

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## Archaeology

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 05 / June 1899, pp 276 - 282  
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00078689, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00078689](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00078689)

### How to cite this article:

(1899). Archaeology. The Classical Review, 13, pp 276-282 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00078689

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

## ARCHAEOLOGY.

FOUGÈRES' *MANTINÉE ET L'ARCADIE ORIENTALE*.

*Mantinée et l'Arcadie Orientale*, par GUSTAVE FOUGÈRES, ancien membre de l'École Française d'Athènes, chargé du cours d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art à l'Université de Lille. Paris, Fontemoing, 1898. 8vo, pp. xvi, and 623, with 10 plates. 20 fr.

IN the centre of the northern half of the eastern (and higher) Arcadian plain, more than 2,000 feet above the sea, is the site of the ancient Mantinea, the scene of excavations conducted by MM. Fougères and Bérard on behalf of the French School at Athens in 1887-9. Some chapters of this monograph are based directly upon those excavations, while the remainder contain a *résumé* of the history, constitution and customs of Mantinea itself, and the topography of the immediately surrounding country. It is rare that such elaborate study has been devoted to a town and territory of dimensions so modest; but even second-rate Greek states possess an individuality and a separate history of their own, and Mantinea is one of the most interesting of all second-rate Greek states. Partly from her strong democratic tendencies, and partly from her neighbourly quarrels with Tegea on such matters as the control of the water-system of the plain, she was generally anti-Spartan; Tegea, unable (as Fougères puts it) to exist with an enemy on either hand, was commonly on the Spartan side. But political combinations in the Peloponnese shift like the figures in a kaleidoscope; and Fougères, who has a natural partiality for Mantinea as the principal scene of his own labours, claims for her, not without some justice, that she was, in all her vicissitudes, on the side of liberty as against the successive attempts at domination of the Peloponnese made by Sparta, Thebes, Macedon, Sparta again (Agis and Cleomenes), and the Achaean league; while she had, for herself, neither the will nor the power to dominate at any time.

It will only be possible in this short notice to touch on a few details of so extensive a treatise; so it may be well to begin by saying that M. Fougères' work appears to us to have been very well done, combining a considerable amount of research

with the lucidity and order which generally mark French scholarship. The chapter most open to criticism is perhaps that dealing with Mantinean cults, where the writer has fallen into the common error of attempting to explain everything, where much is necessarily fortuitous. An example of this will be found in the paragraphs on the relations of Maira (representing the solar principle), to Poseidon and Demeter, and their respective spheres of influence in the Mantinean plain (pp. 251-3).

Of the historical part of the work (Book III.), perhaps chaps. vii. and viii. are the most interesting. They cover the period from B.C. 387 (Peace of Antalcidas) to 362 (Battle of Mantinea). The former chapter recounts the razing of the city by the Spartan Agesipolis, the exile of the democratic party, and the enforced 'dioecism' (*i.e.* dissipation of the inhabitants into a number of separate villages); and the latter includes the rebuilding of Mantinea, with its modern and elaborate fortification-wall (still in great part extant), and the Arcadian revival under Theban influence. Among Mantinean institutions (Book II, chap. vii) the most characteristic are the systematic cultivation of music and dancing, for which the town was famous, and the custom of *ὄπλομαχίαι* and *μονομαχίαι*. Fougères' theory that the latter, invented by the legislator Demonax in the 6th century B.C., were intended as a mitigation of a pre-existing system of vendetta, can hardly be correct. The organised duel would be as repugnant to Greek ideas in historical times as the gladiatorial combat, which Fougères rightly discards. The term *μονομαχία* clearly denotes, like *ὄπλομαχία*, a military exercise, though apparently a dangerous one—see Herod. vi. 92, 'μονομαχίην ἐπασκέων τρεῖς μὲν ἄνδρας τρόπῳ τοιοῦτῳ κτείνει.' Other references will be found in Daremberg and Saglio, *s.v.* "Hoplomachia."

