

STUDIES IN HERODOTUS

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649223831

Studies in Herodotus by A. G. Laird

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

A. G. LAIRD

**STUDIES IN
HERODOTUS**

Yours sincerely
A. G. L.

STUDIES IN

HERODOTUS

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

By A. G. LAIRD

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

MADISON, WISCONSIN

1904

UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA

Gift of author

- I. The Inscription on the Serpent-Column of Delphi, and its Counterpart at Olympia.
- II. Herodotus, and the Greek Forces at Salamis and Plataea.
- III. The Battle of Salamis.

D56
 .52
 H45L35
 1904
 MAIN

THE INSCRIPTION ON THE SERPENT-COLUMN OF
 DELPHI AND ITS COUNTERPART AT OLYMPIA

UNIVERSITY OF
 CALIFORNIA

No satisfactory explanation has yet been given of the order in which the Greek states stand upon the celebrated monument dedicated at Delphi from the spoils of the battle of Plataea.¹ As is well known, the monument consisted of a golden tripod, standing upon a bronze column of three intertwining serpents. The inscription begins upon the thirteenth coil from the base, and the names stand in a single column, three upon each coil, with the exception of the fourth and seventh, upon which there are four, and the third, which has but two. The names of the

¹Roehl, I. G. A., 70; Roberts, Greek Epigraphy, No. 259; Cauer, Delectus,² 12; Dittenberger, S. I. G.,³ 7; Hicks, Greek Histor. Inscr., 12; Fabricius, Jahrb. d. k. d. arch. Inst., I (1886). p. 176.

The inscription, as restored by Fabricius, runs as follows:

Τοῖδε τὸν	Φλειάσιοι	25 Χαλκιδεῖς
πόλεμον ἔ	Τροζάνιοι	
πολέμεον	15 Ἐρμιονεῖς	Στυρῆς
		Φαλείοι
Λακεδαιμόνιοι	Τιρινῆσιοι	Ποσειδαιῶται
5 Ἀθηναῖοι	Πλαταιεῖς	
Κορινθιοὶ	Θεσπιεῖς	Δευκάδιοι
		30 Γαλακτορῆες
Τεγεᾶται	Μυκηνεῖς	Κίθνιοι
Σικιῶνιοι	20 Κεῖοι	Σίφνιοι
Αἰγιναῖται	Μάλιοι	
	Τήνιοι	Ἀμπρακιδῶται
10 Μεγαρεῖς		Λεπριῶται
Ἐπιδαύριοι	Νάξιοι	
Ἐρχομένιοι	Ἐρετριεῖς	

²Hdt. IX. 81.

Tenians and Siphnians, which stand fourth upon the seventh and fourth coils respectively, are very badly written,¹ and it is admitted that they are later insertions.

The difficulties in the arrangement of names may perhaps best be indicated by stating the chief theories that have been advanced in explanation, and the overwhelming objections to them.

1. Frick² says: "In diesem waren deutlich zwei Gruppen der Festlandstaaten und Inselstaaten gesondert, deren jede mit den unbedeutendsten Mächten (Mykenäer—Kythnier, Siphnier) schloss, und denen beiden gleichsam als Anhang die den übrigen gegenüber in einer Ausnahmestellung befindlichen Ambrakioten und Lepreaten angefügt waren." But in Frick's first group of Mainland states we find Aegina, among his Island states the Eleans, Potidaeans, and Anaactorians. Further, there is no good reason for the exceptional position of the Ambraciots and Lepreatæ.

