λύειν ἄγους (Α&Λ) the knot of pollution; 601f, 606 show that an ἄγος has been spread. Alternatively λύειν ζύγους 'the knot of the yoke' where the image is of an animal struggling with the harness after an accident (σφαλείσαι). ζύγους was the reading which accounts for the otherwise inexplicable scholia on the passage (about chariot fastenings and the Gordian knot).

735f B deletes $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \delta \zeta$ 739 also $\mu \epsilon \lambda \delta \theta \rho \omega \nu$ 749, assuming a double corruption in strophe and antistrophe - something which is rightly regarded in general as a dubious expedient. For the intrusion of $\mu\epsilon\lambda\delta\theta\rho\omega\nu$ B 'can offer no explanation'. The phrase Ζηνός παρά κοίταις 749, 'by the bed of Zeus' seems pretty flat to me. Clearly B's emendation is essentially a bit of tidying or improvement. The acid test is really can a convincing emendation of either str or antist be found? I believe there is. Read oloma : $\pi v \rho \delta \zeta$ in 739. B talks as if the shining tears of Phaethon's sisters fall into a river. But in the Aristotelian $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ $\theta a \nu \mu$. 836a we hear: 'in the Electrides Islands near the mouth of the Eridanus there is a LANE near a river; Phaethon fell into this lake; there are many black poplar trees from which Elektron '(this cannot be 'amber' as it is so often ridiculously translated, but a resin) oozes. This lake contains hot water'. Οίδμα πυρός is a volcanic lake with hot bubbling deposits; a bold phrase but with many parallels (πυρός ρεύμα Ar.op.cit.846: πυριστάκτω πέτρα Eur.Kyk.298). The Bhaethon legend is not the story of amber, but a description of the production of a resin-based distillate (perhaps used as a substitute for amber), with poplar trees supplying the resin, and a volcanic lake somehow being used for the distilling.

746. The MSS are divided between $\varkappa \upsilon \rho \tilde{\omega} \nu$ and $\nu \alpha \ell \omega \nu$. B plumps for $\varkappa \upsilon \rho \tilde{\omega} \nu$ (= $\varkappa \upsilon \rho \tilde{\omega} \nu$ 'stablishing'); but why $\nu \alpha \ell \omega \nu$? And why as

Murray reminds us in his Apparatus did a scholiast use the word προσεγγίζειν as a gloss? The correct reading, we can say with practical certainty, was πραίνων, from which ναίων arose by carefess metathesis, and on which πυρών the prose word was a gloss (cf Hecuba 219 πρανθείσαν is glossed πυρωθείσαν). προσεγγίζειν 'bring? (or come?) near' came into the gloss, here irrelevantly, because what was appointed was something which was approaching: Hipp 868 το πράντεν glossed το μέλλον γενέσθαι.

748-9. Text and interpretation are closely interwoven here. B insists that this strophe is essentially about Zeus' marriage. Yet there is nothing in our text to support this. A schol 749 says (on unknown authority) έχει φασι τον Δία μιχθήναι τη Ηρα. μηλόσπορον in '742 is supposed to be an allusion to the marriage gift of Earth to Hera - but would a Greek hearing this phrase have the least idea of such an allusion? Znyòc π apà xo ℓ π a; c 749 where the text is admittedly uncertain, and even if read with B need not refer to marriage at all. B combines with this insistence on one idea a complete and bland ignorance about the whole subject of Western paradise. My own view is that this paradise is the haven of an elect group (referred to in various Greek traditions as 'heroes' or $\theta \in Cot$ which I would read at 751); and that marvelbus food and drink (a normal feature of paradise) is being described in 748-751. In 748 άμβρόσιαι means 'reviving's this is the roct idea of this word in Greek (as established by $d\mu\beta\rho\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma$ = Sanscrit AMRITA); as used of baths, food and drink it refers to the well known recuperative effects. Here the springs appear to be reviving Zeus - not at all an absurd idea for a Greek (cf Hera's renewal of her beauty He. 767 at a spring). Possibly the springs are pouring forth honeyed sleep µelt-OUVTA KOLTOV or, if the effect on Zeus seems rather irrelevant, pouring forth (watering, fertilising) a honeyed garden μελιτούντα κάπον. In 749 B reads $\delta\lambda\beta\iota\delta\delta\omega\rho\sigma\varsigma$ in accordance with a recherché idea about wedding gifts. Read α βιόδωρος more colourful and pointed: Euripides was probably thinking of the luxuriance of N Africa (where Herodotus put the Hesperides' land).

756f $\tilde{\eta}$ Yap $d\pi'$, $d\mu\phi\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$... Bad omens on both sides. What were they? It shounds as if we are going to hear. Then we got some irrelevant verbiage about ship cables. Then $d\nu\theta'$, $\omega\nu$ opening the next stanza - 'this is the reason why Phaedra fell in love with Hippolytus' - but Euripides has not given us half a reason as the text stands. There is more than a mere possibility that we once had the reasons buried amid the irrelevances of 759-763. Reason no 1 would be connected with Phaedra's departure; in 757 as B argues $\eta ~\kappa\rho\eta\sigma\ell\alpha\zeta$ is corrupt. It is just conceivable that the words that B suggests to replace them give the first (implied) reason: Mt $\nu\omega\ell\delta\sigma\zeta$ τ' since Mt $\nu\omega\zeta$ was a byword for tyranny and bloodlust in tragedy. But how on earth could this corruption have occurred? Certainly $\kappa\rho\eta\sigma\ell\alpha\zeta$ could not be a gloss on Mt $\nu\omega\ell\delta\sigma\zeta$; B retracts the suggestion p 434; it would have to be an adscript from 752 explaining the subject of the verb $\epsilon\pi\tau\alpha\pi\sigma$; cf Aeschylus SAT 149 "Apteµt $\eta\ell\lambda\alpha$ explains who the $\kappa\sigma\vartheta\alpha$ is in terms borrowed from 154. Possibly read $d\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\ell\alpha$ (i.e. Phaedra was cut off from her Cretan estates); and I have toyed with $d\kappa\rho\alpha\sigma\ell\alpha$ - 'cursed with the

unsociable-ness that was associated with Crete', (an $\ddot{\alpha} \varkappa \rho \alpha \tau o \zeta \alpha \ddot{\alpha} \alpha$ would be the same as an $\ddot{\alpha} \varkappa \varkappa \tau \tau o \zeta$), with a pun on the name Cretan. The second bad omen must lie in the place where Phaedra landed; and Mouvé- $\chi \circ \upsilon$ 761 the first word in the clause would (as the corruptions in the MSS remind us) irresistibly suggest Artemis Mounychia, who would be averse to the approach of newly weds (cf Stesichoros: Artemis had Acteon killed so that he might not take Semele for his wife); $\dot{\alpha} \varkappa \tau \alpha \tau \delta \iota \upsilon$ 760 does not mean 'shore' but the rocky headland where Artemis had her sanctuary. To reinforce this idea read $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \iota \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$ (for the banal MSS reading $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi$ ' $\dot{\alpha} \pi \varepsilon \iota \rho \circ \upsilon \tau \varepsilon \gamma \tilde{\alpha} \zeta$): they set foot on untried ground (i.e. a place which was $\ddot{\alpha} \beta \alpha \tau \circ \upsilon$ to people affected by the miasma of sex). In this case Artemis put a curse on Phaedra's marriage, so the chorus think; 'Aqpodíta c in 1 765 does not mean that Aphrodite sent the malady, merely that it was a malady of sexual passion of $\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \varkappa \tau \rho \omega \upsilon$ 'Aqpodíta C Iph Aul 545.

770 B struggles to defend $\dot{\alpha}\mu\varphi\iota$, but it is oddly misplaced and ruins the flow of words. Read $\dot{\alpha}\mu\varphi\iota\beta\circ\lambda\circ\nu$; cf Eur Tro 537 where $\varkappa\lambda\dot{\omega}\sigma\tau\circ\nu$ $\dot{\alpha}\mu\varphi\iota\beta\circ\lambda\circ\iota\varsigma$ $\lambda\iota\nu\circ\iota\circ$ is usually read, and where the schol glosses $\dot{\alpha}\mu\upsilon\iota\beta\circ\lambda\circ\iota\varsigma$ with $\sigma\chi\circ\iota\nu\iota\alpha$ (ropes). 'She will fix to the beams of the nuptial chamber a hanging circle, fitting it to her white neck'. $\beta\rho\circ\chi\circ\nu$ came from an explanatory note (cf $\beta\rho\circ\chi\circ\iota\varsigma$ 779, $\beta\rho\circ\chi\circ\nu$ 802).