We must not linger long over the archaeology (in the narrower sense), which occupies Book II, chap. iv and Appendix II. By far the most important work of art discovered in the course of excavation is the series of bas-reliefs (Apollo, Marsyas, and the Muses), which adorned the base of Praxiteles' temple group of Leto and her children. The contemporaneity of these reliefs with the group itself is now very generally admitted. It is curious that Fougères,

while comparing them with the mourners ('Pleureuses') on one of the Sidon sarcophagi (date probably about 370 B.C.), omits all reference to the 'Pyrricist' base in the Acropolis Museum at Athens. The bas-reliefs on this base contain two figures almost identical, in posture and drapery, with two of the Mantinean Muses; and the date is fixed, by the archon's name, to either 366 or 323 B.C. (see Beulé, *Acropole d'Athènes*, vol. ii. pl. 4 and 5, and *C.I.A. II.* 1286). As regards the arrangement of the Mantinean plaques, the author holds to his original theory (*Bull. de Corr. Hell.*, 1888, p. 106) that the base was a square one, with one plaque on the front, one on each of the sides, and possibly a fourth (no longer extant) at the back. His reasons for discarding Dr. Waldstein's proposed arrangement (*Americ. Journ. Arch.*, vol. vii. pl. 1)—a continuous frieze of four plaques decorating the front only, the ends and back being plain—are based partly on the probable dimensions of the group and partly on aesthetic grounds. Dr. Waldstein's arrangement also necessitates the change of reading in Paus. viii. 9, 1 from *Μούσα* to *Μούσαι*, a change which seems to us (though not, apparently, to Fougères—see pp. 544–5) to be unjustifiable. It is very unlikely that, if *Μούσαι* had been written, it would have been changed to *Μούσα*, since the Muses are nearly always spoken of collectively, and the plural would therefore have been more familiar to the transcriber than the singular. But it is still possible that a minute examination of the plaques in every detail may decide the much-debated question of arrangement on material rather than on aesthetic or textual grounds.

On topographical questions M. Fougères generally exercises a sound judgment. In his identification of the two roads from Mantinea to Orchomenus M. Fougères (pp. 121–3) defends the generally-accepted theory, as against the contention of the present writer (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. xv., pp. 84–5) in favour of the earlier view taken by Col. Leake. He explains the inversion of Pausanias' order of description (E., S., W., N.) by reference to the Temple of Artemis Hymnia, which lay on the westernmost route and was common to the Mantineans and Orchomenians, thus forming a natural transition from the account of Mantinea to that of Orchomenus. The question must still be regarded as an open one. In the case of the so-called 'Πρόλις,' i.e. the site of the original Mantinea, abandoned in historical times,

Fougères and the present writer are at one. The hill of Gourtzoúli, conspicuous from the later site, is not Πρόλις but the 'Tomb of Penelope,' Πρόλις being represented by a lower hill about a mile further north. The expression *πεδίον οὐ μέγα καὶ ὄρος ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ* (Paus. viii. 12. 7)—or even the proposed emendation of it, *πεδίον καὶ ὄρος οὐ μέγα ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ*—is otherwise unintelligible (*J.H.S.* vol. xv. p. 84).

The great battle of 362 B.C., always known as the battle 'of Mantinea,' is rightly described as taking place just over the border, in Tegean territory, though nearer in point of distance to Mantinea than to Tegea, and fought as an attack on, and in defence of, the former town (cf. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. xv. p. 87). And the correct explanation is given of the name Σκοπή, which is not really derived from, but rather gave rise to, the legend that Epaminondas, when wounded, was carried to this point of vantage to witness the termination of the battle. Remains of a fourth century watch-tower have, in fact, been found on a spur of Μύτικα, about 400 feet above the plain, commanding a fine view of the territories both of Mantinea and of Tegea.