2. Rawlinson³ says: "With regard to the order of the names in the inscription, we may remark, that, while it is to some extent irregular, it is not wholly so. In the earlier part the guiding principle is that of the greater importance, which may be traced as far as the seventh or eighth name ———. After this the prevailing idea is the geographic one. First the Peloponnesian states are given; then those of central Greece; then the eastern islanders; finally the outlying states towards the west. The irregularities are difficult to account for: perhaps they arise chiefly from additions (made at one or other extremity of a line) of states omitted at first. *Μυκωνῆς* at the commencement of line 7, *Πορφυραῖται* at the close of line 10, and *Κίθνοι*, *Σίφνοι*, at the close of line 11, are perhaps such additions." Besides the difficulties admitted by Rawlinson, it may be pointed out that the Eleans and Lepreatæ are Peloponnesian and not "outlying states towards the west" strictly speaking.

¹Fabricius, *l. c.*, p. 133.

²Jahrb. f. kl. Phil., 8 (1862), p. 451.

³History of Herodotus, IV, p. 400.

3. von Domaszewski¹ holds that the three most important states, Lacedæmon, Athens, and Corinth, stand at the head; the rest clearly fall into three groups, the first of which, Tegea to Tiryns, includes the states of the Peloponnesian League, the third group, from Potidæa to Ambracia, contains the Corinthian colonies, and the second group is composed of the states under the leadership of Athens. He holds the Tenians, Siphnians, and Cythnians to be later insertions; the first three names had suggested the apportionment of three to each coil, and the last four (Leucadians, Anactorians, Ambraciots, and Lepreatæ) had been divided, two to a coil. The Lepreatæ, he believes, stand at the end because they did not belong to any of the three groups. This theory is certainly ingenious, but it is not difficult to pick holes in it. Why should the Mycenians and Eleans belong to the Athenian League, or the Thespians for that matter? Fabricius,² too, asserts that there is no reason for assuming the later insertion of the Cythnians, so why should they stand between the Anactorians and the Ambraciots?

It must be admitted that the first seven names, at least, have this position on account of their importance; that from the Epidaurians to the Tirynthians we have an unbroken series of Peloponnesian states, and from the Ceans to the Styrians an unbroken series of Island states. But all attempts at explanation have left us completely in the dark about the following points. (1) Why do the Plateans and Thespians stand between the Tirynthians and Mycenians, two cities so closely connected geographically, and grouped together by Herodotus³ as furnishing at Platea a combined force of 400 hoplites? (2) Why are the Eleans so strangely placed? The suggestion⁴ that they falsified the record by substituting their own name for that of the Pales (who, according to Herodotus, were present

¹Heidelberger Jahrbücher, 1891. p. 181. I cite from Sitzler's summary in Jahresb. f. Altertumswiss. 83. p. 81.

²*Loc. cit.*, p. 183, footnote.

³IX. 28. 16.

⁴Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, IV. p. 256.

at Plataea) is the only one that approaches a solution from the geographical point of view, and even then we can not see why the Potidaeans should come between the Paleans and the Anactorians. (3) Why do the Cythnians (assuming the Siphnians to be a later insertion) separate the Ambraciots from the Anactorians? (4) Why are not the Lepreatæ (as well as the Eleans) placed among the Peloponnesians?

From the spoils of Plataea there was also erected a monument at Olympia, a bronze Zeus¹ of ten cubits, and upon the base of this, too, the Greek states were inscribed. The original of this inscription has not been preserved, but Pausanias² has given us the list of names. The problem of the Delphian inscription is by no means made easier by a comparison with Pausanias' record, for, while the first seventeen names at Olympia are the same as the first at Delphi, with the omission of the Thespians, and in the same order, except that the Tegeans are in the seventh instead of the fourth place, in the remaining portions the two lists are a mass of strange variations and startling correspondences.

Frick³ offered a correction of the text of Pausanias by filling in the four missing names (Thespians, Eretrians, Leucadians

¹Hdt. IX. 81. 6.