790-1. B leaves 791 in daggers. One of the two nominatives must go. Perhaps read γυναϊχες, ίστε τις ποτ' έν δάμοις βόης 'What's all the shouting about?' and then έχθρα βαρεΐα προσπόλων έφίχετο; 'Has a fierce feud fallen upon my servants?'. Then 792 follows naturally - 'For they are not coming to receive me'.

826. Impossible, but retained by B. τίνα λόγον ··· τίνα τύχαν are rhetorically parallel, yet one is internal, the other external accusative. It could be patched up: τύχαν looks suspicious with τύχων 827. But some or all of this may be intrusive actors' rant.

903 B reads $\dot{\epsilon}\varphi'$ $\ddot{\psi}$ othous $\ddot{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ for the MSS (fere codd) $\dot{\epsilon}\varphi'$ $\ddot{\psi}\tau\iota\nu\iota$ ot $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$. An implausible corruption. Perhaps read $\dot{\epsilon}\varphi'$ $\ddot{\psi}$ ot $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\ddot{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ ($\ddot{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ glossed $\nu \bar{\nu}\nu$ the reading of MSS DE and Chr.Pat., and misplaced); a reshuffle at line-ends is common. 'The matter about which you are still moaning is unknown to me'. A suitable (cold) remark from Hippolytus.

952. A point which affects our treatment of the crux in 953. 'B argues that abxes denotes 'mental attitude' not 'utterance' ('pride'.. 'not its expression'). He does not seem to be aware of the built-in ambiguities of his quest to differentiate. How can B say at Aes Pers 351 only Xerxes' attitude is involved, as if there could have been no boastful noises! Similarly the presence of $\mu \epsilon \gamma \delta \lambda a \nu \chi o \zeta$ and words like $\mu \epsilon \gamma a \phi \rho o \nu \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ proves absulutely nothing. At Pindar Pyth I 179 a $\delta \chi \eta \mu a$ $\delta \delta \xi a \zeta$ seems to be the 'fanfare of glory' revealing the lives of the dead in histories and songs. In IG 14 2001 a $\delta \chi \delta \Sigma \epsilon \beta \tau_1 \rho a \nu$ seems to be a declaration (as probably $a \delta \chi \delta \gamma \delta \rho a \delta \chi \delta \delta$ Aes Prom 333). The evidence of scholia and lexica for $a \delta \chi \delta \delta$ is indecisive; often it is glossed $\varkappa a \nu \chi \delta \rho \mu a \iota$, but sometimes $\pi \epsilon \pi o \iota \theta a$, $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu \delta \nu \rho \mu a \iota$ etc. Philologically I fear to pronounce a verdict: the ancients and some moderns connect $a \delta \chi \delta \omega$ with $\varkappa a \nu \chi \delta \rho \mu a \iota$; there may be an onomatopeic reinforcement of trenchant utterance in $a \delta \chi - \kappa a \nu \chi$, $\epsilon \delta \chi - \delta \eta \chi - \delta$

953. Here B's retention of the MSS oftoic is an extraordinary and lamentable blot on his edition. oltoic is a weak and banal repetition after $\delta\iota'$ $d\psi \upsilon \chi \circ \upsilon \beta \circ \rho \delta \varsigma$; and it has no real construction (taken with $\varkappa \alpha \pi \eta \lambda \epsilon v$ by B as giving the 'sphere of showmanship' but if it is so taken it would mean that H was a retailer in bread). B's notion that σίτοις could mean 'food in general' is impossible, since δί ἀψύχου BOPAG has made the distinction that the Greeks expressed by oftal κρέα, σίτοις must be either an intrusive gloss, as is made likely by the schol and loc τοῖς σιτίοις ... μηδέν ἀπο τῶν ὀρνέων έσθίοντες ... άλλὰ σίτον μόνον or else en ad sensum reshuffle of letters. Read πίστεις χαπήλευ . Hipp is to trade in pledges of the λογέμποροι mentioned by the scholiasts (also τους λόγους καπηλεύ-OVTES ib.) XATH. EV must have an object; it expresses the idea of interchange in a pejorative way of $\pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon i c \delta \delta v \alpha i$ and $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha v \epsilon i v$ Xen An. 3.2.5. and $\pi \log c_{\lambda} \delta \log c_{\lambda} \delta \log c_{\lambda}$ Plat. Tim. 119d. I take $\pi \log c_{\lambda} \cos c_{\lambda} \delta c_{\lambda}$ used by Hippolytus' group to establish mutual pledges - this is the principle of commensality celegrated by the Hellenic, as by Semitic peoples. Translate: 'Carry on with your big talk now (that we know what you are). use your vegetarian meals to peddle your pledges ... - you're caught'.

1014-5. Arrant nonsense, as B says, leaving a dagger to mark the spot. Charging $\eta \times \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ to $\mu d \wedge \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ seems a creaky device. But I hardly think 'wholesale interpolation' (B p 354) is involved. The main trouble is that 1015 wanders off into a haze. Take 1014 by itself. After 'you think that sensible people like absolute rule' it is rather Irish to say 'not at all, unless <u>they</u> are crazy'; so read $\varepsilon \iota \mu \eta \tau \iota \varsigma \phi \rho \varepsilon \nu \alpha \varsigma \delta \iota \varepsilon \phi \theta \circ \rho \varepsilon \nu$ 'it does not appeal to anyone except a man who's crazy'. Is 1015 then a half witted insertion to 'fill out' the sense of a corrupted text? Perhaps. But it may be saved by an asyndeton:

θηρῶνθ' ὄσοισιν ἀνδάνει μοναρχία / ἐγώ δ'..... Let them hunt it, those who like the idea of sole rule - put as for me...

1104f. This ode is a well known crux: are the chorus male or female? 'Four or perhaps five time the singers use a nom sing participle of themselves; twice (1111,1118) this part. if fem., twice (1105,1107) and perhaps a third time (1121) it is masc.' (B p 336). B's discussion is full, but it has the despondent tone of an obligatory run-through. B discusses possible instances of a masculine participle used by a female in self-references; in Fur frag 413 surely the most obvious explanation is that Ino (who we know assumed a disguise and was used as agent by

Themisto) is disguised as a man (a $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\delta\varsigma$?). The only real solution in the sunning is Verrall's idea of a secondary chorus of men. B objects that 1. there is a secondary chorus only when the main chorus 'will not serve' - by this cryptic phrase B seems to mean that the secondary chorus must have a particular function separate from that of the main chorus; also the secondary chorus should have its entry announced, 2. the secondary chorus could only consist of the male citizens of Trozen responding to $i\omega \pi \delta\lambda\iota\varsigma$ 884, but these have nothing particularly to do with Hippolytus, 3. the regular chorus should begin the extras follow, 4. the continuity of thought in the ode makes a change of speaker er impossible (in particular $\gamma\alpha\rho$ 1120).

I would suggest in reply: 1.&.2. the chorus of men are the male followers of H referred to 1098, and they are performing the Pompe or Processional requested at 1099; cf the Processional (also in dactyls) at the end of the Eumenides. Generally it has been assumed that this body must go out with H at 1099, but there would be no incongruity if they mardh slowly round as H goes out; they could be out of the Orchestra by 1142 or possibly 1130. 3. not a weighty point, since here the Pompoi are asked to perform and consequently lead off. 4. B is remarkably insensitive to the current of thought in this ode.

The male chorus are involved in a cult of purity; their ideal is thought and understanding (EUVEOLG); change is regarded as a disturbance (1109-10). The females echo their counterparts ($\theta \varepsilon \delta \theta \varepsilon \nu / \theta \varepsilon \omega \nu$), but they are essentially more commonplace in their aims; their ideal is ADJUSTMENT, and change is accepted as part of a way of life (116-7). I would translate (B's rendering is slipshod): 'How effectively my thinking about the gods, when it enters my mind, relieves my cares'. B thinks the μελεδήματα are gods' care for men; but Eur has added όταν φρένας έλθη to make it clear. 'But though I have hopefully stored away in my heart a sort of understanding, I fall short as I lock round amid the chances and actions of mortal men'. (The Euveous will not square with experience). 'Change yields to change, and for men the cycle of time is ever veering, ever wandering'. (Change is the source of our confusion, as in Plato). Now the antistrophe. Here the accomodating attitude is quite different from an earnest seeking: the women's view is like that assigned to Amphiaraus (Pindar fr 43) - be like the rolypus (we say 'chameleon!) -

άλλοτ' άλλοδα φρόνει

Their savoir faire is similar to the Nurse's - it's wrong to be too straight (115 $d\tau p \epsilon \kappa \eta \zeta$; cf $d\tau p \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \epsilon \zeta$ 261). 'When I pray, may Fate give me this from heaven - a lot with prosperity included, a heart untroubled by pain'. The object is comfort, not understanding. 'Let not my supposing be too rigorous nor yet debased in me - let my disposition be pliable, let me change always for the morrow and always, by adjusting ($\sigma \nu \nu$ -), live a happy life.'

ll21. Έλλανίας φανερώτατον ἀστέρ' Αθάνας. Etar of the Panathenaea) international athlete? Read Αφαίας – one of the titles of Artemis-Dictynna. Έλλανίας now has particular point as the shrine of Aphaea was on the mountain of Zeus Ἑλλάνιος on Aegina.