Fougères definitely, and very wisely, abandons the tradition supported even by his colleague Bérard (*Bull. de Corr. Hell.* vol. xvi. p. 534) that the river now known as Sarandapotamós, which at the present day turns eastward after entering the Tegean plain, and disappears down the Katavóthra of Vérzova, formerly flowed westward to that of Táka (whose waters, according to the erroneous theory of Pausanias, reappeared at the springs of Frankóvrysi, and ultimately found their way to the Alpheus). This tradition is clearly disproved by a careful study of the levels and of other natural features of the ground. Our author's counter-theory that, by the excavation of a short and shallow canal to the eastward of Tegea, the river was at times, and for hostile purposes, diverted into the bed of the stream which flows northward towards Mantinea (see Plate IX.), and that the name Λαχῆς (Herodian, *Fragm.* iii. 26) belongs to this partly artificial stream, is plausible, and even probable, but necessarily incapable of proof.

The map of the Tegean plain, and that of the Mantinean territory and surrounding country, (Plates IX. and X.), well illustrate the topographical portions of the book. In the former, which is specially designed to show the levels of the ground, with reference

to the course of the Sarandapotamós, the current error is repeated of identifying the 'Χῶμα,' (Paus. viii. 44-5) which marked the boundary of the Megalopolitan territory as against the Tegean and Pallantian, with the causeway which still exists near the village of Birbáti; an error which has been corrected in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. xv. pp. 34, 35 (cf. Frazer's *Pausanias*, vol. iv. p. 419). The latter—a more general map, but on a smaller scale—is well designed and executed; but the modern parts of it are not quite up to date. For example, of six carriage roads radiating from Tripolitsá, only two are marked; and the new road from the Khan of Plátsas to Kapsiá is omitted, while the old track (not a carriage road) to the same place from the point of Mýtika is shown. The ancient boundaries of the Mantinean territory are very rightly inserted, though necessarily conjectural in part.

We take leave of this conscientious and exhaustive monograph with a hope that, what M. Fougères has done for Mantinea, other scholars may by and by undertake in connection with other Greek cities and territories. Such studies, involving much labour in the library, are a fitting sequel to the more romantic task of excavation and exploration in Greece itself.

W. LOBING.

#### FURTWÄNGLER'S ARCHAEOLOGICAL PAPERS 1898—1899.

- I. *Neue Denkmäler Antiker Kunst*: von A. FURTWÄNGLER, aus den Sitzungsberichten der philos.-philol. und der histor. Classe der K. bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. 1897. Bd. II. Heft I. 6 m.
- II. *Zu den Tempeln der Akropolis von Athen*, von ADOLF FURTWÄNGLER: aus den Sitzungsberichten, etc. 1898. Heft III.
- III. *Griechische Original-Statuen in Venedig*, von ADOLF FURTWÄNGLER (mit 7 Tafeln und mehreren Textbildern): aus den Abhandlungen der K. bayer. Akademie Munich 1898. 5 m.
- IV. *Neuere Fälschungen von Antiken*: von ADOLF FURTWÄNGLER (Giesecke und Devrient, Berlin und Leipzig, 1899). First read as a paper before the Bavarian Academy, November, 1898. 5 m.
- V. *Ueber Kunstsammlungen in alter und neuer Zeit*: Festrede gehalten in der öffentlichen Sitzung der K. bayer. Akademie am 11. März 1899 von ADOLF FURTWÄNGLER. 1 m.

ACADEMIES may be reckoned among the best abused of institutions. We are all familiar, mostly on the authority of those outside them, with what they have ignored, suppressed, or omitted; and there are obviously many reasons why it might be difficult at the present day to defend institutions which by their nature must be exclusive, aristocratic, and, as a general rule, unpractical. But so long as there are any regions left unsubdued to the common sense of the average man, academies will find room to flourish. They serve to employ and to dignify activities which might otherwise fail to find an outlet in commoner channels. At least will it be instructive to note the results achieved in some fifteen months in one department of the Bavarian Academy by a single savant.