²V. 23: Καὶ αὖτις ὡς πρὸς ἄρκτον ἐπιστρέφοντι ἀγαλμὰ ἐστὶ Διός. τοῦτο τέτραπται μὲν πρὸς ἀνίσχοντα ἥλιον, ἀνέθισαν δὲ Ἑλλήνων ὅσοι Πλαταιῶσιν ἐμαχέσαντο ἐναντία Μαρδονίου τε καὶ Μήδων. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἐγγεγραμμένοι κατὰ τοῦ βᾶθρου τὰ δεξιὰ αἱ μετασχοῦσαι πόλεις τοῦ ἔργου, Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν πρῶτοι, μετὰ δὲ αὐτοὺς Ἀθηναῖοι, τρίτοι δὲ γεγραμμένοι καὶ τέταρτοι Κορινθιοὶ τε καὶ Σικυῶνιοι, πέμπτοι δὲ Αἰγινήται, μετὰ δὲ Αἰγινήτας Μεγαρεῖς καὶ Ἐπιδαύριοι, Ἀρκάδων δὲ Τεγεᾶται τε καὶ Ὀρχομένιοι, ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτοῖς ὅσοι Φλοισῦντα καὶ Τροιζήνη καὶ Ἐρμιόνα οἰκοῦσιν, ἐκ δὲ χώρας τῆς Ἀργείας Τυρῖνθιοι, Πλαταιεῖς δὲ μόνου Βοιωτῶν καὶ Ἀργείων οἱ Μυκῆνας ἔχοντες, νησιῶται δὲ Κεῖοι καὶ Μήλιοι, Ἀμβρακιῶται δὲ ἐξ ἡπείρου τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος, Τήνιοι τε καὶ Λεπρεᾶται, Λεπρεᾶται μὲν τῶν ἐκ τῆς Τριφυλίας μόνου, ἐκ δὲ Αἰγῶν καὶ τῶν Κυκλάδων οὐ Τήνιοι μόνου ἀλλὰ καὶ Νάξιοι καὶ Κίθιοι, ἀπὸ δὲ Εὐβοίας Στυρᾶς, μετὰ δὲ τούτους Ἠλείοι καὶ Ποιδαιᾶται καὶ Ἀνακτόριοι, τελευταῖοι δὲ Χαλκιδαῖς οἱ ἐπὶ τῷ Εὐρώπῳ.

³Loc. cit., p. 454.

and Siphnians), and cleverly shifting the order of the words, so as to agree with the Delphian inscription, but, when the order on the preserved inscription itself is so unintelligible, it is dangerous to correct texts to correspond with it. von Domaszewski here offers another ingenious suggestion, viz., that the names on the Olympian monument were arranged in three columns of nine, nine, and ten;¹ that there was not sufficient room in the third column, and so the last two names (the Ambraciots and Lepreatæ) were placed between the second and third columns; and that the name of the Chalcidians, being perhaps not understood at first by the copyist from whom Pausanias' record comes, was, when deciphered, placed at the end. Apart from the very unsatisfactory attempt to explain the position of the Chalcidians, it might be asked why there was not room in the third column for nine names, as well as in the first and second; in that case only the Lepreatæ would be left for insertion between the second and third columns. But, aside from all this, von Domaszewski's explanation of the Olympian inscription only brings us back again to the difficulties in the Delphian.

Is it possible to find any explanation of the order of names in Pausanias' list, treating it by itself, and paying no attention to the actually preserved monument of Delphi? It may be stated as a certainty that, on a base supporting a statue of ten cubits, thirty-one (or twenty-seven) names would not be written in one vertical column. Is it not possible, or rather, is it not probable, that these columns (whether three or more) were arranged with some attention to an intelligible grouping of the states, and not, as in von Domaszewski's suggestion, to be read through the first column, then the second, and so forth, so as to get the same result as in the single column at Delphi? If this latter view were correct, the *Φλαάσιοι*, at the head of the sec-

¹ Sitzler's summary does not state which states these twenty-eight are. If they are the same as D.'s assumed twenty-eight for the original form of the Delphian inscription (*i. e.* omitting the Tenians, Cynhians, and Siphnians), how did two of these get into the Olympian list, and what became of the Thespians, Eretrians, and Leucadians in the copy of Pausanias?