Aphaea was astral, her name taken to mean 'bright appearing', and this makes $\varphi a \nu \epsilon \rho \tilde{\omega} \tau a \tau \sigma \nu$ more apt. At 1459 $\tilde{\omega} \times \lambda \epsilon \ell \nu$ ' A $\varphi a \ell a \zeta$ is probably the correct reading.

1189 αὐταἴσιν ἀρβύλαισιν1. cannot be taken as 'bbots and all' as B rightly says, 2. must be what H fits his feet into. What are they? B accepts the scholiast's word - that they are footstalls, but he should not be so peremptory with those who disagree; there is no support in literature or archeology for the existence of such footstalls (Eustathius on H II 5 729 is not independent as he quotesHipp 1189), and the scholiast must only be giving someone's guess. But why should not H put his boots on before getting into his chariot? Boots were often carried, and would be put on (as by a horseman mounting a horse) to protect the feet in the chariot. But αὐταῖσιν is wrong. B gives a colourful picture of H swinging himself into the chariot with one movement (all very entertaining but what has it to do with our text?) and tries to twist αὐταῖσιν somehow to indicate expertise. Away with this fumbling. Read αὕαισιν rawhide boots. For the ornamental epithet in this messenger speech of τμητῶν Εμάντων 1245, στόμια πυριγενή1223 κολλητῶν ὄχων 1225.

1237 δυσεξήνυστον Heath for the MSS δυσεξήνυτον is generally accepted. But not by B, who thinks that the adj would mean difficult to accomplish/complete. The verb from which the adj is formed means 'make one's way out of' (intransitive). It is a fallacy to suppose that $\delta v\sigma$ **efiver** of for untransitive). It is a fallacy to suppose that $\delta v\sigma$ **efiver** of find but 'difficult to suppose that $\delta v\sigma$ lis not 'difficult to find' but 'difficult to find one's way out of'. B's choice for emendation is $\delta v\sigma \varepsilon \xi \delta \iota \kappa \tau \sigma v$; which is inept. A man tangled up in the reins is yearning to get out, not attempting to unty(?) the knots (or 'roll out'?)

1292 μεταβάς βιότον is impossible grammar; left with a dagger by B. Try μεταμειβόμενος cf P Nem 10 55 - the Dioskouroi μεταμειβόμενοι δ' ένάλλαξ spending some time up, some down. Certainly βιότον is intrusive; not a gloss, for the gloss-words were β ίος, ζώη.

1313f A flat passage, not generally suspected and not by B, in which Artemis summarises the plot for Theseus and presumably for anyone in the audience who has gone to sleep. An actor's or producer's interpolation, poorly motivated ω_{ζ} α_{V} of $\mu\omega\xi\eta_{\zeta} \pi\lambda\delta\sigma_{V}$ (1314) to 'rub it in', but early i.e. 4th century, as there are no errors of metre and syntax. Let 1327 follow 1313. The passage was inserted to give scope for a bit of rant, and to make the legend clear to later and more ignorant audiences. Admittedly Euripides is obsessed with clarity, but there is no need for a resumé HERE (contrast the tedious Phoenissae prologue which was necessary and in place.)

1389f The last scene. B does not see that various oddities in the MSS hang together as marks of an intrusive PEDANTIC FOOL. He has intruded chiefly in the group of MSS (HCDEL) which B calls Λ . (p 61-2) He is responsible for:

1389 <u>οία συμφόρα</u> (Λ+ Ch.Pat.: οίαις συμφόραις ΩV et gnom.) <u>προσεζύγης</u> (A: συνέζυγες ΩVLet gnom)

1390 διωλεσεν (Λ: ἀπώλεσεν ΩV et gnom.)

1393 δόμοισι (ΒΛ : τόποισι ΟΑΥ)

1398 δύσποτμος (LCDE: προσφιλής γ' ΩV)

1418 κατασχηπτουσι (Λ: κατασχήψουσιν ΩV)

1437 $\varphi \theta_{i} \tau \sigma \vartheta \zeta$ (A: $\nu \varepsilon \varkappa \rho \sigma \vartheta \zeta \Omega \nabla$. Here as against B I accept $\nu \varepsilon \varkappa - \rho \sigma \vartheta \zeta$ and take $\varphi \theta_{i} \tau \sigma \vartheta \zeta$ to be an improvement)

1448 $\underline{\phi} \underline{\rho} \underline{\delta} \underline{\nu} \underline{\alpha}$ (AA et γB : $\chi \underline{\delta} \rho \alpha$ BOV et $\gamma A^2 \gamma D$)

1452f Here all the MSS have the lines in an odd order. How did it come about? Theseus says (1452): $\dot{\omega} \phi (\lambda \tau a \theta)$, $\dot{\omega} \zeta \gamma \epsilon \nu \nu a \epsilon \delta \zeta$, $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \phi a \ell \nu \eta$ $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \ell$. Then in the MSS we have $\dot{\omega} \chi \alpha \epsilon \rho \epsilon \chi \alpha \ell \delta \phi$, $\chi \alpha \epsilon \rho \epsilon \pi \delta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \delta \ell$, $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \rho$. Here the P.F. has chosen a line starting $\dot{\omega}$ and sounding complimentary as one to respond best with Theseus words, Then (1454): Theseus makes a compliment ('What a good boy!') and back comes (1455) the courteous reply ('I hope all your boys are the same').

METRE

B's metrical analysis is chiefly of service for defining long and short syllables in the text and for allotting names to groups of such in accordance with modern fashion. He does seem sensitive to structure e.g. the difference in subject between strophic pairs (p.182) and to ethose.g. agitated dochmiacs combined with calm iambics (pp 266-7).

I feel that his use of indenting (which he justifies p 422) i.e. the setting out of cola on the page so as to 'bring the double shorts in all the cola into vertical alinement one with another' - although this follows the example of e.g. Snell's Pindar - is a ridiculous and infuriating mannerism: it is a way of implying something about the interrelation between cola without saying what it is. What is the point for instance of alining the shorts of a choriamb, ionics, glyconics and rising dactyls (p293) - is it implied that these are fulfilling a similar dynamic function? If not, what is meant?

One vital feature of Snell's Bindar that B should have incorporated is the marking of significant word breaks common to strophe and antistrophe. Greek poetry - and not merely stichic - was extraordinarily sensitive to word breaks, and it would do more for the appreciation of its refinement if we draw attention to its precision than by devising meaningless arabesques. Thus in 128 τέγγουσα, θερμᾶς δ. ἐπι νῶτα πέτρας: 138 Δάματρος ἀκτᾶς: δέμας ἀγνὸν ἴσχειν: 129. evalor: ... xazépati: joberduoi.

139 μρυπτῷ πάθει; θανάτου θέλουσαν; we cannot fail to see the graceful and measured movement even if we are not sure where cola begin and end. In 759f = 771f one must emphasise the lack of pause in a long and heavy series of iambics, and realise that the consequent 'knotted' effect is in both strope and antistrophe a perfect form for the subject (tying ropes).