I. The first monograph, quoted above, makes known, with the help of twelve well-executed plates, some unpublished objects, of which the most interesting are a bronze head from Sparta and of Spartan workmanship (Museum of Boston) of the period about 460 B.C., an archaic statuette of a youth of the type of 'Apollo,' from Olympia, now in the rich collection of Mr. E. P. Warren at Lewes. The text to three further bronze statuettes of youths, which served as supports for mirrors, constitutes an elaborate disquisition on this class of figures. An analogous female figure of great beauty, from the early years of the fifth century, now in the collection of Mr. Charles Loeser at Florence, is known to the present writer.

II. In the second monograph Professor Furtwängler brings fresh detailed argument to show, versus Professor Dörpfeld, why the 'old temple' discovered on the Akropolis by Dörpfeld and the Greek excavators in 1885 cannot possibly have been left standing after the building of the Erechtheion. We note that Furtwängler has again abandoned a view he passingly adopted in the English edition of the *Masterpieces* (p. 425), that the *opisthodomos* of the inscription (*C.I.A.* i. 32) was a separate building. He now reverts to his former opinion that it was simply the large back chamber of the Parthenon. In a second article he reverts by way of answering the objections raised to it, to the restoration he proposed in his *Intermezzi*<sup>1</sup> for the eastern pediment of the Parthenon, maintaining that the Athena Medici is the lost central Athena, a view to which the present writer strongly inclines,

<sup>1</sup> See *Class. Rev.* 1896, p. 444 ff.

since seeing the cast of the Medici torso, placed in the new museum of casts at the Louvre, in that relation to the Parthenon sculptures which Furtwängler claims for it.

A third article discusses afresh the date of the little temple of Athena Nike: Furtwängler combats the view of Kavvadias that the now famous inscription of the years 460-450 B.C., discovered in 1897, refers to the building of the temple we know. According to Furtwängler, who, relying on the character of its sculptures, still maintains that the temple is contemporary with the Propylaea (*i.e.* first period of the Peloponnesian war), the inscription must refer to a plan projected but never put into execution.

III. In hunting through the Italian museums in search of Roman copies after Greek statues, Professor Furtwängler has had the signal good luck to find not a few Greek originals which had passed unheeded at least by the public. In the monograph before us we have a first instalment of such originals, from the Venetian *Museo Archeologico*, which has lately been rearranged by Dr. Mariani. These statues, which are well reproduced, are purely Attic works of the fifth century, not perhaps of the highest order of merit as works of art, but pleasantly reflecting the excellencies of their period. Curiously enough they nearly all represent Kora and Demeter, so that Furtwängler conjectures that they probably came as a group from the same 'find spot,' *i.e.* from some shrine of these goddesses. The beautiful figure on Plate I. is very close indeed to Parthenon work. Owing to this fact as well as to its excellent preservation (the head is original) it should, together with one of its companions, a lovely Demeter with veil and kalathos, soon find its way into our handbooks of Greek art. Our author himself rises to great enthusiasm in describing these figures, wisely forgetting for the moment his own dictum in the preface to the *Meisterwerke* that, where the great originals are lost, copies after these are better worth one's study than originals by minor masters. Historically perhaps, yes,—but aesthetically, no. Besides this charming group of figures we get a new type of Athena of the Pheidian period also in the Doge's palace, and a very pretty early Praxitelean Artemis with her dog, now in the Museo Civico Correr. In a note Furtwängler states that he has examined the glorious relief of Herakles (*not* Theseus) in the Doge's palace, probably the only antique in Venice which is familiar to the layman,

and has ascertained that the realistic details of trees and architecture which clash with the Pheidian character of the personages are due to a working up in the Renaissance.