B follows a modern trend in his use of the name 'aeolic'; perhaps he was a little uneasy about it (he composes an appendix for classifying sorts of aeolic). This aeolising trend, which for its vagueness seems to have been named after the god of winds, is wrong in principle and in practice: in principle because it abuses an ethnic name (which originally referred to local idioms) and applies it willy nilly to any combination of double short and single short which does not fit a ready made pattern (rather in the way the term 'logaoedic' - speech-song - was used in the 19th century), because it is a mechanical substitute for hard thinking about the organic complexity of Greek lyric; in practice the aeolisers cause confusion by refusing to recognise ionic (which in anacreontic and other measures clearly involve double short and single short), rising dactyls, and Archilochean combinations of dactyls and trochees. When at 755-6

έπόρευσας έμαν άνασσαν, όλβίων άπ' οίκων - - - - - - ith. occurs, B shows vague recognition of its 'Archilochean' character but contents himself with an inaccurate parallel (p 299 'a variant of the archilochean Ερασμονίδη χαρίλαε χρήμα τοι φελοίον '; but this is - D ithyphallic!); in his analysis it goes down as 'enh b + ith' - but with the dactylic phrase in 1 756 who can doubt that the opening of 755 is also dactylic (in rising dactyls) and not the byform of a phrase with an indeterminate opening? The metre of 755-6 can be defined as w-wv+ trochaic metron + ithyphallic clausula. Noteable in this 'aeolic' analysis (perhaps it arises from Wilamowitz evolutionary notions) is the muddling of amorphous and defined. Thus on p 257 ----- is called a Sapphic hendecasyllable with 'aeolic base' - but what sense is there in saying that an amorphous form is variant of Sappho's which always starts with a trochaic metron? If it is argued that this precise evolved from that amorphous scheme, then this is a hypothesis of derivation which is quite unsupported and which I think much inferior to G Thomson's hypothesis (Stud Anc Gk Soc. p 470-471).

It is necessary that modern metric should move away from this naming of parts and study the dynamic interrelation of phrases. There is a silly tendency to squeeze extant patterns into a few handy moulds and throw the remainder into a bag of wind called 'aeolic'. More thought is required about odds and ends. Take 732 for instance $\eta\lambda\iota\beta$ to ι_ζ in $\lambda\iota_\varepsilon$ is required about odds and ends. Take 732 for instance $\eta\lambda\iota\beta$ to ι_ζ in $\lambda\iota_\varepsilon$ of μ and ι_ε γ evolution. At the end of the line clearly ionic as shown by what follows. But what is this isolated 'choriamb' doing? $\eta\lambda\iota\beta$ to ι_ζ is an epic word and would suggest dactyle to the audience. The only sensible way of scanning is $\eta\lambda\iota\beta$ atolog in κ evolution γ evolution that is the dactylic D changes

into ionic. This is of course a hypothesis - perhaps false. To call the opening rhythm 'a choriamb' on the other hand is perfectly innocuous so

- 1

long as we realise that this is shorthand for -wd- ; if we think it implies a community with choriambs elsewhere then again we have a hypo- : thesis, true or false.

The aeolists mix all genres together and then find themselves at a loss to define what 'aeolic' is. B's definitions have the merit of simplicity (p 422-3). They are wrong. The use of x in his pattern is based on confusion. Ancient testimony and usage show that a Pherecratean is a by-form of the Glyconic; the ending - is not x-x but effectively v_{--} , and related to the $-v_{-}$ ending of the glyconic in the same way as an ithyphallic $-v_{-+}$ is related to the lecythion $-v_{-+}$. This is important. Similarly an 'enhoplian' may be x- v_{--} not x- v_{--} and this means that we can have (sometimes at least) a succession of enhoplians i.e. $x-v_{-+}$ (whereas x- v_{--} x bis would be anomalous in putting ancipites together).

1102f A case where more than a scholastic sorting of shorts and longs is needed.

άλλα γάρ άλλοθεν, άμείβεται, μετά δ' ίσταται etc. δάδια δ' ήθεα, τόν αύριον, μεταβαλλομένα etc.

Succession and change, the central ideas here, are made manifest in the metre. The dactyls are interrupted, then resume. Note the clear and significant word breaks.

1268f An ode where metrical and textual analysis must work hand in hand. In B there is a feeble analysis of meaning - we get the impression that something complimentary is being said about Aphrodite; and an unthinking assumption of dochmiac metre. How much of this ode is definitely dochmiac? Note the uncertain quantities e.g. $K \dot{\upsilon} \pi \rho \iota$, $\theta \epsilon \tilde{\omega} \nu$. The answer is very little, as it stands; but much has been imported by emendation. The most significant pattern is dactylic and dactylo-trochaic. This and not dochmiac would be suitable for a cult-hymn. Such phrases as ooa te Yã tréget are not definitely dochmiac any more than πυρφύρεα φάρεα in the first ode. 1268 is scanned as two dochmiacs. But such a bacchiac pattern i.e. U--: y--: in dochmiacs was carefully avoided (cf 849yuvatxov άρίστα θ' where the θ' may make a difference). 1270 is definitely dactylic. 1271 is also dactylic if L (as sometimes happens) has the right reading (which is here better in view of $\pi \sigma \iota \varkappa \iota \lambda \delta \pi \tau \epsilon \rho \tilde{\omega}$). 1272 εύάχητον θ' is an impossible reading: who but the veriest landlubber ever thought the sea melodious? 1273 uncertain as the $\hat{e}\pi\hat{i}$ may be intrusive (see 1272). 1274 iambic and dactylic, 1275? the first part could be dactylic; 1276 the only line in the whole piece where something definitely dochmiac emerges but φύσιν όρεσκόων is a prose periphrasis unsuitable here and thus corrupt. 1279 the reading of rearly all MSS is said by B to be either 2 queer dochmiacs or no metre! A bad mistake: scan vD e! 1280-1 definitely trochees and dactyls; the last line rising dactyls (i.e. starting).

MYTH AND CULT.

Despite the fact that Euripides, as elsewhere, is careful to connect

37 •

the story of his drama with actual cult (1423ff.), B is very dismissive about cult and cult-myth, and seems only too glad to get on to the safe (? ground of legend (pp 3-6 cult, pp 6 legend). B tells us 'this is no place to speculate about the origin of his (i.e.H's) cult' (p 4 n 7), but nevertheless gives us a garbled account of an original hero -cult aquiring the ritual appropriate to a god. It is no wonder, when the treatment of cult is so dismissive, that the cult-associates are called a 'miscellany' (p 4 n 7) i.e. B has no wish to sort them out. Any work that sets out to deal with the cult of Hippolytus must run the danger of being called illiterate when there is no mention of Frazef's Golden Bough.

B talks of the dedication of hair to H by girls before marriage as a fusing of marriage custom with mourning custom, and talks of brides dedicating their hair to heroes. In fact hair was dedicated on such occasions to gods as well as heroes (p 4 n 3) which shows that a tribute to a dead man cannot be always intended; such an explanation (which the Greeks were liable to give themselves) is clearly a tawdry rationalisation. The slightest acquaintance with the anthropological evidence on such customs makes it clear that here we have a ritual of initiation - the loss of a part of the body symbolising the death of the old self and the transition to a new status. On the Greek side, it appears that this pre-marital hair-clipping was connected ethnically with the Carian-Semitic culture whose religion was centred on Artemis-Astarte. (At Megara, Iphinoe receiver of the clippings is the title of Artemis; similarly at Delos, Hekaerge and Opis are Hekate and Artemis). Inexcusably B does not mention the evidence of Lucian dea Syria 60 that the Troezenian hair-clipping was identical with the ritual at Hierapolis in honour of 'the Syrian goddess' who is almost certainly a form of Astarte.

Is the story of H a mythical pattern, does it hang together as the Aition of a rite? This is the question which B does not face. In his analysis of the legend, he talks as if the legend had become completely separate from cult and myth, a disembodied entity which different poets could turn into this or that shape. There is little awareness of the fact that the Greek poet was choosing from and weaving folk-traditions, not spinning words from his own head. In the fashionable attack on Seneca (p 16-17) B might have made clear that Seneca's supposed vices in no wise cancel out his value as a mythological source.

In studying the H story there are many clues to the ritual lying behind it. The fertility goddess with which he is associated - Aphrodite-at-thelookout or Artemis-of-marshy-places is none other than the Semitic Astarte, goddess for sailors and irrigationists. The Azosioi Theai (Damia and Auxesia) in the precinct of H at Trozen are concerned particularly with the yearly cycle of drought: Azosios is the name for the 'drying out' month July/August at Epidaurus, and Hippolytus' death (as many scholars have suggested) is a symbol of a seasonal pattern. A comparison of the H story with the Canaanite Poem of Baal (T H Gaster Thespis pp 111 ff) shows that H is enacting the role of Asherat, a temporary interrex bringing irrigation at the hottest time of year when Baal (who is largely identified with the Hellenic Apollo) is absent. This comparison makes clear that Theseus in the H story by descending to the underworld

(Sophocles, Seneca) is acting the part of Baal; and in fact Euripides' depiction of his absence as due to a Theoria discussed by B p 31-2) is but giving a rationalising version of the absence of Apollo Thearios (who under the title of Epibaterios was worshipped in H's shrine at Trozen), i.e. the Hellenised Baal. The bull-from-the-sea that causes the death of H is the Semitic Yam: his coming is the coming of the September floods, the end of the dry season.

In his function of interrex H is similar to Myrtilus (who is also connected with chariot-death). Myrtilus is promised half the kingdom and the privilege of sleeping with Hippodameia; when he tries to exact his reward he is kicked into the sea. In the original story, presumably, H becomes temporary king and sleeps with the Queen (Phaedra), then is conveniently dispensed with, thus allowing the real king (Theseus) to carry on his rule There are a few hints that H temporarily acquires the regalia of kingship: thus in Seneca Ph 899 the sword of kingship is mentioned; and in Eur Hipp 1189 the boots are mentioned. Both the sword and the boots we know from Callimachus and Pausanias to have constituted the regalia of Theseus' kingship which he received from King Aegeus.

In view of this analysis, and with the help of Frazer's account of kingship, we can understand the three Arai which Theseus derived from his father Poseidon (cf B p 39ff). These Arai are 'curses', not 'prayers'. In the Greek stories which I follow Frazer in associating with early Greek kingship, curses are frequently delivered by a deposed king on his successor (e.g. Kronos on Zeus; Oedipus on his sons; Oenomaos on Myrtilos, who in turn curses Pelops). The meaning of these curse-stories is shown by the Semitic ritual of the scapegoat: the king of the land is bound by a curse, which is taken off by the scapegoat, this curse embodies the sins of the people (E O James Origin of Sacrifice pp 196 ff). We may guess that Aegeus-Poseidon passes on the Arai to Theseus, in that Theseus is the successor (and probably as many mythologists have thought responsible for his father's death) and carrier of the public Curse. Hippolytus is used as interrex and scapegoat; like the scapegoat he carries away the sins of his people as he wanders to a foreign land (Leviticus XVI 21 22; Eur Hipp 1048-9). Then the story of the kingship was bowdlerised presumably by the Athenians, anxious to present Theseus in a noble light, and we end up with the hezy account in Euripides, which B misunderstands (pp 39-40).

B does not appreciate how in tragedy traditional motifs were frequently adapted to new themes; he has not taken the measure of Zielinski's Tragodoumenon. Take for instance the girls' marriage contest for H's bed mentioned by Eur H 1140-1; we would not have associated the puritanical H with such behaviour. If the rites for H were in practice premarital initiation ceremonies, this theme is a ritual motif, not just decoration. Also the Charites at 1148 must have had some function in H's rites; why else are they said to escort H from his house? At any mate B's explanation of $\pi \xi \mu \pi \pi \pi \epsilon$ - 'by not preventing his fate they have become responsible for it' is a feeble evasion. Charites are associated in Greek story with beauty contests, and the goldesses in the Judgment of Parls may have been originally Charites (cf the passages quoted in **T** C W Stinton Euripides and the Judgment of Paris 1965); in Eur Iph T 1143 ff where bands of girls are vying with each other $\chi \alpha \rho (\tau \omega \nu \dot{\epsilon} \zeta \dot{\alpha} \mu (\lambda \lambda \iota \zeta \max y \operatorname{be} \operatorname{an} \operatorname{allusion}$ the rite is in honour of Artemis Lochia; in the Partheneion of Alcman, which clearly involved a beauty contest, the Charites and 'house' are mentioned (in a fragmentary passage); at Athens the Charites were associated with Hermes and Artemis-Hekate Epipyrgidia who may be the same as or similar to Apbrodite Kataskopia in H's sanctuary; in a lyric (Bacchylides? J M Edmonds Lyra Graeca 2. p 390-391) the Charites are 'joined' ($\check{\alpha}\rho\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu \dot{\epsilon}\nu \chi\alpha\rho\ell\tau\omega$) to carry the victorious athlete. Most probably here then Euripides is alluding to the practice of girls in an Artemis rite (cf Leto Eur H 1139) at Trozen; perhaps a young man was chosen and escorted away by a band of girls arm-in-arm ($\sigma\nu\zeta\nu\gamma\ell\alpha\iota$).

IDEAS

To appreciate the H as a play we must follow the current of ideas in it. If B has failed to lead us, it is not that he does not try; but as can be seen by the lack of a proper introduction, there is an obliqueness in his notes which almost amounts to a shyness ($\alpha t \delta \omega \zeta$) about ideas. There is in fact nowadays an attitude in classics which may be summed up: drama is drama, not philosophy, politics or what have you. Perhaps this has affected B's study. There are elements of truth in the truism. Drama is drama; but designed for an audience of Athenians not for dramatic critics; for an audience that was alive to ideas and all too ready to question values; an audience used to seeing practical issues debated fully and in the open; and H was written by a man who became known as the philospher of the stage.

'Pure drama' is liable to become pure stage-behaviour. On p 363 B shows that he recognises that H's obsessive quest for purity compensates for his illegitimacy; he gets the point, then throws it away - it is irrelevant to the 'action of the play'. What is the action of the play? Does not action include motive? How ridiculous to think that Euripides' effort to understand and let us understand why H does as he does is 'irrelevant'!

The ideal of aesthetic objectivity is generally foreign to a popular audience, which will detect in a play quite spontaneously contemporary meanings - thus very probably Theseus the national hero would remind them of Pericles. What strikes the modern scholar as extra-dramatic fancy might be what really made the play go; conversely an ordinary spectator would find himself lost in the timeless world of meaning ('timeless' B p 172-3).

<u>atowc</u> B's treatment of Phaedra's atowc (385-6) is a travesty of polite scholarship. Unclear about the basic meaning of this word, he attempts to disguise this unclarity by the use of a shuffling archaism 'shamefastness' (p 230). B is also unable to see the reason for Phaedra's long speech. Euripides is making a point here, and like Brecht he is ready to sacrifice 'realism' i.e. illusionism to the communication of ideas. Phaedra's speech looks like. and is, an explanation.

Basically atowc has nothing to do with 'conscience' or 'guilt'.

učδως is concerned with how you LOOK. Secondly it is an automatic response (revealed e.g. in blushing) and hence - we follow Aristotle not B on this - not a virtue; the man lacking αἴδως is wicked, but the mere presence of αἴδως does not imply excellence. Thirdly it is a negative impulse, it stops you doing something.

alowc is an awareness of one's situation: a student before the great scholar, the young girl before male company, show alowc, an awareness of their place in the social set-up. Euripides makes clear what Phaedra's alowc is in the second half of the long speech. Women cannot be immoral, as the secret is bound to come out (11.415-18); immorality brings disgrace on the family (415); bad people are bound to be shown up and Phaedra does not wish to appear in their company (426-8, 430; omit 429). Phaedra is afraid of what people will say. That is the sum total of her morality. Euripides is a keen social satirist: he satirised not merely the greatness which is an illusion but also (as trenchantly in the Iphigeneia in Aulis) the niceness which proves disastrous.

Phaedra argues (277f) that people go wrong through being diverted: they have the right ideas, but do not put them into practice. Then we have a list of diversions - 383f conversation, leisure and $\alpha \ell \delta \omega \zeta$. Then the distinction between the two sorts of $\alpha \ell \delta \omega \zeta$. Clearly ' $\alpha \ell \delta \omega \zeta$ ' l.must be relevant to Phaedra's condition, and 2. must fit in with the train of thought. B's 'indecisiveness' suits l. but not 2. - since it is not a diversion; and what would $\delta \chi \theta \circ \zeta \circ \ell \varkappa \omega \nu$ a burden on households' mean then?

Phaedra's trouble is respectability. In the form of 'keeping face' this is a burden on households. That Phaedra does have it is shown by the rest of her speech. It is a pleasure since doing the done thing brings a glow of satisfaction. It diverts us from reality into spiritless conformity. Phaedra is a weak good woman with no morality: under a crisis she has no definite response coming from herself, her goodness is parasitic on her environment.

But Euripides does not leave it here. In general $\alpha \ell \delta \omega \zeta$ is no bad thing: at H 1258f Theseus' $\alpha \ell \delta \omega \zeta$ makes him hesitate to gloat over misfortunes; Euripides well knows that some of the automatic sanctions of morality (Unwritten Rules) are valuable. But Euripides has a particular difficulty here in facing the Athenians audience. To say Phaedra's trouble was $\alpha \ell \delta \omega \zeta$ would seem to imply that if Phaedra were $\alpha \nu \alpha \ell \delta \eta \zeta$ and go on a merry romp then all would be well. The first Hippolytus had caused such a furore by its supposed immorality that Euripides must make it clear that he is not recommending (as some modern psychcaralysts faced with a Phaedra might) therapeutic promiscuity. So he must show that Phaedra's is false $\alpha \ell \delta \omega \zeta$ as opposed to the good $\alpha \ell \delta \omega \zeta$ that is a necessary condition for good behaviour.