IV. This book is the expansion of a paper read before the Academy on November 8th of last year; a notice of Professor Furtwängler's attack on the forged head acquired by the Museum of Berlin appeared, I believe, in the *Times* of Nov. 18th, 1898. As the Berlin management have since then acknowledged the head to be modern and withdrawn it from exhibition, it would be ungracious to dwell further upon their error. The book contains, however, a number of important criteria for the detection of forgeries. These criteria Furtwängler applies to various examples, chief among which are a clumsy copy of a head of the Aeginetan Athena that haunts the Roman market, the Hera of Girgenti in the British Museum and kindred heads with their long noses and weak chins, and a *Doryphoros* recently acquired for *Ny Carlsberg*. This collection, indeed, while owning so much that is precious and beautiful, contains, alas, too many examples also of the forger's art. A valuable section deals with forged Roman portraits, and to many it will come as a blow to learn that the popular bust of Caesar in the British Museum (Bernoulli i. Pl. 15) is nothing but a modern forgery.

If forgeries too often pass as antiques, it also sometimes happens that a genuine work which does not fall into any known class has been too readily labelled as a forgery. So Professor Furtwängler claims as genuine a beautiful bronze female head with turreted crown in the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, to which he at last gives the publicity it deserves. It had lately been suspected by several French savants, who were misled no doubt by the unusual shape of the turreted crown; I had already ventured in the pages of this review,<sup>1</sup> in a notice of M. Reinach's *Bronzes de la Gaule Romaine*, to assert the genuineness of this bronze, though the date there put forward would, according to Furtwängler who considers the head Augustan, be too early. In dealing with the forgeries of vases and of terra cottas we note that Furtwängler maintains that a vase in the Louvre moulded in the form of two heads back to back is a forgery.<sup>2</sup> M. S. Reinach on the other hand in his review of

<sup>1</sup> *Class. Rev.*, 1894, p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> He already put forth this view in *Cosmopolis*, 1896, p. 579.

the 'Fälschungen'<sup>1</sup> inclines to defend the authenticity of the vase. I can only say that on careful examination of the vase the breakages certainly seemed to me singularly suspicious, nor is M. Reinach's argument derived from the Hermes of Olympia convincing; the whole head of the Hermes was intact, having lain in a bed of soft earth, while in the Louvre vase what is suspicious is that the actual features are untouched while all the surrounding parts of the heads have been violently broken. Forged bronzes and gems are also discussed at length. Perhaps the only flaw in this illuminating book is the ironical tone adopted towards the Museum of Berlin, who certainly are not as fortunate in their acquisitions as when Furtwängler was the honoured head of the *Antiquarium*. One could wish also that Furtwängler had allowed to drop, as finally settled, the question of the *tiara of Saitaphernes*. I fancy that, even in France, to attack the tiara will soon be looked upon as flogging a dead horse.

V. If the Munich professor can thus, while preparing his huge *Corpus* of gems, find time to pour out monograph upon monograph dealing with special theories arising from more or less isolated facts, the last paper before us shows him to be equally alert in the realm of general ideas. His paper, which is this spring's annual address at the open or public meeting of the Academy, deserves to be translated and freely circulated; it is not only a learned disquisition on the contents of the temples, the Pinakotheks and treasure-houses of antiquity or an historical essay on the formation of our modern museums; it sketches their possibilities of development into a future which we hope may not be too distant, though to some it will doubtless appear Utopian. The architectural character of the Museum (Furtwängler advocates a simple almost neutral environment for works of art that these may work their full and undisturbed effect upon us), its arrangement, its organisation—larger staffs, whose members shall expound the works of art to the public—its aim, and above all the spirit of science that should reign there are all dwelt upon. So far as architectural reform is concerned, we shall not altogether wish it to be retrospective. No one who in the Louvre has strained his eyes in studying the ill-lit collection of vases, or tried to appreciate correctly, in spite of the cross lights, the modelling of a statue, will wish for