What then is the relevance of Hesiod's distinction between the two sorts of $\alpha \ell \delta \omega \zeta$ (B p 230-1)? Except in so far as Hesiod had made a dichotomy and therefore supplied a precedent, absolutely NONE! Bad $\alpha \ell \delta \omega \zeta$ for Hesiod was bad because it was part of an aristocratic system of values

to which Hesiod as an immigrant farmer is opposed: it is the allow of a countryman touching his cap to the lord. (As we should expect the Megarian Junker Theognis praises allow frag 291-2, and identifies avat - $\delta \epsilon$ (η with violations of the old order.) Hesiod with his devotion to hard work stands for social mobility - the possibility of success. Turn now to Euripides. The allow of Phaedra is clearly not the cap-touching sort but the very opposite - 'noblesse oblige', the sense of being superior and not abusing one's position. She is topavvoc and knows that the lower class always follows the upper (411-412). Both kinds of bad allow are ways of knowing your place, but the place varies from lower to higher.

A clear instance where αἴδως must practically mean 'conformism' is given by Plutarch (Mor 44 D): people in the theatre, feeling that they must respond, applaud as if forced into it through αἴδως.

<u>Purity</u> The ethics of good form find their natural antithesis in the ethics of individual self-development. The Pythagorean paradox $\alpha l \sigma \chi \upsilon \upsilon \varepsilon \circ$ $\sigma \alpha \upsilon \tau \circ \upsilon -$ 'respect yourself' (not others) shows an attempt to rise above the criterion used by Phaedra. Before going to bed the good Pythagorean had to ask himself "Where have I gone astray?". In this play Hippolytus is said to imagine himself 'special' $\pi \varepsilon \circ \iota \circ \sigma \circ \varsigma$ (948), is the member of an elect body with natural purity (73ff) is engaged in a course of Askesis i.e. self-improvement (1080); and his extreme self-absorption comes out in the exclamation

είθ' ήν έμαυτὸν προσβλέπειν ἐναιτέουνστάνθ...(1078-9) These characteristics lead him into trouble: he does not know how to handle people. In the opening scene, haughtiness is emphasised; he says the wrong thing very loudly (and Phaedra's plot is the outcome); and he does not know how to talk to his father (this seals his doom).

What would this mean to the audience? Is H for them a member of a mystic group - Orphic or Pythagorean? Naturally there is much difficulty in proving one or the other, partly because the history of such movements is imperfectly known. But, 'pure-drama' dogmas aside, does not Theseus' attack on H sound to us suspiciously like the portrayal of the philosopher in Attic Comedy? e.g. 943f, esp. 956-7.

Anpeύουσι γάρ / σεμνοίς λόγοισιν, αίσχρά μηχανώμενοι. If once the mustic nature of H's role is assumed, certain parts of his behaviour fall into known patterns: thus his pacifying anti-beast, his puritanical anti-sex, activity; his obsession about oaths (like the Essenes, Pythagoreans and Empedocles); his ideal of self-improvement (άκολουθείν το θεώwas the Pythagorean aim; and Empedocles became a god). Such a small point as where H says he must wash his ears after hearing the Nurses words (653-4) implies a strong sensitivity to miasma which Essenes and Pythagoreans shared.

At 953 H is said to have Orpheus as his leader. When Orphism was fashionable in classical studies, it was thought that H must be an Orphic. Nowadays we hear the fashionable refutation: H cannot be an Orphic because the Orphics were vegetarians and H is a huntsman who kills animals. (B p 344-5; B's point that Orphics were not connected with Artemis is

not convincing: at Aegina the mysteries of Hekate who is clearly Artemis-Hekate are said to be founded by Orpheus Paus 2 30). The trouble with this formal disproof is that it is formal. Drama does not follow the rules of a police-court interrogation. One does not have to look very hard to see that whereas one point is supposed to demolish the 'Orphic' case, a multitude of points for the Orphic case are ignored. One could argue that what is attributed to H here is not 'vegetarianism' (a modern concept) but the practice of sharing humble cereal meals to symbolise piety and restraint (as in the cult of Cybele). And eventually we get down to the question - Why on earth does Theseus his father SAY that H is a follower of Orpheus?

The solution to the impasse lies I think in the recognition that Hippolytus to the Trozenians must have been, not an Orphic, but an analogue to Orpheus, used by the Kathartai (Purifiers) a magico-religious fraternity that still existed in Pausanias' day (Paus 2.31.3-4, 8-9). It would at any rate seen much easier to suppose that H was already assodiated with a mystic cult of purity BEFORE Euripides wrote the play. Otherwise we are left with the supposition that Euripides unaccountably made a huntsman into a mystic.

J.W.Fitton

The Amphorae and Tablets of the Northern Entrance Passage at Knossos; A query on the dating of the destruction of Knossos.

The Problem.

The problem concerns the dating of the Linear B tablets at Knossos. Evans' view was that the tablets were proserved by being baked in the fire which destroyed the Palace at Knossos at the end of the LM 11 period in c.1400 BC. Professor Palmer's opposed view is that the tablets were preserved by a fire at the end of the LM 111 period in c.1150 BC. The problem before us is how to explain the stratigraphical fact that a "Great Deposit" of tablets were found in the Northern Entrance Passage of the Palace among 40 whole double amphorae dateable to the LM 111 period.

Lest it be thought that quibbling over pottery is simply a 'storm in a double amphora', to use Palmer's own phrase, it will be well to survey the historical consequences at stake.

The Historical Consequences.

Throughout this articles three questions are to be borne in mind. What is the political relationship between Knossos and the Mainland

1.	It may	be helpful	for the reader t	o have the	traditional	chronological
	sdReme	of the Late	Bronze Age befo	re him:-		
	Crete Date Mainland					
	Late	Minoan I.	1580-1500/1450	Late Hella	dio I	
	Late	Minoan II.	1500, 1450-1400	Late Hella	dic II	
	Late	Minoan III.	1400-1100	Late Hella	dic III	
1	Note that	at these are	Archaeological,	not Ethnic	, terms.	

during the LM 11 period? Who destroyed Encasos in c.1460? What is the political relationship between Knossos and the Mainland in the last period of Knossos during LM 111?

Evans' view was that in LM 11 there was Minoan control of the Mainland, as evidenced by the greatness of 'Palace Style' pottery found at Knossos and on the Mainland. The fall of Knossos in 1400 was at the hands of Mycenaeans from Tiryns and Mycenae who were under pressure from the Achaeans and, in search for homes, appealed to their Minoan forefathers to take them back. They were refused and so took by force what was denied to their supplication. LM 111 was a period of Partial Reoccupation when the Palace was inhabited by "Squatters". It was also a period of decadence, for LM11 was the great hey-day of Knossos.

Evans' 'Knossocentric' view rests on four premises. (a) The Linear B tablets are thought to belong to the LMI1 period. (b) Being undeciphered in Evans' day they were believed to be non Greek. (c) In the belief that the Minoans were the inspiration of mainland Greece, Evans did not think to distinguish between Late Minoan and Late Helladic pottery'. (d) Finally Evans believed that the unity of Minoan civilisation was such "as almost to impose the conclusion that there was a continuity of race".² Since it was not known that the Mycenaeans spoke Greek and since no distinction was made ethnically between Mycenaeans and Minoans, it was believed that Knossos fell in 1400 by the hands of its own children³.

Two other views may be given of LM I-lll history which may be said to represent the divided camp that esisted up to the decipherment in June 1952.

Furumark⁴ believed that during LM 1 Knossos was independent of the Mainland though evidence for Minoization of the Mainland survived. During LM 11 cultural and trading connections were severed, for Minoan pottery was rarely seen on the Mainland. It was the "Calm before the Storm"5. Knossos was destroyed circa 1400 by Greeks from the Mainland. During L.M.111 "Minoan power [now broken] succumbed to the rising Mycenaean."⁶

- 1. A.J.B. Wace in <u>Documents in Mycenaean Greece</u>, Ventris & Chadwick, 1956, p.xxii.
- 2. Presidential Address in J.H.S. 32(1912), 281.
- 3. It was believed in antiquity that the Mycenaeans were Greeks, for Herod, says the Trojan war was a struggle between Έλληνες and Asiatics (1,3-5). Evans' view required that Homer, although professedly commemmorating the deeds of Achaean heroes, set them in non-Hellenic (Minoan & Mycenaean) surroundings; the Homeric epic was thus a borrowing or translation into Greek from an earlier Minoan epic cycle. This took place under bilingual conditions when Greeks 'Hellenised' Mycenaean society. J.H.S.32(1912)287-8.