museums built as palaces. We may also regret with Furtwängler the step taken by Vienna, where the palatial plan of the New Museum, with its gorgeous decorations, reduces the works of art exhibited to mere insignificant detail; where, as our author puts it, 'the loud tones of a powerful orchestra drown the silent music of the works of art themselves, which reaches us at the most only as a plaintive melody.' Still, although many old collections need wise rearrangement, one cannot deprecate too strongly moving them altogether from their time-hallowed seats. Those will appreciate my meaning who, at Florence, miss the *Idolino* in the Uffizi, where harmonious surrounding only enhanced the loveliness of the bronze youth. Now we have to look for him in a sort of dismal one-windowed closet in the new *Museo Archeologico*, whither, if report says true, more of the Uffizi statues are to be ultimately transferred. There is some danger, I have often thought, lest the desire for scientific museums *versus* the picturesque grouping of antiques put in fashion at the Renaissance, become a dangerous weapon in the hands of ignorant and inartistic curators anxious only to enrich some petty museum they govern at the expense of older and wealthier collections. Professor Furtwängler himself shows that the scientific method is not altogether admirable when it results in giving equal relief to the good and to the insignificant relics of the same epoch; such an arrangement is mostly the cause of the *ennui* so often felt by the general public when they visit museums. Rather, if we understand him rightly, should each period have its 'Salon Carré' or its 'Tribuna' where its best achievements will be grouped together.

Museums in our modern sense of the word were practically unknown to antiquity. The temples of Greece had only accidentally assumed that character, owing to their crowd of votive offerings which were so many precious works of art. Again, when these had made their way to Rome as spoils of war to adorn the public temples and the private villas of the conquerors, the formation and arrangement of galleries were governed by the accidents of conquest rather than by public spirit or scientific intention. True, the great Agrippa had 'urged that all pictures and statues should be made public property,' and Asinius Pollio had thrown open his own galleries to the people; *spectari sua monumenta voluit*, but these attempts were isolated and therefore abortive.

The idea of a public Museum for the en-

<sup>1</sup> *Revue Critique*, 1899, p. 246.

joyment and instruction of the people as opposed to the private gallery intended primarily for the pleasure of its owner was reserved for our century and, as Furtwängler points out, is of Napoleonic origin. It was the genius of Napoleon which planned and realized for the first time in the Louvre, as our own Hazlitt saw it in the year 1806,<sup>1</sup> a representative collection of the best art of the world, entrusted indeed to the nation then most powerful to protect it, but generously thrown open to the whole of civilized humanity. The events of 1815 caused the re-dispersion of the Napoleonic Louvre, but the idea fructified, and to it we owe the great representative collections which soon adorned every great capital, and which were thrown open without restraint to the public of all nations. In reviewing the history and the development of these various museums, the German savant pays a high and well-merited tribute to the British Museum, which, as he quotes from the words of the foundation, was established from the beginning 'for the general use and benefit of the public,' and he continues: 'a collection thus supported by the scientific spirit could contain within itself the beautiful or even the most beautiful—and the good fortune which accompanied this foundation, soon brought to it in the sculptures from the Parthenon, the greatest marvel of pure beauty which antiquity has left us—but it could also afford to receive what was outwardly insignificant and mutilated, though to the eye of the scholar priceless; nor did it need to rest content with showy and decorative objects worked up or restored in modern times. The British Museum was a free state—for a long time the only one—for original works of art from Greece and the East which were left unrestored and untouched by any modern hand. Here were soon gathered together all the most significant works, which have enabled us to build up by degrees out of Greek and Oriental originals a history of art such as Winckelmann in Rome scarcely dreamt of.' We cannot pretend to give even a summary of the wealth of ideas and of facts contained in the speech which crowns the year's archaeological contributions of the Bavarian Academy—but we would emphasize the spirit of liberality towards foreign achievements as evidence that the author practises what he preaches for the ideal Museum.

The five papers before us are an example of that breadth of knowledge of all the branches of archaeology, which is the only true or sure foundation for our aesthetic enjoyment of ancient art. In the Essay on Museums, Furtwängler deprecates the silly notion that knowledge can destroy or cramp our feeling for art, and he adds in a passage which students of his subject should ponder, 'only knowledge can lead to real understanding. The feeling for art which is based upon understanding will deepen in proportion as the necessary steps to knowledge are conquered, and our outlook becomes freer. Pure realization of the work of art is the art scholar's most precious reward for his labours.'

EUGÉNIE STRONG (*née* SELLERS).

## MONTHLY RECORD.

### ITALY.

*Rome.* The excavations in the Via Giulia for the recovery of the fragments of the Forma Urbis have come to an end; 451 new pieces have been found, making a total, with those found elsewhere, of 1,034. In the Forum, remains have been found of two earlier temples of Saturn, and of an altar, which preceded them. The first temple was built in 497 B.C., and to this belong the remains of a platform of tufa; the second, by L. Munatius Plancus in 42 B.C., to which belong the travertine platform of the existing one and fragments of the *antae* and architrave of the door. A stone wall at the lowest level may possibly belong to the primitive altar. Six more steps of the front of the temple of Antoninus and Faustina have come to light, showing that the original level of the Via Sacra was about four feet below that of the paved road which dates about A.D. 600.<sup>1</sup>

According to Dionysius of Halicarnassos (i. 87) the site of the grave of Faustus was marked by a stone lion of archaic workmanship near the Rostra, within the Comitium. Varro, on the other hand, mentions two lions guarding the grave of Romulus in the same corner of the Comitium. The pedestal of one of these lions has now been found, and is clearly the work of an Etruscan stone-cutter; the other pedestal is probably to be found on the opposite side of the 'black stones.' It is four feet below what had been supposed to be the level of early Rome, and measures 6 ft. by 3 ft. Near it was found an archaic bronze statuette of an augur carrying a *lituus*, with head bent backwards as if scanning the sky.

The drainage-system of the Via Sacra has been thoroughly explored and cleared. The drains are of three periods: (1) *opus quadratum* covered with flag-stones, of early Roman date; (2) *opus reticulatum* of the Augustan age; (3) *opus latericium* of the Empire. The latter are paved, and covered with stamped *tegulae bipedales*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Louvre*, in *Notes of a Journey through France and Italy*.

<sup>1</sup> *Athenaeum*, 1 April.

<sup>2</sup> *Athenaeum*, 22 April.

## GREECE.

*Epidaurus.* The excavation of the Stadion has thrown much light on the question of the form and arrangement of the older Greek stadion. Firstly, it had not a semi-circular, but a rectangular termination. Secondly, the starting-line and the winning-line were in Greek times marked simply by a line, and not as later by stone paving. The course was marked out by small columns every hundred feet, rendering it possible to shorten it if necessary, e.g. for boys' and girls' races. Thirdly, the places of the competitors at the start were marked out by iron pegs, and not, as in Roman times, by half-columns. Fourthly, light has been thrown on the expression of Pausanias, i, 26, 7, γῆς χῶμα. In his time the Stadion had stone seats, as now existing, but the γῆς χῶμα refers to Stadia which had no stone foundations or walling. It was spoken of as a 'stone' stadium, not because of the stone seats, but because the wooden framework or supports were replaced by stone foundations and supporting side-walls. The I form of the iron clamps on the seat of the Ἀγανόδικαι shows the early date, this form being characteristic of the fifth and fourth centuries, but not of a later period. A base was found inscribed Θρασυμήδης ἐπόλεσε. The total length of the stadium has been shown to be about 197 yards.<sup>3</sup>

## ASIA MINOR.

*Priene.*—A statuette has been discovered which appears to be a portrait of Alexander the Great. It is of rather rough, yet skilful workmanship, and probably dates from the life-time of Alexander, who was a great benefactor to Priene. The marble is that commonly used in works found here. The head is described by Kekulé as having a strongly-modelled lion-like brow, indicating a strong daring will, the eyes imperious in expression, the lips full of disdainful pride.<sup>4</sup>