4. Arne Furumark, Opuscula archaeologica VI (1950), 150-271.

5. A. Furumark, op.cit, 262

6. A. Furumark, op.cit.271

Wace, 'on the premise that all 'Palace Style' jars found on the Mainland were local and not imported, denies that the LM 11 dynasty ruled the Mainland: rather the contrary is true, that Knossos was inspired by the Mainland. Knossos was destroyed in 1400 by the Cretans themselves who disliked 50 years or so of Achaean rule, and insurrected against their Greek overlords. The Minoans of LM 111 had just enough power to keep the Achaeans away.

In sum: Evans' dating of the destruction of the LM 11 Palace in 1400 is generally accepted.² Evans likewise is followed in the view that LM 111 is a period of decline.³ But whereas Evans believed that Knossos inspired the Mainland during LM 11, Wace thinks the opposite, and Furumark thinks they are independent powers whose cultural and trading relations have ceased.

Then came the discovery by Ventris that Linear B is Greek. The excavations of tablets at Mycenae and the interpretation of Linear B as Greek made it certain that there has been a continuous civilisation in Greece since 1500 at least. Clearly the decipherment of the tablets at Knossos as Creek, with Evans' dating, discredited the traditional view of Furumark (who nevertheless welcomed the decipherment) and gave credence to the Mainland view of Wace.

Brofessor Palmer has argued that Evans has not represented the archaeological evidence and the resultant chronology correctly. He has been led to this view from philological considerations and a comparison between the archaeclogical papers which Evans bequeathed to the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, (among them the daybooks of the excavations kept by his assistant, Duncan Mackenzie) and the published works entitled Palace of Minos and Scripta Minoa. Palmer's belief that the tablets belong to the period immediately before the destruction of the Palace in IM 111B implies that during LM 11 Knossos and the Mainland are independent power (as Furumark); Knossos was destroyed in 1400 by Mycenaean Greeks from the Mainland, who introduced the Greek script. During LM 111 there was a flourishing Achaean power with a flourishing export trade of Stirrup Jars containing oil, tallying with the Homeric +radition that Crete was an important religious centre.4 This contrastsstrongly with the picture of Partial Reoccupation in a period of decline suggested by Evans and followed by everybody.

The evidence for Palmer's revolutionary view rests on four premises.5

- 1. First suggested in C.W.Blegen & A.J B.Wace, P.C.Ph.S, 169-71(1938), 1-2; repeated often as in Ventris and Chadwick, op.cit.xxiii.
- 2. But see below on Popham.
- 3. The revised Bury adheres, p. 25: and the now <u>Standard Companion to Homer</u>, Wace & Stubbings, 1962, 295.
- 4. Homeric <u>Hymn to Apollo</u>. Deliphi is traditionally founded by priests from Crete.
- 5. Professor Palmer's views are contained in <u>Mycenaeans & Minoans</u>, London, 1961 (referred to as MM.), and in <u>On the Knossos Tablets</u>, Oxford,1963 (referred to as KT.). Professor Boardman's opposing views are contained in the same book in the second part (referred to a KT. <u>with the pages underlined</u>). For a survey of articles published by Boardman & Palmer, with reffs, published up to 1962 see Sinclair Hood, <u>Antiquity</u>, 36, (1962), 38-40.

First, a philological consideration that the language of the Knossos bablets is later than the Pylos tablets (1200 according to Blegen) has led Palmer to date the tablets at Knossos to c.1150.¹ Second, "there are no such objects as LM 11 tablets" (MM,184,199etc.). According to this dictum tablets are only dateable by their ceramic context,² and that is where the 40 double amphorae come in. Thirdly, there was a fire in 1150 (as well as 1400) as is proved by charred wheat in the Lapidary's Work.shop (KT.205-6). Finally, it is thought possible to link up the tablets to such an extent that they must have formed a 'Unity of Archives'. This fact, taken with the internal evidence of the tablets showing awareness of impending danger (MM.132f), indicates that they were all written in the months or weeks before the disaster of 1150 and also counters any attempt "to differentiate chronologically, as Evans did, between the different deposits of tablets" (KT.171).³

Evidence for our Problem.

Almost every part of the Palace has been subjected to the following scruting: at which level were various sherds or tablets found? What were the ceramic surroundings? How did the tablets and sherds come to be found together?

I wish to turn attention to the 40 double amphorae found together with the 'Great Deposit' of tablets in the Northern Entrance Passage. A decisive answer to various problems here could be decivive in deciding 250 years of Minoan history.

Stratigraphy, pottery, tablets, the question of reoccupation, and evidence for fire is all brought up for scrutiny in the Northern Entrance Passage. The tablets found are not themselves dateable, but their seals of course are: they have been dated, by the study of glyptic comparisons, to LM 111A or even LM 11 by Mr. V.E.G.Kenna (KT. Appendix B, <u>96-100</u>); and if this hazardous dating of the seals is correct4 the ground is entirely removed from under Palmer's feet, since Palmer's thesis rests on the premise that the tablets were all written in the weeks or months before 1150, which means LM 111B. The pottery found in context is also dateable. Palmer and Boardman are agreed that the amphorae are LM 111B.

- 1. Boardman points out (<u>Antiquity</u>, 38(1964),46) that a serious philological difficulty raised in <u>Antiquity</u>, 36(1962),64-7, goes unanswered.
- 2. No tablets have been found with LM 11 pots (KT.204,209). This has been denied as a point of fact (KT.<u>161</u>).
- 3. Palmer adds "with the exception of a few fragments" (KT.171). That even one should be earlier than the 'final destruction' destroys at a blow the arguments about the Unity of Archives (Boardman in <u>Antiquity</u>, 38 (1964),46).
- 4. cf <u>Antiquity</u> (35(1961), 310 for an objection to dating, and <u>Antiquity</u> 36(1962), 39 for a defence. Palmer claims (<u>Antiquity</u>, 38(1964, 49) that Kenna originally dated some comparable seals found in the "Lapidary's workshop" as LM 111B, and subsequently (<u>The Date of the Knossos Tablets</u>, 20) has retracted. The inaccessibility to me of <u>Cretan Seals</u> (Oxford, 1960) has prevented me from checking this point, which is now interesting rather than essential, in time for publication.

The tablets found are themselves a testimony to a fire to which they owe their survival, yet the amphorae appear to show no signs of fire. One very important stratigraphical detain remains to be added. The amphorae and tablets were found ABOVE a LM 111 floor,¹ These are the facts. We give two solutions: the interpretations of Professor Palmer and Professor Boardman.

Palmer's argument is as follows. According to Evans some imperfectly: baked tablets survived. If these are dated IM 11, how, asks Palmer, could these survive the 250 years of Reoccupation? It is simpler to assign them to the end of LM 111. (MM p.185) Note that Palmer's statement carries the implication that the destruction in LM 111B was by fire. How does a complete absence of fire marks on the 40 amphorae fit the theory? Palmer says three things here. First, note that already we have come across imperfectly baked tablets; that they could escape the fire is evidence that the amphorae could also (on the grounds that fires are rarely 100% destructive). Second, pottery which is already fired does not always show effects from exposure to fire, as the pots at Pylos prove where the conflagration was intense. Finally the amphorae may have had traces of smoke removed if they were cleaned in acid baths. There is then no objection to the fire theory in 1.150 (KT 206-7), and charred wheat and beans in the Lapidary Workshop are evidence of a IM 111B fire. The above evidence, when fitted to the fact that amphorae and tablets were found ABOVE the LM 111 floor, can only mean that in 1150 there was a fire and tablets on the upper floor fell onto the LM 111B amphorae below, which were themselves lying on a LM 111 floor. (KT 206,208). Evans himself frequently suggested that tablets were stored in upper rooms of the palace and had been precipitated at the time of fire into the basements where they were often found. This is what Evans said happened in 1400. But just this is why Palmer disagrees. How could LM 11 tablets fall onto LM 111 pottery on a IM 111 floor? The tablets must be contemporary or later than the amphorae, the date 1150 also.