## AFRICA.

*Carthage.*—Recent excavations have been carried on by Dr. Gankler, on a part near the shore that was

always inhabited. A large shaft was sunk right down to the living rock. The first graves encountered were Byzantine; below these were late Roman buildings, then a Roman house of the time of Constantine containing a marble head of M. Aurelius, and two rectangular rooms with very fine mosaic pavements, meriting a detailed description. The larger measures 12½ ft. by 15½ ft., and represents sea-scapes: about twenty figures boating, fishing, and walking by the sea; Venus adorned with jewellery and holding a mirror, rising out of a large mussel-shell held by two sea-monsters; and on either side, a medallion with the bust of a Triton blowing a conch-shell. The smaller represents mounted hunters with javelins and double-headed axes pursuing lions and panthers. They date from the fourth century after Christ, but are entirely pagan in character. Adjoining these rooms is a large hall with painted stucco decorations and a row of niches, with a partition-wall across it. In the further part were found pottery, Christian lamps with the fish, palm, and cross emblems, and fragments of painted stucco in Pompeian style. Among other finds are: statues of Venus with dolphin, seated Jupiter with eagle, Bacchus giving drink to panther, seated youth in chlamys, and head of Cupid; masks of Seilenos and a goddess; a lion's head water-spout; two terracotta figures of Mithras; part of a statuette with the head of a Carthaginian horse; and a realistic portrait of a woman. In the corner of the hall, fastened to the wall, was a marble plate inscribed IOVI HAMMONI BARBARO SYLVANO, with a dedication by the twelve priests of the god and the *mater sacrorum*; below it was a marble bull's head with crescent and an inscription to Saturn, also twenty *baetyli* of granite and various votive balls of stone and terracotta, such as have been found before in Carthage. Also a marble statue of a veiled goddess, and a group of Ceres, a Canephoros, and a veiled woman. Below all these were Punic tombs of the sixth century B.C. containing gold and bronze objects, scarabs, etc.<sup>5</sup>

H. B. WALTERS.

<sup>3</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 11 March.<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 22 April.<sup>5</sup> *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 29 April.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

*Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum, etc.* Vol. 3. Part 1, 1899.

*Die Geschichtliche Entwicklung der griechischen Taktik*, E. Lammert. As democracies superseded oligarchies, the cavalry—the weapon of the aristocracy—came to be of less importance than infantry. So tactics were nearly confined to hoplites. It was Alexander who brought to perfection the tactics of horse and light-armed troops. *Neuestes aus Oxyrhynchos*, F. Blass. (1) Fragments of Aristoxenus which B. attributes to his *βυθμικά στοιχεία*, (2) some lines of a lyric poem which he conjectures to belong to Alkman, (3) lastly a piece which comes from Sappho or more probably from Erinna. *Griechische und römische Bildnisse*, O. Rossbach. Seeks to show that in two cut stones portraits of Horace and Arisippus are to be recognised. By a comparison with coins the result is that in busts of the so-called Papyrus-villa of Herculaneum the following seven princes

are represented: Ptolemy I. Soter, Ptolemy II. Philadelphus, Ptolemy V. Epiphanes, Antiochus II. Theos, Antiochus IV. Epiphanes, Demetrius I. Soter, Seleucus I. Nikator, and lastly Cassius the murderer of Caesar.

Part 2. *Die Orestessage und die Rechtfertigungs-idee*, Th. Zieliński. The two new truths of the Apollo-religion in the field of morality were (1) the murdered man has his right to be avenged secured to him, and (2) the avenger is justified by the declaration of the Delphian god. The case of Orestes shows the paramount necessity for the avenging of blood, because the slaughter of a mother puts the case at the highest. *Neuere Kommentare zu lateinischen Dichtern*, C. Hosius. As examples of recent philology the following works are criticised: Heinze's *Lucretius*, Book III., Rothstein's *Propertius*, Sudhaus' *Aetna*, Palmer's *Ovid's Heroides* with the Greek translation of Planudes, Vollmer's *Silvae* of Statius, Langen's *Valerius Flaccus*, and Francken's