Boardman declines the view that the tablets precipitated onto the amphorae, for they would then surely have broken. He also denies any evidence for a fire in 1150 in the Palace itself. (Antiquity 1961,p.234: KT. <u>58,72</u> etc.) and says the charred beans and wheat in the Lapidary's Workshop were bound BELOW the LM 111B pottery floor (KT. 20). He suggests that the history of the vases and tablets must have been very different. The onus is upon him to explain how it came about that, if the tablets are LM 11 and the amphorae are LM 111 and the tablets survived the 250 of the reoccupation period to be found with the later pottery (in other words he must explain the "physical history" of these friable tablets, some of them only partly baked), and why no LM 11 pots were found there.

 See Palmer, KT. 215, Fig.4. Evans mentions the find in <u>P.M.</u>iii, 171 and fig.114 and sites the tablets above the LM 111 floor. (N.B, Evans, <u>loc.cit</u>., styles the amphorae as LM 111A though in <u>P.M.</u>iv, 736 he mentions the pottery of the Stirrup Jars which include two similar amphorae as LM 111B - their true date as all agree). Boardman's solution is that the tablets suffered fire (IM 11) before the Reoccupiers came in and placed their amphorae on them in IM 111. He maintains that the Reoccupiers swept up the tablets which were lying around (hence the fact that the 'Great Deposit' do not in fact form a unity of archives themselves but a mixture) and IM 111B pots were subsequently placed thereon, and survived whole (KT49). The fact remains that both vases and tablets are ABOVE the IM 111 floor. And Boardman's solution would lead us to expect tablets IN the LM 111 floor, which we do not find.

A Possible Solution.

A solution may be sought along lines suggested for other parts of the Palace, in the light of a fresh study of the pottery. Mr.M.R.Popham (Antiquity, 1966, 24-8) from a study of eight pots identifies certain sherds as LM 111A, 1 and LM 11A,2 and believes that both styles made their appearance before the fall of Knossos which traditionally marks the end of IM 11. He finds that Mackenzie and his successor Pendlebury¹ also dated some LM 111 pottery to a period before the destruction of 1400. A comparative study reveals that pottery of the LM 111A,2 style occurs at the outside 50 years or more likely 25 years after the traditional 1400 date, and if Popham's view is correct that these styles preceed the "IM 11" destruction there is nothing less to be ione than date the fall of the Palace, traditionally dated 1400, 25 or possibly 50 years later, and to think of it as marking not the end of LM 11 but the end of LM 111A,1-2. It may be helpful to recall that while LM 11 is only a period of 50 or so years (see p.43 n.l above), LM 111 is some 200-300 years, and that LM 111A,2 is much closer to LM 11 than to LM 111B. The suggestion that the LM 11 destruction may have occurred after the appearance of LM 1114,1 ceramics, had already been suggested by Furumark2, and the suggestion that the LM 11 destruction may be later than the traditional date has been suggested by Schachermeyr. Popham of course still retains the LM 111B dating for the double amphorae (KT.Appendix Λ , 94), so there can be no pushing of these into the IM 11/ 1114 destruction-period - as yet.3

One line of investigations is not called for. Since the amphorae and tablets were found ABOVE a LM 111 floor (as mentioned above) we must now pose the question, "what period of LM 111?"⁴ If the floor is IM 111A, then the view that the tablets are LM 11 (LM 111A, 2 as we now see) may still be tenable.

We may expect to hear more of these amphorae and this LM 111 floor in the future.

- 1. Mackenzie, <u>Pottery Note Books</u>, vol.11.39 where "late Palace style" seems to refer to the LM 111A,1 style; cf. Popham in KT. <u>93 n.5</u>, cf Pendlebury, <u>Dating of Pottery in the Stratigraphical Museum at Knossos</u> i-iii; and KT.<u>3n.2</u>.
- 2. A.Furumark, <u>op.cit</u>.254, with refs. to his own <u>Chronology</u>,83f,110f and <u>Analysis,169</u>.
- 3. Presumably Evans made a slip in styling them as LMIILA(seep.47n.labove)!
- 4. The problem is by no means simple, since in the 1923 results Mackenzie attributed not fewer than three successive floor levels to the LMIII period (KT.207)!

Raymond J. Clark

The Joint Association of Classical Teachers

I would like to draw the attention of all students who are considering teaching as a career to the very considerable advantages of joining the Joint Association of Olassical Teachers. Here are some details of this excellent society; further information from the Secretary, 31-34 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1.

F.D.H.

Aims

The Joint Association of Classical Teachers was founded during 1962 in the belief that classical studies have something of irreplaceable value to contribute to education, and that their future depends on the quality of the teaching and on the ability of those responsible for it to reinterpret the traditional discipline in terms appropriate to the present day. By increased cooperation, by active reconsideration of methods and by the pooling of resources, teachers of classics, at whatever level, can strengthen their own position and state the claims of their subject with more effect, as the teachers of some other subjects have already successfully done. To this end, the Classical Association, the Association for the Reform of Latin Teaching and the Orbilian Society have cooperated in the establishment of JACT and are actively concerned with it. From its official initiation in January 1963, JACT has rapidly gained a membership representative of classical teachers of all levels and of all schools of thought, and from a number of countries in all the continents of the world. To earry out its proposed activities still more fully, it needs the largest and most representative membership possible, and therefore appeals to all practising teachers of classics to join.

Activities

- 1. The production of a Journal, Didaskalos, which since 1963 has appeared annually, in the summer term.
- The provision of a service and information bureau, supported by a panel 2. of scholars. This Bureau
- issues each term a bulletin of current information, with notices of A forthcoming events, new books and material of interest to teachers of classics;
- is building up bibliographies and classified lists of teaching aids, В with a view to helping teachers and librarians;
- sponsors recording of Greek and Latin readings, with a view to strength-C ening the oral side of teaching and learing, and to helping to overcome problems of pronunciation and verse-reading;
- answers queries from members on matters of scholarly or professional D interest; the volume of this correspondence is considerable;
- maintains contact with countries overseas, so that experiences, exper-Ε iments and materials may be shared more widely;
- commissions and publishes short pamphlets on subject of interest to F sixth-form teachers and others;
- collects and supplies information about tours to classical sites and G places of historic and artistic interest, and in due course will consider supporting or organising such visits.

- 3. The promotion and coordination of local activities courses, discussions, reading- parties - with the constituent societies and in other ways.
- 4. The appointment of standing committees for particular pupposes, and of study-groups to conduct <u>ad hoc</u> inquiries: reports of their findings are made available to members.

<u>Officers</u>

President (1965-67)	Professor T.B.L. Webster, University College London
Chairman of Committee	J.C. Dancy, Master of Marlborough College
Hon. Treasurer	B.M. Forrest, Headmaster, Southgate Grammar School, Sussex Way, Cockfosters, Herts.
Hon. Secretary-General	C.W. Baty, JACT, Institute of Classical Studies, 31-34, Gordon Square, London W.C.1.

Subscriptions to J.A.C.T.

- 1. The Annual Subscription to J.A.C.T. will be £2 2 0, payable on January 1st of each year. A subscription paid between January 1st and September 30th will last until the end of the current year. A subscription paid between October 1st and December 31st will last until the end of the subsequent year.
- 2. This £2 2 O subscription will entitle a Member of J.A.C.T. to all the privileges of membership of the C.A. and A.R.L.T., and to full member. ship, subject to confirmation by the relevant Association. Centaur Books, on hehalf of the Orgilian Society, has agreed to supply to each Member a free copy of each issue of the Orbilian Society's <u>Bulletim</u>.
- 3. Those joining J.A.C.T. who are already Members of C.A. &/or A.R.L.T. can, if they wish, continue to pay their annual subscriptions direct to these Associations. They should, then, deduct 5/- (C.A. Members) or 7/6 (A.R.L.T. Members) or 12/6 (those who are Members of both C.A. and A.R.L.T.) from the £2 2 0 sent to the Hon. Treasurer of J.A.C.T.
- 4. In order that Members of J.A.C.T. who are or become members of a C.A. <u>local branch</u> shall hot have to pay a branch subscription an arrangement has been made whereby the Treasurer of any <u>local branch</u> of the C.A. may claim the local branch subscription for every Member of J.A.C.T. who is, or becomes, a member of his branch.
- 5. Members who are assessable to Income Tax under Schedule E in respect of the emoluments of an office or employment, are entitled to claim Income Tax relief on their subscriptions to J.A.C.T. Instructions about claiming this relief will be sent to all who join the Association.

803

STUDENTS CAN AT THE END OF THEIR TRAINING YEAR JOIN J.A.C.T. FOR FOUR SCHOOL TERMS AT A REDUCED SUBSCIRPTION OF £1 1 O. This membership will not, however, entitle them to receive a copy of C.A.'s <u>Proceedings</u> or of A.R.L.T.'s <u>Latin Teaching</u> in their first term of membership.

